Gender Equality
and Aid Delivery

WHAT HAS CHANGED IN DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION AGENCIES SINCE 1999?

OECD

ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

The OECD is a unique forum where the governments of 30 democracies work together to address the economic, social and environmental challenges of globalisation. The OECD is also at the forefront of efforts to understand and to help government respond to new developments and concerns, such as corporate governance, the information economy and the challenges of an ageing population. The Organisation provides a setting where governments can compare policy experiences, seek answers to common problems, identify good practice and work to co-ordinate domestic and international policies.

The OECD member countries are: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Korea, Luxembourg, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Slovak Republic, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States. The Commission of the European Communities takes part in the work of the OECD.

OECD publishing disseminates widely the results of the Organisation's statistics gathering and research on economic, social and environmental issues, as well as the conventions, guidelines and standards agreed by its members.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Table of contents

Tables

Boxes

ACRONYMS

CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DFID	Department for International Development
GAD	gender and development
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
NGO	non-governmental organisation
PRS	poverty reduction strategy
SWAps	sector-wide approaches
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNIFEM	United Nations Development Fund for Women
WID	women in development

Executive Summary

There have been seismic shifts in the global approaches to development co-operation over the past decade, as the development community has ushered in poverty reduction strategies and sector-wide approaches in the 1990s, the Millennium Development Goals in 2000 and the *Paris Declaration* in 2005. Donors are making commitments to increasing bilateral aid and scaling up for results, enhancing local ownership, and improving aid effectiveness through harmonisation and alignment.

In 1999, a DAC study recommended that development co-operation agencies step up their efforts to promote gender equality and empower women. Agencies were called upon to hire more gender specialists, deploy more of them in the field, regularly monitor progress and use it as a management tool, and set aside specific budgets.

In early 2006, the OECD Development Assistance Committee's Network on Gender Equality set out to document institutional practices and structural arrangements that promote gender equality in development co-operation and empower women in development assistance activities. The research team examined how those practices and arrangements have evolved since 1999.

They found that bridging the gap between policy and implementation continues to be an uphill climb. Despite progress, no agency fully matches its own political rhetoric and objectives on gender equality with the required human and financial resources or accountability measures to ensure progress towards gender equality and women's empowerment.

Almost all DAC members have gender equality policies, but only a handful have the staff, budgets and management practices needed to implement these policies. Lip service abounds, practice remains weak. To be sure, some of these agencies are now taking stock and introducing changes that they hope will bring their actions into line with their policies. A surprising level of pessimism was found in those agencies that have been working in this area the longest, with some considering recent changes in aid modalities as presenting more challenges than opportunities for the promotion of gender equality.

How have agencies tackled the challenges of promoting gender equality within the new aid modalities? No agency seems, as yet, to have found a formula for success. It seems that the most important underlying issue is how to increase the operational commitment to gender equality and women's empowerment, within both donor agencies and partner country governments. However, some agencies have been pleased with results from:

- Partnering with in-country civil society organisations to strengthen demand for gender equality actions within partner countries;

- Promoting the development of gender action plans in partner countries;

- Working with other donors to make poverty reduction strategies and sector-wide plans more gender responsive;

- Introducing specific gender equality issues into country dialogue;

- Supporting analytical work to identify gender inequalities;

- Investing in gender-responsive budget initiatives to detect and eliminate gender biases in partner country budget expenditures; and

- Linking gender equality actions to other cross-cutting issues, particularly HIV/AIDS.

All of these steps require dedicated staff with sufficient technical expertise, time and budgets, however. Thus, lack of success in promoting gender equality under the new aid modalities reflects an under-investment in staff, budgets and effective management practices.

If DAC members are to succeed in matching their implementation with their policy commitments, they will need to:

- **Recognise that gender mainstreaming is expensive.** It requires trained staff who help their colleagues and counterparts to understand critical gender inequalities and design actions to reduce them. It calls for regular, detailed monitoring so that the agency can use the results to step up performance. Mainstreaming can work, but only if agencies make the kinds of investments they made to mainstream the use of desk-top computers.

- **Make management and staff accountable** for progress in this area and offer incentives for high levels of performance. Tracking agency actions that promote gender equality and reviewing progress regularly allow agencies to hold management and staff accountable. Agencies should reward representatives who introduce gender equality issues into country dialogue with finance ministries or line ministries. Agencies find ways to ensure action in areas they consider important: a focus on poverty reduction, or sound economic policies, for example. They can also find ways to ensure action in promoting gender equality – if they care to do so.

- **Put more senior gender specialists in the field.** The new aid modalities make country dialogue far more critical to what happens on the ground than in the era when agency staff designed and implemented projects. Trained, dedicated gender specialists need to be where the action is, and they need to have sufficient seniority and connection to the agency to enable them to participate fully in key meetings and carry weight at those meetings.

- **Train staff and embassy personnel to understand and take actions to alleviate gender inequalities.** Gender relations is one of the most complicated and entrenched areas of human society, and "seat-of-the-pants" intuition about how to reduce inequality between males and females often is wrong. There is a large body of research concerning gender relations. Although not all agency or embassy staff need to become experts, they need sufficient training to understand how to identify and alleviate inequalities in the areas in which they work.

Above all, mainstreaming gender equality is a necessary but not a sufficient strategy to promote gender equality and women's empowerment. Specific measures for women's empowerment need to be reintroduced, financed and placed centre stage to build ownership of the development process by all stakeholders.

The OECD's Development Assistance Committee provides leadership to the international development community by setting standards and collectively working to improve aid and development effectiveness. There is a unique opportunity for DAC members to take on the challenge of fully integrating gender equality and women's empowerment into the implementation of the overarching principles of the aid effectiveness agenda – ownership, alignment, harmonisation, managing for results and mutual accountability - and ensuring that there is increased investment in gender equality as we make good our commitments to increased aid.

The combination of these two actions would accelerate progress towards the achievement of gender equality and women's empowerment and towards a just world in which women, men, girls and boys live in dignity and enjoy their full potential.

I. Introduction

This report presents the key findings and conclusions of a study of changes in the gender equality practices and institutional approaches of OECD DAC members' development co-operation ministries, departments and agencies (referred to as "agencies" in the remainder of the report) since 1999.

The study is a follow-up to two earlier DAC reports: a review of progress in the implementation of the DAC High Level Policy Statement, *Gender equality: moving towards sustainable people-centred development,* published in 2000 and a study entitled *Analysis of aid in support of gender equality, 1999-2003,* which examined the financial contributions of DAC members to gender equality.

The current study is based on a survey of DAC members conducted in February-March 2006 (see Annex A for the questionnaire). Twenty-seven member agencies responded to the survey. Their responses and supporting documents form the basis of the conclusions reached in this report (see Annex B for a list of responding agencies). Selective telephone interviews were also conducted to supplement the information from the survey.

The study set out to:

- Map the gender equality mandate of member agencies;

- Map the staffing and institutional arrangements that support gender equality objectives and mainstreaming gender equality efforts across agency programmes;

- Document the changes that have occurred since the end of 1999 in staffing and institutional arrangements and incentives, including changes designed to respond more effectively to the new aid environment and evolving priorities;

- Identify the elements of emerging good practice and technical advice in integrating gender considerations into the new aid delivery mechanisms, and explore the implications for staffing and institutional arrangements; and

- On the basis of the above, provide broad direction on how staffing and institutional arrangements in bilateral agencies should be changed or adapted to work in the new aid environment.

Gender equality: moving towards sustainable people-centred development, published in 2000, examined changes in gender equality practices and institutional approaches resulting from the 1995 Beijing Fourth World Conference on Women. At that conference, United Nations (UN) member countries had agreed to an ambitious *Platform for Action.*

The 2000 survey of DAC members saw major changes among donors, suggesting that the Beijing conference had a strong impact on member agencies. For example, virtually all gender units had increased in influence over the previous five years, some gender units had moved to more strategic and cross-cutting locations within their organisations where

they were closer to key decision makers, and many members had increased gender specialist staff and budgets. The study also reported, however, that members felt that gender mainstreaming (see Box 1.1), the process that most agencies use to promote women's advancement and gender equality in partner countries, requires more resources than the traditional approach of creating special projects to assist women. Under a mainstreaming approach, all staff assume some responsibility for gender issues, and gender units shift to more catalytic, advisory and supportive roles.

Box 1.1 What is gender mainstreaming?

According to the ECOSOC Agreed Conclusions 1997/2 (which can be found at www.un.org/womenwatch/osagi/pdf/ECOSOCAC1997.2.PDF):

"Mainstreaming a gender perspective is the process of assessing the implications for women and men of any planned action, including legislation, policies or programmes, in all areas and at all levels. It is a strategy for making women's as well as men's concerns and experiences an integral dimension of the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies and programmes in all political, economic and societal spheres so that women and men benefit equally and inequality is not perpetuated. The ultimate goal is to achieve gender equality."

In most development agencies, a mainstreaming approach to gender equality in development co-operation has come to mean that gender analysis and actions are to be incorporated into all areas of donor activity, not just into one or two "women's" sectors such as education or health. It also means that all operational and policy staff are, in theory, responsible for ensuring that gender analysis and actions are incorporated into their area of responsibility.

Because gender issues are complex and understanding them requires knowledge of a well-established body of research, gender mainstreaming also requires the support of specialised staff who provide guidance, tools and training for their colleagues in the operational and policy branches. They are often referred to as gender advisors or co-ordinators. The term "gender focal point" can refer to a gender advisor or co-ordinator, but more often means an individual who does not have training or experience in the field of gender and development, but who is asked to take responsibility for supporting gender mainstreaming on a part-time basis.

The 2000 report had four key recommendations:

- Ensure that gender units have adequate human resources (in terms of both numbers and capacity of staff) so that they can fulfil their catalytic, advisory and supportive roles;
- Shift the work of gender specialists towards working in partnership at the country and programme assistance level (as well as at the project level), in order to make a comprehensive difference;
- Systematically monitor and report on progress, which is fundamental to reinforcing accountability for gender equality; and
- Establish adequate budgets, including a specific budget for catalysing mainstreaming activities and staff training.

As its contribution to the UN's Beijing plus 10 review, the OECD conducted a Creditor Reporting System study. The report, *Aid activities in support of gender equality, 1999-2003* (published in 2005), revealed that only USD 3.1 billion of a total of USD 17.2 billion in sector-allocable bilateral aid was focused on gender equality. Two-thirds of this is in the social sectors, especially basic education and basic health, including population and reproductive health (traditionally "women's issues"). Little is

reported in the transport, communications and energy infrastructure sectors even though well-designed infrastructure projects can bring significant positive benefits for women and girls by improving access to markets, schools and health services or by improving women's physical safety. Donors have tended to focus on the social sectors, or social protection, rather than seeing women as active players in generating pro-poor growth – despite compelling evidence, particularly from sub-Saharan Africa, that gender inequalities slow economic growth and that women's participation is essential to a productive economy.

The rationale for the current survey is partly to determine whether the recommendations of the 2000 report have been implemented. A re-examination of aid practices and institutional arrangements for gender equality is particularly critical at this time, because of changes since 1999 in the way that aid is managed and delivered by many bilateral donors.

This report looks at recent changes in aid goals and modalities that have created new challenges for gender mainstreaming and how agencies have coped. These changes include:

- The support of all UN member countries for the MDGs, one of which specifically concerns gender equality and empowering women;

- A renewed emphasis on poverty reduction as the overarching goal of development co-operation (it is the first of the eight MDGs and is viewed by many observers as the most fundamental goal);

- An increased emphasis on country ownership of development processes and alignment of aid with partner government policy and structures, for example, by using country-generated poverty reduction strategies (PRSs) or sector-wide strategies to guide development assistance;

- A move from donor-generated projects to programmatic delivery of aid, for example, through sector-wide approaches (SWAps) and general budget support for PRSs; and

- More emphasis on policy dialogue with partner countries, which strengthens understanding of mutual accountabilities and partner-country strategies and processes.

In addition to these changes, the 2005 *Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness* set out objectives that would affect agencies in their gender mainstreaming efforts. It called upon agencies to reduce the aid burden on partner countries by harmonising their assistance programmes, to judge the success of assistance by monitoring results on the ground, and to focus on mutual accountability between donors and partner countries.

The second chapter of this report reviews the changes in aid goals and modalities reported by DAC member agencies. Have the changes that many observers believe to have occurred actually been made? This section also examines the perceived consequences of these changes for gender mainstreaming and women's empowerment activities in development co-operation.

The report then goes on to examine gender equality policies and institutional arrangements and practices in member country agencies. What are they, and have they changed since 1999? Are gender units being replaced by lone gender advisors as aid decentralises increasingly to the partner countries, and are there more gender advisors in the field? These and other questions are addressed in Chapter 3.

Subsequent chapters of the report assess how well bilateral agencies promote gender equality in partner countries, describe the challenges agencies face, and review some of the approaches to meeting these challenges that have proven to be effective. The report closes with a summary of findings and conclusions concerning the elements critical for promoting women's empowerment and gender equality in the new aid environment.

GENDER EQUALITY AND AID DELIVERY: WHAT HAS CHANGED IN DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION AGENCIES SINCE 1999?

13

II. Changes in Aid Goals and Modalities

Evidence from the current survey findings suggests that the new aid goals have indeed been embraced in most member agencies. Twenty-six of the 27 agencies in the 2006 survey use the MDGs as a framework for development co-operation (see Annex C for a statistical summary of responses to the quantitative questions).

Also, as shown in Table 2.1, poverty reduction has moved to the front of the line as the overarching goal of development co-operation in more than half of the agencies. Among those agencies that report no change in the importance given to this goal, some three-quarters are agencies that had a gender policy in place by 1995 (which we use as an indicator of the maturity of the agency) and doubtless already placed a high priority on poverty reduction.

Table 2.1 **Importance given to changes since 1999 in development co-operation goals and modalities of agencies**

(Percentages)

Aid goal or modality	More important	Less important	Unchanged	Base N
Poverty reduction/elimination as the overarching goal of development co-operation	58%	4%	38%	24
Country ownership of development co-operation strategies and plans	88	4	8	26
Focus on the policy dialogue with partner countries	85	4	12	26
Alignment of bilateral development assistance with PRSs or other country-generated development plans	96	4	0	26
Use of programme-based approaches such as general budget support and SWAps	93	4	4	27
Use of projects in development assistance	0	62	38	26
Harmonised approaches with other donors through joint assistance strategies, "silent" partnerships, etc.	92	4	4	26
Contributions to multilateral development co-operation agencies and global funds	72	4	24	25
Focus on managing for results	81	4	15	27
Focus on mutual accountability with partner countries	76	4	20	25

Note 1 : Don't know, inapplicable and blank responses are excluded from the Base N.
Note 2: In all tables, numbers may not add up to 100, due to rounding.

Table 2.1 suggests a strong focus on country ownership, policy dialogue and the use of country-generated strategies to guide bilateral aid. Most agencies report that country ownership of development strategies has become more important in the past five years, and that they place a high priority on policy dialogue with partner countries. Almost all agencies are working to align their assistance with PRSs and other country-generated development plans, and programme-based approaches are increasingly popular. As might be expected, the use of projects in development assistance is waning.

Most agencies report changes consistent with the *Paris Declaration*, as witnessed by the growing importance of harmonisation with other donors, managing for results and mutual accountability with partner countries. In light of the move to programmatic approaches, many agencies also report larger contributions to multilateral aid agencies and global funds since 1999 - not surprising given the creation of several special-purpose aid funds in the past six years. In short, there is plenty of evidence of major changes in aid goals and modalities since the end of 1999.

Despite a growing focus on programmatic approaches to aid, expenditures in this area remain relatively small, as shown in Table 2.2. Most agencies spend less than half of their bilateral aid expenditures on programme-based approaches. Thus, although such mechanisms as SWAps and budget support for PRS implementation have become more important, only a handful of agencies devote more than half of their aid to these approaches.

Table 2.2 **Reported percentage of agency expenditures on bilateral development assistance that goes to programme-based approaches**

(Percentages)

None	1 – 24%	25 – 49%	50 – 74%	75 – 100%	Base N
5%	55%	25%	15%	0%	20

How have these changes affected gender equality actions and gender mainstreaming? The answer to this question depends on the indicator examined. When asked about their agency's overall emphasis on gender equality or women in development (WID) actions, almost two-thirds report that these actions have become more important since 1999. There is no difference between the mature agencies (those with a gender policy in place before 1995) and the other agencies. Thus, according to this indicator, the introduction of new aid modalities in member agencies was accompanied by a stronger focus on gender equality.

However, when asked directly how changes in aid goals and modalities affected the integration of gender equality into development co-operation, the picture is less rosy (see Table 2.3). A number of respondents believe that the new aid modalities have hampered gender equality actions. Over half of the mature agencies say the new aid modalities have made gender mainstreaming more difficult – and none say that they have made it less difficult. To be sure, the greater pessimism in the mature agencies than in other agencies might reflect the difficulty of adapting gender equality practices to a new environment rather than creating these practices *de novo*. But it may also reflect the lack of experience in the less mature agencies to make an informed judgment about change.

Table 2.3 **Do new aid modalities make gender equality actions more or less difficult?**

(Percentages)

Gender policy before 1995?	More difficult	Less difficult	About the same degree of difficulty as always	Don't know	Base N
Yes	58%	0%	33%	8%	12
No	9	27	36	27	11
Total	35	13	35	17	23

Note: Four agencies failed to identify the year their agency first had a gender policy.

Agencies cite diverse effects of new modalities on gender equality actions. Several agencies perceive accountability to be more elusive under programme-based approaches than in traditional projects, because such approaches are complex and the country, not the donor, is responsible for implementation. Moreover, it is often the ministry of finance that is responsible for dialogue with the donor, and as one agency notes, "gender responsiveness is not common at all" in these ministries. Box 2.1 outlines what one experienced agency sees as some of the problems arising from the new aid modalities.

Box 2.1 **The role of partner governments**

An agency with a long track record in prioritising gender equality actions in development co-operation describes why programme-based approaches, country ownership and increased donor harmonisation have made gender mainstreaming more difficult:

Programme-based approaches have shown a lack of comprehensive gender analysis and have not proved to be very gender-sensitive or provided for monitoring or evaluation of gender equality results within their frameworks. Poverty Reduction Strategy Programmes have typically had a poor record of including women's organisations in their planning and lack a sound gender analysis. It is also more difficult to conduct dialogue on gender equality with partner countries when looking at country-led solutions if gender equality is not considered a priority in that particular country. When working on harmonisation and joint country plans, donors may also have different views and standards in regards to gender equality and this can become a point of contention and requires concerted efforts to reach an agreed arrangement. Gender mainstreaming is still seen as the responsibility of individual advisors or women's affairs ministries and not the organisation or government as a whole. However, if these obstacles are overcome, there is also ample room for gender equality as a sector of its own to become more prominent in programming.

Other agencies believe the problem rests within the donor agency. Staff may lack expertise and tools for integrating gender equality actions into programme-based approaches, and there may be no mandate to include gender equality issues in country dialogue (see Box 2.2). One agency points out that with increased harmonisation between donors, problems may crop up if donors disagree on gender equality as a priority. In a few cases, agencies report that the greater difficulty of taking gender equality actions resulted from changed priorities within the agency or the donor country government, rather than the adoption of new aid goals and modalities *per se*.

Box 2.2 **The changing role of agency staff**

An agency that has strongly supported gender equality and women's empowerment in its development work for many years describes how the changes in aid modalities have affected the roles of agency staff:

The first generation gender specialists at the embassy level did give guidance to their colleagues and supported national efforts to eliminate discrimination. With SWAps and budget support, their task is much more to support national efforts (partly those of civil society) to engender Poverty Reduction Strategy Programmes and SWAps. Their responsibility is more to advise than to manage a programme.

Thus, the skill set required of gender specialists working in the field has changed. This has implications both for the recruitment of field-based gender advisors and for the other roles that such advisors might be asked to take on, such as liaison with civil society organisations.

Among the agencies reporting that gender actions have become *easier* since 1999, a common theme is the power of the MDGs for promoting gender equality as a key to poverty reduction. Some of these agencies also point out that the principles agreed to in the *Paris Declaration* increase opportunities for gender equality actions. In other cases, the reduced difficulty appears to reflect internal changes in the agency or the donor country, for example, because of a newly created gender policy or strategy. Thus, the reduced difficulty does not always reflect the rise of new aid modalities.

In summary, it is clear that the OECD development community, together with partner countries, has ushered in significant changes in the goals and methods of development co-operation since the end of 1999. These changes have offered both opportunities and challenges to donors' gender equality actions in development co-operation. While the MDGs and the *Paris Declaration* have facilitated the promotion of gender equality, the sector remains inherently complex, making it difficult to monitor gender equality results in budget-wide approaches and to hold programme implementers accountable for results. Programme-based approaches have also tended to make ministries of finance particularly powerful actors in determining development actions, and these ministries often are unaware of (or unconcerned about) gender equality as a development issue, as are many staff on the donor side. In some cases, agencies have yet to develop the training and tools that would help agency and embassy staff to integrate gender equality actions into programme-based approaches.

GENDER EQUALITY AND AID DELIVERY: WHAT HAS CHANGED IN DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION AGENCIES SINCE 1999?

17

III. Current Policies, Institutional Arrangements and Changes

This section explores agencies' gender policies, staffing and budgets, and practices and processes that are designed to promote gender equality as part of development co-operation.

Gender policies

All but one of the 27 agencies responding to the survey has a gender policy in place. As Table 3.1 shows, about half the agencies adopted gender policies prior to the UN Fourth World Conference on Women (Beijing, 1995), with the pioneer agencies adopting such policies in the late 1970s and early 1980s. The Beijing conference appears to have provided the impetus to many agencies: nine agencies first developed a policy in the subsequent decade. However, two agencies were without gender policies until 2005.

Table 3.1 **Year agency first adopted a gender policy (N=27)**

Year→	1976-1984	1985-1994	1995-2004	2005	Unknown
Number of agencies	5	7	9	2	4

With few exceptions, the policies have taken an equity or equality rationale. That is, they are based on the principle that women and men should be equal, benefit equitably from development, or that women should be empowered to enjoy the same rights and opportunities as men. A few policies, however, look instead at the impact of gender equality on economic and social development or poverty reduction, i.e. they take an efficiency approach to promoting gender equality.

In addition, almost all of the policies combine a mainstreaming approach to achieving the goal of gender equality with a specific targeted approach in which equality or women's advancement in particular sectors is mandated as a focus of aid activities (see Box 3.1 for one country's gender policy.) Thus, most agencies seek to ensure that gender equality actions are a part of their entire package of development activities and policies, and *additionally* focus on enhancing women's opportunities or rights in particular arenas such as secure livelihoods, education, reproductive health, legal rights or freedom from violence.

18

GENDER EQUALITY AND AID DELIVERY: WHAT HAS CHANGED IN DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION AGENCIES SINCE 1999?

Box 3.1 **Sweden's gender policy**

Sida's policy report *Promoting Gender Equality,* published in October 2005, updates Sweden's gender equality policy for development co-operation.[1] The policy states that, "gender equality is at the centre of Sida's mission to promote and create conditions for poverty reduction in partner countries", which is the main goal of Swedish development co-operation. The renewed policy is the outcome of an evaluation of Sida's work on gender equality conducted in 2002 as well as recommendations from Swedish governmental and civil society organisations.

The policy starts from five "points of departure":

- Gender equality further strengthens Sida's work for poverty reduction;
- Gender equality is crucial in order to reach sustainable democratic development;
- Power structures are fundamental for working towards equality between women and men, girls and boys;
- Gender equality is about the relationship between women and men, girls and boys; and
- Equal economic opportunities for all are fundamental for achieving sustainable and democratic development and pro-poor growth.

Sida's strategy uses a gender mainstreaming approach, including the mainstreaming of gender analysis into poverty analysis. Three techniques are used in work for gender equality: actively applying and integrating the gender perspective, targeting specific groups or issues, and conducting a gender-aware dialogue with partners. The strategy targets two major areas: strengthening rights for women and men, girls and boys; and power structures and relations, both economic and political. Thus, Sweden's policy for promoting gender equality encompasses both gender mainstreaming and targeted interventions in pursuit of the goals of gender equality and poverty reduction.

Sixteen of the survey respondents have changed or updated their policies since the end of 1999. Most of these changes appear to have strengthened the policy by incorporating one or more of the following improvements:

- More closely integrating it with other agency goals, including new aid goals and modalities such as PRSs and programme-based approaches;

- Broadening the approach to gender equality to include mainstreaming as well as specific WID targets;

- Identifying specific goals or target areas in order to make the policy more concrete; and

- Adding accountability requirements to the policy in order to give it "teeth".

One agency expanded its policy from a strict focus on bilateral aid, to include a broader array of multilateral agencies and activities, for example, support for UNFPA and UNICEF in addition to UNIFEM.

In addition to their gender policies, 19 of the 27 agencies report that their agency's highest policy statement on development co-operation prioritises gender equality, women's empowerment or gender mainstreaming. Eighteen agencies report that some or all of their agency's sectoral policies identify actions to promote gender equality or women's advancement in that sector. Thus, most agencies not only have gender policies

---

1. Can be found at: www.sida.se/eng.

(many of which have been revamped in recent years), but also explicitly support gender equality in other policy statements. DAC members clearly "talk the talk" when it comes to promoting gender equality in development co-operation. We next turn to the question of whether their staffing, budgets and practices are adequate for them to "walk the walk".

Staffing and budgets

We first focus on the primary organisational entity through which the agency promotes gender mainstreaming: specifically, whether the agency has a central gender unit with at least two staff members or instead relies on a lone central gender advisor. As Table 3.2 indicates, about equal numbers of agencies have units and lone advisors – and several report having both.[2] This is unrelated to agency size. If anything, the smaller agencies are more likely to have central gender units than are the larger ones (data not shown). Perhaps not surprisingly, the mature agencies are far more likely to have gender units than are the other agencies.

Table 3.2 **Central gender units and/or central gender advisors**

(Percentages)

Gender policy before 1995?	Central gender unit	Central gender advisor	Both	Base N
Yes	50%	33%	17%	12
No	18	64	18	11
Total	41	41	18	27

Note: Base Ns for first two rows do not add up to 27 because four agencies did not indicate the year they first adopted a gender equality policy.

It is difficult to judge whether a central unit or a lone advisor is the most effective way of assisting colleagues and counterparts with gender mainstreaming, without further information about the agency. A well-placed lone advisor may, for example, exert far more influence within the agency than a poorly placed gender unit.[3] Insofar as a central unit implies more staff involved in the effort, however, it would appear that staffing to promote gender mainstreaming remains thin in many agencies, especially those that have come to gender equality more recently.

The same conclusion is suggested by the size of the central gender unit among agencies that have such units (see Table 3.3). Most of these units have fewer than 10 staff members, and when only staff within the unit who have *significant* responsibility for

---

2. Although the questionnaire asked about a central advisor who was *not* the head of the central gender unit, some respondents may have misunderstood the distinction and may therefore have incorrectly reported having both a central gender unit and a (supposedly independent) central gender advisor. At least one agency, however, has confirmed that they have both arrangements.

3. The survey did not ask about the organisational location of either the gender unit or central lone gender advisor, only how many levels down from the top executive of the agency that position is placed (see later analysis).

gender equality are counted, the median drops to well below five.[4] These numbers are small relative to the number of countries in which most agencies work, and relative to the number of other agency staff to be inspired, trained and assisted. Thus, even though central gender units normally play a catalytic role (rather than taking direct responsibility for projects, programmes or country dialogue), the very small staff size in most of these units may hinder agency-wide gender mainstreaming under the new aid modalities.

Table 3.3 **Size of the central gender unit and number of staff**

Variable	Fewer than five staff members	Five to nine staff members	10 or more staff members
Total unit size	5	6	4
Staff with gender responsibility	11	3	2

Note: Figures in the table are numbers of agencies, not percentages. The total number of agencies differs between the two lines of the table because of missing data.

Even when there is no central gender unit, agencies may deploy gender advisors at headquarters or in the field, an arrangement that may be more consistent with gender mainstreaming and country ownership policies than having a single, large, centralised unit. Table 3.4 suggests, however, that only slightly more than half of the agencies have gender advisors *other than* those in the central gender unit.[5] Moreover, in many cases, the number of other such advisors is small: the median is approximately 12 staff members.[6] These numbers might be adequate if most of the agencies with small numbers of other gender advisors had relatively large central gender units but, in fact, the opposite holds. Agencies with central gender units report having more additional gender advisors, on average, than do agencies without central gender units (data not shown).

Table 3.4 **Number of gender advisors other than those in the central gender unit or the central gender advisor (N=27)**

None	1 – 9	10 – 25	26 or more	Unknown
10	6	3	4	4

Note: Figures in the table are numbers of agencies.

---

4. Many agencies group responsibility for promoting gender equality with other cross-cutting issues such as assistance for youth or the disabled. Hence, some staff in the so-called "gender unit" may focus on these other issues rather than on gender.

5. Again, although the questionnaire defined gender advisor in a manner that was meant to exclude part-time, untrained gender focal points, some respondents appear to have misunderstood this distinction (which, admittedly, is difficult to make in a short definitional paragraph). In some agencies, then, the gender "advisors" being described may, in fact, be focal points who spend little time on gender-related activities and who are not necessarily gender specialists.

6. Some of the agencies with very large numbers of gender advisors appear to have gender focal points rather than advisors.

Although the number of additional advisors in most agencies is fairly small, these advisors might be highly effective if they were positioned in the field rather than at headquarters, and if most were relatively senior officers. Table 3.5 indeed suggests that many gender advisors are deployed in the field rather than headquarters, and that many embassies or field offices have such advisors on their staff. However, there is only one agency where most of these advisors are senior officers. Thus, while there is widespread decentralisation of gender advisors, these advisors often are not in a position to carry strong influence in country dialogue or with their colleagues in the donor agency. Moreover, the small numbers of such advisors points to poor coverage of the countries in which most agencies work.[7]

Table 3.5 **Gender advisors in partner country embassies or field offices**

Variable	None	1 – 24%	25 – 49%	50 -74%	75 – 100%	Unknown or no such advisor
Advisors located in the field	4	1	2	5	1	14
Field offices with a gender advisor	4	1	2	6	2	12

Note: Figures in the tables are numbers of agencies, not percentages.

In addition to the number of gender staff, the location of the central gender unit or gender advisor within the organisation is crucial in determining the influence of the gender specialists. To determine organisational position, the survey asked how close was the highest level gender position (i.e. the head of the central gender unit or the most senior central gender advisor) to the top of the organisation.

In only eight agencies, the most senior gender advisor is one or two levels down from the agency's top officer, reflecting a fairly strong position of influence. In most agencies, however, the senior gender advisor is between two and four levels down from the top executive officer (see Table 3.6). In agencies that are small and highly collegial, this may not be a significant barrier to influencing agency policy (as was noted by one respondent from a small agency, which she reported to be highly democratic and open). These results nevertheless indicate that a majority of agencies have not positioned their most senior gender advisor for maximum influence within the organisation.[8]

---

7. The survey also asked whether field-based advisors were seconded from headquarters or were locally engaged. Five agencies report that most field advisors were seconded from headquarters and eight report that most were locally engaged, with the others having a mix. We are unable to ascertain which of these patterns is most effective in promoting gender equality in development co-operation. Seconded staff are more likely to be career members of the agency, which may give them greater clout, but well-qualified locally engaged staff may have more knowledge of their country and carry greater credibility with their government or local civil society organisations.

8. There is a mild tendency for mature agencies to position their most senior gender advisor higher up in the organisation than is the case in other agencies, but the difference is small (the correlation

Table 3.6 **Levels between top executive position and most senior gender advisor (N=27)**

Zero levels down	One level down	Two levels down	Three levels down	Four levels down	Five or more levels down
0	2	6	8	9	2

Note: Figures in the table are numbers of agencies, not percentages.

The 2000 DAC report recommended that agencies establish budgets for gender mainstreaming and training. In almost half of the agencies responding to the survey, the central gender unit or central gender advisor has no discretionary programme budget under their control (see Table 3.7). In another third of the agencies, the dedicated budget totals less than half a million euros.[9] The total amounts being spent on gender equality actions by most of the agencies are, according to the DAC gender equality policy marker, well above the relatively modest amounts shown in Table 3.7 (see *Analysis of aid in support of gender equality, 1999-2003).* But in most agencies, this reflects the use of country programming budgets for gender equality actions rather than specific budget allocations to support the central advisory function. Moreover, the *percentage* of total bilateral aid being spent on gender equality actions often is small.

Table 3.7 **Discretionary annual programme budget of the central gender unit or central gender advisor, in thousands of euros (N=25)**

(Percentages)

None	<€100	€100-€499	€500-€1 500	>€1 500
48%	12%	16%	16%	8%

The analysis here suggests that both staffing and dedicated budgets to support gender mainstreaming are thin in many agencies, and that the number of decentralised gender advisors probably cannot meet the need for gender expertise in country dialogue. It is important to ask, however, whether staffing and budget have *improved* over the past half-decade, even if they are not at the levels needed to ensure full implementation of agencies' gender equality policies (see Table 3.8).

The statistics in Table 3.8 can be read in two ways. The positive side of the picture is that for every aspect of staffing and budget examined, more agencies report an improvement than report a deterioration since 1999. Thus, where change has occurred, more often than not it has involved an *increase* in the size of the central gender unit, the number of gender advisors, the number of field-based gender advisors, the percentage of field offices with a gender advisor, the seniority of gender advisors in the field, the status

coefficient is -.18, where "mature" agencies are scored 1 and others are scored 0, and where a lower score on agency position means being higher up).

9. Central gender units have budget to pay for staff, but the issue here is whether they have additional monies that they can use to offer staff or counterpart training, develop tools and guidance, etc.

of the most senior central gender advisor, or the size of the central discretionary programme budget for gender activities.

Table 3.8 **Whether staffing and budget for gender mainstreaming have increased, decreased or remained unchanged since the end of 1999**

(Percentages)

Staffing or budget issue	Has increased	Has decreased	Has remained unchanged	Base N
Number of staff in the central gender unit	40%	20%	40%	25
Number of gender advisors other than in the central unit	39	22	39	23
Number of gender advisors in the field	33	8	58	12
Number of field offices with a gender advisor	31	15	54	13
Average level of seniority of gender advisors in the field	14	7	79	14
Number of levels down from top executive of the most senior gender advisor	18	23	59	22
Size of central discretionary gender programme budget	33	29	38	21

Note: Base N varies because of varying number of inapplicable, don't know and blank responses.

On the negative side, however, a number of agencies have reduced staffing and budgets for gender mainstreaming. For example, the central gender unit has shrunk in five agencies, the discretionary programmatic budget of the chief gender advisor has been reduced in six agencies, and the number of gender advisors outside the central unit has decreased in five agencies. Perhaps not surprisingly, these reductions have occurred in the mature agencies more often than in the agencies that have come to gender mainstreaming more recently (data not shown). Thus, while the overall picture can be seen as one of progress, it is disturbing that some of the "old hands" in the gender and development field have reduced staff and budgets in this area.

Practices and processes

The final aspect of DAC members' institutional arrangements to come under the microscope are the specific practices and processes that agencies use to achieve their goal of promoting gender equality or empowering women in partner countries.

Table 3.9 examines a variety of processes within agencies while Table 3.10 focuses on externally oriented processes.

Table 3.9 **Internal practices to promote gender equality in development co-operation**

(Percentages)

Practice	All agencies	Had gender policy before 1995	Did not have gender policy before 1995
Annual monitoring of gender equality in development co-operation	52%	58%	45%
Annual top management review of gender mainstreaming progress	22	33	18
DAC policy marker used for monitoring in some or all sectors	81	83	73
DAC policy marker used for planning	62	58	64
Gender-sensitive log frames used	41	33	64
Gender criteria used for assessing project/programme quality	70	83	64
Institutional sign-off for gender responsiveness of projects/ programmes required	11	25	0
Required gender training for all staff	22	42	9
Optional gender training for staff	59	58	55
Gender knowledge a criterion for hiring professional staff	11	8	18
Gender actions part of individual performance evaluations	4	8	0
Special recognition for good gender mainstreaming in projects, etc.	7	8	0
Base N	27	12	11

Table 3.9 suggests considerable variation in particular practices to promote gender equality in development co-operation. For example, while most agencies say they use the DAC policy marker on gender (usually in all sectors), only half report conducting annual or more frequent internal monitoring of gender equality actions in agency projects, programmes and policies. Annual progress reviews by top agency management are even less common (they occur in only six of the 27 agencies). The use of log frames containing gender indicators is also relatively infrequent.

Although systematic monitoring for accountability appears to be spotty, a sizeable majority of agencies use gender criteria when assessing the quality of development projects or programmes. All of these practices are somewhat more common among the mature agencies, suggesting that those that have come more recently to gender and development have yet to develop as full a range of monitoring and accountability mechanisms.

Observers give high marks to two practices that give gender mainstreaming policies "teeth": requiring that gender specialists sign off on agency projects, programmes or policies before implementation, and requiring that all staff receive gender training. Yet only a handful of agencies have adopted these practices. Institutional sign-off is particularly rare. Compulsory gender training is almost as rare, although optional gender training is offered in a majority of agencies. (An issue not broached in the survey is the nature of the training offered, in particular, whether it focuses on general consciousness-raising or on implementing gender-responsive actions in a specific sector. It would be useful to learn not only the type of training offered, but its impact on agency staff and counterparts.)

Two additional practices are favoured by many observers: making knowledge of gender issues a requirement when hiring professional staff, and basing annual performance evaluations in part on the individual's promotion of gender equality actions. Yet only three agencies make gender knowledge a requirement when hiring professional staff, and only one agency reports basing annual performance evaluations in part on gender equality actions. Thus, while many agencies have adopted monitoring tools (the DAC gender equality policy marker being the most common), few have adopted the practices that some observers believe would provide the strongest support for agencies' gender equality policies.

Table 3.10 suggests external practices are more common than many of the internal practices reviewed above. Again, however, the practice most likely to have on-the-ground impact –including gender equality issues in country dialogue – is also the *least* common one. Only 37% of agencies report regularly including gender issues in policy dialogue (although over half of the mature agencies say they do so).

Most agencies provide financial or political support for gender equality efforts in multilateral agencies, global funds or non-governmental organisations (NGOs), and a majority sponsor special events to raise awareness of gender issues. Almost all participate in international events that are focused on gender issues, and many promote gender equality objectives in other international events, such as those sponsored by the UN.[10]

In short, while agencies use a variety of tactics to try to ensure that gender equality is an aspect of their bilateral and multilateral aid, the practices that some observers believe have the most clout are used far less often than are more symbolic practices. Generally, the more mature agencies use all tactics more often than do the agencies that have come to gender and development issues relatively recently. Thus, there is considerable room for many agencies to strengthen their work to promote gender equality and women's advancement in development co-operation.

---

10.   All of these practices are particularly common among the mature agencies.

Table 3.10   **External practices to promote gender equality in development co-operation**

(Percentages)

Practice	All agencies	Had gender policy before 1995	Did not have gender policy before 1995
Policy dialogue regularly includes gender equality	37%	58%	27%
Financial or political support for gender equality efforts in multinational agencies or global funds	70	75	55
Financial or political support for NGOs that advocate for gender equality in development co-operation	85	100	64
Sponsorship of special events to raise awareness of gender issues	67	83	45
Participation in international gender forums and events	96	100	91
Pursuit of gender equality objectives in UN conferences and other global events	78	92	55
Base N	27	12	11

IV. Putting Policy into Practice

So far, the analysis has suggested that more agencies "talk the talk" through good gender policies than actually provide the staffing, budget and institutional practices needed to fully "walk the walk". We have yet to assess the extent to which the member agencies are succeeding in incorporating gender equality actions into their development assistance. In this section, we examine several indicators of success in promoting gender equality and women's advancement in partner countries.

The first indicator explores the extent to which the agency's projects, programmes and country strategies include gender-related actions. As shown in Table 4.1, a majority of agencies report that at least some of their agency outputs contain gender-related actions, with country strategies being the most frequently mentioned. Only three agencies, however, can boast that *most* of their projects, programmes or country strategies contain such actions.

Table 4.1 **Gender-related actions in agency projects, programmes and country strategies**

(Percentages)

Product	Most have gender-related actions	Some have gender-related actions	Only a few have gender-related actions	Base N
Projects	26%	63%	11%	27
Programmes	23	58	19	26
Country strategies	48	36	16	25

In another section of the questionnaire, agencies were asked to agree or disagree with the following statement: "There are agreed gender equality objectives in most or all co-operation agreements with individual partner countries." A total of 37% of the agencies concurred with the statement.[11] Thus, while gender equality actions are included in some of the outputs of most member agencies, *full* gender mainstreaming is occurring in only a handful of agencies. This is consistent with past assessments of the extent of gender mainstreaming in both bilateral and multilateral development agencies.[12]

---

11. A comparison of the two questions reveals apparent inconsistencies among approximately 15% of the agencies that responded to both questions: 4% agreed with the quoted statement but said that only "some" country strategies had gender-related actions, and another 11% did not agree with the quoted statement but said that "most" country strategies had such actions. This suggests the need for caution in interpreting the results from any single measure.

12. Recent evaluations of some member agencies can be found on their Web sites (see Box 6.2 for the examples of Norway and DFID). Annex D reprints a report from an informal consultation with

The survey also asked about changes within the agency since 1999. Respondents were asked: "Overall, has the focus on gender equality or women's advancement in your organisation's development work increased, decreased or remained unchanged since the end of 1999?" They were also invited to report an increase or decrease in the amount of their agency's development assistance focused on gender equality and women's advancement. (The question was intended to refer to the agency's total budget for gender equality, not the gender unit's or gender advisor's catalytic budgets.)

The responses to both questions suggest most agencies are making progress in gender mainstreaming, particularly those that came to gender and development relatively recently (see Table 4.2). Most respondents in the latter category report that the overall focus on gender equality has *increased*, and that the amount of official development assistance for gender equality has also *increased*. Even among the mature agencies, over half report similar changes. In fact, only a fraction of all agencies report a *decreased* focus on gender equality and development assistance for gender equality actions.[13]

Table 4.2 **Whether focus on, and funding for, development assistance for gender equality has increased, decreased or remained unchanged since the end of 1999**

(Percentages)

Had a gender policy before 1995?	Increased	Decreased	Unchanged	Base N
Overall focus on gender equality				
Yes	50%	25%	25%	12
No	90	10	0	10
Total	65	23	12	26
Amount of development assistance for gender equality				
Yes	67	22	11	9
No	78	0	22	9
Total	70	10	20	20

Note: Base Ns vary because of missing data.

In a similar vein, 18 of the 26 agencies that use the MDGs as a framework for development co-operation emphasise Goal 3 (the gender equality and women's empowerment goal) as strongly or more strongly than the other MDGs. Twenty agencies also say that they focus on the entirety of Goal 3, not just on the relatively narrow educational target associated with it. Twenty-four agencies say that they also address the

---

gender focal points from UN agencies held in Oslo in November 2002 that reaches many of the same conclusions.

13. Interestingly, although the single largest group of agencies (10) reports increases in both the focus on and amount of development assistance for gender equality, two agencies that say that the focus on gender has increased report *decreased* expenditures for gender equality, and one agency that reports a *decreased* focus says that the amount spent in this area has *increased*!

GENDER EQUALITY AND AID DELIVERY: WHAT HAS CHANGED IN DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION AGENCIES SINCE 1999?

29

gender aspects of at least some of the other MDGs, with12 saying they address the gender aspects of *all* of the other MDGs. Thus, most agencies have integrated gender issues into the new development co-operation framework provided by the MDGs.

Overall, this analysis points to considerable agency progress in gender equality in development co-operation since the end of 1999. In that period, most agencies increased attention and overall development assistance for gender equality or women's advancement. There clearly is room for improvement, however, as fewer than half of the agencies report that most of their projects, programmes and country strategies contain gender-related actions. Moreover, the evidence reviewed earlier about staffing, budgets and practices calls for heavier investment in this area if agencies are to fulfil their gender equality policies. Nevertheless, considering the paucity of staff and budget that many agencies devote to implementing their gender equality policies, a surprising degree of progress appears to have been made in the past half decade, at least as reported in the survey.

V. Challenges and Effective Strategies

What are the most important constraints to gender mainstreaming in DAC member agencies? How have agencies met these challenges? This section explores these questions with special attention to the challenges posed by the new aid environment of country ownership, programme-based assistance and strengthened country dialogue.

Constraints to gender mainstreaming

Agencies were asked about the constraints to gender mainstreaming that they face, within and external to their agency. The data in Table 5.1 highlight a paucity of gender advisors as the mostly commonly perceived constraint within the agency. Some 70% named this as a major constraint and another 22% said it was a minor constraint. Almost as high on the list is lack of gender training for agency staff. As one respondent summarised it, the barrier to full gender mainstreaming is often "an internal culture oriented towards economics and technical aims". Such a culture breeds a "lack of knowledge and willingness to promote gender equality, lack of gender awareness raising and training for staff, and lack of means [i.e. staff]."

Half of the agencies feel hampered by too few gender staff in the field. Although many agencies have gender advisors or focal points in their field offices or embassies, there are just not enough of them. They often do not have the time and resources to play a serious role in promoting gender equality and they often are too low in the hierarchy to influence their colleagues or their counterparts in the partner country.[14] Interestingly, relatively few agencies see any problem with the organisational location of the central gender unit or gender advisor.

In light of the strong consensus that lack of staff and training are major obstacles to successful gender mainstreaming, it is interesting that relatively few agencies identify insufficient budget for the central gender unit or advisor as a hindrance. As some respondents noted, most of the programming budget is controlled by field offices or embassies, and with mainstreaming, putting large budgets in the hands of a central unit or officer does not make a lot of sense. Also, spending large budgets may be difficult if there are few gender advisors. Half of the agencies, however, feel that the agency devotes insufficient budget to gender equality actions, suggesting that it is often difficult to influence how budgets controlled by field offices or embassies are spent.

---

14. Although the survey did not ask about the employment status of field-based gender advisors, some agencies employ consultants or short-term contract workers in this role. Such advisors have only a temporary attachment to the agency and a low status within it, something that may pose a challenge to playing a catalytic role either with colleagues or partner country counterparts.

Table 5.1 **Institutional arrangements seen as constraints to gender mainstreaming**

(Percentages)

Institutional arrangement	Major constraint	Minor constraint	Not a constraint	Base N
Inadequate staff for gender mainstreaming	70%	22%	7%	27
Lack of central unit or advisor	14	32	55	22
Poor organisational location of central unit or advisor	29	29	42	24
Too few gender advisors in the field	52	0	48	25
Field-based advisors of too low a status to be influential	56	38	6	16
Insufficient budget for gender unit or gender advisors	42	23	35	26
Lack of gender training for staff	65	35	0	23
Lack of monitoring of gender equality objectives	50	38	12	26
Insufficient agency budget for gender equality in development co-operation	50	17	29	24
Absence of any requirement of gender equality actions for institutional sign-off on projects, programmes or strategies	57	22	22	23

In addition to concerns about staff and budget levels, at least half of the respondents underlined two other internal processes that inhibit full gender mainstreaming: a lack of regular monitoring of gender equality objectives; and the absence of any requirement for gender actions as a prerequisite to institutional sign-off on projects, programmes or strategies.

Overall, then, a substantial number of agencies see ongoing constraints in areas that were recommended for improvement in the 2000 DAC report: staffing (especially in the field), training, systematic monitoring for accountability and budgets to support gender mainstreaming. Although the four recommended actions made in the 2000 report are under the control of agency management, the amount of development assistance for gender equality actions increasingly reflects the outcome of the country dialogue and the development plans that the country creates.

As Table 5.2 indicates, most agencies perceive a lack of concern with gender inequalities in partner governments as an obstacle to development assistance for gender equality. Thus, as decision making has shifted from donors to partner countries, the relative indifference of many partner country governments to gender inequalities has increasingly become a stumbling block to gender mainstreaming and targeted gender equality actions. To be sure, indifference to gender equality issues within the donor agency may have played the same role in the past. Even today, the indifference of partner country governments to this issue may reflect in part a lack of priority given to gender equality by donor country representatives during dialogue. That most agencies perceive partner government indifference as a constraint to gender mainstreaming may thus reflect attitudes among donors as well as partner governments. Unless donors give partner governments stronger incentives to pay attention to the gender dimension of development, full implementation of member agencies' stated gender equality policies is unlikely.

Table 5.2 **External conditions seen as constraints to gender mainstreaming**

(Percentages)

External constraint	Major constraint	Minor constraint	Not a constraint	Base N
Lack of national political leadership on this issue in the agency's country	31%	27%	42%	26
Partner governments' lack of concern with addressing gender inequalities	50	38	12	24
Multilateral agencies'/global funds' indifference to addressing gender inequalities	35	39	26	23

The two other external constraints to gender equality actions shown in Table 5.2 are a lack of national political leadership in the donor countries *vis-à-vis* gender equality, and indifference to addressing gender inequalities in multilateral agencies and global funds. However, only a minority of agencies expressed concern about these two points.

Effective practices and processes

Agencies have developed several approaches to gender mainstreaming that they perceive to be effective under the new aid modalities. Although some of these practices may be "old hat" among the more mature agencies, they are all worth reviewing.

Because development co-operation is increasingly driven by PRSs, sector-wide strategies and other country-generated development plans, it is vital to draw up gender equality objectives for these plans and strategies, if donors are to provide aid in support of this goal. Agencies have found it helpful to:

- Work with women's organisations and like-minded civil society groups in partner countries to help them have a more forceful voice during the creation and implementation of country-generated development plans;

- Support women's groups or government agencies in partner countries to develop a gender action plan for the country;

- Partner with other donors to analyse and critique country-generated plans from a gender perspective; and

- Focus on specific gender equality results and identifying key areas for action in country dialogue.

Several agencies also have found certain types of analytical work to be effective in promoting gender equality. These include:

- Gender-oriented analyses of PRSs and other development plans, which permit tracking of the extent to which partner country development plans incorporate a gender dimension;

- *Ex-ante* gender impact assessments of proposed development actions, which in principle identify gender-biased outcomes and allow for mitigating actions to be built into the programme or project; and

- Efforts to identify specific gender inequalities in a given country or sector, of which partner governments or agency staff may not be aware.

In fact, half of the agencies report that such analytical work has become more common since 1999 (data not shown).

Agencies also favour supporting gender-responsive budget initiatives in partner countries, and linking gender equality with other cross-cutting issues, particularly with HIV/AIDS. The rationale for gender-responsive budget initiatives is to establish a process in partner countries whereby the differential effects on males and females of particular budget decisions are understood and biases are corrected. Such initiatives have become increasingly important from a donor perspective with the rise of country-driven development planning, and can be a way to empower civil society *vis-à-vis* ministries of planning and finance. Many agencies are linking gender to cross-cutting issues, HIV/AIDS in particular, because of the intense attention that AIDS has received and the highly gendered nature of the epidemic. Certainly, such linkages are wholly in the spirit of mainstreaming and may help to reduce silos and competition for attention and money among different sectors and issues.

The internal mechanisms that agencies identify as effective should sound familiar, as many of them reflect the perceived constraints and existing institutional arrangements reviewed earlier. Several agencies, including some mature ones, call for increasing the number of gender staff, especially for inclusion in project teams and in country dialogue where PRSs, SWAps and other forms of programme-based assistance are discussed. A gender expert at project or dialogue meetings can often sway critical design decisions; when no such expert is present, gender consequences are often forgotten.

Agencies also recommend gender training for agency staff; regularly monitoring and reporting on progress in gender equality; a focus on consequences in planning, dialogue and monitoring; and documenting and sharing good practice. Many agencies pointed out the need for monitoring as an accountability tool. Although few agencies have developed systematic agency-wide, results-based assessment tools, the Canadian International

Development Agency (CIDA) has developed and tested an assessment framework (see Box 5.1).

Box 5.1 CIDA's framework for assessing gender equality results

CIDA's new gender equality results assessment framework is intended to answer the question: to what extent do CIDA's development results reflect its policy commitment to gender equality? The framework provides a basis for holding CIDA managers accountable for achieving gender equality development results, and for identifying where further study is needed.

CIDA's gender policy identifies three specific corporate objectives: (i) equalising the "participation of women with men as decision makers in shaping the sustainable development of their societies"; (ii) enabling "women and girls... to realise their full human rights"; and (iii) reducing "inequalities between women and men in access to and control over the resources and benefits of development". The assessment framework focuses on these three results. It is intended to be used in evaluating both bilateral and multilateral development investments by the government of Canada.

The assessment tool is used retrospectively in two stages. Stage I involves the categorisation and rating of "results achieved by a broad sample of investments selected to be representative of CIDA's directive and responsive investments". Each investment is categorised into 1 of 10 categories that represent subdivisions of the three corporate objectives. The investment is then rated on a four-point scale for the significance of its gender equality results. Finally, the ratings are aggregated across the sample of investments to determine to what extent gender equality results are being achieved.

In Stage II, more focused studies explore the strengths and gaps identified in Stage I to understand better the "factors conducive to achieving results, reasons for gaps in performance, and implications for project selection, design and management by CIDA". The framework suggests several types of follow-up studies of projects that have made significant contributions to gender equality, modest or weak contributions to gender equality, or those that focus on a particular area of gender equality results (i.e. one of the three objectives of the gender policy).

A separate tool assesses CIDA's core funding to institutions, such as multilateral development organisations.

* All quotations are from *CIDA's Framework for Assessing Gender Equality Results* (CIDA, 2005), which can be found at www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/ under "Global Issues: Gender equality – tools and resources".

Some agencies also drew attention to due diligence assessments of gender work in multilateral agencies and global funds, and impact orientation in monitoring. The most sophisticated agencies recognise that there are often attribution problems in results monitoring – was it the support of a particular agency that made the difference for women in the partner country? But focusing on results is critical in an environment where partner country governments are increasingly influencing the course of development assistance and are responsible for implementing development plans.

The survey also invited agencies to report on their own successes. Twenty agencies said they had enjoyed successes. Their examples covered a wide range of experience, many of them involving projects rather than programme-based approaches. Although many of the examples are inspiring, together they do not tell a consistent story. There is no apparent "magic bullet" for successfully improving gender equality and empowering women, although several success stories bring together the effective approaches just reviewed.

VI. Summary and Conclusions

All but one of the 27 member agencies that responded to the 2006 survey have gender policies in place. Their policies aim for gender equality in partner countries, and emphasise gender mainstreaming as well as specific actions to address gender inequalities. For the most part, these policies are strong. However, agency staffing, budgets and accountability procedures for seeing that gender policies are implemented are less strong. Indeed, almost all agencies report a shortage of gender advisors, many point to a lack of gender training for non-specialist staff, and the majority lament an absence of accountability procedures that an agency's senior management would use to review results and improve agency-wide performance.

The majority of agencies report that spending on gender equality actions is on the rise (perhaps because more money is being spent on development assistance overall) and confirm that these actions have become a stronger focus of attention in recent years. **Few agencies, however, match their policy rhetoric with the resources and procedures required to implement these policies fully.**

Recent changes in aid goals and modalities have had a mixed impact on gender equality actions in development co-operation. On the positive side, the MDGs have helped focus attention on gender equality, particularly in agencies that formerly did not make this area a priority. (Box 6.1 illustrates some of the positive changes and challenges facing agencies that have come to gender equality relatively recently.) Other changes in aid goals and modalities, including the move to country ownership and programme-based approaches, have often made it more difficult to promote gender equality, a perception that is particularly common among the agencies with the most experience in this area.

The move away from projects designed and implemented by donors, towards a system in which donors help to fund the partner country's development plans, has made the inclusion of gender equality objectives in development co-operation far more dependent on partner country views than on the policies of the donor agency. As noted earlier, however, what partner countries emphasise reflects in part the incentives that donors provide. The move to country ownership has put implementation more fully into the hands of the partner government and, in the case of sector- or economy-wide plans, has made monitoring of impacts on gender equality more complex.

> **Box 6.1 The challenges faced by newcomers to gender mainstreaming**
>
> **The example of Irish Aid**
>
> Many DAC members have adopted gender equality policies in recent years and are in the process of creating the structures, procedures and cultures needed to implement these policies. Although the experience of these agencies is generally positive, like other agencies, they face challenges that are illustrated by Irish Aid's experience.
>
> Irish Aid has had a strong poverty focus since its founding in 1974, and audits have shown that this focus has benefited women in partner countries. In 2004, Irish Aid adopted a formal gender equality policy that stresses the full achievement of women's and men's human rights, equal access to resources and services, and equal participation in political and economic decision making. The policy calls for a strategy of mainstreaming to ensure that gender equality is aligned with and influences the design and implementation of the entire aid programme.
>
> Since the adoption of the policy, Irish Aid's senior management has supported implementation. Thanks to training and the development of action plans at the country programme level, the staff of the agency have come to understand that gender equality is an integral part of fighting poverty and the HIV/AIDS epidemic, links that they might not have seen in the past.
>
> The current challenge at Irish Aid is ensuring that there is adequate technical expertise and staffing, challenges that the survey suggests many other agencies face as well. Irish Aid has a sound gender mainstreaming strategy, but the number of staff members from different backgrounds with gender expertise is small. Without economists, health professionals, education specialists, infrastructure specialists and desk officers who understand the relevance of gender issues in particular contexts, gender mainstreaming is unlikely to occur.
>
> Many agencies have incentive structures for agency staff that emphasise the disbursement of programme funds rather than the design of development actions that help to promote gender equality. Gender equality actions often require relatively little money to implement. Thus, unless agency staff are committed to, and capable of, ensuring that projects, programmes and strategies are gender-responsive, they are likely to focus on getting the money out the door without dwelling on how well a programme or country strategy will promote equal rights, resources, and participation of women and men in the partner country.
>
> How will Irish Aid and similar agencies take the needed steps to ensure adequate staff and effective incentives for gender mainstreaming? The successful advancement of gender equality policies in development co-operation programmes may well depend on the answer to this question.

The results of this study suggest that **the four actions recommended by the 2000 DAC study - more gender staff centrally, more gender staff in the field, systematic monitoring and reporting for accountability, and establishment of specific budgets - have *yet to be fulfilled* in most agencies**. To be sure, there has been progress made on some fronts, particularly among agencies that are new to the field. But there has also been some backtracking in the more experienced agencies, and no agency can yet boast that they have fully implemented their gender policy. A few of the mature agencies that have lost ground have, however, pinpointed where some of the failures lie and are planning reforms that they hope will stage a comeback (Box 6.2 describes two examples).

Box 6.2 **Pioneer agencies take stock and seek reforms**

Norway

A recent evaluation of Norway's bilateral work on gender equality in development concluded that Norway's gender mainstreaming approach had been poorly implemented in most sectors, with the exception of the traditional social sectors of education and health.[15] When a new government took office in late 2005, it mandated that gender equality be one of four pillars of Norway's development co-operation.

In response to these developments, the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs is undertaking a three-year project on women and gender equality to improve efforts for women's rights and gender equality in development co-operation. The project first seeks to strengthen gender mainstreaming by adapting the elements that have worked in other organisations to the development co-operation work of the foreign service.

Second, targeted interventions will be intensified. Work on gender equality and women's rights in health, reproductive health, education and HIV/AIDS will be stepped up, for example, to press for the decriminalisation of abortion and, where legal, the provision of safe abortion. The targeted interventions will also emphasise new areas such as the legal rights of women in land reforms and economic empowerment. Norway has taken the initiative on a High Level Commission on the Empowerment of the Poor, where women's rights are an important focus, particularly in relation to rights to own land and property. Norway has also developed an action plan on UN Security Council Resolution 1325 on Women, Peace and Security, which will enhance work on women's participation in post-conflict reconstruction. Most important will be actions to ensure that women are at the table wherever development decisions are being taken.

Thus, by refocusing on gender mainstreaming and targeting both old and new areas for intervention, Norway hopes to strengthen its bilateral development co-operation for women and gender equality.

DFID

In 2000, the United Kingdom's Department for International Development (DFID) issued a gender equality strategy, *Poverty Elimination and Women's Empowerment,* that identified specific goals such as securing equal rights for women and girls, ensuring women's livelihoods, ending violence against women, closing gender gaps in human development, enabling women's leadership and helping women challenge discrimination.

In early 2005, however, a paper was submitted to DFID's senior level Development Committee suggesting that far less was happening on the ground than was implied by DFID's strategy. This paper proposed that DFID either drop the rhetoric or institute reforms to improve work to promote gender equality and women's empowerment in partner countries. DFID's Development Committee chose the latter option, and asked for a thorough evaluation of DFID's work on gender equality that would pinpoint specific weaknesses and make recommendations to improve DFID's performance in this area.

The evaluation is close to completion. It underlines the need to update DFID's gender strategy to reflect the changed context for development co-operation, in particular, the increased emphasis on programme-based approaches to aid, and a greater focus on newer policy areas such as security and development, economic growth and international trade. Currently, DFID's Policy Division is helping to draft an implementation plan that will set out actions across the organisation aimed at strengthening its work on gender. Through such honest internal stocktaking and a willingness to institute reforms, a "mature" agency known for its support of gender equality and women's empowerment hopes to regain its traditional strength in this area.

---

15. Norwegian Institute for Urban and Regional Research (NIBR) (2005), *Evaluation of the "Strategy for Women and Gender Equality in Development Co-operation (1997-2005)",* NIBR, Oslo. www.norad.no/default.asp?MARK_SEARCH=YES&SEARCH_ID=77&V_ITEM_ID=3589.

Perhaps most importantly, few agencies appear to have found the "magic bullet" to deal with gender equality effectively in the new aid environment. Agencies have identified many practices that they believe can be effective in promoting gender equality actions:

- Partnering with in-country civil society organisations;
- Promoting local development of gender action plans;
- Working with other donors to influence PRSs and SWAps;
- Introducing specific gender issues into policy dialogue;
- Facilitating analytical work to identify gender inequalities;
- Supporting gender-responsive budget initiatives; and
- Linking gender equality with other cross-cutting issues such as HIV/AIDS.

Few agencies can boast of clear successes in the new environment, however, and many appear to be searching for answers as to how to deal with gender equality actions when partner countries are in the driver's seat and aid takes the form of budget support. Also, most of the effective practices that agencies have identified require levels of staffing and specialised budgets as well as accountability mechanisms that lie beyond agency grasp.

The overall conclusion of this study is thus that **progress towards fulfilling the promise of the Beijing *Platform for Action* has been slow and uneven among the DAC members' development co-operation agencies**. In most member countries, development co-operation agencies are "talking the talk", but they are only partially "walking the walk" and are doing so largely in the areas of development co-operation that have always been seen as "women's issues": education and health. What steps are needed to overcome this disappointing collective record? How can member governments improve their performance in this area? This study, as well as earlier studies (for example, the results of the informal consultation reprinted in Annex D), suggests four areas needed to improve the record to date.

First, recognise that implementing a gender mainstreaming approach is expensive and make the necessary investments. Mainstreaming involves an ongoing need for specialist staff, training of non-specialists and budgets to support the catalytic work of the specialists. One of the most serious misunderstandings about a mainstreaming approach is that it can be done on the cheap, with few specialist staff, minimal training of non-specialists, and inexpensive, part-time focal points responsible for ensuring implementation. This view is wrong.

Imagine how well agencies would function if there were no technical staff, help desks or training to support the mainstreaming of information technology onto individuals' desk tops, laptops and handheld devices! Most agencies have invested heavily in the mainstreaming of technology and continue to provide significant support in this area. Gender equality requires a similar investment if it is to be effectively mainstreamed into the agency's development work. Indeed, the mainstreaming of gender equality actions is far more complicated and demanding than is the mainstreaming of desk top computing because gender mainstreaming involves not just agency staff, but partner country counterparts as well. It also deals with myriad aspects of social, economic and political life, and with a culturally and personally sensitive set of issues. If member governments choose to maintain a strategy of gender mainstreaming, they need to recognise the commitment of resources needed to make this approach work – and make the needed investments on an ongoing basis.

Second, institutionalise attention to gender equality issues through accountability and incentives structures as well as staff recruitment and training procedures. Issues that organisations take seriously become a focus of internal controls and culture. Where poverty reduction in partner countries is the development co-operation agency's main goal, many agencies adopt structures and practices that reinforce attention to the poverty implications of development actions and that reward agency staff who pay attention to these implications. Management also reinforces attention to poverty reduction through frequent monitoring and performance assessments.

Yet very few member agencies have instituted a full package of such controls and procedures to ensure agency action on gender equality issues. Without monitoring for results by top management, without course corrections based on monitoring outcomes, and without staff recruitment and training practices that reinforce a culture of gender awareness, the gender equality policies of member agencies are unlikely to be implemented fully. Currently, agencies say they promote gender equality in development co-operation, but they do not have in place the structures and procedures that raise this goal to the level of the goal of disbursing development assistance or fighting poverty.

Third, increase the number of well-trained, senior, dedicated gender advisors in the field. Because donor actions increasingly depend on country dialogue and the partner government's development plans, experienced, well-trained, dedicated gender equality champions need to be present in partner countries to ensure that government plans and country dialogue incorporate gender equality issues. Indeed, as was noted earlier, all of the approaches that agencies have identified as effective for gender mainstreaming in the new aid environment require the support of dedicated experts, particularly in the field.

Raising gender issues in country dialogue, partnering with civil society organisations, supporting gender-responsive budget initiatives, sponsoring analytical work to identify critical gender equality issues or assess the likely gender consequences of government policies and development plans, supporting in-country development of gender action plans, and working to link donor-supported activity on HIV/AIDS with gender equality actions – *all* of these approaches require a significant staff presence on the donor side. In some partner countries, it may make sense to combine the gender mainstreaming support function with the civil society liaison function, but agency management needs to recognise that working with peers and counterparts to promote gender equality actions in development co-operation takes a significant expenditure of staff time and expertise. It cannot be done by a lone staff member whose main responsibilities and technical expertise lie elsewhere.

Fourth, recognise the staff capabilities needed to effectively promote gender equality actions in the new aid environment. The new aid goals and modalities demand new capabilities of all agency staff, especially those in the field. These new capabilities include negotiating skills, ability to dialogue effectively, listening skills, organising complex work loads and knowing how to partner with governmental and civil society entities. Gender advisors need all of these skills plus additional skills: arguing persuasively and convincing others to take actions that are not always popular; maintaining the networks and information sources to know when critical meetings are taking place; ensuring they will be invited to these meetings; influencing many processes simultaneously that involve other agency staff, other donors, civil society organisations and partner governments; and understanding analytical work well enough to be able to sponsor sound gender analysis and use the results in dialogue with country counterparts.

Effective gender advisors also need sectoral knowledge and skills to ensure their credibility and ability to understand key intervention points. This often means having multiple advisors, because no single individual with a strong background in gender and development is also likely to have expertise in all sectors in which the agency works.

Although this study and others have made clear that **some of the failures to meet the commitments made at Beijing arise from weak structures, poor procedures, low levels of investment and, ultimately, a failure of political will**, many questions remain about the way forward to strengthen donor countries' support for gender equality and women's empowerment in partner countries. Questions concerning donor agencies that are in need of further study (and which may have different answers in different agencies) include:

- Whether staff training for gender mainstreaming actually affects the extent to which agencies include gender equality actions in their development co-operation – or the type of training that is most effective in achieving this goal;

- Whether centralised gender units or lone advisors supported by a network of field-based gender advisors can best promote gender mainstreaming;

- Where in the agency the chief gender advisor should be located for maximising influence;

- The most effective monitoring and accountability procedures for ensuring consistent, agency-wide attention to the gender implications of agency policies and actions vis-à-vis partner countries; and

- Whether a gender mainstreaming approach needs to be supplanted or heavily supplemented by a strategic focus on interventions in particular sectors or areas of development activity.

This last question is especially pressing. Gender mainstreaming has been the main approach used by development agencies to achieve the goal of gender equality for over a decade, but this approach has not borne the fruit that was anticipated at the Beijing conference. It may be time to reconsider this strategy and give serious thought as to whether there are more effective alternatives.

On a final note, we need to look more at the changes in society that are most critical for empowering women and ensuring greater equality between males and females. Although many documents, including the Beijing *Platform for Action* and the recently completed Millennium Project report on gender equality[16] identify desirable areas of change, the empirical evidence needed to know which changes are most critical often is weak. To take one example, the extent to which female education actually empowers women in the absence of other societal changes is not well understood, despite the extensive evidence that female education has many desirable consequences for women and girls, men and boys and society as a whole.

---

16. UN Millennium Project (2005), *Taking Action: Achieving gender Equality and Empowering Women.* Task Force on Education and Gender Equality. United Nations Development Programme, New York.

If we understood better the changes that are most critical for empowering women in partner countries, it might allow donor agencies to devise more targeted and successful programmes than a broad mainstreaming approach has thus far achieved.

ANNEX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

Review of Changing Gender Equality Policies and Institutional Approaches in Development Co-operation

DAC Network on Gender Equality

December 2005

Introduction

At its July 2005 meeting, the OECD DAC Network on Gender Equality agreed to conduct a survey of members to update the information on gender equality in development co-operation that was collected in 1999 [see DCD/DAC/WID(99)13]. The findings of this new survey will be used as an input into a planned revision of the *DAC guidelines for gender equality and women's empowerment in development co-operation.*

Because the goals and modalities of development co-operation have changed considerably since 1999 and are continuing to change rapidly, the Network felt that an assessment of changing gender equality policies and practices was needed. Are ministries, agencies and departments of development co-operation changing the ways in which they promote gender equality and women's advancement in their development co-operation in light of such new goals and aid modalities? Some agencies have had nearly 10 years experience aligning their development co-operation with Poverty Reduction Strategies (PRSs) and other medium-term plans, and some have had extensive experience developing sector-wide approaches (SWAps). These approaches are being accelerated as we move into an era that promises significantly scaled-up aid and in which there will be a determined effort by both donors and partner countries to put into practice the partnership commitments of the *Paris Declaration* (2005): ownership, alignment, harmonisation, managing for results and accountability. An increasing number of donors are adopting budget support as a primary strategy with some of their partners. Large-scale global funds for public goods have also emerged in recent years. At the same time, the achievement of the MDGs continues to be of primary importance for many donors and partners.

The goals of this review are to ascertain any changes and identify emerging good practices and success stories that can be shared among members. The questionnaire-based study is intended as a complement to the Creditor Reporting System study, *Analysis of Aid in Support of Gender Equality, 1999-2003* (2005).

GENDER EQUALITY AND AID DELIVERY: WHAT HAS CHANGED IN DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION AGENCIES SINCE 1999?

43

The questionnaire that follows has been designed for ease of response. Please fill it in electronically. You can save the file at any time, then re-open it to enter additional information. If you wish to explain any of your answers, there are boxes in various places that can be used for this purpose, including at the end of the questionnaire. If your organisation completed a questionnaire in 1999, you will find it attached to aid you in identifying changes during 2000-2005. Responses to the current questionnaire will be analysed statistically and qualitatively. Individual member organisations will be identified in the final report only to note examples of good practice or success stories.

We have sent the questionnaire to you because our records identify you as the highest-level person responsible for promoting gender equality or women's advancement in the work of your organisation. **If you no longer hold this position, we ask that you let us know who currently holds it as soon as possible.**

We ask that you return the completed survey and supporting documents no later than Friday, 3 February 2006. To return the questionnaire, simply press the "Submit by email" button that appears on the last page. You may want to save the file first on your computer and you will have the option of printing it out for your records at the same time you submit it via email. If you have any questions about the questionnaire or the survey, please contact the Secretariat for assistance. E-mail Julie.Seif@OECD.org or telephone her at +33-1-45-24-89-75.

Note: We use the shorthand "GAD" to refer to gender and development and "WID" to refer to women in development. "DK" means "don't know," which is used as an answer option in some questions. Please use this option if you are unable to ascertain the answer to the question.

Please enter your organisation's name here:

A. Gender equality mandate of your organisation

1. Does your agency have an official policy to promote gender equality or women's advancement or rights in its development work?

    Yes > **Answer Question 2**
    No > **Skip to Question 7**

2. Please describe this policy in a sentence or two:

3. *If this* policy *or a summary is available in English on the Web, please click the circle and enter the URL below. Alternatively, if you have an electronic version or hard copy in English, please click the appropriate circle and email or post a copy to the Secretariat.*

    URL:
    A copy is being emailed to Julie.Seif@OECD.org.
    A copy is being posted to Julie Seif, OECD DAC, 2 rue André Pascal, 75775 Paris CEDEX 16, France.
    There is no English translation or summary of this policy available.

4. Has this policy changed since the end of 1999?

    Yes
    No > **Skip to Question 6**
    Don't know > **Skip to Question 6**

5. How has the policy changed?

6. In what year did your agency first adopt a gender equality or WID policy?

   Year
   Unable to ascertain

7. According to the best available information, to what extent is your agency promoting gender equality or women's advancement in partner countries? Specifically, do **most**, **some** or **only a few** of your agency's projects, programmes and country strategies include gender-related actions?

   a. Projects
   MostSome   Only a few   Don't know

   b. Programmes
   MostSome   Only a few   Don't know

   c. Country strategies
   MostSome   Only a few   Don't know

8. Does your organisation use the MDGs as a framework for development co-operation?

   Yes
   No > **Skip to Section B, Question 12**

9. In your organisation's work, is Goal 3 (the gender equality goal) emphasised **as strongly**, **more strongly** or **less strongly** than the other MDGs?

   As strongly
   More strongly
   Less strongly
   Unable to ascertain

10. Does your organisation focus on all aspects of Goal 3 or only on the Target for Goal 3 (eliminate gender disparity in education)?

    All of Goal 3
    Goal 3 Target only
    Goal 3 is ignored completely
    Unable to ascertain

11. To what extent does your organisation address the gender equality dimensions of the other MDGs (Goals 1-2 and 4-8)?

    Gender equality dimensions are addressed in **all** of the other MDGs
    Gender equality dimensions are addressed **in some but not all** of the other MDGs
    Gender equality dimensions of the other MDGs are **ignored**
    Other. Please describe:
    Unable to ascertain

B. **Staffing and institutional arrangements for advising on gender equality and women's advancement**

12. How large is your ministry, agency or department? *Please click the appropriate circle and enter the total number of full-time equivalent staff, including managers:*

Enter number
Unable to ascertain

13. Does your organisation have a centralised gender equality or WID unit with two or more people, including the head?
Please include any unit with multiple mandates, one of which is gender equality/WID.
Do not *include units whose sole focus is gender equality within the organisation (personnelissues) rather than in development co-operation.*

Yes
No > **Skip to Question 17**

14. How many full-time equivalent individuals are in this unit when it is at full strength, including its head?

Enter number:

15. And how many of these staff members have responsibility for gender/WID work?

All of them
Enter number if not all of them:

16. What is this unit's annual discretionary programme budget, i.e., money that can be used strategically as the unit or its head sees fit? *Please report using your country's currency.*

Annual discretionary budget:

17. Does your organisation have a central advisor for gender equality or WID who works without support from a gender equality or WID unit?
By advisor, we mean a person with gender expertise who has responsibility for gender policy implementation and who devotes a significant portion of her/his time to this responsibility.

Yes
No > **Skip to Question 19**

18. What is this person's annual discretionary programme budget for gender equality/WID, i.e., money that can be used strategically as she or he sees fit? *Please report using your country's currency.*

Annual discretionary budget:

19. How many levels down from the organisation's top executive position is the most senior gender advisor or gender/WID unit head?

0 levels down - the top executive is also the most senior gender person
1 level down
2 levels down
3 levels down
4 levels down
More than 4 levels down
There is no gender advisor or gender/WID unit head

20. In addition to staff in a central gender equality/WID unit or a central gender advisor, how many other gender equality/WID advisors does your organisation have?

None > **Skip to Question 26**
Some.
Enter number here:

21. To whom do the gender advisors outside of the centralised gender equality/WID unit typically report? *Check all that apply.*

    Headquarters advisors report to chief gender advisor or gender/WID unit head
    Headquarters advisors report to someone else at headquarters
    Embassy/field advisors report to chief gender advisor or gender/WID unit head
    Embassy/field advisors report to someone else at headquarters
    Embassy/field advisors report to someone in the embassy or field office
    Other. Please describe:

22. What percentage of all gender advisors are located in partner country embassies or field offices rather than at headquarters?

    None > **Skip to Question 26**
    1 - 24%
    25 - 49%
    50 - 74%
    75 - 100%
    Unable to ascertain

23. Approximately what percentage of all your partner country embassies or field offices have a gender/WID advisor on their staff?

    1 - 24%
    25 - 49%
    50 - 74%
    75 - 100%
    Unable to ascertain

24. Are the gender advisors in embassies or field offices typically senior officers, mid-level officers or junior officers?

    Most are senior officers
    Most are mid-level officers
    Most are junior officers
    Other. Please describe:
    Unable to ascertain

25. Are most of the gender advisors in embassies or field offices locally engaged or are they seconded from headquarters?

    Most are locally engaged
    Most are seconded from headquarters
    Other. Please describe:
    Unable to ascertain

26. *Now we would like to learn about your agency's expenditures on gender equality or women's advancement in partner countries.* In addition to the budget of the gender/WID unit or chief gender advisor, approximately how much does your organisation spend annually on gender or WID-related development co-operation activities? *Please report in your country's currency.*

    Enter approximate amount here:
    Unable to ascertain

27. Does your agency use the DAC gender equality policy marker to report to the OECD on development assistance that is principally or significantly focused on gender equality?

    Yes, in all sectors
    Yes, only in some sectors
    No, not in any sectors > **Skip to Question 29**

28. Does your agency also use the DAC gender equality policy marker for planning, monitoring or other purposes within your agency?

    Yes > **Skip to Question 30**
    No > **Skip to Question 30**

29. What is the main reason your agency does not use the DAC policy marker on gender equality?

30. Which of the following policies and procedures does your organisation use to promote gender equality or women's advancement in development co-operation? *Check all that apply.*

    Agency policies
    The agency's highest policy statement on development co-operation prioritises gender equality, women's empowerment or gender mainstreaming
    Some or all of the agency's sectoral policies identify actions to promote gender equality or women's advancement in that sector

    Agency internal procedures
    There is annual or more frequent monitoring of gender equality/WID in development co-operation
    Log-frames that contain gender indicators or elements are used for all projects and programmes
    Gender/WID actions are a criterion for assessing the overall quality of projects and programmes
    As part of institutional sign-off, a gender/WID expert must certify that policies, projects, programmes or strategies cover GAD/WID adequately
    Top management reviews progress in gender equality/WID promotion annually or more frequently

    Agency personnel policies and practices
    There is required gender/WID training for all staff and/or managers
    There is optional gender/WID training for staff and/or managers
    Knowledge of gender equality/WID is a criterion used when hiring professional staff (not just gender specialists)
    Annual performance evaluations of all staff are based partly on gender equality/WID actions
    There is special recognition of projects, programmes, policies or strategies with outstanding treatment of gender/WID issues (e.g. prizes, ceremonies, certificates)

    Relations with partner countries
    There are agreed gender equality objectives in most or all co-operation agreements with individual partner countries
    There is regular policy dialogue on gender equality with partner countries (and not just with the Minister for Women's Affairs)

Building external support

The agency provides financial or political support for the gender equality efforts of multilateral organisations and/or global funds

The agency provides financial or political support to NGOs that advocate for gender equality or women's advancement in development co-operation

The agency sponsors special events to raise awareness of gender equality/WID issues

The agency participates in international forums and events that highlight GAD/WID issues

The agency pursues gender equality objectives when participating in global forums, such as UN conferences, or works to ensure that other government representatives do so

Other. Please describe:

C.   Changing aid goals and modalities

Some of the new aid goals and modalities have been in existence only since the Millennium Summit*, but others have been in existence longer. In this section of the questionnaire, we are interested in learning about changes since 1999 in your agency's aid goals and modalities.*

31. Which of the following aid goals and modalities have become **more** important, **less** important or have remained unchanged in importance in your organisation's development assistance since the end of 1999?

    a. Poverty reduction or elimination as the overarching goal of development co-operation

    b. Country ownership of development co-operation strategies and plans

    c. Focus on the policy dialogue with partner countries

    d. Alignment of bilateral development assistance with PRSs or other country-generated development plans

    e. Use of projects in development assistance

    f. Use of programme-based approaches such as general budget support and SWAps

    g. Harmonised approaches with other donors through joint assistance strategies, "silent" partnerships, etc.

    h. Contributions to multilateral development co-operation agencies and global funds

    i. Use of in-house analytical work guide development assistance

    j. Focus on managing for results

    k. Focus on mutual accountability with partner countries

    l. Overall emphasis on gender/WID actions in development assistance

32. Currently, approximately what percentage of your organisation's expenditures on bilateral development assistance goes to programme-based approaches such as budget support or SWAps (versus projects)?

GENDER EQUALITY AND AID DELIVERY: WHAT HAS CHANGED IN DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION AGENCIES SINCE 1999?

49

None
1 - 24%
25 - 49%
50 - 74%
75 - 100%
Unable to ascertain

33. Do you feel that changes in aid goals and modalities in your organisation have made it more or less difficult to integrate gender equality/women's advancement into development co-operation?

More difficult
Less difficult
No change: About the same degree of difficulty as always
Don't know

34. Why is this?

D. Changes in staffing and institutional arrangements to support gender equality and women's advancement

35. Has each of the following **increased**, **decreased** or remained **unchanged** since the end of 1999?

a. Number of staff in the central gender/WID unit

b. Size of gender unit's or chief advisor's discretionary programme budget

c. Number of levels down from the top executive of the most senior gender position

d. Number of gender advisors in the agency, other than in the central gender/WID unit

e. Number of gender advisors in the field

f. Number of embassies/field offices with a gender advisor

g. Average level of seniority of gender advisors in the field

h. Amount of your agency's development assistance focused on gender equality and women's advancement

36. Have any of the changes you identified above been instituted specifically to respond to changing aid goals and modalities?

Yes
No > **Skip to Question 40**

37. Please describe the changes and how they respond to changing aid goals or modalities:

38. Have these changes helped to maintain or improve the integration of gender equality or women's advancement into development co-operation?

Yes
No

39. Why is that?

40. Overall, has the focus on gender equality or women's advancement in your organisation's development work **increased**, **decreased** or **remained unchanged** since the end of 1999?

Increased
Decreased
Remained unchanged
Unable to ascertain

E. Emerging good practice/success stories and constraints to greater success

41. Are there policies, practices or new ways of working in your organisation, alone or in partnership with other organisations, that you think have been particularly effective in improving gender equality or women's advancement in partner countries?

Yes
No > **Skip to Question 43**

42. Please describe these policies or practices and explain why you think they have been particularly effective:

43. Are there instances where your organisation has been particularly successful in promoting gender equality or women's advancement in partner countries?

Yes
No > **Skip to Question 45**

44. Please describe the success(es):

45. In your judgment, is each of the following a **major** or **minor** constraint or **not a constraint** at all to integrating gender equality/WID dimensions into your organisation's work?

a. Inadequate staffing for gender/WID work

b. Lack of a centralised gender equality/WID function or unit

c. Too few gender advisors in the field

d. Field-based gender advisors are of too low a status to be influential

e. Insufficient budget for gender unit or gender advisors

f. Poor organisational location of gender unit/central advisor

g. Insufficient agency budget for gender equality/WID in development co-operation

h. Lack of staff training on gender equality/WID

i. Lack of monitoring of gender equality/WID objectives in development co-operation

j. Absence of any requirement of gender equality/WID actions for institutional sign-off on projects, policies, programmes or strategies

k. Lack of national political leadership on this issue

l. Partner governments' lack of concern with addressing gender inequalities

m. Multilateral agencies'/global funds' indifference to addressing gender inequalities

n. Other. Please describe:

46. Is there anything else you would like to explain that might be helpful to the Secretariat?

Thank you very much for your co-operation in completing this questionnaire. We would also like URLs, electronic versions or hard copies (in English) of the following documents:

Any guidance notes, technical advice documents or frameworks that have been developed or are in draft that recommend gender-responsive practices under the new aid modalities

Any other relevant evaluations or appraisal reports that would help our understanding of how to integrate gender equality dimensions into the new aid modalities

URLs
Copies are being emailed to Julie.Seif@OECD.org
Copes are being posted to Julie Seif, OECD DAC, 2 Andre Pascal, 75775 Paris, CEDEX 16, France

Please provide the name, email address and telephone number of a person we may contact if we have any questions.

Name:
Email address:
Telephone (with country and city codes):

Thank you again **for your contribution to this study. Please remember to save the questionnaire on your computer before submitting it. To submit, press the button below. A menu of options will appear that includes printing and submission of the file.**

ANNEX B

RESPONDING AGENCIES

Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID)
Austrian Development Agency
Belgian Directorate General for Development Co-operation and the Belgian
  Technical Co-operation (responded together)
Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)
Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA)
European Commission
Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland (MFA)
Agence française de développement (AFD)
German Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development (BMZ)
German Technical Co-operation Agency (GTZ)
German Development Bank (KfW)
Development Co-operation Ireland
General Directorate for Development Co-operation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
  of Italy
Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan (MOFA)
Japan International Co-operation Agency (JICA)
Japanese Bank for International Co-operation (JBIC)
Ministère des affaires étrangères et de l'immigration du Grand-Duché de
  Luxembourg - Department for Development Co-operation
Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Netherlands
New Zealand Agency for International Development (NZAID)
Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Norwegian Agency for Development Co-operation (NORAD)
Portuguese Development Assistance Institute (Instituto Português de Apoio ao
  Desenvolvimento) Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Ministério dos Negócios Estrangeiros)
Development Aid Policies Planning and Evaluation Division, Spanish Secretariat
of State for International Co-operation
Swedish International Development Co-operation Agency (Sida)
Swiss Agency for Development and Co-operation (SDC)
Department for International Development (DFID), United Kingdom
US Agency for International Development (USAID)

ANNEX C

STATISTICAL SUMMARY OF QUANTITATIVE RESPONSES

1. Does your agency have an official policy to promote gender equality or women's advancement or rights in its development work?
   Yes – 26
   No – 1

4. Has this policy changed since the end of 1999?
   Yes – 16
   No – 10
   NA – 1 [NA means "not answered" or "not applicable"]

6. In what year did your agency first adopt a gender equality or WID policy?
   1976-1990 – 9
   1991-1996 – 7
   1997-2005 – 7
   NA – 4

7. According to the best available information, to what extent is your agency promoting gender equality or women's advancement in partner countries? Specifically, do **most**, **some** or **only a few** of your agency's projects, programmes and country strategies include gender-related actions?

   a. Projects
   Most – 7
   Some – 17
   Only a few – 3

   b. Programmes
   Most – 6
   Some – 15
   Only a few – 5
   Don't know – 1

   c. Country strategies
   Most – 12
   Some – 9
   Only a few – 4
   NA – 2

8. Does your organisation use the MDGs as a framework for development co-operation?
   Yes – 26
   No – 1

9. In your organisations work, is Goal 3 (the gender equality goal) emphasised as **strongly**, **more strongly** or **less strongly** than the other MDGs?
As strongly – 16
More strongly – 2
Less strongly – 7
Unable to ascertain – 1
NA – 1

10. Does your organisation focus on all aspects of Goal 3 or only on the Target for Goal 3 (eliminate gender disparity in eduation)?
All of Goal 3 – 20
Goal 3 target only – 3
Goal 3 is ignored completely – 0
Unable to ascertain – 3
NA – 1

11. To what extent does your organisation address the gender equality dimensions of the other MDGs (Goals1-2 and 4-8)?
Gender equality dimensions are addressed in **all** of the other MDGs – 12
Gender equality dimensions addressed in **some but not all** of the other MDGs – 12
Gender equality dimensions of the other MDGs are **ignored** – 1
Unable to ascertain – 1
NA – 1

12. How large is your ministry, agency or department?
<300 – 7
300-599 – 5
600-999 – 3
1000-1999 – 5
>2000 – 5
NA – 2

13. Does your organisation have a centralised gender equality of WID unit with two or more people including the head?
Yes – 16
No – 11

14. How many full-time equivalent individuals are in this unit when it is at full strength, including its head?
<6 – 7
6-9 – 4
10+ - 4
NA – 12

15. And how many of these staff members have responsibility for gender/WID work?
All of them – 7
Some – 10
NA – 10

Enter number if not all of them:
.5-3 – 5
4+ - 4
NA – 18

16. What is this unit's annual discretionary programme budget, i.e. money that can be used strategically as the unit or its head sees fit? *Please report using your country's currency.*
Zero – 5
€1-499,000 – 4
€500,00-699,999 – 4
€700,000+ - 3
NA – 11

17. Does your organisation have a central advisor for gender equality or WID who works without support from a gender equality of WID unit?
Yes – 16
No – 11

18. What is this person's annual
Zero – 12
€1-99,000 – 2
>€100,000 – 2
NA – 11

19. How many levels down from the organisation's top executive position is the most senior gender advisor or gender/WID unit head?
Zero levels down – 0
One level down – 2
Two levels down – 6
Three levels down – 8
Four levels down – 9
>Four levels down – 2

20. In addition to staff in a central gender equality/WID unit or a central gender advisor, how many other gender equality/WID advisors does your organisation have?
None – 14
<10 – 6
10-25 – 3
26-60 – 3
>60 – 1

21. To whom do the gender advisors outside of the centralised gender equality/WID unit typically report? *Check all that apply.*
Headquarters advisors report to chief gender advisor or gender/WID unit head - 4
Headquarters advisors report to someone else at headquarters - 7
Embassy/field advisors report to chief gender advisor or gender/WID unit head - 1
Embassy/field advisors report to someone else at headquarters -3
Embassy/field advisors report to someone in the embassy or field office - 8
Other - 7

22. What percentage of all gender advisors are located in partner country embassies or field offices rather than at headquarters?
None – 4
1-24% - 1
25-49% - 2
50-74% - 5
75-100% - 1
Unable to ascertain – 6
NA – 8

23. Approximately what percentage of all your partner country embassies or field offices have a gender/WID advisor on their staff?
    None – 4
    1-24% - 1
    25-49% - 2
    50-74% - 6
    75-100% - 2
    Unable to ascertain – 4
    NA – 8

24. Are the gender advisors in embassies or field offices typically senior officers, mid-level officers or junior officers?
    Most are senior officers – 1
    Most are mid-level officers – 4
    Most are junior officers – 4
    Other – 3
    Unable to ascertain – 3
    NA – 12

25. Are most of the gender advisors in embassies or field offices locally engaged or are they seconded from headquarters?
    Most are locally engaged – 8
    Most are seconded from headquarters – 5
    Unable to ascertain – 2
    NA – 12

26. *Now we would like to learn about your agency's expenditures on gender equality or women's advancement in partner countries.* In addition to the budget of the gender/WID unit or chief gender advisor, approximately how much does your organisation spend annually on gender of WID-related development co-operation activities? *Please report ion your country's currency.*
    <€1 million – 1
    €1-4.9 million – 6
    €5-99 million – 3
    >€99 million – 6
    Unable to ascertain/NA – 11

27. Does your agency use the DAC gender policy market to report to the OECD on development assistance that is principally or significantly focused on gender equality?
    Yes, in all sectors – 21
    Yes, only in some sectors – 1
    No, not in any sectors – 5

28. Does your agency also use the DAC gender policy marker for planning, monitoring or other purposes within your agency?
    Yes – 17
    No – 5
    NA – 5

30. Which of the following policies and procedures does your organisation use to promote gender equality or women's advancement in development co-operation? *Check all that apply.*

Methods 1 – 20

The agency's highest policy statement on development co-operation prioritises gender equality, women's empowerment or gender mainstreaming.
Method 1 – 19

Some or all of the agency's sectoral policies identify actions to promote gender equality or women's advancement in that sector.
Method 2 – 18

There is annual or more frequent monitoring of gender equality/WID in development co-operation.
Method 3 – 14

Log-frames that contain gender indicators or elements are used for all projects and programmes.
Method 4 – 11

Gender/WID actions are a criterion for assessing the overall quality of projects and programmes.
Method 5 – 19

As part of institutional signoff, a gender/WID expert must certify that policies, projects, programmes or strategies cover GAD/WID adequately.
Method 6 – 3

Top management reviews progress in gender equality/WID promotion annually or more frequently.
Method 7 – 6

There is required gender/WID training for all staff and/or managers.
Method 8 – 6

There is optional gender/WID training for staff and/or managers.
Method 9 – 15

Knowledge of gender equality/WID is a criterion used when hiring professional staff (not just gender specialists).
Method 10 – 3

Annual performance evaluations of all staff are based partly on gender equality/WID actions.
Method 11 – 1

There is special recognition of projects, programmes, policies or strategies with outstanding treatment of gender/WID issues (e.g. prizes, ceremonies, certificates)
Method 12 – 2

There are agreed gender equality objectives in most or all co-operation agreements with individual partner countries.
Method 13 – 10

There is regular policy dialogue on gender equality with partner countries (and not just with the Minister for Women's Affairs).
Method 14 – 10

The agency provides financial or political support for the gender equality efforts of multilateral organisations and/or global funds.
Method 15 – 19

The agency provides financial or political support to NGOs that advocate for gender equality or women's advancement in development co-operation.
Method 16 – 23

The agency sponsors special events to raise awareness of gender equality/WUID issues.
Method 17 – 18

The agency participates in international forums and events that highlight GAD/WID issues.
Method 18 – 26

The agency pursues gender equality objectives when participating in global for a, such as UN conferences, or works to ensure that other government representatives do so.
Method 19 – 21

Other
Method 20 – 7

31. Which of the following aid goals and modalities have become **more** important, **less** important or have remained **unchanged** in importance in your organisation's development assistance since the end of 1999?

a. Poverty reduction or elimination as the overarching goal of development co-operation.
More important - 14
Less important – 1
Unchanged – 9
Don't know – 1
NA – 2

b. Country ownership of development co-operation strategies and plans.
More important – 23
Less important – 1
Unchanged – 2
Don't know – 1

c. Focus on the policy dialogue with partner countries.
More important – 22
Less important – 1
Unchanged – 3
Don't know – 1

d. Alignment of bilateral development assistance with PRSs or other country-generated development plans.
More important – 25
Less important – 1
Don't know – 1

e. Use of projects in development assistance.
More important – 0
Less important – 16
Unchanged – 10
NA – 1

GENDER EQUALITY AND AID DELIVERY: WHAT HAS CHANGED IN DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION AGENCIES SINCE 1999?

59

f. Use of programme-based approaches such as general budget support and SWAps
More important – 25
Less important - 1
Unchanged – 1

g. Harmonised approaches with other donors through joint assistance strategies, "silent" partnerships, etc.
More important – 24
Less important – 1
Unchanged – 1
Don't know – 1

h. Contributions to multilateral development co-operation agencies and global funds
More important – 18
Less important – 1
Unchanged – 6
NA – 2

i. Use of in-house analytical work to guide development assistance
More important – 13
Less important – 3
Unchanged – 9
Don't know – 2

j. Focus on managing for results
More important – 22
Less important – 1
Unchanged – 4

k. Focus on mutual accountability with partner countries
More important – 19
Less important – 1
Unchanged – 5
Don't know – 2

l. Overall emphasis on gender/WID actions in development assistance
More important – 17
Less important – 4
Unchanged – 5
Don't know – 1

32. Currently, approximately what percentage of your organisation's expenditures on bilateral development assistance goes to programme-based approaches such as budget support or SWAps (versus projects)?
None – 1
1-24% - 11
25-49% - 5
50-74% - 3
75-100% - 0
Unable to ascertain – 7

33.Do you feel that changes in aid goals and modalities in your organisation have made it more or less difficult to integrate gender equality/women's advancement into development co-operation?
More difficult – 10
Less difficult – 4
About the same degree of difficulty as always – 9
Don't know – 4

35.Has each of the following **increased, decreased** or **remained unchanged** since the end of 1999?

a. Number of staff in the central gender/WID unit.
Increased – 10
Decreased – 5
Unchanged – 10
Don't know, inapplicable – 2

b. Size of gender unit's or chief advisor's discretionary programme budget.
Increased - 7
Decreased – 6
Unchanged – 8
Don't know, inapplicable – 6

c. Number of levels down from the top executive of the most senior gender position.
Increased - 4
Decreased – 5
Unchanged – 13
Don't know, inapplicable – 5

d. Number of gender advisors in the agency, other than in the central gender/WID unit.
Increased – 9
Decreased – 5
Unchanged – 9
Don't know, inapplicable – 4

e. Number of gender advisors in the field.
Increased – 4
Decreased – 1
Unchanged – 7
Don't know, inapplicable – 14
NA – 1

f. Number of embassies/field offices with a gender advisor.
Increased – 4
Decreased – 2
Unchanged – 7
Don't know, inapplicable – 14

g. Average level of seniority of gender advisors in the field.
Increased – 2
Decreased – 1
Unchanged – 11
Don't know, inapplicable – 12
NA – 1

h. Amount of your agency's development assistance focused on gender equality and women's advancement.
Increased – 14
Decreased – 2
Unchanged – 4
Don't know, inapplicable – 7

36. Have any of the changes you identified above been instituted specifically to respond to changing aid goals and modalities?
Yes – 8
No – 18
NA – 1

38. Have these changes helped to maintain or improve the integration of gender equality or women's advancement into development co-operation?
Yes – 9
No – 3
NA – 15

40. Overall, has the focus on gender equality or women's advancement in your organisation's development work **increased, decreased** or **remained unchanged** since the end of 1999?
Increased – 17
Decreased – 6
Remain unchanged – 3
Unable to ascertain – 1

41. Are there policies, practices or new ways of working in your organisation, alone or in partnership with other organisations, that you think have been particularly effective in improving gender equality of women's advancement in partner countries?
Yes – 18
No – 8
NA – 1

43. Are there instances where your organisation has been particularly successful in promoting gender equality or women's advancement in partner countries?
Yes – 20
No – 4
NA - 3

45. In your judgment, is each of the following a **major** or **minor** constraint or **not a constraint** at all to integrating gender equality/WID dimensions into your organisation's work?

a. Inadequate staffing for gender/WID work
Major constraint – 19
Minor constraint – 6
Not a constraint at all – 2

b. Lack of a centralised gender equality/WID function or unit.
Major constraint – 3
Minor constraint – 7
Not a constraint at all – 12
Don't know – 3
NA – 2

c. Too few gender advisors in the field.
Major constraint – 13
Minor constraint – 0
Not a constraint at all – 12
Don't know – 2

d. Field-based gender advisors are of too low a status to be influential.
Major constraint – 9
Minor constraint – 6
Not a constraint at all – 1
Don't know – 8
NA – 3

e. Insufficient budget for gender unit or gender advisors.
Major constraint – 11
Minor constraint – 6
Not a constraint at all – 9
Don't know – 1

f. Poor organisation location of gender unit/central advisor.
Major constraint – 7
Minor constraint – 7
Not a constraint at all – 10
Don't know – 1
NA – 2

g. Insufficient agency budget for gender equality/WID in development co-operation.
Major constraint – 12
Minor constraint – 4
Not a constraint at all – 7
Don't know – 1
NA – 3

h. Lack of staff training on gender equality/WID.
Major constraint – 15
Minor constraint – 8
Not a constraint at all – 0
Don't know – 2
NA – 2

i. Lack of monitoring of gender equality/WID objectives in development co-operation.
Major constraint – 13
Minor constraint – 10
Not a constraint at all – 3
Don't know – 0
NA – 1

j. Absense of any requirement of gender equality/WID actions for institutional signoff on projects, policies, programmes or strategies.
Major constraint – 13
Minor constraint – 5
Not a constraint at all – 5
Don't know – 3
NA – 1

GENDER EQUALITY AND AID DELIVERY: WHAT HAS CHANGED IN DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION AGENCIES SINCE 1999?

63

k. Lack of national political leadership on this issue.
Major constraint – 8
Minor constraint – 7
Not a constraint at all – 11
Don't know – 0
NA – 1

l. Partner government's lack of concern with addressing gender inequalities.
Major constraint – 12
Minor constraint – 9
Not a constraint at all – 3
Don't know – 1
NA – 2

m. Multilateral agencies'/global funds' indifference to addressing gender inequalities.
Major constraint – 8
Minor constraint – 9
Not a constraint at all – 6
Don't know – 2
NA – 2

ANNEX D

INFORMAL CONSULTATION ON "STRATEGIES FOR GENDER EQUALITY – IS MAINSTREAMING A DEAD END?"

Oslo, November 2002[17]

Conclusion and recommendations

Following four days of discussion of strategies for gender equality in international organisations, the gender focal points of 15 UN organisations and development banks together with representatives of five donor agencies and resource persons drew the following conclusions and recommendations related to lessons learned in promoting institutional change and effective strategies for the future:

A. **Gender mainstreaming** is not a dead-end strategy. But it is not always fully understood and implemented in the right way.

- There is confusion about concepts: "gender" and "women". However, one term does not exclude the use of the other. The use depends on the context. "Gender" is most fruitfully used as an adjective, not a noun, in concepts like "gender equality" and "gender analysis". "Women" (and girls) are essential actors and target groups in relation to gender equality. It is important to analyse issues so that gender differences and disparities appear and women are visible in relation to men.

- There is also confusion about goals and means. The goal is gender equality and women's empowerment. To achieve the goal, different strategies and actions are needed according to circumstances. Polarisation of approaches does not work. A main strategy is gender mainstreaming of all policies, programmes and projects. But "women must not be lost in the mainstream, or malestream!". Targeted women-specific policies, programmes and projects are necessary to strengthen the status of women and promote mainstreaming. In any case, there must be specialist support, institutional mechanisms and accountability.

- Agencies have chosen different bases for their action: human rights or efficiency considerations. In fact, it is not a question of either/or. The human rights basis is more fundamental, but is not always made explicit and in some organisations it is not well-understood or appreciated. The emphasis will vary from one organisation to the other, but it is important to realise that the promotion of gender equality implies a

---

17. This is a report summarising the main conclusions reached at an informal consultation held in Oslo in November, 2002. Participants in the consultation included the chief gender advisor or focal point of most of the UN agencies (including the World Bank) as well as five bilateral donors. Funding for the consultation was provided by the government of Norway.

social transformation in society in addition to more effective economic development and poverty reduction.

B. **Global commitment.** The international women's conferences from Mexico (1975) to Beijing (1995) established a global consensus and commitment to promote gender equality which was reaffirmed by the Millennium Summit (2000). This is a long-term commitment and it is important to keep the goal on the agenda. Ongoing political and financial support from member states is essential to maintain focus on gender issues and ensure implementation of the recommendations. The mandates and policy statements of UN organisations and development banks should have conceptual clarity and explicit language so people understand them. Commitments should be clearly spelled out, given visibility and cultivated. Without pressure from governing bodies and top management, mandates and policy statements do not get implemented. External advisory gender boards or panels can be used to answer questions and help elucidate and depersonalise issues.

C. **Organisational change.** The challenge is to transform multilateral organisations to actively pursue the goal of promoting gender equality and women's empowerment through a process of gender mainstreaming and other forms of organisational change. As gender equality often touches on power relations, there can be strong discomfort and even resistance to change. To make progress the following is needed:

- strong, active leadership
- incentives and accountability
- a critical mass of committed individuals

D. **Tools.** Useful tools include:

- partnerships: internally and externally
- action plans to move from general policies to practice
- advocacy events to keep the issues visible
- simple, understandable language that is suitable for non-specialist audiences
- universal norms, country statistics and local knowledge
- sex-disaggregated data and analyses
- best practice dissemination to excite the imagination
- regular reporting on commitments, monitoring and evaluation
- gender champions in relevant positions with appropriate financial resources
- gender-balanced staffing and supports, including adequate training
- individual recognition for good practice, rewards and incentives

E. **Top management.** Responsibility for promoting gender equality is system-wide and rests at the highest levels of management. The active support of top management is crucial to increase action and impact. There must be more than lip service. Leaders need to issue regular instructions and "walk the talk". The responsibility of different levels of management must be clearly defined. The most important responsibility must be to create an enabling environment for gender equality. Measures – scorecards – for "enabling environment" should be put in place by top management. The gender units/advisors need to be proactive in advocating with and assisting top management to obtain the necessary support for gender equality. Also female top leaders need assistance on this. There are competing concerns, goal congestion and resistance to change and to addressing gender issues.

F. **Enabling environment.** An enabling environment for the promotion of gender equality is important. Indicators of this include among others:

- percentage of core funds dedicated to gender issues
- gender inputs and outputs in corporate programmes and results frameworks
- gender issues integrated in corporate policy
- gender mainstreaming performance in performance appraisal reviews of staff
- gender perspectives in human resources policy: affirmative action in recruitment, gender balance, work/life measures, harassment policy, value and visibility of interdisciplinary skills in vacancy announcements and promotions
- regular gender audits including baseline data and monitoring

G. **Gender units.** To promote gender equality, funds and competent staff are required. Corporate gender units are necessary. Regarding the level, resources and institutional placement of the gender units, the key objective is maximum and timely access to key corporate strategic processes and high-level management. There must be a critical mass of staff resources/gender specialists kept together and then ideally additional full-time specialists in other units and decentralised offices. There should be allocation of adequate resources and a match of expectations and resources expressed in clear terms of reference of catalytic functions of the gender unit.

H. **Capacity building.** Capacity building for gender mainstreaming is still needed in international organisations. A corporate capacity-building plan should be elaborated and be the responsibility of the staff training and capacity-building unit. The sustainability of efforts and investments is crucial, particularly in times of high staff turnover. It is important that policy informs practice as practice should influence policy. Capacity building should be tailor-made and demand-driven for various audiences: orientation for newcomers, gender modules in other courses (e.g. project cycle), gender sensitivity training, gender analysis training, etc. Examples of successful practice are very useful and more cases should be presented. But lessons learned cannot only be general, some must be context-related.

I. **Networks.** Networks and alliances are important within the organisation and outside. Internally, ownership should be shared by both women and men, and between headquarters and the field. Externally, collaboration should be established with governments, civil society and other UN organisations. Links should be established and support provided for women's organisations and groups, keeping in mind the character of the different groups and organisations. It is also important to collaborate with business and professional organisations, employers and trade unions, social and cultural associations, youth clubs, etc.

J. **Involvement of men.** The involvement of men is important to promote gender equality: more male staff in gender specialist posts, more male gender focal points in other units and more male trainees/facilitators for gender capacity-building courses. Training curriculum should be packaged with a results-oriented focus to appeal to managers. It is important to break stereotypes. HIV/AIDS might be a good entry point for talking with men about "masculinity", gender-based violence, trafficking etc. Contacts should be established with male government and NGO representatives and they should be encouraged to participate in advocacy events and discussions.

K. **Accountability.** To monitor progress it is important to define different roles and responsibilities for staff members at different levels of accountability. Existing

accountability mechanisms need to be catalogued or mapped by level: leadership (executive head), management (assistant director general/director), gender advisors in units, corporate gender units, country representatives. The role and accountability should also be mapped for non-programme/non-technical units such as evaluation/audit offices, programme budget offices and human resources offices. Core competencies needed for fulfilling various responsibilities need to be identified. Special attention should be given to the development of results frameworks and systematic measurement of results. Even if planned results are not achieved, efforts undertaken to meet gender commitments should be acknowledged.

L. **Mottos**:

"Whatever works, do it" (don't be hung up in dogmatic approaches or language)

"Be persistent (things are never fast and easy), passionate (both competence and involvement are needed) and keep a sense of humour (there are many perspectives and ways of thinking)"

"Don't compromise your dignity" (there are limits to what a gender focal point can or should do)

"Damned if you do, damned if you don't" (there are rarely simple solutions)

"Don't reinvent the wheel, there are so many wheels" (learn from the experiences of others)

"The more you advance, the more remains to be done" (new opportunities entail new challenges)