

# Effective Use of Gender Responsive Budgeting (GRB) Tools and Strategies in the context of the Aid Effectiveness Agenda: Multi Country Review

**UNIFEM – EC**

Mozambique Case Study

Some preliminary findings

Nathalie Holvoet & Liesbeth Inberg

Institute of Development Policy and Management (University of Antwerp)

Belgium

# Outline

## I. Introduction

- I.1. Overview of UNIFEM-EC Programme
- I.2. Gender and NAM: love is in the air...
- I.3. Is it really?
- I.4. GRB – NAM

## II. Preliminary findings for Mozambique

- II.1. PARPA I & II through a gender lens
- II.2. Donor entry points through a gender lens
- II.3. Assessment of GRB experience in context of NAM
  - II.3.1. strengths
  - II.3.2. weaknesses
  - II.3.3. facilitating factors – opportunities
  - II.3.4. hindrances – threats

# I. INTRODUCTION

## I.1. Introduction: Overview of UNIFEM-EC Programme

- UNIFEM (proposal/implementation) – EC (funding)
- Duration: 3-years (start in January 2008)
- Aim
  - Analysing the aid effectiveness agenda from a gender perspective
  - Engendering the aid effectiveness agenda & new aid modalities & instruments
  - Demonstrate how gender-responsive budgeting (GRB) tools and strategies contribute to enhancing a positive impact on gender equality of aid provided in the form of GBS (&SBS)
  - Contributing to the realisation of the commitments regarding gender equality (made by donors & recipients)

## I.1. Introduction: Overview of Programme (cont.)

- set-up:
  - 1st phase: multi-country research review (2008)
    - ✓ results to be presented at Accra High Level Forum
  - 2nd phase: technical support & capacity building (2009-2010)
- methodology (first phase)
  - desk review
  - primary data collection
    - ✓ interviews with key stakeholders
    - ✓ meeting + discussion

## I.2. Gender equality & NAM: love is in the air...

- Rationality for gender-sensitivity of NAM
  - equality argument
  - effectiveness and efficiency argument
    - ✓ Gender efficiency argument
  
- Key-principles of NAM: opportunities & risks (challenges) for gender equality & empowerment
  - upward move in aid modalities
  - increasing power for ministries of finance
  - country ownership & leadership
  - 'participation' conditionality
  - results-orientation (~ GRB)

## I.3. ....is it really?

### ➤ General findings

- 2005 Paris Declaration
  - 'gender equality' together with other crosscutting issues in paragraph 42
- Surveys on Harmonisation and Alignment (OECD/DAC or SPA) or to monitor the Paris Declaration
  - Gender is not a topic → gender-blindness will go unnoticed
- PRSPs, SWAPs + donor (new) entry points: largely gender-blind

+ : emerging on the agenda (see Dublin workshop)

but need for elaboration of policy, implementation and M&E

instrumentarium

→ danger of gender retro-fitting

## I.4. GRB – NAM

### ➤ definition

“gender budgeting is an application of gender mainstreaming in the budgetary process. It means a gender-based assessment of budgets, incorporating a gender perspective at all levels of the budgetary process and restructuring revenues and expenditures in order to promote gender equality”  
(Group of specialists on gender budgeting, Council of Europe, 2005)



## I.4. GRB-NAM (cont.)

### ➤ **usefulness GRB in context of NAM**

- confrontation of inputs and results (~results-based reforms)
- accountability and transparency (good governance)
- useful in hands of governments & outside government actors
- underlying budgetary processes: 'inclusiveness' (see principles of 'participation')

## **II. PRELIMINARY FINDINGS FOR MOZAMBIQUE**

## II.1. PARPA I & II through a gender lens

- PARPA 1

- Largely gender-blind
- Content + processes
- All phases
- All dimensions

- PARPA II

- Substantial improvement from PARPA 1 to PARPA 2
- GAD > WID
- Diagnosis and selection of priorities > budgeting & implementation, M&E
- Capabilities > opportunities, security and empowerment dimensions of poverty
  - ✓ Fight against civil and domestic violence is highlighted as a priority

## II.1. PARPA I & II through a gender lens (cont.)

- PARPA II
  - installment of institutional apparatus is highlighted as priority
    - ✓ Including GRB
  - gender-specific priorities translated in specific programmes
  - BUT
    - ✓ gender-specific priorities not budgeted for
    - ✓ institutional apparatus not budgeted for
    - no application of GRB
    - risk of policy evaporation (selected priorities not implemented)
  - GRB not discussed in section on macro-economic framework and budgetary reform processes (MTEF, programme-based budgeting, sistafe, etc.)
    - No systemic integration of GRB

## II.1. PARPA I & II through a gender lens (cont.)

- M&E:
    - GRB-tools only marginally integrated in conventional M&E at sector and central level (MIS, household surveys, etc.)
    - GRB-tools only marginally present in participatory M&E (Development Observatories)
    - Targets & indicators:
      - o Inclusion for some sectors (e.g. health)
      - o Specific (process) gender indicator
- .also included in PAF (donor entry point)  
 +: monitoring guaranteed (on the agenda of Annual Review)  
 BUT little analysis of (non)achievement of indicators (M>E)

## II.1. PARPA I & II through a gender lens (cont.)

- Underlying processes:

- improvement from PARPA 1 to PARPA 2
- increased participation of gender actors (in different arenas) + networking (GCG-Gender Working Group)
- track-record of gender actors in 'mainstream' planning & budgeting processes increased

BUT

- MMAS financially & technically weak
- CANAM lacks independence (location + financially)
- GFP: large differences among ministries (location + knowledge)
  
- some 'mainstream' actors on board (MPD, MINF, individual members of EWG, budget analysis group, PAMS, ...)

## II.2. Donor entry points through a gender lens (EC – Sweden)

### ➤ institutional apparatus

- GFP present
  - not full-time: < 20% (not officially defined)
    - ✓ 'gender' only one of the responsibilities
    - ✓ mainly involved in management of 'project' modality
  - ad-hoc involvement of gender expertise within activities at GBS/SBS (new) entry points
    - ✓ at crucial moments: e.g. indicator selection (EC)
    - ✓ mainly through participation in GCG/Gender Working Group (EC GFP was chair in 2006/Sweden co-chair in 2007)
  - little investment in 'mainstream' capacities of GFP
- little/no investment in 'gender' expertise of 'mainstream' actors

## II.2. Donor entry points through a gender lens (EC – Sweden)

- guidelines/instrumentarium

### EC:

- general guidelines on how to engender several components of NAM exist (see EC Gender Toolkit)
  - ✓ but no specific translation to country level (↔ mainstreaming HIV/Aids)
  - ✓ not clear who should do this
- indirect support through other budget lines ('Investing in People')

### Sweden:

- 'gender equality' and 'empowerment' (increasingly) (GOVERNANCE) important objectives
- no general/specific guidelines on how to engender NAM (gender policy draft manual for all modalities)
- GBS not the main locus of attention for 'gender' interventions



## II.2. Donor entry points through a gender lens (EC-Sweden)

	EC	Sweden
<b>Cooperation strategy/policy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 'gender' mentioned as important cross-cutting issue</li> <li>▪ alignment to PARPA</li> <li>▪ diagnosis: gender policy of government described</li> <li>▪ other sections &amp; NIP: some reference to gender in sector sections, no specific proposals</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ importance of 'gender' highlighted</li> <li>▪ alignment to PARPA (&lt; cultural development &amp; governance)</li> <li>▪ 'gender' equality mentioned among the goals</li> <li>▪ gender issues included in sections on target group + some specific sector sections</li> </ul>

## II.2. Donor entry points through a gender lens (EC-Sweden)

	EC	Sweden
<b>M&amp;E</b> PAF Fixed/variable tranche	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4/13 gender-related SECTOR RESULTS indicators in variable tranche (40%)</li> <li>no inclusion of the gender 'process' PAF indicator in variable tranche (currently under revision)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>18 PAF governance indicators in variable tranche (25%)</li> <li>no gender indicator in variable tranche</li> </ul>
Sector Working Groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GFP in GCG/Gender Working Group (chair in 2006)</li> <li>ad-hoc in other SWG (GFP)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GFP in GCG/Gender Working Group (co-chair in 2007 + financial support for Technical Secretariat)</li> <li>ad-hoc in other SWG (GFP)</li> </ul>
Joint annual & mid-annual reviews & <b>policy dialogue</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GWG participates → 'gender' issues on the agenda (since 2005)</li> </ul>	

## II.2. Donor entry points through a gender lens (EC-Sweden)

	EC	Sweden
<p><b>Capacity building -government (AT)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ no capacity building of 'gender' institutional apparatus</li> <li>▪ no 'gender' issues in mainstream CB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ no capacity building of 'gender' institutional apparatus</li> <li>▪ no 'gender' issues in mainstream CB</li> </ul>
<p><b>Capacity building outside government actors (CSOs)-parliament (projects)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ no focus on gender actors</li> <li>▪ 'gender equality' is taken on board in selection process of projects/support to CSO</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ organisational strengthening of gender actors in CSO</li> <li>▪ gender issue in CB of CSOs</li> <li>▪ support to creation of committee on HIV/aids &amp; gender issues (through AWEPA)</li> </ul>

## II.2. Donor entry points through a gender lens (EC-Sweden)

	EC	Sweden
<b>Support to/through specialised multilateral organisations</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ UNIFEM</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ UNFPA</li> <li>▪ UNICEF</li> </ul>
<b>Other mechanisms of 'soft' influence</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ article/ interview with ambassador (importance of gender equality) ('mind-setting', 'enabling environment')</li> </ul>

## II.3. Assessment of GRB experience in context of NAM (cont.)

### II.3.1. STRENGTHS

- Entry into various strategic NAM entry points
  - Central ministries (MPD, MINT, INE)
  - Sectoral ministries (Health, Interior)
  - CSO (PO)
  - Donors (to a lesser extent, but some interesting opportunities!)
- some effective process changes at various arenas
  - Budget call circular (but general)
  - Promising evolutions towards systemic integration GRB within sectoral ministries (particularly health!)
  - Inclusion of gender process indicator in PARPA policy matrix, in PAF, AR, MAR
  - Inclusion of gender in budget hearings (proposal)

## II.3. Assessment of GRB experience in context of NAM (cont.)

### II.3.1. STRENGTHS

- strong networking among GRB actors located at different arenas
- sensitization and knowledge of gender and mainstream actors on GRB has increased

## II.3. Assessment of GRB experience in context of NAM (cont.)

### II.3.2. WEAKNESSES

- gender in budget guidelines is very general
- no real articulation of HOW GRB can be used in national and sectoral processes and documents (see table in annex)(currently on agenda)
  - training: useful but very general (Moz. budget process  $\neq$  Tanz. budget process)
  - lack of technical capacity in different arenas
  - responsibilities of who should do translation from general to specific is not clear (MPD, MINF, MMAS, sectoral ministries)
- no real involvement with ongoing PFM & budgetary reform processes (currently on agenda)
  - no real articulation of potential linkages among GRB & budgetary reform processes (sistafe, functional classification exercises, MTEF, programme-based budgeting pilots, etc.)
  - not really taken advantage of the fact that GRB can be bridge between 'gender actors' and 'economists & budgeting & planning & M&E actors'

## II.3. Assessment of GRB experience in context of NAM (cont.)

### II.3.2. WEAKNESSES

- no institutionalisation, no critical mass yet
- no real articulation of HOW GRB can be useful in donor entry points & aid effectiveness agenda
  - M&E: PAMS, PER, PETS, analysis of non-achievement of indicators (most SWG)
  - Mainstream capacity building efforts
- Weak coordination among various UN-agencies involved in GRB and gender mainstreaming (but is improving, see UNDAF)



## II.3. Assessment of GRB experience in context of NAM (cont.)

### II.3.3. FACILITATING FACTORS – OPPORTUNITIES

- Budgetary reform processes
  - Improvement of horizontal linkages among central – line ministries (also GBS)(↓ problem of ‘horizontality’)
  - Improvement of integration between financial and real sphere
  - Improvement of feedback cycles
  - ↑ Results-orientation
  - Capacity-building on programme-based budgeting (cf. PEFA)
- (slightly) increasing importance of M&E (also related to budgetary reform processes)
  - Inclusion of ‘gender’ necessary in analytical exercises (analysis of non-achievement)
  - GRB-tools articulate well with existing M&E tools & exercises (e.g. PSIA)
  - GRB tools improve analytical quality of existing M&E tools and exercises

## II.3. Assessment of GRB experience in context of NAM (cont.)

### II.3.3. FACILITATING FACTORS – OPPORTUNITIES

- Strong GCG – Gender Working Group
- CSO efforts in local level monitoring processes
  - Accountability
  - Learning & feedback (information on demand side, men and women’s COINS)
- ‘gender’ expertise at UEM
  - Inclusion of GRB in curriculum
- receptive chair of Troika: cheerleader?
  - Gender & aid effectiveness workshop
  - New PARPA
- move towards portfolio approach
  - new-style projects particularly interesting for second-track of ‘gender equality’ policy

## II.3. Assessment of GRB experience in context of NAM (cont.)

### II.3.4. HINDRANCES – THREATS

- lack of REAL political commitment (discourse ↔ action)
- reform fatigue
- quality – quantity trade-off
- linkage between sectoral – central level not optimal (parallelism)
- feedback cycle not functioning
- focus too much on Monitoring at detriment of Evaluation
- danger of mis-understood results-orientation (management by results replaces management for results)
- split among MINF/MPD

## II.3. Assessment of GRB experience in context of NAM (cont.)

### II.3.4. HINDRANCES – THREATS

- weakness of MMAS & CANAM (~ lack of political commitment)
  - large and increasing responsibilities ↔ weakness (financial – capacity – location)
- move towards the aggregate
- financing modalities for CSOs
  - large transaction costs
- GRB capacity-building: focus too much on MINF/MPD (at the detriment of sectoral level)
- misunderstanding of approach/concept of GRB
  - full cycle (not only budgeting)
  - also possible without programme-based budgeting
- expectations about GRB too high

**Possible actions and instruments to engender the PRSP & sector programmes**

<b>PROCESS of elaboration, implementation, monitoring and evaluation</b> (see also PRSP Sourcebook, Technical Notes, I.1)	<b>CONTENT</b>			
	<b>(Poverty) diagnosis and analysis</b> (see also PRSP Sourcebook, Technical Notes I.2., I.6 en Technical Notes I.4 for checklists for all priority sectors)	<b>Identification of priorities and strategies</b> (see also PRSP Sourcebook, Technical Notes I.3)	<b>Budgeting and implementation</b> (see also PRSP Sourcebook, Technical Notes I.2, I.5)	<b>Monitoring and evaluation</b> (see also PRSP Sourcebook, Technical Notes I.2. and I.5)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increasing participation of gender actors within government (gender ministry, gender focal points in line ministries)</li> <li>Increasing participation of gender actors outside government (women's organisations, research groups, women parliamentarians, etc)</li> <li>In case of participation and stakeholder consultation at local level, inclusion of analysis of existing participation of women and gender expertise at participatory processes, if needed change of format of processes (place, time, etc.)</li> <li>affirmative action to promote equal opportunities in public sector employment (especially within central ministries and at higher levels of hierarchy)</li> <li>Investing in the macro-economic &amp; general policy analysis capacity of the 'gender' actors involved (ministry of equal opportunities, women's groups, ...)</li> <li>Investing in the 'gender' capacity of the macro-economic actors involved (ministry of finance, ministry of planning, different line ministries)</li> </ul>	<p>Take into account different take-off position of men and women</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Use of relevant secondary information:</u></li> <li>-existing gender-disaggregated indicators (covering different issues including opportunities, capabilities, voice and agency, security. Check for this Human Development Reports; World Development Reports; UNIFEM reports; UN report the World's Women, ...).</li> <li>Two important indicators are the Gender Development Index (GDI) and Gender Empowerment Measure (GEM)</li> <li>-existing country gender assessments (see PRSP Sourcebook Technical Notes I.6; see also genderStats, WB database of gender statistics)</li> <li>-results of previous application of gender-analysis frameworks</li> <li>-information at the Ministry of Equal Opportunities</li> <li><u>Primary data collection and analysis:</u></li> <li>-country gender assessment (GCA)</li> <li>-use of gender analysis frameworks as Harvard, Moser</li> <li>*time use and distribution over reproductive, productive and collective spheres</li> <li>*access to production factors (human capital, financial capital, material properties as land)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>take into account results of previous phase of diagnosis and analysis (in case it has been done in a gender-sensitive way)</li> <li>use of gender-disaggregated beneficiary and needs assessment</li> <li>integration of priorities and strategies included in gender policy notes (documents from ministry of equal opportunities e.g., Beijing policy action plans; Gender Country Assessment)</li> <li>use of <b>gender-aware policy appraisal</b></li> <li>if it does not exist, building institutional capacity for gender responsive diagnosis, planning, budgeting, implementation, monitoring and evaluation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>use of gender-aware macro economic framework</li> <li>integration of gender dimension in results-based management frameworks (see <b>Budget Cycle Framework</b>)</li> <li>check whether gender-sensitive priorities identified in the previous phase are also budgeted for</li> <li>check whether implementation procedures have been foreseen for gender-sensitive priorities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>engendering conventional monitoring and evaluation instruments (incidence analysis, impact assessment, ...):</li> <li>-assessment of gender-sensitiveness of service delivery</li> <li>-use of <b>gender-disaggregated benefit incidence analysis</b></li> <li>-use of gender-disaggregated tax incidence analysis</li> <li>-use of gender-disaggregated analysis of the impact of the budget on time use</li> <li>-use of gender impact assessment (see PRSP Sourcebook, p. 364)</li> <li>disaggregation of input, output, outcome indicators (if not yet done during previous stages)</li> <li>identification of indicators for follow-up of gender equality and empowerment</li> </ul>



**Thank you!**

**[nathalie.holvoet@ua.ac.be](mailto:nathalie.holvoet@ua.ac.be)**

**GRB-website:**

**<http://www.gender-budgets.org/>**