



# Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action through a gender lens. Case-study Tanzania Preliminary Findings

## DPRN Gender On Track

**Nathalie Holvoet – Liesbeth Inberg**  
Institute of Development Policy and  
Management, University of Antwerp

# Outline of presentation

1. Introduction: PD/AAA and its gender-sensitivity
2. Research objectives - set-up – expected output
3. PD/AAA key-principles: opportunities and challenges for gender equality. Case Study Tanzania. Preliminary findings
  - 3.1. Ownership
  - 3.2. Harmonisation
  - 3.3. Alignment
  - 3.4. Results-orientation
  - 3.5. Mutual accountability

Annex

# **1. Introduction: PD/AAA and its gender-sensitivity**

- shifts in aid modalities
  
- PD/AAA: reform agenda around 5 key-principles and 11 indicators
  - ownership
  - harmonisation
  - alignment
  - management for development results
  - mutual accountability
  
- PD/AAA in Tanzania
  - strong on ownership, management for results and mutual accountability
  - moderate on alignment and harmonisation

- gender dimension in PD/AAA?
  - largely neglected, particularly in PD
  - slight improvement in AAA but
  - still absent from monitoring indicators

↔ evidence regarding cost of gender-blindness
  
- no unequivocal position on expected effects of PD/AAA on gender equality & women's empowerment
  - consensus: PD/AAA key-principles entail opportunities & challenges

↓

see annex for overview + paper (first phase of research)

## **2. Research objective & set-up & expected output**

## ➤ objective

- analysis of extent to which opportunities have been grasped/challenges countered in Tanzania
- focus mainly on Dutch development cooperation

## ➤ methodology

- rationale of case selection
- desk study
- interviews with key informants
  - ✓ gender/non-gender actors
  - ✓ different fora (donor, government, CSO, research institute)

## ➤ expected output

- report (first draft end of June)
- feedback session in HQ (July, 1st)
- presentation at 'Gender on Track' conference (November 2010)

### **3. PD/AAA key-principles: opportunities and challenges for gender equality.**

#### **Case-study Tanzania**

#### **Preliminary findings**



### 3.1. Ownership

#### STRONG

- political commitment
- gender-sensitive policy framework
  - national gender policy/strategy
  - gender-sensitive Mkukuta
  - gender indicators
- gender-sensitive legal framework
- performant GMWG-MP
  - increased awareness of PS
  - GFP strengthened
    - capacity
    - location (selected ministries)
- active gender actors outside government (TGNP, FemAct, ...)
- 1st GRB-initiative (TNGP)
  - increased awareness

#### WEAK

- gender policy evaporation
  - ← inherent difficulty of gender mainstreaming (GM)
    - horizontality
    - notion unclear
    - inadequate operationalisation (how?) & sector-specific framing
    - unclear responsibilities
  - ← bureaucratic commitment & capacity & incentives
- gender-sensitive laws not implemented: legal pluralism on the ground
- gender ministry
  - resources
  - human capacity
  - institutional capacity

### 3.1. Ownership

#### OPPORTUNITIES

- new GRB initiative (MOFEA/UNIFEM)
  - leadership/ownership of MOFEA
  - different strategic entry-points (finance/sector; central/local)
- transfer of GMWG-MP to gender ministry → increased institutionalisation & leverage
- increased gender research at universities & research institutes
- increased media attention for gender issues
- increased attention & capacity in parliament for gender issues
- increased efforts for GM in CSOs (cf. Foundation for Civil Society)

#### CHALLENGES

- general gap policy/implementation
- transfer of GMWG-MP to gender ministry → evaporation
- gender-sensitivity Mkukuta II
- increased conservative religious influence

### 3.2. Harmonisation

#### STRONG

- DPG-gender present
  - division of labour approach
- good practice of coordination in GBV-interventions

#### WEAK

- low track record in sectors & macroeconomics of GFPs and gender experts
- DPG-gender not represented in DPGs M&E, PFM, macroeconomics
  - no direct access/influence of highest level
- lack of coordination among gender (responsive budgeting) initiatives

#### OPPORTUNITIES

- increased room for:
  - exchange of data + tools
  - mapping of existing donor interventions
  - coordination among interventions
  - joint funding



gender basket fund & projects

#### CHALLENGES

- successfulness of division of labour dependent on mixed expertise of gender experts
- commitment in donor agencies for gender equality/women's empowerment

### 3.3. Alignment

#### Entry-points

##### STRONG

- GBS aligned to gender-sensitive policies
- EKN-use of entry-points
  - CB (funding) of GMWG-MP
  - GFP-EKN active in GMWG-MP
  - integration of gender concerns in health sector dialogues
    - \*M&E (sex-disaggregated data)
    - \*MTEF (budgetline reproductive health)
  - use of well-aligned project (cf. fistulla repair & prevention)

##### WEAK

- PAF not gender-sensitive
- overlap among DPG-gender & GMWG-MP
- no use of GRB in GBS
- watering down of interventions targeted at demand side
- EKN: no systematic integration of gender dimension in entry-points
  - (sector) track record
  - sector/general GBS dialogue on policy & institutional apparatus
  - joint (sector) reviews

### 3.3. alignment

#### Gender-sensitivity of EKN

##### STRONG

- commitment
  - gender-sensitive policy
- capacity
  - GFP (1FTE + mandate)
  - gender training of staff
  - 1-1 gender advice
- incentives
  - surmons
  - \*political commitment NL

##### WEAK

- policy evaporation
- capacity
  - no bridging frames
  - GRB underexploited
  - output of GMWG-MP underexploited
  - GFP not systematically involved in GBS & sector basket funds → at best 'add-on' + 'gender retrofitting'
- incentives
  - no sticks & carrots

### 3.3. Alignment

#### OPPORTUNITIES

- increased importance to M&E
  - sex-disaggregated data
  - gender analysis: input from gender unit REPOA
  
- use of portfolio approach (GBS/sector/innovative pilot project)
  - ↓
  - influence on policy & processes (supply side)
  - ↓
  - tackling demand side

#### CHALLENGES

- political commitment in NL (elections)
- commitment of new HOS

### 3.4. Results-orientation

#### STRONG

- gender-sensitive indicators/targets in Mkukuta
- level of sex-disaggregation increasing
- increased availability of gender statistics
- increased integration of gender dimension in mainstream M&E (cf. surveys, MIS, time use studies)

#### WEAK

- gender-sensitive indicators mainly limited to sector-specific *results*
- lack of gender *process* indicators related to systemic changes
- lack of empowerment indicators
- no gender indicators in PAF
- under-usage of available data
- monitoring (descriptive) > evaluation (analysis)

#### OPPORTUNITIES

- increased use of performance-based budgeting (~ GRB)
- increased importance of M&E

#### CHALLENGES

- move towards 'the aggregate'
- focus on quick-wins ↔ gender: LT
  - use of TPA
  - 'management for results' often misinterpreted as 'management by results'

### 3.5. Mutual accountability

#### STRONG

- (gender) CSO demand side at national (policy) level

#### WEAK

- gender CSO demand side at local level
- inadequate linkage between local/urban gender demand side
- CSOs participation: not representative (urban + not necessarily gender-sensitive)
- no gender accountability of donors

#### OPPORTUNITIES

- programme to strengthen local accountability (EKN – SNV – VNG)  
→ possibility to link with Gender Equitable Local Development programme (GELD)
- increased efforts to link local – urban gender demand side (cf. TGNP project)
- existence of mechanism: inclusion of donor performance indicators in PAF

#### CHALLENGES

- “mutual accountability” mainly rhetoric  
← sticks and carrots limited to peer pressure among donors (naming & shaming)





**Thank you!**



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



## **Annex. PD/AAA key principles through a gender lens: opportunities and challenges**

Key-principles	Opportunities	Challenges
<b>Ownership</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-↑ effective implementation of policies</li> <li>-most countries have national gender plans &amp; apparatus</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-misused as excuse to abandon responsibility</li> <li>-national gender policies often marginalised</li> <li>-national gender apparatus often weak</li> </ul>
<b>Harmonisation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-clarification of notions</li> <li>-reduction of confusion</li> <li>-joint analytical work</li> <li>-harmonise programming and funding for gender equality and empowerment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-gender concerns sidelined to reach consensus</li> <li>-harmonisation towards the lower end</li> <li>-sectoral focus &gt; horizontal issues</li> </ul>

Key-principles	Opportunities	Challenges
<b>Alignment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-↑ gender mainstreaming through influence and dialogue at the overall sector &amp; macrolevel (↔ projects)</li> <li>-integration of gender perspective in BS entry points               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>.policy dialogue</li> <li>.appraisal and monitoring of quality of national plans and processes and systems</li> <li>.capacity building</li> <li>.M&amp;E exercises (joint reviews, etc.)</li> </ul> </li> <li>-room for 'gender equality' &amp; empowerment projects (agenda-setting track) in portfolio approaches</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-uncritical alignment to gender-blind policies &amp; processes</li> <li>-curtailing of donor's agenda-setting 'gender equality' &amp; 'empowerment' track</li> </ul>

<b>Key-principles</b>	<b>Opportunities</b>	<b>Challenges</b>
<b>Management for development results</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-collection of evidence about results</li> <li>-focus on targets diminishes policy evaporation</li> <li>-analysis of failing development results could identify gender-blindness as a causal factor</li> <li>-similarities among results-oriented budgeting and gender budgeting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-‘gender equality’ and ‘women’s empowerment’ often not captured in targets</li> <li>-indicatorism and lack of analysis of failing results</li> <li>-‘management for results’ often misinterpreted as ‘management by results’</li> <li>-reductionist focus on gender equality in education</li> <li>-lack of (use) of sex-disaggregated data</li> </ul>
<b>Mutual accountability</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-assessment of gender-sensitivity of donor practices</li> <li>-participation of non-state gender actors in accountability and review exercises</li> <li>-use of gender budgeting as accountability instrument</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-accountability reduced to a narrow interpretation of aid effectiveness</li> <li>-absence of a strong gender demand side among non-state actors</li> </ul>