

# Gender Mainstreaming within the context of changing aid modalities: evidence from Tanzania

**EADI General Conference  
September 2011**

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

# Outline

1. Introduction: PD/AAA and its gender-sensitivity
2. Research objective
3. Analysis framework: opportunities & challenges for GEWE
4. Case-study Tanzania
  - 4.1 Methodology and case selection
  - 4.2 Selected findings and discussion
5. Conclusions

# 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

➤ gender dimension in PD/AAA?

- largely neglected, particularly in PD
- slight improvement in AAA
- assessment on gender equality indicators is optional in 2011 survey

↔ rationale for integration (effectiveness, efficiency, equality arguments)

➤ no unequivocal position on expected effects of PD/AAA on gender equality & women's empowerment

→ consensus: PD/AAA key-principles entail opportunities & challenges



(see Holvoet and Inberg, 2009)

## 2. Research objective

- analysis of extent to which opportunities have been grasped/risks handled on the ground
- analysis of the way various actors (government, civil society and donors) are handling gender mainstreaming

# **3. Analysis framework: Opportunities and challenges for gender equality & women's empowerment objectives**

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
<p><b>Alignment</b></p>	<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>
<p><b>Management for development results</b></p>	<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 (M&gt;E)</li> <li>- gender is dependent and independent variable</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>
<p><b>Mutual accountability</b></p>	<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>

# **4. Case study Tanzania**

## **4.1 Methodology and case selection**

## ➤ case study: rationale of case selection

- Netherlands: original research undertaken in the context of the Dutch 'on track with gender' trajectory'; Netherlands is 'ahead of the crowd' on PD/AAA implementation.
- Tanzania: relatively good scores on PD/AAA indicators (strong on ownership, management for results and mutual accountability principles); relatively gender sensitive national policy; and gender sensitive Dutch embassy in Dar es Salaam.

## ➤ combined methodology: field + desk

- desk: academic and grey literature
- field: interviews with key informants
  - ✓ gender/non-gender actors
  - ✓ different fora (donor, government, CSO, research institute)

## **4.2 Selected findings and discussion**

# Ownership

strong	weak
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ political commitment</li> <li>➤ existence of gender policies and laws</li> <li>➤ active GMWG-MP               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-GFP strengthened (capacity and location)</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ active gender actors outside government (e.g. TGNP, FemAct)</li> <li>➤ increased awareness thanks to first GRB-initiative (TGNP)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ existing national gender policies sidelined in Mkukuta (→ return to WID)</li> <li>➤ gender policy/law evaporation               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-general implementation gap + inherent difficulty GM</li> <li>-horizontality</li> <li>-notion unclear</li> <li>-inadequate operationalisation (how?) &amp; sector-specific framing</li> <li>-unclear responsibilities</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ gender ministry weak in resources, human- and institutional capacity</li> </ul>

# Ownership

opportunities	challenges
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ new GRB initiative (MOFEA)</li> <li>➤ transfer of GMWG-MP to gender ministry -&gt; increased institutionalisation &amp; leverage</li> <li>➤ increased gender-sensitivity of outside government actors               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- gender research at universities &amp; research institutes</li> <li>- gender issues from media</li> <li>- gender issues in parliament</li> <li>- gender mainstreaming in civil society organisations</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ transfer of GMWG-MP to gender ministry -&gt; evaporation</li> <li>➤ gender-sensitivity of Mkukuta II</li> <li>➤ Increased conservative religious influence</li> </ul>

# Alignment

strong	weak
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ commitment EKN: gender sensitive policy</li>   <li>➤ capacity at EKN               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- GFP (1FTE + mandate)</li> <li>- gender training of staff</li> <li>- 1-1 gender advice</li> </ul> </li>   <li>➤ GBS aligned to gender-sensitive policies</li>   <li>➤ EKN use of entry-points               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- CB funding of GMWG-MP</li> <li>- GFP active in GMWG-MP</li> <li>- integration of gender concerns in health sector dialogues</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ GBS tends to water down demand side interventions</li>   <li>➤ no use of GRB in GBS</li>   <li>➤ Netherlands embassy in Tanzania:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-no systematic integration of gender dimension in (sector) track records, sector/general GBS dialogue, joint sector reviews</li> <li>-capacity weaknesses (institutional)</li> <li>-lack of incentives (sticks – carrots)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

# Alignment

opportunities	challenges
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ use of portfolio approaches               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-GBS: entry point for GM at sector/macro policy level</li> <li>-room for 'gender equality' &amp; empowerment projects (agenda-setting track)</li> </ul> </li>   <li>➤ increased importance of monitoring and evaluation               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- sex-disaggregated data</li> <li>- gender analysis</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ political commitment in Netherlands</li> <li>➤ commitment of new HOS</li> </ul>



## 5. Conclusions

## ➤ ownership

- strong in Tanzania: gender sensitive policies and laws
- general challenges still exist: weak capacity and position of gender machinery; weak gender capacity of staff members involved in budgeting and implementation.

## ➤ harmonisation

- opportunities exist through relatively active DPG-gender, but many are not yet materialised
- persistent challenge: sidelining gender issues

## ➤ alignment

- opportunities for mainstreaming gender in budget support entry-points remain underutilised
- transformative and agenda-setting track under stress

## ➤ management for development results

- opportunities have been materialised: inclusion of gender in outcomes, targets and indicators; introduction of GRB facilitated by move towards performance based budgeting
- some challenges are still prevalent: misinterpretation of 'managing for results' as 'managing by results'; limited availability and use of sex disaggregated data

## ➤ mutual accountability

- opportunities not materialised for donor accountability, partly for domestic accountability
- remaining challenges for domestic accountability: limited number of gender (sensitive) CSOs at local level; lack of linkages among rural and urban-based organisations; limited influence due to lack of information and capacity constraints



**Thank you!**



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

