

Advance Copy



Findings from the Gender Equality Module of the 2011 Paris Declaration Monitoring Survey



TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	3
1. INTRODUCTION	4
1.1 Background to the gender equality module of the Paris Declaration Survey	4
1.2 Methodology of the gender equality module.....	5
2. OVERVIEW OF MODULE FINDINGS.....	6
3. OWNERSHIP OF GENDER EQUALITY	7
Indicator 1: Measuring ownership of gender equality	7
3.1 Addressing gender equality in development plans	7
3.2 Gender equality in the long-term development vision	8
3.3 Linking national gender equality priorities to the budget	9
3.4 Quantitative indicator scores on ownership of gender equality	11
3.5 Donors' approaches and resources for gender equality.....	11
3.6 Future considerations on ownership of gender equality.....	12
4. MEASURING AND ACHIEVING GENDER EQUALITY RESULTS THROUGH SEX DISAGGREGATED DATA.....	13
Indicator 2: Measuring gender equality results.....	13
4.1 Collection of data disaggregated by sex	13
4.2 Analysis and use of data disaggregated by sex.....	14
4.3 Quantitative indicator scores on gender equality results.....	14
4.4 Donor support for and use of sex disaggregated data	16
4.5 Future considerations on gender equality results	16
5. MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY FOR GENDER EQUALITY	17
Indicator 3: Measuring mutual accountability for gender equality.....	17
5.1 Accountability for and policy dialogue on gender equality	17
5.2 Future considerations on mutual accountability for gender equality	18
6. ADDRESSING GENDER EQUALITY IN FRAGILE AND CONFLICT-AFFECTED COUNTRIES	19
Measuring progress on gender equality in fragile situations	19
6.1 Ownership of gender equality in fragile situations.....	19
6.2 Results and accountability for gender equality in fragile situations.....	21
6.3 Donor support for gender equality in fragile situations	21
6.4 Future considerations on gender equality in fragile situations	22
7. LESSONS LEARNED AND WAY FORWARD	23
7.1 How to better address gender equality in efforts to make aid more effective.....	23
7.2 Lessons learned on monitoring gender equality and aid effectiveness	24

REFERENCES	25
ANNEX A: RATIONALE AND METHODOLOGY OF THE THREE GENDER EQUALITY INDICATORS.....	26
ANNEX B: PARIS DECLARATION INDICATORS OF PROGRESS AND CORRESPONDING OPTIONAL GENDER EQUALITY INDICATORS	28
ANNEX C: THE GENDER EQUALITY MODULE QUESTIONNAIRE	30

TABLES:

Table 1.	Scores for gender equality indicator 1 - ownership	11
Table 2.	Scores for gender equality indicator 2 - results	15

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report is based on replies by the 24 countries that chose to test the gender equality module of the 2011 Paris Declaration Monitoring Survey: Albania, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Comoros, Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Gabon, Honduras, Kenya, Malawi, Mali, Moldova, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Peru, Rwanda, Togo and Zambia. National Co-ordinators of the Paris Declaration Monitoring Survey in these countries were essential to the success of this exercise. The representatives from different government Ministries, civil society and donor agencies in countries who were consulted were also indispensable. UN Women, in particular, played an active role and supported the process in several countries.

This report was produced by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), Development Co-operation Directorate. It was prepared by Jenny Hedman, with substantive contributions from Patti O'Neill and Catherine Gaynor (consultant).

The gender equality module's methodology was developed by Jenny Hedman, Patti O'Neill, Robin Ogilvy and Marjolaine Nicod at the Development Co-operation Directorate, with inputs from Catherine Gaynor. Julie Seif provided administrative assistance in finalising the gender equality questionnaire and the report.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the gender equality module of the Paris Declaration Survey

In 2005, donors and developing countries endorsed the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness – an ambitious set of principles designed to make aid more effective. One of the features of the Paris Declaration was the commitment by donors and partner country governments to hold themselves and each other to account for implementing the Declaration at the country level through a survey of 12 indicators of progress. Paris Declaration Monitoring Surveys were undertaken in 2006, 2008 and 2011.

The Paris Declaration sets out to “Increase the impact aid has in reducing poverty and inequality (...) and accelerating achievement of the MDGs” (para. 2). It acknowledges that “harmonisation efforts are also needed on other cross-cutting issues, such as gender equality” (para. 42). The 2008 Accra Agenda for Action (AAA) goes further by recognising that gender equality is one of the cornerstones for achieving enduring impacts on the lives and potential of poor women, men and children; and identifies specific actions (see box).

Gender equality in the Accra Agenda for Action (2008)

Para 3: “Gender equality, respect for human rights, and environmental sustainability are cornerstones for achieving enduring impact on the lives and potential of poor women, men, and children. It is vital that all our policies address these issues in a more systematic and coherent way.”

Para 13c: “Developing countries and donors will ensure that their respective development policies and programmes are designed and implemented in ways consistent with their agreed international commitments on gender equality, human rights, disability and environmental sustainability.”

Para 21b: “At country level, donors and developing countries will work and agree on a set of realistic peace- and state-building objectives that address the root causes of conflict and fragility and help ensure the protection and participation of women.”

Para 23a: “Developing countries will strengthen the quality of policy design, implementation and assessment by improving information systems, including, as appropriate, disaggregating data by sex, region and socioeconomic status.”

Based on the commitments included in the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action, the 2011 Paris Declaration Monitoring Survey was complemented by an optional module on gender equality with three indicators. The gender equality module also responded to a proposal set out in the DAC Guiding Principles for Aid Effectiveness, Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment (2008) to develop “qualitative and quantitative gender equality indicators to measure progress towards challenging commitments such as country ownership”. The optional gender equality indicators of the 2011 Paris Declaration Survey aimed to:

- generate evidence on the extent to which efforts to strengthen aid and development effectiveness have addressed gender equality,
- provide an in-depth understanding of progress on gender equality since 2005, including progress on the gender equality commitments of the 2008 Accra Agenda for Action,
- facilitate dialogue on gender equality and women's empowerment at the country level, and
- pilot some gender equality indicators for any future aid effectiveness monitoring framework to follow the Fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness (HLF4) in 2011.

This report presents the findings from the 24 developing countries that tested the gender equality module during the 2011 Paris Declaration Monitoring Survey.¹ An overview of the findings is included in Aid Effectiveness 2005-10: Progress in Implementing the Paris Declaration (OECD, 2011).

1.2 Methodology of the gender equality module

The gender equality module comprised three indicators, each linking up with one of the 12 indicators of the Paris Declaration Monitoring Survey:

1. *Ownership*: gender equality and women's empowerment are grounded in a systematic manner in national development strategies (linked to Paris Declaration indicator 1, ownership)
2. *Results*: data is disaggregated by sex (linked to Paris Declaration indicator 11, results)
3. *Mutual accountability* for gender equality and women's empowerment (linked to Paris Declaration indicator 12, mutual accountability)

These three indicators were identified as the best for measuring support for gender equality and women's empowerment in the process of implementing the Paris Declaration. Ownership, results and mutual accountability for gender equality are all essential to make aid effective. The three indicators link up directly with commitments in the Accra Agenda for Action (paragraphs 13c and 23) and with existing indicators in the Paris Declaration Monitoring Survey. At the same time, the selected indicators can be monitored while avoiding imposing additional burdens on national co-ordinators and other stakeholders in the management of the Paris Declaration survey process at the country level. The gender equality and aid effectiveness indicators were not intended to provide a comprehensive tool for tracking progress against the Paris Declaration principles, nor were they intended for tracking gender equality outcomes.²

The three indicators focussed on developing countries' progress on gender equality, but also comprised qualitative questions on donor resources and approaches. Countries that opted to test the module were requested to answer a set of qualitative questions for each indicator and, based on their replies, provide a quantitative score on their performance against each gender equality indicator.

National co-ordinators for the Paris Declaration Monitoring Survey were invited to complete the gender equality module alongside the 2011 Survey, in consultation with donors and civil society. Because the module was optional, it is possible that countries which chose to test it had identified gender equality as a priority. The results may therefore not be representative of the performance of all developing countries that undertook the 2011 Paris Declaration Monitoring Survey.³

-
1. Albania, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Comoros, Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Gabon, Honduras, Kenya, Malawi, Mali, Moldova, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Peru, Rwanda, Togo and Zambia.
 2. See Annex A for a detailed explanation of the rationale and methodology, and Annex C for the module questionnaire.
 3. 78 developing countries undertook the 2011 Paris Declaration Monitoring Survey.

2. OVERVIEW OF MODULE FINDINGS

Twenty-four of the developing countries that undertook the 2011 Paris Declaration Monitoring Survey chose to also pilot the survey's gender equality module. The module prompted discussions about progress on gender equality at the country level. Many countries organised workshops or consultations with government agencies, donors and civil society representatives in order to discuss the descriptive questions and the indicator scores.⁴ Other countries consulted mainly with donors.⁵ Seventeen African countries tested the module, four Latin American, two Eastern European and one Asian. Eleven countries submitted the module responses in French, nine in English and four in Spanish.

Module replies show that countries have made more progress against the indicator "ownership of gender equality" (indicator 1), than against the indicators on "gender equality results" (indicator 2) and "mutual accountability for gender equality" (indicator 3). Gender equality and women's empowerment are overall relatively well grounded in countries' national development strategies. The most common approach amongst countries is to mainstream gender equality in their national strategies, most often in the areas of social or human development. However, neither countries nor donors match resources for gender equality with their policies and commitments, which hampers implementation (Chapter 3).

Indicator 2 on gender equality results measures the availability and use of sex disaggregated data. Module replies show that such data are rarely collected or analysed systematically. However, examples from several countries indicate that where data disaggregated by sex are used as a basis for decision making, this leads to an increased focus on and budget allocations for gender equality and women's empowerment by both countries and donors (Chapter 4).

About half of the countries where broad based dialogue is in place note that gender equality is addressed in the dialogue. Several countries call for a stronger accountability framework on gender equality and women's empowerment (Chapter 5).

Four of the countries that tested the module (Burundi, Comoros, Democratic Republic of Congo and Togo) also undertook the 2011 survey of the Principles for Good International Engagement in Fragile States and Situations.⁶ Replies from these four countries were complemented by information from Somalia and Afghanistan, to analyse how gender equality is addressed in fragile and conflict-affected states. In these situations, donors and countries need to recognise that gender equality and the protection of women are the means of supporting peace and statebuilding, rather than competing objectives (Chapter 6).

4. Albania, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Dominican Republic, Gabon, Honduras, Kenya, Malawi, Mali, Moldova, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Peru, Rwanda, Togo.

5. Comoros, Democratic Republic of Congo, Egypt and Mozambique.

6. See www.fsprinciples.org

3. OWNERSHIP OF GENDER EQUALITY

Indicator 1: Measuring ownership of gender equality⁷

“Ownership” is one of the five aid effectiveness principles of the Paris Declaration (2005). One of the twelve Paris Declaration indicators also measures progress on ownership. The concept of ownership has since evolved from solely referring to developing countries’ central governments to involving a broader range of national actors, including civil society. With the 2008 Accra Agenda for Action, both donors and developing countries agreed that national development policies – on which donors commit to align their support – must be consistent with international commitments on gender equality, human rights, disability and environmental sustainability (Accra Agenda for Action, paragraph 13c).

The gender equality module’s indicator on ownership of gender equality draws on commitments in the Accra Agenda for Action and the Paris Declaration, and measures to what extent gender equality and women’s empowerment are grounded in a systematic manner in national development plans and strategies.⁸

The 24 countries replied to a set of qualitative questions and, based on these, scored their performance against the indicator “Gender equality and women’s empowerment are grounded in a systematic manner in national development strategies – ownership” on a scale from 1 (lowest score) to 5 (highest score) (Section 3.4).

3.1 Addressing gender equality in development plans

All the 24 countries that tested the gender equality module address gender equality in their national development plan/strategy. The topic is integrated as “cross cutting”, generally in some or several areas or sectors of the plan. In **Moldova**, for example, gender equality was integrated into four of the five priority sectors in 2008 following a multi-stakeholder consultative process.

This is consistent with all 24 countries having ratified gender equality commitments such as the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW); along with the aim of meeting MDG3 – gender equality.

- **Albania** stresses that it is “not ever enough to address gender equality only through a cross-cutting strategy”.
- **Burundi** explains that gender equality has low priority because the topic is cross-cutting.
- **Honduras** notes that mainstreaming remains a challenge.
- **Zambia** observes that even though gender equality is expected to be mainstreamed throughout all sectors, it is not clear how this would happen.

7. Linked to Paris Declaration indicator 1, operational development strategies (ownership).

8. See Annex for methodology of the gender equality indicator on ownership (indicator 1).

However, some countries observe that integrating gender equality as a cross cutting issue - “mainstreaming gender” - is not enough. Even though gender mainstreaming is a necessary strategy to promote gender equality and women’s empowerment, it is not sufficient. Specific measures for women’s empowerment need to be introduced, financed and placed centre stage to build ownership of the development process by all stakeholders.⁹

Zambia is the only country which addresses gender equality both as a “cross cutting” issue and as a sector in its own right in the national plan. Such a twin-track approach to gender equality is in line with the 1995 commitments set out in the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action.

Sectoral focus of gender equality priorities in the development plan

Gender equality is often integrated into the areas of exclusion or social or human development in countries’ development plans (Cameroon, Cape Verde, Democratic Republic of Congo, Dominican Republic, Gabon, Kenya, Mozambique, Niger). In some countries a number of separate sectoral strategies also promote gender equality – also most commonly in the social sectors (Burundi, Cameroon, Comoros, Ecuador, Honduras, Mali, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Peru, Rwanda, Togo, Zambia). This focus on social and human development alone risks disregarding women’s economic opportunities and empowerment, and hampering overall economic growth. For example, Zambia observes that in the agriculture sector, sweet potatoes and cassava – which are crops often used by women and important for resilience in food security and nutrition – are not well supported by the government. Maize, which is perceived a “man’s crop” is on the other hand subject to subsidies and government support in markets.

Countries which make a conscious effort to strengthen women’s economic empowerment include Nepal, where employment-generating activities have been supported and Burundi, which focuses on women’s access to resources and gender equality in the governance sector. In Peru the transport sector strategy includes a gender equality dimension and in Rwanda the specific strategies of all key sectors address gender equality.

Specific gender equality objectives in the development plan

Eleven countries (Albania, Cape Verde, Democratic Republic of Congo, Egypt, Kenya, Moldova, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Rwanda and Zambia) state that they have identified at least one gender equality objective or target at some level in their national development plan.¹⁰ In Kenya, the permanent secretariats in all line ministries are accountable to different targets, including gender mainstreaming.

3.2 Gender equality in the long-term development vision

Some countries address gender equality and women’s empowerment in their long-term development vision (Cameroon, Cape Verde, Mali, Morocco, Rwanda, Kenya). In Kenya, the long-term development framework (“Vision 2030”) addresses gender equality as a separate sub-sector. Cape Verde and Cameroon focus on equality in the economic sectors in these documents. In Morocco, gender equality

“(Finding from the module) and women’s empowerment are integral parts of a wider long-term transformation of the country, aiming to align the judiciary with international conventions on human rights.

9. OECD (2007), *Gender equality and aid delivery. What has changed in development co-operation agencies since 1999?* Paris.

10. In addition, Honduras has defined specific gender equality targets in its government plan.

Several countries that tested the gender equality module also noted that they have developed a national gender strategy or action plan.¹¹

3.3 Linking national gender equality priorities to the budget

Policies and objectives on gender equality are overall not matched by adequate resources. Countries observe that existing budget allocations for gender equality priorities are generally low and sometimes the smallest item of the national budget (Cape Verde, Ecuador, Kenya).¹² Resources for programme implementation by the Women's Ministry and/or gender units in Ministries are inadequate – in particular compared to other ministries (Albania, Honduras, Mozambique, Peru, Togo and Zambia). In some countries, no budget is allocated for national gender equality priorities (Democratic Republic of Congo, Moldova).

However, some countries do allocate significant financial resources to implement their gender equality priorities. In Nepal, 18% of the 2010-11 government budget was allocated for direct support to women. In Morocco, a specific budget line has been put in place for women's empowerment.

Existing budgets for gender equality are often allocated in a few sectors only – generally in the education or health sectors (Burundi, Mali, Mozambique, Niger). This mirrors the sectoral focus in national development plans, where gender equality is often treated only in the social or human development sectors. Funds for women or for gender equality in the economic and productive sector are more limited. For example, Burundi notes that even though the agriculture sector benefits from increased resources and many women are active in this sector it is “not clear” how

these financial resources support

women. Countries need to ensure that sufficient financial resources are allocated to implement their gender equality policy priorities, in order to reach gender equality and wider development objectives.

“Countries need to ensure that sufficient financial resources are allocated to implement their gender equality policy priorities, in order to reach gender equality and wider development objectives.”

(Finding from the module)

“Gender units in ministries equal maximum effort, minimum budgets” (Honduras)

“Line ministries typically get very inadequate overall budgets, or the budgets are cut midyear due to revenue or donor financing shortfalls. When the little money is disbursed by the Treasury, the Directors of finance will more often than not sequester funding for gender activities and allocate funds to those areas with greater administrative or political exigencies.” (Zambia)

11. This question was however not explicitly asked in the questionnaire.

12. In Cape Verde and Ecuador, the budget for gender equality priorities is less than 0.2% of the total budget. In Cape Verde, this does not include the budget of sectors where gender equality is mainstreamed.

Gender responsive public financial management

- In Nepal, all line ministries and departments are required to code their programmes based on a score of their gender responsiveness. This helps to evaluate public expenditure and steer planning divisions and gender focal points in line ministries.
- Mali has developed a national strategy and tools for gender responsive budgeting at the national, regional and local levels.
- Rwanda has been piloting gender responsive budgeting in the sectors of education, health, infrastructure and agriculture since 2008. Today Rwanda is implementing programme-based budgeting and at the same time working to identify opportunities for integrating a gender equality dimension at each stage of budget planning and implementation.
- In Egypt, the expenditure report of the budget department measures gender specific allocations and their impacts on gender equality.
- In Morocco, the gender-responsive budgeting initiative was from the outset part of a broader public financial management reform process. Today, the impacts of financial policies on women and men are monitored in the sectors of agriculture, health, justice, employment and education. Morocco notes that this approach helps ensure that resources are used efficiently, by clarifying who benefits and where more efforts are needed.
- Moldova is putting in place *ex ante* policy impact assessments, including gender assessments. The country aims to ensure that policy formulation and allocation of financial resources are based on a gender analysis, to avoid setting up a separate budget for gender equality.

To ensure that government resources are used efficiently to benefit the entire population, based on differing needs and priorities, public financial management systems should ideally be gender-responsive from the outset. Around half of the countries that used the gender equality module are at different stages of piloting gender-responsive financial management or budgeting initiatives.

Despite these numerous initiatives several countries note that the implementation of gender responsive financial management is challenging due to lack of political will and commitment, capacity, and lack of data disaggregated by sex. There are also some misconceptions about what gender responsive budgeting implies, which leads to resistance. Some believe that gender responsive budgeting equals funding to a Women's Ministry, or represents a specific programme which benefits only a certain population group.

Prerequisites for successful gender-responsive budgeting include political support, a lasting commitment with enough time to build a sense of accountability ("one-off" initiatives are unlikely to have a significant impact), and the availability of data disaggregated by sex.¹³

13. *Integrating gender equality dimensions into public financial management reforms*, OECD DAC Network on Gender Equality, October 2010.

3.4 Quantitative indicator scores on ownership of gender equality

Countries were asked to self-assess their performance against a qualitative indicator measuring to what extent gender equality and women's empowerment are grounded in a systematic manner in national development strategies, on a scale from 1 (lowest score) to 5 (highest score). In some countries different actors had diverging views on the score to allocate. In these instances an average score was calculated and rounded up or down by the OECD Secretariat in consultation with the country.¹⁴

Four of the 24 countries scored "2 – elements exist", estimating that gender equality and women's empowerment are partly addressed in the national development strategy/PRSP, and that there is some basis in the country for defining gender equality objectives/targets and/or making progress in linking gender quality and women's empowerment to the budget.

The majority of countries that tested the module, 17 countries, scored "3 – action taken", implying that progress is being made although not yet enough. The national development strategy and sector and sub-national strategies address gender equality to a certain extent. The objectives/targets of the national development strategy/PRSP are partly linked to gender equality; and progress has been made on allocating a budget to gender equality objectives. A basis exists for more progress.

Three countries scored "4 – developed", estimating that significant progress has been made on gender equality, although further action is needed to ensure sustainability in the country. No country scored 1 or 5.

Table 1. Scores for gender equality indicator 1 - ownership

Scores for gender equality indicator 1: "Gender equality and women's empowerment are grounded in a systematic manner in national development strategies (ownership)"	
Score	Number of countries
Little action (score 1)	0
Elements exist (score 2)	4
Action taken (score 3)	17
Developed (score 4)	3
Sustainable (score 5)	0
Total	24

3.5 Donors' approaches and resources for gender equality

Donors generally align their strategies and actions to developing countries' gender equality priorities. Nearly all countries that tested the survey module state that donors in the country support the gender equality priorities of the national development plan or the national gender equality action plan. **Moldova**, for example, explains that Sweden's support has "always been designed by the national counterparts, thus following entirely the principle of national ownership." **Malawi** also notes that donor support is aligned with the national development plan and that gender equality initiatives in the country "have been largely dependent on donor support". Donor-partner gender equality working groups are in place in several countries and in some countries donors have set up joint funds for gender equality.

14. Because this was the first time the gender equality module was tested, there were also some misunderstandings of the scoring methodology. Some countries provided a score for each quantitative question instead of for the indicator. In these cases, an average was calculated by the OECD Secretariat and rounded up or down to the closest score in consultation with the country. This foot note concerns 5 countries.

In **Morocco** and **Mali**, donors aim to address gender equality in their policy dialogue with the government. However, civil society organisations in Morocco stress that donors have yet to find the right balance between implementing specific – but small – gender equality projects which have limited impact on the one hand, and larger budget support programmes which rarely address gender equality systematically on the other.

Nepal notes that donors normally are in a position to support integration of gender equality and women's empowerment into programme design and implementation, and that many have a gender expert or focal point based in the country. In **Moldova**, some of the DAC donors support gender equality including in “non-traditional” sectors such as infrastructure and road construction. In 2008-09, DfID and Sida organised training on gender equality for other donors present in Moldova.

However, some countries consider that donors lack human and financial resources for gender equality, and that this hampers the implementation of gender programmes (Cape Verde, Kenya, Peru). **Peru** stresses that donors allocate relatively little resources for gender equality compared to other topic areas. This sometimes results in donors' lack of understanding of the relevance of integrating a gender equality dimension into some of the sectors where they are active (such as infrastructure and road construction). **Egypt** explains that donors tend to focus on youth empowerment rather than on women's empowerment and **Moldova** stresses that the non-DAC Eastern European donors, which are becoming increasingly active in the country, entirely lack capacity to support gender equality.

Dominican Republic and **Honduras** regret donors' limited use of national technical expertise on gender equality. **Honduras** makes the point that donor decisions are sometimes more responsive to their own interests than to countries' priorities.

3.6 Future considerations on ownership of gender equality

- Countries' national development plans address gender equality. While this is positive, countries need to also ensure that resources allocated to gender equality match their objectives and commitments.
- Countries should consider taking a “twin track” approach to gender equality by addressing the issue both as a sector or through specific actions, and through gender mainstreaming.
- Countries and donors should reflect on the sectoral focus of their efforts to strengthen gender equality. Support for gender equality in the economic and productive sectors could be strengthened.
- Countries should initiate or continue efforts to ensure that public financial management systems are gender-responsive. This is a means for strengthening the quality of these systems and ensuring that resources are used efficiently, to benefit the entire population based on differing needs and priorities. This will take political will, data disaggregated by sex and a long-term commitment.
- Donors can strengthen their alignment to partner countries' gender equality priorities by ensuring that sufficient resources, both human and financial, are available and by using national technical expertise on gender equality.

4. MEASURING AND ACHIEVING GENDER EQUALITY RESULTS THROUGH SEX DISAGGREGATED DATA

Indicator 2: Measuring gender equality results¹⁵

The Paris Declaration commits donors and partner countries to manage and implement aid in a way that focuses on the desired results, and uses information to improve decision making (paragraphs 43-46). Developing countries commit to strengthen the linkages between strategies and budgets, and endeavour to establish results-oriented reporting and assessment frameworks. One of the Paris Declaration indicators also measures whether countries have results-oriented assessment frameworks in place. In the Accra Agenda for Action (paragraph 23a), developing countries commit to improve information systems, including by disaggregating data by sex, region and socioeconomic status.

The module's indicator on gender equality results measures the extent to which gender equality and women's empowerment are addressed in national results or performance assessment/management frameworks through the availability and use of data disaggregated by sex. Based on discussions and analysis of replies to the qualitative questions in the module questionnaire, the 24 countries scored their performance against the indicator "data is disaggregated by sex (managing for gender equality results)", on a scale from 1 to 5 (Section 4.3).¹⁶

4.1 Collection of data disaggregated by sex

The 24 countries that tested the optional gender equality module of the Paris Declaration survey indicate that data disaggregated by sex are very rarely systematically collected. For example, in **Mozambique** the need to disaggregate data by sex has been a recurring recommendation in the government-partner joint review process but this recommendation has yet to be implemented. Also, many national surveys collect data at the household rather than individual level. This lack of data disaggregated by sex can be partly explained by a broader situation where further support for and increased investments in national statistical capacity and information systems are needed overall.¹⁷

Amongst the 24 countries, sex-disaggregated data are most commonly available in the sectors of health and education, and scarce in the economic sectors (Burundi, Cape Verde, Democratic Republic of Congo, Gabon, Honduras). This finding reflects countries' overall stronger focus on gender equality in the social sectors than in the economic and productive sectors (see Chapter 3). **Nepal**, however, is a positive exception. In Nepal, all major surveys produce data that are disaggregated by sex, caste and ethnicity.

15. Linked to Paris Declaration indicator 11: results-oriented assessment frameworks (results).

16. See Annex for methodology of the gender equality indicator on results (indicator 2).

17. OECD (2011), *Aid Effectiveness 2005-10: Progress in Implementing the Paris Declaration*.

4.2 Analysis and use of data disaggregated by sex

Where data disaggregated by sex are used as a basis for decision making, this leads to an increased focus on and budget allocations for gender equality and women's empowerment.

(Finding from the module)

A number of countries that tested the module explain that existing sex-disaggregated data are not always used, or not sufficiently used, in programme and policy management and decision making (Cape Verde, Ecuador, Dominican Republic, Honduras, Mozambique, Niger, Peru, Zambia). Honduras states that economic and political factors, not directly linked to gender inequalities, are often a more important basis for decision-making than sex-disaggregated data.

However, examples from several countries show that where data disaggregated by sex are used as a basis for decision making, this leads to an increased focus on and budget allocations for gender equality and women's empowerment either by the country or donors.

Dissemination of sex disaggregated data

Countries that disaggregate data by sex tend to make available such data to the public (Albania, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Comoros, Democratic Republic of Congo, Egypt, Gabon, Honduras, Mali, Moldova, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Peru, Rwanda, Togo, Zambia). **Albania** earlier published an annual report with data on a range of dimensions but this has not been published since 2008 and is not accessible on-line. **Malawi** notes that reports that use sex-disaggregated data and have gender equality as their main focus¹⁸ are “usually taken on board by the gender stakeholders and not the wider development environment”. Some countries even have dedicated web sites. Only a couple of countries note that existing sex disaggregated data are not readily available to the public (Burundi, Kenya).

4.3 Quantitative indicator scores on gender equality results

Countries were asked to self-assess their performance against a qualitative indicator measuring to what extent data is disaggregated by sex on a scale from 1 (lowest score) to 5 (highest score). Countries scored overall lower on this indicator than on the ownership indicator (Section 3.4). In some countries different actors had

- In Cameroon, the analysis of a survey on household living conditions in the north of the country led to the implementation of an anti-poverty project specifically focused on women.
- In Albania, the analysis of data on women's political representation led to the introduction of a 30% political quota.
- Kenya notes that although sex disaggregated data are used in a haphazard way such data have helped document inequalities in access to services, and in turn influence the education and water sector strategic plans.
- In Moldova, sex disaggregated data were used to develop a new law on ensuring equal opportunities for women and men – even though such data are not yet analysed and used to the full extent in the country.
- There were similar examples of how the use of sex disaggregated data have increased attention to gender equality and/or women in several other countries (Burundi, Egypt, Mali, Morocco, Peru, Rwanda and Togo).

18. Such as the Gender Development Index for Malawi and the Human Development Report by the UNDP

very divergent views on the score that should be allocated. In these instances an average score was calculated and rounded up or down by the OECD Secretariat in consultation with the country.¹⁹

One country scored “1 – little action”, noting that action has remained at a virtual standstill and that disaggregation of data by sex is sporadic or non-existent. Nine countries scored “2 – elements exist”, which means that there is some basis for making progress on sex-disaggregated data, either through what already exists or through definite plans. Data disaggregated by sex is not systematically analysed or disseminated.

Twelve countries scored “3 – action taken”, implying that progress is being made, although not yet enough. Disaggregation of key monitoring indicators, and data collection and analysis has become systematic and some information is made publicly available. Plans are in place to ensure the use of data in decision-making but the system may not yet be functioning at all levels of government. The basis exists for more progress.

Two countries scored “4 – developed”, estimating that significant progress has been made on disaggregating data by sex, although further action is needed to ensure sustainability. Data disaggregated by sex for national results or performance assessment/management frameworks are generally timely and comprehensive. No country scored “5”.

Table 2. Scores for gender equality indicator 2 – managing for gender equality results

Scores for gender equality module indicator 2 “data is disaggregated by sex (managing for gender equality results)”	
Score	Number of countries
Little action (score 1)	1
Elements exist (score 2)	9
Action taken (score 3)	12
Developed (score 4)	2
Sustainable (score 5)	0
Total	24

19. Because this was the first time the gender equality module was tested, there were also some misunderstandings of the scoring methodology. Some countries provided a score for each quantitative question instead of for the indicator. In these cases, an average was calculated by the OECD Secretariat and rounded up or down to the closest score in consultation with the country. This footnote concerns 4 countries.

4.4 Donor support for and use of sex disaggregated data

- Cameroon notes that donors tend to use sex disaggregated data for decisions mainly in the social sectors.
- Kenya reports that donors tend to use sex-disaggregated data in their own planning, programming and allocations, but not necessarily in joint processes.
- In Nepal, donors are often at the forefront in advocating use of disaggregated data.
- Mozambique indicated that “the use of sex-disaggregated data for decision making and resource allocation varies significantly from one donor to another. Yet it is neither systematic nor comprehensive.”

Module replies concerning donor behaviour show that they are very likely to use, at least partly, data disaggregated by sex in their decision making when such data are available.

Donor support for strengthening country capacity to collect sex-disaggregated data could be improved. In **Kenya**, even though donors fully appreciate the importance of data and have set up a platform to regularly discuss sex disaggregated data and inform decision making, only a limited number of donors support collection and analysis. The **Democratic Republic of Congo** explains that donors support the collection of sex-disaggregated data for their own needs and not in areas which are of priority for the country – and that national institutions do not have capacity to collect such data.

Several positive examples of donor support nevertheless exist. In **Mali**, donors support sex disaggregated data in the sectors of health, education and agriculture. In **Albania**, some donors have supported the implementation of a time-use survey. Donors in **Rwanda** and **Togo** provide co-ordinated support for data collection, including sex disaggregated data. Cameroon, Egypt, Moldova, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger and Peru also state that several donors provide support for data disaggregated by sex.

4.5 Future considerations on gender equality results

- For effective results-management, both governments and donors need to make use of existing data disaggregated by sex for policy and programme management and decision making.
- Donors should support country capacity for the collection of data disaggregated by sex.
- Existing data disaggregated by sex should be made available on-line whenever possible, in order to enable the public to access and use these data.

5. MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY FOR GENDER EQUALITY

Indicator 3: Measuring mutual accountability for gender equality²⁰

The Paris Declaration recognises that for aid to become truly effective, stronger and more balanced accountability mechanisms are required. It calls upon donors and developing countries to be accountable to each other for their commitments. The Accra Agenda for Action has broadened the understanding of accountability by putting stronger emphasis on transparency and accountability towards citizens, both in donor and developing countries, and on the role of parliaments and civil society. It calls for further efforts to ensure that mutual assessment reviews, including broad based dialogue, are in place in countries.²¹

The module's indicator on mutual accountability for gender equality measures whether progress on national, regional and international commitments on gender equality and women's empowerment is addressed in mutual assessment reviews.²² It draws on and uses information from indicator 12 of the 2011 Paris Declaration monitoring survey: the number of partner countries that undertake mutual assessments of progress in implementing agreed commitments on aid effectiveness including those in this Declaration.

5.1 Accountability for and policy dialogue on gender equality

"Mutual assessment reviews" as defined by the 2011 Paris Declaration monitoring survey are in place in one third of the countries that tested the gender equality module. One of the key criteria for countries to meet to be considered as having a mutual assessment review is to have broad based dialogue in place. Sixteen of the 24 gender equality module countries have broad based dialogue in place.²³

Eight of the 16 countries where broad based dialogue is in place state that gender equality is addressed, or partly addressed, in the dialogue.

- In Malawi, the annual reviews of the Growth and Development Strategy provide a forum for mutual assessments on gender equality. Women's groups are generally involved in this process. The performance assessment framework for budget support in Malawi also focuses on gender equality to some extent.
- In Burundi, gender equality is treated in some sectoral working groups such as education and governance. There are, however, no clear guidelines as to when and where to address gender equality.

20. Linked to Paris Declaration indicator 12: mutual accountability

21. OECD (2011), *Aid Effectiveness 2005-10: Progress in Implementing the Paris Declaration*.

22. See Annex for methodology of the gender equality indicator on accountability (indicator 3)

23. Results on indicator 12 of the 2011 Paris Declaration monitoring survey

Several countries explain that a separate dialogue on implementing the national gender equality policy is in place, or that donors hold a separate dialogue with the Ministry of Women.²⁴

Zambia argues that donors are not held accountable for the performance of the gender equality programmes they support but that “poor performance is always explained by poor country systems”. Incentives for donors to achieve gender equality results are therefore weak. Similarly, senior-level government officials are not held accountable for gender equality. Several countries call for a stronger accountability framework on gender equality and women’s empowerment.

“Poor performance is always explained by poor country systems” (Zambia)

- Niger, Peru and Togo all note that there is an absence of mechanisms and procedures to address gender equality.
- Albania does address gender equality in existing dialogue processes, though the involvement of the Women’s Ministry is limited.
- Rwanda also addresses gender equality in dialogue processes and includes the Women’s Ministry.
- In Mozambique, all indicators of the performance assessment framework, which includes some gender equality indicators, are addressed in reviews. The Ministry of Women and Social Welfare participates in the review process.
- Egypt notes that gender equality was addressed in mutual assessment reviews before the revolution in January 2011, but that the commitment to gender equality is no longer clear.

5.2 Future considerations on mutual accountability for gender equality

- Donors and partners should systematically address progress against agreed commitments on gender equality and women’s empowerment in their dialogue and mutual assessment reviews at the country level.
- A stronger accountability framework for tracking funding and measuring progress on gender equality and women’s empowerment commitments at the country level should be part of the follow-up to HLF4 in Busan.

24. Such separate dialogue processes were however not directly addressed by the gender equality module.

6. ADDRESSING GENDER EQUALITY IN FRAGILE AND CONFLICT-AFFECTED COUNTRIES

Measuring progress on gender equality in fragile situations

Four of the countries that tested the module (Burundi, Comoros, Democratic Republic of Congo and Togo) also opted to undertake the 2011 survey of the Principles for Good International Engagement in Fragile States and Situations.²⁵ These four countries are therefore considered as “fragile states” in this report.

However, the gender equality module was not intended for or adapted to fragile or conflict-affected states or situations. The challenges which are often particularly prevalent in fragile settings, including violence against women and women’s participation in statebuilding processes, were therefore not addressed by the module and cannot be assessed here. Likewise, the implementation of UN Security Council Resolutions on women and conflict, including SCR 1325 on Women, Peace and Security, was not addressed by the module. Burundi stresses that the questions and indicators in the gender equality module were challenging to respond to because of the specific country context.

The analysis in this chapter is complemented by information from Somalia and Afghanistan. Somalia undertook the survey of the Fragile States Principles and, in parallel, carried out an exercise to assess progress on gender equality through consultations with civil society. The information from Afghanistan is entirely based on the country chapter of the Paris Declaration Evaluation, which addresses progress on gender equality extensively.²⁶

6.1 Ownership of gender equality in fragile situations

Gender equality is addressed as a cross-cutting issue in the national development plans of Burundi, Comoros, Democratic Republic of Congo and Togo. The **Democratic Republic of Congo** has also identified gender equality as a specific objective in the poverty reduction strategy, though no funding is allocated to the topic. **Burundi** indicates that some funding is allocated to combat gender-based violence and to ensure free health-care for women giving birth and for small children. However, funding for strengthening gender equality is overall very limited in the four countries that carried out both the

*“Political stability has been seen as more important than gender equality”
(Democratic Republic of Congo)*

*“Gender equality is often upstaged in favour of governance issues or conflict resolution”
(Somalia)*

25. These Principles provide a set of guidelines to improve involvement of the international community in situations of conflict and fragility. The implementation of the Principles is monitored through a voluntary survey which relies on national consultations. See www.fsprinciples.org

26. Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, Ministry of Finance and Baawar Consulting Group (2010), *Joint evaluation of the Paris Declaration Phase 2: Islamic republic of Afghanistan, 2010*.

gender equality module and the Fragile States Principles survey.

The focus of gender equality programmes in the **Democratic Republic of Congo** has been to protect women, who are perceived as vulnerable rather than as development actors in their own right. The Democratic Republic of Congo explains that political stability has been seen as more important than gender equality, and that the country has failed to identify gender equality and women's empowerment as a means for ensuring political stability. This is also the case in Somalia, where gender equality is often upstaged in favour of governance issues or conflict resolution. However, many women's groups note that women play an important role in conflict situations – from active support or opposition to unwilling physical and symbolic co-option. There are examples of positive results in the country generated by the inclusion of women in peacebuilding and conflict resolution processes.²⁷

During the gender equality monitoring exercise in **Somalia**, it was generally acknowledged that donors are the drivers of efforts to strengthen gender equality in the country. Gender equality is sometimes seen by national authorities as “an alien ideology” and many local authority figures are resistant. However, many Somali women's groups that were consulted argue that gender equality is indeed a “Somali issue” and that both donors and national authorities should pay more attention to the local initiatives taking places. Overall, there is an opportunity for all partners to bring women's organisations and civil society actors more substantially into the analysis, planning and implementation of governance and conflict resolution initiatives.

In **Afghanistan**, there is a sense that women and gender equality have been used “symbolically” by all actors. The Paris Declaration Evaluation argues that women in the country do not believe that anyone sees them as a priority. The existing Gender Action Plan is perceived as “a wish list which has not yet been translated into implementable programs, with associated results”. Women were not consulted during the preparation of the Afghanistan National Development Strategy. Even though “some symbolic meetings were called”, insufficient time was given to women to express their views and concerns. Gender equality has never been mainstreamed in the government strategies, policies, and projects in Afghanistan.²⁸

27. OECD (2011), *2011 Report on International Engagement in Fragile States. Somali Republic*.

28. Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, Ministry of Finance and Baawar Consulting Group (2010), *Joint evaluation of the Paris Declaration Phase 2: Islamic republic of Afghanistan, 2010*.

6.2 Results and accountability for gender equality in fragile situations

The availability and use of data disaggregated by sex, and the extent to which donors support this, differ between the four countries that carried out both the gender equality module and the 2011 Fragile States Principles survey.

Burundi, Comoros and Democratic Republic of Congo all lack mutual accountability mechanisms. Democratic Republic of Congo in particular highlights that accountability mechanisms on gender equality are needed. In **Afghanistan**, women consulted during the Paris Declaration evaluation feel that neither the government nor the donors are accountable to them.²⁹

In **Togo**, on the other hand, broad-based policy dialogue is in place and gender equality is indeed addressed in this dialogue.

6.3 Donor support for gender equality in fragile situations

The gender equality exercise of the Fragile States Principles survey in Somalia notes that gender equality objectives are often pushed from donor headquarters, without sufficient analysis or understanding of gender relations in the local context. Somalia is culturally rich in local and traditional norms, and Islam in its various interpretations is a strong foundation of the Somali social system. A more delicate approach to gender equality is needed by donors, because “heavy handed”, short term approaches will only exacerbate discrimination.³⁰

The Paris Declaration Evaluation of **Afghanistan** draws a very similar conclusion. Few donors in the country have adequate expertise on gender equality, human rights and environment, and lack an understanding of the local context. A telling example is how, as a response to women and girls being raped on their way to fetch water from a distant point, water wells were constructed inside or near mosques. This initiative was not based on a contextual cultural analysis – only men are allowed into mosques to pray in Afghanistan, and women and girls are not allowed around the peripheries of the mosques during prayer which coincide with the time to fetch water.³¹

- In **Burundi**, data disaggregated by sex were used to analyse the 2005 election process – leading to a decision to use quotas in the 2010 local elections. There is however limited donor support for data collection in the country.
- In **Togo**, once donors had analysed data disaggregated by sex, they decided to increase funding for women and gender equality projects.
- In the **Comoros**, donors have set up a joint programme to support the collection of data disaggregated by sex but challenges exist when it comes to updating these data.
- The **Democratic Republic of Congo** argues that donors support the collection of data disaggregated by sex for their own needs, rather than in sectors linked to the country's priorities. National institutions lack capacity to collect such data.

29. Ibid.

30. OECD (2011), *2011 Report on International Engagement in Fragile States. Somali Republic*.

31. Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, Ministry of Finance and Baawar Consulting Group (2010), *Joint evaluation of the Paris Declaration Phase 2: Islamic republic of Afghanistan, 2010*.

Burundi also notes that donors have little expertise available on gender equality, while **Democratic Republic of Congo** highlights USAID's focus on gender equality in the country and how Japan makes efforts to consult with women's groups.

This paints a rather bleak picture of how donors address (or not) gender equality in fragile situations. Donors will need to strengthen their efforts to protect women in fragile situations and, in particular, to support women as development actors and involve them in statebuilding processes.

6.4 Future considerations on gender equality in fragile situations

- Countries and donors need to strengthen their efforts to protect women in conflict and include women in statebuilding processes, in line with UN Security Council Resolutions on women and conflict (including SCR 1325).
- It should be recognised that gender equality and empowered women will support peace and statebuilding. Gender equality is complementary to and does not “compete” with governance or peace building goals.
- There is a need for greater inclusion of civil society actors, including women and women's organisations, in national and international decision making processes.
- Donors need to strengthen their understanding of gender relations in the specific country context, including understanding of the religion and culture.

7. LESSONS LEARNED AND WAY FORWARD

7.1 How to better address gender equality in efforts to make aid more effective

Gender equality and women's empowerment are powerful multipliers of development efforts. For aid and development to be effective, gender equality first needs to be addressed effectively. The lessons learned through the gender equality module, which would allow countries and donors to strengthen their approaches to gender equality, include:

- Countries' national development plans address gender equality. While this is positive, countries need to also ensure that resources allocated to gender equality match their objectives and commitments.
- Countries should consider taking a "twin track" approach to gender equality by addressing the issue both as a sector or through specific actions, and through gender mainstreaming.
- Countries and donors should reflect on the sectoral focus of their efforts to strengthen gender equality. Support for gender equality in the economic and productive sectors could be strengthened.
- Countries should initiate or continue efforts to ensure that public financial management systems are gender-responsive. This is a means for strengthening the quality of these systems and ensuring that resources are used efficiently, to benefit the entire population based on differing needs and priorities. This will take political will, data disaggregated by sex and a long-term commitment.
- Donors can strengthen their alignment to partner countries' gender equality priorities by ensuring that sufficient resources, both human and financial, are available and by using national technical expertise on gender equality.
- For effective results-management, both governments and donors need to make use of existing data disaggregated by sex for policy and programme management and decision making.
- Donors should support country capacity for the collection of data disaggregated by sex.
- Existing data disaggregated by sex should be made available on-line whenever possible, in order to enable the public to access and use these data.
- Donors and partners should systematically address progress against agreed commitments on gender equality and women's empowerment in their dialogue and mutual assessment reviews at the country level.
- A stronger accountability framework for tracking funding and measuring progress on gender equality and women's empowerment commitments at the country level should be part of the follow-up to HLF4 in Busan.

- Countries and donors need to strengthen their efforts to protect women in conflict and include women in statebuilding processes, in line with UN Security Council Resolutions on women and conflict (including SCR 1325).
- It should be recognised that gender equality and empowered women will support peace and statebuilding. Gender equality is complementary to and does not “compete” with governance or peace building goals.
- There is a need for greater inclusion of civil society actors, including women and women’s organisations, in national and international decision making processes.
- Donors need to strengthen their understanding of gender relations in the specific country context, including understanding of the religion and culture.

7.2 Lessons learned on monitoring gender equality and aid effectiveness

Respondents to the gender equality module were asked to comment on the three indicators and the methodology used, and how they would envisage measuring progress on gender equality and aid effectiveness after the HLF4 in Busan.

Overall, the 24 countries felt that the three selected indicators were relevant, straightforward and effective in enabling them to measure progress on how gender equality has been addressed in efforts to implement the Paris Declaration. Many countries called for a stronger accountability framework for tracking funding and measuring progress on how gender equality is addressed in efforts to make aid and development effective after HLF4.

Eight countries suggested identifying, for any aid effectiveness monitoring framework after HLF4, a specific indicator on financial resources spent on gender equality – by donors (ODA) and/or by partner countries (government expenditure). The DAC gender equality policy marker and gender responsive public financial management tools could be used to further reflection on such an indicator. Three countries proposed an indicator on donor harmonisation around support for gender equality. Two countries also suggested sector-specific gender equality and aid effectiveness indicators.³²

It is clear from countries’ replies that the module prompted frank discussions about how gender equality has been addressed in efforts to implement the Paris Declaration. Many countries organised workshops or consultations with government agencies, donors and civil society representatives in order to discuss the descriptive questions and the indicator scores. This is, in itself, a positive result of the gender equality module as it is likely to increase the understanding of the role gender equality can play in accelerating aid and development effectiveness.

32. Some countries also noted that additional gender equality *outcome* indicators are needed after the HLF4. While measuring development outcomes is not the scope of the aid effectiveness monitoring framework, the need for gender equality outcome indicators can be addressed by other initiatives agreed at the HLF4.

REFERENCES

Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, Ministry of Finance and Baawar Consulting Group (2010), *Joint evaluation of the Paris Declaration Phase 2: Islamic republic of Afghanistan, 2010*.

OECD (2007), *Gender equality and aid delivery. What has changed in development co-operation agencies since 1999?*, Paris.

OECD (2010), *Integrating gender equality dimensions into public financial management reforms*, OECD DAC Network on Gender Equality, October 2010.

OECD (2011), *2011 Monitoring Survey on the Fragile States Principles*, Paris.

OECD (2011), *Aid Effectiveness 2005-10: Progress in Implementing the Paris Declaration*, Paris.

OECD (2011), *2011 Report on International Engagement in Fragile States. Somali Republic*, Paris.

Wood, B; Betts, J; Etta, F; Gayfer, J; Kabell, D; Ngwira, N; Sagasti, F; Samaranayake, M. (2011), *The Evaluation of the Paris Declaration*, Final Report, Copenhagen, May 2011

ANNEX A: RATIONALE AND METHODOLOGY OF THE THREE GENDER EQUALITY INDICATORS

Rationale and methodology of gender equality indicator 1: ownership

The Paris Declaration recognises that development efforts are more likely to be successful and sustainable where the developing country takes the lead in determining the goals and priorities of its own development, and sets the agenda for how these are to be achieved. To make country ownership a reality, developing countries must lead their development policies and strengthen their institutions and systems for managing public resources, including external resources. Donors need to respect and encourage this leadership, by helping to strengthen partner countries' capacity to exercise it. Indicator 1 of the Paris Declaration Monitoring Survey ("ownership") measures whether partner countries have operational development strategies.

In the Accra Agenda for Action, the importance of country ownership was reaffirmed. Developing country governments committed to take stronger leadership of their own development policies, and also engage with their parliament and citizens in shaping those policies. Donors and developing countries also agreed to design and implement their development policies and programmes in ways consistent with international commitments on gender equality, human rights, disability and environmental sustainability (paragraph 13c).

The gender equality indicator on ownership (indicator 1) draws on the Accra Agenda for Action and uses an adapted version of the criteria assessed by the Paris Declaration ownership indicator. It asks descriptive questions about the extent to which gender equality and women's empowerment objectives are part of the national development strategy and the long-term vision that underpins the latest national development strategy. It addresses the linkages between the objectives of the national development strategy and gender equality, and whether a specific budget is allocated to gender equality and women's empowerment objectives. It also asks whether a gender equality perspective has been integrated into public financial management, through gender-responsive budgeting.

Countries were asked to allocate a quantitative score from 1 (lowest possible score) to 5 (best possible score) on this indicator, based on consultations with stakeholders.

Gender equality indicator 1 also provides qualitative information about to what extent donors' development policies and programmes are designed and implemented at the country level in ways consistent with agreed international commitments on gender equality (in line with the Accra Agenda for Action para. 13c) and whether donors are equipped to meet their commitments on gender equality.

Rationale and methodology of gender equality indicator 2: results

The Paris Declaration (paragraphs 43-46) commits donors and partner countries to manage and implement aid in a way that focuses on the desired results and uses information to improve decision

making; partners to strengthen the linkages between strategies and budgets, and endeavour to establish results-oriented reporting and assessment frameworks; donors to link country programming to results and align them with partners' assessment and monitoring frameworks, and harmonise reporting requirements; and partner and donors to jointly strengthen the necessary capacities. Indicator 11 of the Paris Declaration Monitoring Survey ("results") measures the extent to which the country commitment on establishing performance frameworks has been realised.

In the Accra Agenda for Action (paragraph 23a), developing countries committed to improve information systems, including by disaggregating data by sex, region and socioeconomic status. This is necessary in order to manage and measure development results.

The gender equality indicator on results (indicator 2) measures the extent to which gender equality and women's empowerment are addressed in national results or performance assessment/management frameworks by asking whether data disaggregated by sex are collected. The indicator also comprises descriptive questions about the extent to which existing sex-disaggregated data are analysed and used for decision-making, and disseminated to the public.

Countries were asked to allocate a quantitative score from 1 (lowest possible score) to 5 (best possible score) on this indicator, based on consultations with stakeholders.

Gender equality indicator 2 also provides qualitative information about to what extent donors support the development of national capacities for the collection, analysis and dissemination of data disaggregated by sex and to what extent sex-disaggregated data is used in donor decision-making, allocation and programming processes.

Rationale and methodology of gender equality indicator 3: mutual accountability

The Paris Declaration recognises that for aid to become truly effective, stronger and more balanced accountability mechanisms are required at all levels. In particular, it calls donors and partner countries to jointly assess through existing country level mechanisms mutual progress in implementing agreed commitments on aid effectiveness including those included in the Paris Declaration (paragraph 50). Indicator 12 of the Paris Declaration Monitoring Survey ("mutual accountability") measures the number of partner countries that undertake mutual assessments of progress, and asks three questions relating to the existence of an aid policy or strategy, country level aid effectiveness targets and whether broad based dialogue is in place.

Gender equality indicator 3 measured mutual accountability for gender equality by asking:

- Whether progress on national, regional and international commitments on gender equality and women's empowerment are addressed in mutual assessment reviews where these are in place. National co-ordinators were invited to respond "yes", "no" or "not applicable (there is no mutual assessment review in place)", and to motivate their response.
- Whether representatives from the Ministry in charge of gender equality and gender equality focal points from line ministries, as well as representatives from civil society, are systematically involved in mutual review processes where these are in place. National co-ordinators were invited to respond "yes", "no" or "not applicable (there is no mutual assessment review in place)", and to motivate their response.

ANNEX B: PARIS DECLARATION INDICATORS OF PROGRESS AND CORRESPONDING OPTIONAL GENDER EQUALITY INDICATORS

PD Indicators		Targets for 2010	Optional gender equality indicators
1	Operational development strategies	At least 75% of partner countries have operational development strategies.	Gender equality and women's empowerment are grounded in a systematic manner in national development strategies
2a	Reliable Public Financial Management (PFM) systems	Half of partner countries move up at least one measure (i.e., 0.5 points) on the PFM/ CPIA (Country Policy and Institutional Assessment) scale of performance.	
2b	Reliable Procurement systems	One-third of partner countries move up at least one measure (i.e., from D to C, C to B or B to A) on the four-point scale used to assess performance for this indicator.	
3	Aid flows are aligned on national priorities	Halve the gap — halve the proportion of aid flows to government sector not reported on government's budget(s) (with at least 85% reported on budget).	
4	Strengthen capacity by co-ordinated support	50% of technical co-operation flows are implemented through co-ordinated programmes consistent with national development strategies.	
5a	Use of country Public Financial Management systems	Reduce the gap by two-thirds — A two-thirds reduction in the % of aid to the public sector not using partner countries' PFM systems. For partner countries with a score of 5 or above on the PFM/CPIA scale of performance (see Indicator 2a).	
		Reduce the gap by one-third — A one-third reduction in the % of aid to the public sector not using partner countries' PFM systems. For partner countries with a score between 3.5 and 4.5 on the PFM/CPIA scale of performance (see Indicator 2a).	

5b	Use of country procurement systems	Reduce the gap by two-thirds — A two-thirds reduction in the % of aid to the public sector not using partner countries' procurement systems; for partner countries with a score of 'A' on the Procurement scale of performance (see Indicator 2b).	
		Reduce the gap by one-third — A one-third reduction in the % of aid to the public sector not using partner countries' procurement systems; for partner countries with a score of 'B' on the Procurement scale of performance (see Indicator 2b).	
6	Strengthen capacity by avoiding parallel PIU	Reduce by two-thirds the stock of parallel Project Implementation Units (PIUs).	
7	Aid is more predictable	Halve the gap — halve the proportion of aid not disbursed within the fiscal year for which it was scheduled.	
8	Aid is untied	Continued progress over time.	
9	Use of common arrangements or procedures	66% of aid flows are provided in the context of programme-based approaches.	
10a	Joint missions to the field	40% of donor missions to the field are joint.	
10b	Joint country analytic work	66% of country analytic work is joint.	
11	Results-oriented frameworks	Reduce the gap by one-third — Reduce the proportion of countries without transparent and monitorable performance assessment frameworks by one-third.	Data is disaggregated by sex
12	Mutual accountability	All partner countries have mutual assessment reviews in place.	Mutual accountability for gender equality and women's empowerment

ANNEX C: THE GENDER EQUALITY MODULE QUESTIONNAIRE

BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

This optional module³³ aims to provide a gender equality dimension to the progress being tracked by the 2011 Survey on monitoring the Paris Declaration. It supplements the core 2011 Survey, which monitors progress against the 12 indicators agreed in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005).

The gender equality module is being piloted in 2011 on a voluntary basis. It is not anticipated that all countries participating in the 2011 Survey on Monitoring the Paris Declaration should complete this module. Rather, it offers an exploratory framework for interested national authorities in partner countries to engage in dialogue on the linkages between gender equality and aid effectiveness where this is helpful.

Evidence generated by countries using this optional survey module will be drawn on in the 2011 Paris Declaration Monitoring Report – a key input into the Fourth High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness (HLF4 - Korea, 29 November–1 December 2011). More importantly, feedback from countries piloting the gender equality module in 2011 will be used to deepen our shared understanding of gender equality and its interface with aid effectiveness, and as one input to possible monitoring initiatives emerging after HLF4.

The gender equality module responds to a strategy proposed in the DAC Guiding Principles for Aid Effectiveness, Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment³⁴ (2008) to develop “qualitative and quantitative gender equality indicators to measure progress towards challenging commitments such as country ownership”. It draws on commitments in the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action (AAA).


HOW IS THIS OPTIONAL GENDER EQUALITY MODULE LINKED WITH THE 2011 SURVEY ON MONITORING THE PARIS DECLARATION?

The 2011 Survey on Monitoring the Paris Declaration provides an established methodology for assessing progress against the 12 indicators agreed in 2005. Stakeholders in some countries may also be interested in exploring performance against some specific commitments contained in the Paris Declaration and AAA in greater depth. Two optional survey modules – relating to ownership and gender equality – have been developed for this purpose. National co-ordinators may, in consultation with donors and civil society, choose to use these modules to collect additional information and facilitate dialogue on these issues.

33. Developed by the OECD DAC Network on Gender Equality (GENDERNET).

34. Available on www.oecd.org/dac/gender/effectiveness

The 2011 Survey on Monitoring the Paris Declaration is also being rolled out in conjunction with the OECD-DAC 2011 Survey on Monitoring the Principles for Good International Engagement in Fragile States and Situations in those countries that have chosen to participate in both processes.



- ***My country is participating in the 2011 Survey on Monitoring the Paris Declaration. Do we also need to complete the questionnaires on ownership and gender?*** – The survey modules on ownership and gender are optional. National co-ordinators should, in consultation with donors and civil society, decide whether to complete the additional survey modules. The in-depth information gathered through these modules will be analysed in the publications that draw on the 2011 Survey on Monitoring the Paris Declaration.
- ***I am a national co-ordinator and would like to complete one of the optional survey modules. What do I need to do?*** – This document contains the questionnaire which should be completed, and the process through which you should consult with donors, civil society and parliamentarians to allocate scores for the gender equality indicators. You are invited to make contact with the OECD-DAC Secretariat so that further support and advice may be provided.

THREE INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE ON GENDER EQUALITY AND WOMEN'S EMPOWERMENT

Three voluntary gender equality indicators have been identified to complement the existing monitoring framework of the Paris Declaration. The indicators are based on a self-assessment of performance against proposed criteria.

The indicators are grounded in the existing Paris Declaration indicators and provide a gender equality dimension to the progress being tracked by Paris Declaration indicators 1 (partners have operational development strategies – ownership), 11 (results-oriented frameworks) and 12 (mutual accountability). The three indicators also draw on the AAA, in particular paragraph 13c³⁵, 23³⁶ and 24.³⁷

35. Developing countries and donors will ensure that their respective development policies and programmes are designed in ways consistent with their agreed international commitments on gender equality, human rights, disability and environmental sustainability.

- Gender equality indicator 1) gender equality and women's empowerment are grounded in a systematic manner in national development strategies (ownership)
- Gender equality indicator 2) data is disaggregated by sex (managing for gender equality results)
- Gender equality indicator 3) mutual accountability for gender equality and women's empowerment

MANAGING THE PROCESS AT THE COUNTRY LEVEL

National co-ordinators for the 2011 Survey on Monitoring the Paris Declaration are encouraged to complete the Gender equality questionnaire. The information provided in the questionnaire should be discussed alongside the results of the 2011 Survey on Monitoring the Paris Declaration with government ministries, donors, civil society and parliamentarians with a view to validating the qualitative responses, and the scores proposed.

The self-assessment nature of these pilot indicators is such that it may not be possible to reach consensus on responses and scores at the country level. Where there are diverging opinions, national co-ordinators should not seek to reach consensus. Rather, they should document the range of opinions expressed in the final submission shared with the OECD Secretariat.

SUBMISSION OF RESULTS

The completed Gender equality questionnaire should be sent to the OECD Secretariat no later than 31 March 2011 to inform the High-Level Forum in Korea.

The national co-ordinator should submit the Gender equality questionnaire along with the other documents relating to the 2011 Survey on Monitoring the Paris Declaration (Country Spreadsheet, Country Report and Government Questionnaire) by email to pdsurvey@oecd.org, or by fax to + 33 1 44 30 61 27.

HELP DESK

A help desk has been established to respond to queries from national co-ordinators and donor focal points.

How do I contact the help desk?

By email: pdsurvey@oecd.org

By telephone: + 33 1 45 24 89 80 / + 33 1 45 24 94 48 / + 33 1 45 24 79 17

By fax: + 33 1 44 30 61 27

Specific support on the gender equality module is provided by the GENDERNET Secretariat:

- Ms. Jenny Hedman (jenny.hedman@oecd.org; +33 1 45 24 96 18)
- Ms. Patti O'Neill (patti.oneill@oecd.org; +33 1 45 24 18 87)

36. We will improve our management for results [...] including by disaggregating data by sex.

37. [...] step up our efforts to ensure that — as agreed in the Paris Declaration — mutual assessment reviews are in place by 2010 in all countries that endorsed the Paris Declaration.

GENDER EQUALITY QUESTIONNAIRE

Country: [Type here]

National co-ordinator: [Type here]

Donors, CSOs and Parliamentarians consulted: [Type here]

GENDER EQUALITY INDICATOR 1) GENDER EQUALITY AND WOMEN'S EMPOWERMENT ARE GROUNDED IN A SYSTEMATIC MANNER IN NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES (OWNERSHIP)

This indicator is linked to Paris Declaration indicator 1, *Partners have operational development strategies* (ownership).³⁸ Paris Declaration indicator 1 is assessed based on three criteria: i) the existence and quality of a unified strategic framework, ii) prioritisation within that framework, and iii) the existence and quality of strategic links to the budget.

a) Qualitative description³⁹

Q1. *Basic information*: Please describe to what extent gender equality is addressed in the national development strategy/Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP), and in sector and sub-national strategies: [Type here]

Q2. *Unified Strategic Framework*: Please describe to what extent gender equality and women's empowerment objectives are part of the long-term vision that underpins the latest national development strategy: [Type here]

Q3. *Prioritisation*: Please describe the linkages between the objectives/targets of the national development strategy/PRSP and gender equality and women's empowerment⁴⁰: [Type here]

Q4. *Strategic link to the budget*: Please set out whether a specific budget is allocated to gender equality and women's empowerment objectives, and identify the sectors/programmes. Also describe whether a gender equality perspective has been integrated into public financial management, through gender-responsive budgeting: [Type here]

Q5. Please describe to what extent donors' development policies and programmes are designed and implemented at the country level in ways consistent with agreed international commitments on gender equality (in line with AAA para. 13c): [Type here]

Q6. Please describe and give examples of how donors are equipped (specialist staff, tools etc) to support the integration of gender equality and women's empowerment in programme design and implementation: [Type here]

38. It also draws on the AAA paragraph 13c: *Developing countries and donors will ensure that their respective development policies and programmes are designed in ways consistent with their agreed international commitments on gender equality, human rights, disability and environmental sustainability.*

39. Please provide brief answers to the qualitative questions (no longer than a few lines/answer).

40. The Paris Declaration monitoring survey includes a question, under indicator 1, on whether objectives/targets of the strategy are linked with "cross-cutting issues such as gender, environment and governance". The information provided about gender equality can be reproduced and/or developed here.

b) Self assessment – score indicator 1

Based on the qualitative responses in section a), please suggest a score from 1-5 for indicator 1) using the LEADS methodology (see box below): [Type here]

Have the replies and the score been discussed with the developing partner country government, civil society and parliamentarians? Please describe any diverging views: [Type here]

LEADS methodology⁴¹ for scoring indicator 1)

L *Little action (score 1):* Action on addressing gender equality and women's empowerment in the national development strategy/PRSP has remained at a virtual standstill. There is little to no effort to define objectives/targets for gender equality.

E *Elements exist (score 2):* Gender equality and women's empowerment are partly addressed in the national development strategy/PRSP. There is some basis for defining gender equality objectives/targets and/or making progress in linking gender equality and women's empowerment to the budget.

A *Action taken (score 3):* Progress is being made, although not yet enough (compared to D - Developed). The national development strategy and sector and sub-national strategies address gender equality to a certain extent. The objectives/targets of the national development strategy/PRSP are partly linked to gender equality and women's empowerment. Progress has been made on allocating a budget to gender equality objectives. The basis exists for more progress.

D *Developed (score 4):* Significant progress has been made, although further action is needed to ensure sustainability. The national development strategy and sector and sub-national strategies adequately address gender equality. The national development strategy is derived from a long-term vision which addresses gender equality. The objectives/targets of the national development strategy/PRSP are linked to gender equality and women's empowerment, and a specific budget is allocated to gender equality and women's empowerment objectives in identifiable sectors or programmes.

S *Sustainable (score 5):* There are no warning signs of possible deterioration, and there is widespread expectation that the progress achieved in grounding gender equality and women's empowerment in national development strategies (as set out under D - Developed) is sustainable.

41. This methodology has been developed by the World Bank and is used when scoring progress against indicator 1 and 11 or the Paris Declaration monitoring survey.

GENDER EQUALITY INDICATOR 2) DATA IS DISAGGREGATED BY SEX (MANAGING FOR GENDER EQUALITY RESULTS)

This indicator supplements Paris Declaration indicator 11, *Number of countries with transparent and monitorable performance assessment frameworks to assess progress* (results-oriented frameworks).⁴² Gender equality indicator 2) measures the extent to which gender equality and women's empowerment are addressed in national results or performance assessment/management frameworks by ensuring data is disaggregated by sex.

a) Qualitative description⁴³

Q1. Please describe to what extent the data collected for the national development strategy's monitoring and evaluation framework are systematically disaggregated by sex, and whether these data are timely, relevant and comprehensive: [Type here]

Q2. Please describe to what extent sex-disaggregated data are analysed and used for decision-making: [Type here]

Q3. Please describe to what extent sex-disaggregated data are disseminated to the public: [Type here]

Q4. Please describe to what extent donors support the development of national capacities for the collection, analysis and dissemination of data disaggregated by sex: [Type here]

Q5. Please describe to what extent sex-disaggregated data is used in donor decision-making, allocation and programming processes: [Type here]

42. It also draws on the AAA paragraph 10) *Achieving development results — and openly accounting for them — must be at the heart of all we do*, and paragraph 23) *We will improve our management for results [...] including by disaggregating data by sex*.

43. Please provide brief answers to the qualitative questions (no longer than a few lines/answer).

b) Self assessment – score indicator 2

Based on the qualitative responses in section a), please suggest a score from 1-5 for indicator 2) using the LEADS methodology (see box below): [Type here]

Have the replies and the score been discussed with the developing partner country government, civil society and parliamentarians? Please describe any diverging views: [Type here]

LEADS methodology⁴⁴ for scoring indicator 2)

L *Little action (score 1):* Action has remained at a virtual standstill. Disaggregation of data by sex for national results or performance assessment/management frameworks is sporadic or non-existent. Data disaggregated by sex is not analysed or disseminated.

E *Elements exist (score 2):* There is some basis for making progress, either through what already exists, or definite plans for increasingly disaggregating data by sex for national results or performance assessment/management frameworks. Data disaggregated by sex is not systematically analysed or disseminated.

A *Action taken (score 3):* Progress is being made, although not yet enough (compared to D - Developed). Disaggregation of key monitoring indicators, and data collection and analysis has become systematic and some information is made publicly available. Plans are in place to ensure the use of data in decision-making but the system may not yet be functioning at all levels of government. The basis exists for more progress.

D *Developed (score 4):* Significant progress has been made, although further action is needed to ensure sustainability. Data disaggregated by sex for national results or performance assessment/management frameworks are generally timely and comprehensive. The system tracks a sufficient yet manageable number of input, output and outcome indicators relating to gender equality and women's empowerment across all sectors. The data is used for decision-making and disseminated.

S *Sustainable (score 5):* There are no warning signs of possible deterioration, and there is widespread expectation that the progress achieved in disaggregating data by sex (as set out under D - Developed) is sustainable.

44. This methodology has been developed by the World Bank and is used when scoring progress against indicator 1 and 11 or the Paris Declaration monitoring survey.

GENDER EQUALITY INDICATOR 3) MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY FOR GENDER EQUALITY AND WOMEN'S EMPOWERMENT

This indicator draws on Paris Declaration indicator 12, *Number of partner countries that undertake mutual assessments of progress in implementing agreed commitments on aid effectiveness including those in this Declaration* (mutual accountability).⁴⁵

Q1. Is progress on national, regional and international commitments on gender equality and women's empowerment addressed in mutual assessment reviews? (Yes / No / non applicable – there is no mutual assessment review in place) [Type here]

Please provide a brief motivation for your reply: [Type here]

Q2. Are representatives from the Ministry in charge of gender equality and gender equality focal points from line ministries, as well as representatives from civil society, systematically involved in mutual review processes? (Yes / No / non applicable – there is no mutual assessment review in place) [Type here]

Please provide a brief motivation for your reply: [Type here]

45. It also builds on paragraph 24b of the AAA to: [...] *step up our efforts to ensure that — as agreed in the Paris Declaration — mutual assessment reviews are in place by 2010 in all countries that endorsed the Paris Declaration.*

FEEDBACK ON THE GENDER EQUALITY PILOT SURVEY MODULE

To what extent is monitoring of gender equality and aid effectiveness commitments a priority in the country context. [Type here]

Do you have any comments on the three proposed gender equality indicators and the methodology used? [Type here]

How would you envisage measuring progress on gender equality and aid effectiveness after 2011 and HLF4. [Type here]

Findings from the Gender Equality Module of the 2011 Paris Declaration Monitoring Survey

The 2011 Paris Declaration Monitoring Survey was complemented by an optional module on gender equality with three indicators, based on the commitments included in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005) and the Accra Agenda for Action (2008). The gender equality module also responded to a proposal set out in the DAC Guiding Principles for Aid Effectiveness, Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (2008) to develop "qualitative and quantitative gender equality indicators to measure progress towards challenging commitments such as country ownership".

The gender equality module comprised three indicators, each linking up with one of the 12 indicators of the Paris Declaration Monitoring Survey:

1. **Ownership:** gender equality and women's empowerment are grounded in a systematic manner in national development strategies (linked to Paris Declaration indicator 1, ownership)
2. **Results:** data is disaggregated by sex (linked to Paris Declaration indicator 11, results)
3. **Mutual accountability** for gender equality and women's empowerment (linked to Paris Declaration indicator 12, mutual accountability)

This report presents the findings from the 24 developing countries that tested the gender equality module during the 2011 Paris Declaration Monitoring Survey.