

# Analyzing ODA from a Feminist Perspective<sup>1</sup>

Marina DURANO

In assessing whether ODA has contributed to the promotion of gender equality and women's empowerment, reference is made to the recent increasing trend of aid flows and aid allocations for gender equality. Some issues on tracking aid flows and evaluating aid activities need to be recognized, however. Others look into institutional arrangements in and analyze gender policy documents of development cooperation agencies to assess progress in gender mainstreaming. Two other dimensions are necessary to complete a feminist analysis. One is the macroeconomics framework used to guide aid allocations, such as the PRSP. Another is the effect of aid flows on macroeconomic aggregates. Concerns over macroeconomic stability can trump ODA's potential contributions.

**Keywords :** ODA, gender mainstreaming, gender policy, macroeconomics

---

## Introduction

Surveying the history of the international aid system since the 19<sup>th</sup> century, Hjertholm and White (1998) concluded that aid programmes' claims of development have been distorted by commercial and political objectives. Hjertholm and White (1998) and Kanbur (2003) cite, for example, the United Kingdom's 1929 Colonial Development Act that provided loans and grants for the development of infrastructure in British colonies to facilitate provisioning of inputs to British manufacture. In more recent years, these commercial interests have been discussed as tied aid, where bilateral aid agencies require the purchase of goods and services from donor country contractors and providers (Boyce, 2002). Political motivations were especially clear during the Cold War as the United States released most of its aid through the 1951 Mutual Security Act in an attempt to prevent countries from leaning towards the USSR (Hjertholm and White, 1998; World Bank, 1998). Similar political motivations were also found in Soviet aid to China during the same period (Singh, 2002). Even when looking at the aid system after the Cold War, Rogerson, et al. (2004) and Woods (2007) also recognize the influence of "multiple foreign and security policy objectives" shaping the more recent evolutions of the international aid system. Woods (2007) highlights increased security concerns after 9/11 shifting aid allocations of major donors, which reinforces the argument that "geopolitical concerns often play the most decisive role in donor priorities (Boyce, 2002: 241)."

Kanbur (2003) also notes that the evolution of development thinking has been a factor in the shaping of the international aid system<sup>2</sup>. The aid system in its current form is marked by the emergence of the aid effectiveness agenda as an overarching framework whose entry into the aid discourse began in the late 1990s, although its roots lie a decade earlier. The ground was laid for it in the previous decade when the 1980s saw the emergence of balance-of-payments problems in the developing world aggravated by an external debt crisis leading towards an emphasis on adjustment aid, including debt relief (Hjertholm and White, 1998). The search for solutions to the external debt crisis prompted the launch in 1999 of the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) Initiative and the use of the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) as a tool for using debt relief properly (Ryan and Toner, 2003). Ryan and Toner (2003) go on to say that “the HIPC Initiative is more directly related to the machinery for delivering development assistance (aid) than the machinery for sovereign debt workouts (Rieffel, 2003: 179)” and that “the preparation of the PRSP has assumed a wider significance in terms of shaping development policy and the way assistance is allocated and delivered. There is now a distinct possibility that PRSPs may have a greater impact on development practice than on debt relief (Ryan and Toner, 2003: 31).”

Hjertholm and White (1998) also noted in their historical survey that there have been shifts in thematic emphasis of aid. In the early to mid-1990s, some attention was given to environment and gender but this was short-lived. Swiss (2011), on the other hand, argues that there was an increase in adoption of gender policies and that this increase has been influenced by the adoption of women’s rights into the global agenda for development. The objective of this paper is to analyze the international aid system from a gender perspective taking into account the influences raised above. Most of the literature looking at ODA<sup>3</sup> has focused on gender mainstreaming and this will be reviewed. There are other considerations that need to be taken into account and the framework used by this paper hopes to give a broader viewing of the aid system. There are three dimensions covered in this paper in addition to gender mainstreaming in development cooperation: trends in ODA flows and issues around tracking these financial flows, the macroeconomic framework that guides ODA allocation, and the macroeconomic effects of ODA flows. This paper argues that looking at all these dimensions can enhance evaluations of the contributions of ODA to gender equality and women’s empowerment.

This paper is structured as follows. The following section reviews the literature analyzing the aid system from a gender-aware perspective. This is followed by trends on official development assistance using the Creditor Reporting System (CRS) of the Overseas Economic Cooperation Development (OECD)’s Development Assistance Committee (DAC). The sectors in which aid flows are concentrated are shown, including those aid flows that are classified in the CRS as having been allocated with gender equality as the only policy objective. Rather than analyze what explains the trends, the figures are used to illustrate measurement issues, particularly on tracking aid flows. The third section reviews the literature analyzing the gender mainstreaming efforts undertaken by development cooperation agencies. A fourth section discusses the evolution of frameworks that attempt to govern how aid might be allocated. This section traces the history of aid frameworks, particularly the shift from

project-based aid to program and policy-based allocations, including the 2005 Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. Existing analyses of these frameworks from a gender perspective focus on institutional aspects similar to earlier analyses of development cooperation agencies. There is little feminist analysis of the macroeconomic policies that underpin these aid frameworks and principles despite the extensive literature on gender-aware macroeconomics. A fifth section is a short note that takes another step with macroeconomic analysis by looking at the effects of aid flows on conditions of macroeconomic stability. Feminist economists have analyzed macroeconomic stability issues looking at episodes of financial crisis and yet these have not been applied to aid flows.

### Gender Mainstreaming: Institutionalization and Instrumentalism

The literature on the aid system from a gender perspective remains a limited set. Two subsets of analysis can be said to exist. The first subset analyzes the gender policies declared by development cooperation agencies. The second subset focuses on analyzing the gender mainstreaming process at the level of organizational structure and mechanisms of development cooperation agencies. These two subsets are connected such that policy documents signal intent while organizational practices signal capacity for implementation. Oppenheim-Mason (2007), which is the most recent survey of development cooperation agencies, concluded that of the 27 members of the DAC that responded to the survey, only one did not have a policy on gender equality at the time the survey was conducted. Within the DAC, a Guidelines on Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment in Development Cooperation was released in 1997, which was made possible by the stewardship of the United Kingdom's Department for International Development or DFID (Beall, 1998). The release of these Guidelines may have encouraged the remaining DAC members to formulate a gender policy of their own.

As of this writing, a content analysis of all these gender policies in comparative and historical perspective appears to be needed, especially since there have been many developments in the aid architecture since the DAC Guidelines was first released. Swiss (2011), while demonstrating conformity among donors to establishing a gender unit or formulating gender policies, does not provide an analysis of the thematic content and approaches across the gender policies. In particular, it would be helpful to understand how these gender policies relate with, if at all, geo-political motivations as well as the changing development agenda referred to in the introduction. For the latter, existing literature traces the influence of women in development (WID) and gender and development (GAD) approaches in the formulation of gender policies of development cooperation agencies. Among recent developments that need to be taken into account in such an analysis would be the 2005 Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (henceforth, Paris Declaration), the War on Terror, and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). In addition, developments in the field of feminist theorizing such as those covering sexual orientation and gender identity should also be included in the survey.

The literature focuses on various aspects of gender mainstreaming. These assessments focus on organizational aspects. Moser and Moser (2005), for example, compare the components of the gender

policies in the institutions included in their study and find that these organizations employ a dual strategy of integration (or as a cross-cutting theme) and women-specific approaches in programming and staffing. Their study concludes that there is a need for analytical skills and training for gender, the importance of women in decision making structures, resource availability, and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms as part of the accountability structure. Even when studies focus on sector-wide approaches rather than on specific donor agencies, the gender analysis is still about the organizational aspects of gender mainstreaming. ODI (2000), for example, is a study in this vein which looked into gender mainstreaming in sector-wide approaches to education in Ghana, Uganda and India. A similar observation can be made of Theobald, Tolhurst and Elsey (2002), which is an edited collection of studies on gender mainstreaming in sector-wide approaches in health, as well as by Longwe (2003) that reported on a workshop on HIV/AIDs in Tanzania, Mozambique and Zambia. In 2002, the OECD-DAC released “Gender Equality in Sector-Wide Approaches: A Reference Guide” that contained recommendations largely around strengthening organizational capacity.

Among the first to look into this area of gender mainstreaming in international agencies were Jahan (1995), revisited in Jahan (1996), and Razavi and Miller (1995). Jahan (1995, 1996) raises the importance of differentiating between the integrationist approach and the agenda-setting approach to gender mainstreaming and proposes that:

Within the international agencies, an agenda-setting approach will involve greater attention to the substantive objectives of the women’s movement: gender equality and women’s empowerment. The agencies’ preoccupation with instrumental objectives—such as integration and mainstreaming, and WID/GAD institutionalisation will have to give way to prioritising operational issues—removing legal and institutional barriers to women’s equal participation and designing and implementing gender-responsive policies and interventions. (Jahan, 1996: 829)

Razavi and Miller (1995), looking at the institutionalization processes of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), World Bank (WB), and International Labour Office (ILO) as case studies, conclude that in these agencies there has been poor implementation of commitments made to women’s issues despite the increased procedural and institutional mechanisms that have been established. Moser and Moser (2005), involving an analysis of fourteen<sup>4</sup> international agencies, reached similar conclusions. Oppenheim-Mason (2007) also concluded that despite the overwhelming number of development cooperation agencies that did have gender policies, very few of them seemed to have the organizational capacity to implement these policies. Budlender (2008) found in a study covering ten recipient countries of ODA from the European Commission that the Country Strategy Papers, which is the basis of the amount of aid reflected in the National Indicative Programmes, always mentions gender as a cross-cutting issue but “that there was limited evidence of how gender would be addressed beyond general statements about this being a cross-cutting issue (Budlender, 2008: 14).” However, other donors were better at gender equality and Spain’s approach in Peru and Morocco was mentioned as being clear about the gender equality goals in the recipient countries. The resulting gap between policy and implementation has been referred to as policy evaporation<sup>5</sup>.

Moser and Moser (2005) also found in their analysis that instrumentalism, which has also been referred to as an efficiency argument for gender equality, in the gender policy can be a constraint. This refers to the argument that gender equality is valuable for its contribution to development rather than viewing it as an end in itself. The approach is often defended as inevitable, a necessary compromise that has the potential to subvert neo-liberal discourse (Moser and Moser, 2005). Critics, on the other hand, argue that instrumentalism can lead to a depoliticisation of the feminist agenda (Moser and Moser, 2005, citing Miller and Razavi, 1998). Beall (1998), for example, in analyzing the gender content of DFID's "Eliminating Poverty: A Challenge for the 21st Century" (also known as the White Paper), released in 1997 as DFID's policy for development cooperation, noted the efficiency approach in relation to sustainable development and natural resource management and in the social returns to investing in women, although Beall (1998) qualifies the observation by saying that the approach does not permeate the White Paper. MacDonald (2003), which undertakes a similar analysis as Beall (1998) but working with additional documents, concludes that DFID documents "vacillate between a rights-based approach to gender equality and one based on efficiency... with the result that it is not clear if DFID has a common gender analysis or shared understanding of gender mainstreaming (MacDonald 2003: 6)." In the case of AusAid, Australia's development cooperation agency, Kilby and Olivieri (2008) found the loss of rights language, which was fairly strong in their gender policy of the mid-1990s. By 2007, Kilby and Olivieri (2008) note that AusAID's gender policy was focused on women's economic role in promoting growth but was less clear on the agenda for human rights. In Bytown Consulting and C.A.C. Consulting (2008), an evaluation undertaken in 2007 of the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) 1999 Policy on Gender Equality, also noted the dual approach of gender equality as an end as much as a means to sustainable development and poverty reduction but the evaluation did not have a critical view of this dual track.

It is likely that this combination of the integrationist strategy with an instrumentalist gender policy could be the reason why the expected social transformation has not occurred despite the amount of ODA resources made available. Jahan (1996), early on, found that agencies monitored the mechanisms of institutionalization rather than the impact of the programmes being funded. The aid effectiveness agenda is meant to respond to some of these aid management issues and this will be discussed in a later section.

## Concentration of ODA for Gender Equality

In order to get a better understanding of the types of activities that ODA has funded, it will be helpful to look into trends in ODA flows. One method of tracking ODA is through the reporting mechanisms of the DAC. The members include almost all aid agencies from industrialized countries but do not include new and emerging donor countries, such as the People's Republic of China and Brazil. The DAC maintains a Creditor Reporting System (CRS) database, which is an aid information system that gathers the reports on aid activities of development cooperation agencies that are members of the

OECD-DAC, although non-DAC donors are encouraged to share their information. Reporting directives are available to guide DAC members in answering questionnaires and reports. The database is publicly available at the OECD website (<http://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DatasetCode=CRSNEW>).

This section will present the trends for gross ODA disbursements rather than commitments between 2002 and 2009. These are the years for which data is available that distinguishes among different types of aid activities as well as the policy objectives that the aid activities were intended to meet. All figures are in constant 2009 United States dollars, which means exchange rate fluctuations and inflation have already been taken into account thus allowing for comparison of figures across the years observed and across DAC members. Let us begin with general trends first before presenting the aid allocations across sectors and policy objectives.

Table 1. ODA Gross Disbursements, 2002 to 2009 (in constant 2009 US\$ millions)

Year	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
All	78,572	86,517	91,314	128,436	167,417	117,096	126,865	135,104
Total Sector Allocable	41,371	47,006	55,201	67,373	70,859	78,283	85,887	96,137
Commodity aid/general program assistance	6,943	6,510	5,449	5,808	6,123	5,952	7,440	9,935
Action relating to debt	10,052	14,157	10,838	30,941	69,659	12,825	10,269	5,941
Humanitarian aid	4,231	6,098	6,559	10,662	8,989	8,374	10,878	10,765
Administrative costs of donors	1,941	2,253	2,782	3,797	4,352	5,778	6,369	6,446
Support to NGOs	983	1,306	1,874	1,369	1,634	1,473	1,550	742
Refugees in donor countries	690	768	2,194	2,828	1,826	1,776	2,415	3,146
Unallocated/ unspecified	12,361	8,419	6,418	5,657	3,974	2,636	2,058	1,992

Source: OECD-DAC CRS, data extracted on 4 October, 2011.

From Table 1, total aid increased during the period covered from US\$78.6 billion in 2002 to US\$135.1 billion in 2009, peaking at US\$167.4 billion in 2006. In 2009, 71.2 percent of ODA gross disbursements was classified as sector-allocable, up from 52.6 percent in 2002. Humanitarian aid<sup>6</sup> accounted for 8.0 percent of total aid in 2009 while 7.4 percent is accounted for by commodity assistance and general program assistance<sup>7</sup>. It should be noted that when ODA reached its peak in 2006, 41.6 percent of that was classified as actions related to debt, which means that much of the aid during that year was accounted for by the debt cancellations given to developing countries. (See Table 2 for details.)

Table 2. ODA Gross Disbursements, 2002 to 2009, shares to total in percent

Year	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
All								
Total Sector Allocable	52.7%	54.3%	60.5%	52.5%	42.3%	66.9%	67.7%	71.2%
Commodity aid/general program assistance	8.8%	7.5%	6.0%	4.5%	3.7%	5.1%	5.9%	7.4%
Action relating to debt	12.8%	16.4%	11.9%	24.1%	41.6%	11.0%	8.1%	4.4%
Humanitarian aid	5.4%	7.0%	7.2%	8.3%	5.4%	7.2%	8.6%	8.0%
Administrative costs of donors	2.5%	2.6%	3.0%	3.0%	2.6%	4.9%	5.0%	4.8%
Support to NGOs	1.3%	1.5%	2.1%	1.1%	1.0%	1.3%	1.2%	0.5%
Refugees in donor countries	0.9%	0.9%	2.4%	2.2%	1.1%	1.5%	1.9%	2.3%
Unallocated/ unspecified	15.7%	9.7%	7.0%	4.4%	2.4%	2.3%	1.6%	1.5%

Source: OECD-DAC CRS, data extracted on 4 October, 2011.

There are three major policy objectives that are tracked in the CRS reporting mechanism and these are, gender equality, environmental sustainability and participatory development or good governance. Combinations of any two or of all three are possible. Not all aid activities have policy markers as shown in Table 3 and Table 4. In 2009, about 58.9 percent of aid activities did not have any of the three policy markers attached to them. Of the remaining share, 8.1 percent had gender equality as the only policy objective. Another 10.2 percent of total aid in 2009 had a gender equality policy marker along with one or two of the other policy markers. While these figures seem significant, OECD-DAC (2011) notes that most of the aid activities with a gender policy marker classify the objective as significant, meaning that is one of several other objectives rather than principal, meaning that gender equality is the focus of the intervention. Looking at data for 2007 and 2008, OECD-DAC (2002) found that only 2 percent of aid has gender as a principal objective.

Table 3. Gross Disbursements by Policy Objective, 2002 to 2009 (in constant 2009 US \$ millions)

Year	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
(All)	78,572	86,517	91,314	128,436	167,417	117,096	126,865	135,104
Only gender	2,154	2,180	2,064	2,059	3,494	4,062	9,317	10,995
Only environment	4,126	3,448	3,844	5,125	6,208	6,812	9,821	12,124
Only participatory development/good governance	8,334	6,683	7,846	13,287	13,411	14,131	15,880	16,026
Gender and Environment	639	686	602	354	647	556	1,492	1,800
Gender and Participatory Development/Good Governance	2,054	2,163	3,119	3,255	6,283	5,708	6,321	7,669
Environment and Participatory Development/Good Governance	1,261	1,327	2,081	1,703	2,172	2,257	2,781	2,559
Gender and Environment and Participatory Development/Good Governance	914	1,171	1,640	992	3,174	3,070	4,203	4,324
Other (No mark)	59,090	68,859	70,118	101,661	132,028	80,500	77,050	79,607

Source: OECD-DAC CRS, data extracted on 4 October, 2011.

Table 4. ODA Gross Disbursements by Policy Objective, 2002 to 2009, shares to total in percent

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
All								
Only gender	2.7%	2.5%	2.3%	1.6%	2.1%	3.5%	7.3%	8.1%
Only environment	5.3%	4.0%	4.2%	4.0%	3.7%	5.8%	7.7%	9.0%
Only participatory development/good governance	10.6%	7.7%	8.6%	10.3%	8.0%	12.1%	12.5%	11.9%
Gender and Environment	0.8%	0.8%	0.7%	0.3%	0.4%	0.5%	1.2%	1.3%
Gender and Participatory Development/Good Governance	2.6%	2.5%	3.4%	2.5%	3.8%	4.9%	5.0%	5.7%
Environment and Participatory Development/Good Governance	1.6%	1.5%	2.3%	1.3%	1.3%	1.9%	2.2%	1.9%
Gender and Environment and Participatory Development/Good Governance	1.2%	1.4%	1.8%	0.8%	1.9%	2.6%	3.3%	3.2%
Other (No mark)	75.2%	79.6%	76.8%	79.2%	78.9%	68.7%	60.7%	58.9%

Source: OECD-DAC CRS, data extracted on 4 October, 2011.

Maral-Hanak (2009) is critical of this policy marker that is meant to monitor the intent of an aid programme or project and describes the system as oversimplified. While the markers are a useful reminder to development cooperation agencies of gender equality as a policy objective, these are unable to capture the complex social interactions in which gender is embedded (Maral-Hanak 2009). Certainly, OECD-DAC (2011) is careful to point out that the amounts attached to the policy markers indicate support but they do not show the impact of aid.

An immediate parallel can be drawn with gender-responsive budgeting exercises that also face challenges in categorizing public expenditure. Sharp and Broomhill (2002) describe how early analysis involving South Australia's budget needed to categorize public expenditures into one of three categories: women-targeted spending, civil service equal opportunities, and general spending. It was quickly shown that most of the spending went to the third category. This means that only a small portion of the budget went to women-specific spending and that seems to be the case with the gender policy marker for ODA. As with the gender policy marker, budget categories classify monetary inputs and the type of budgeting exercise can determine the extent to which these monetary inputs can be related with outputs and outcomes, which would be easier for performance-based budgeting and less so for line-item budgeting (Sharp 2003).

Even when the gender policy marker is accepted as a signifier of intent, the scoring decision depends on the interpretation of the aid official who assigns codes to submit the reports to the CRS. Murray, et al. (2010), who looked into the IrishAid's use of the gender policy marker, noted "the difficulties relating to the quality and subjectivity of the marker (Murray, et al. 2010: 36)" while acknowledging the marker's usefulness. Budlender (2008) also noted how aid officials interviewed in the ten-country study failed to mention the gender policy marker despite explicit questions about tracking aid for gender.

Table 5. ODA Gross Disbursements by Major Type of Aid Activity, Gender Only as Policy Objective, 2002 to 2009, (in constant 2009 US\$ millions)

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
All	2,154	2,180	2,064	2,059	3,494	4,062	9,317	10,995
Total Sector Allocable	2,024	2,070	1,972	1,865	3,203	3,600	8,249	9,994
Commodity aid/general program assistance	21	33	19	70	48	107	463	299
Action relating to debt	1	2	1	2	13	..	0	..
Humanitarian aid	76	60	62	88	192	328	397	576
Administrative costs of donors	0	0	0	5	-0	1	9	6
Support to NGOs	18	1	2	6	4	12	123	68
Refugees in donor countries	0	0	1	7	21	4	0	19
Unallocated/ unspecified	13	13	7	15	12	10	75	33

Source: OECD-DAC CRS, data extracted on 4 October, 2011.

Table 6. ODA Gross Disbursements by Major Type of Aid Activity, Gender Only as Policy Objective, 2002 to 2009, shares to total in percent

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Total Sector Allocable	4.9%	4.4%	3.6%	2.8%	4.5%	4.6%	9.6%	10.4%
Commodity aid/general program assistance	0.3%	0.5%	0.3%	1.2%	0.8%	1.8%	6.2%	3.0%
Action relating to debt	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		0.0%	
Humanitarian aid	1.8%	1.0%	0.9%	0.8%	2.1%	3.9%	3.7%	5.4%
Administrative costs of donors	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	-0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%
Support to NGOs	1.8%	0.1%	0.1%	0.5%	0.2%	0.8%	7.9%	9.2%
Refugees in donor countries	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	1.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.6%
Unallocated/ unspecified	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%	3.7%	1.6%

Source: OECD-DAC CRS, data extracted on 4 October, 2011.

The CRS allows for the identification of the sectors in which aid activities are undertaken. Specifically for aid activities with gender as a policy marker, these amounts can be broken down by major aid activity and their shares are shown in Table 5 and Table 6 below. Most aid is classified under sector-allocable aid activity and this can be further broken down into sub-sectors. Focusing only on sector-allocable ODA with gender equality as the only policy objective, ODA is concentrated in social, economic and productive sectors as shown in Table 7 and Table 8, but primarily on the social sectors. Between 2002 and 2009, the share of the social infrastructure and services to total sector-allocable ODA was 82.1 percent and most of this is spent on education (average of 40.8 percent over the 8-year period) and health, including population and reproductive health (average of 19.9 per cent). Population and reproductive health expenditure has been receiving an increasing share of ODA to the services sector as seen in Table 9. Sometimes this result is due to a lack of common understanding within (and perhaps across) aid agencies of how gender mainstreaming is to be implemented. MacDonald (2003:14), for example, takes issue with UK DFID's inconsistent application of its gender equality commitments

with some key documents focusing “narrowly on the health and education-related MDGs/IDTs,” referring to the Millennium Development Goals or internationally agreed development targets rather than an approach involving a broader set of sectors. The extent to which the MDGs have influenced aid allocations has yet to be tested.

Table 7. ODA Gross Disbursements by Sub-Sector with Gender Only as a Policy Objective, 2002 to 2009, (in constant 2009 US \$ millions)

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Total ODA	2,153.8	2,180.1	2,064.2	2,059.2	3,494.3	4,061.5	9,316.9	10,994.8
Total Sector-Allocable ODA	2,024.3	2,069.8	1,972.0	1,865.3	3,203.3	3,600.3	8,249.2	9,994.3
100: I. SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE & SERVICES	1,569.9	1,733.2	1,689.6	1,542.8	2,621.3	2,893.1	6,471.1	8,614.6
110: I.1. Education	680.9	680.5	640.2	625.5	1,247.8	1,199.9	2,516.9	3,202.3
120: I.2. Health	315.0	436.7	390.1	349.7	507.4	496.7	654.1	1,007.8
130: I.3. Population Pol./Progr. & Reproductive Health	182.2	225.4	261.1	273.2	461.4	615.7	2,134.7	3,339.1
140: I.4. Water Supply & Sanitation	132.4	131.0	121.1	54.6	96.9	90.5	67.9	81.3
150: I.5. Government & Civil Society	145.3	129.4	138.4	125.8	126.4	335.0	515.5	386.7
160: I.6. Other Social Infrastructure & Services	114.3	130.1	138.7	114.1	181.3	155.3	582.0	597.4
200: II. ECONOMIC INFRASTRUCTURE AND SERVICES	185.5	146.3	133.5	149.0	285.4	385.4	962.4	496.2
210: II.1. Transport & Storage	77.5	61.0	45.3	30.7	74.1	64.0	99.4	22.4
220: II.2. Communications	3.4	7.2	2.0	2.1	4.6	5.7	11.8	22.4
230: II.3. Energy	10.6	7.7	4.5	1.1	26.5	12.9	17.8	22.4
240: II.4. Banking & Financial Services	77.2	49.2	65.8	112.0	160.1	172.1	442.0	381.4
250: II.5. Business & Other Services	16.9	21.1	15.9	3.1	20.1	130.7	391.5	47.5
300: III. PRODUCTION SECTORS	148.3	101.0	80.3	87.2	130.8	154.1	385.0	578.5
310: III.1. Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing	111.7	73.0	61.2	72.7	108.1	116.8	294.0	477.4
320: III.2. Industry, Mining, Construction	35.5	24.1	16.6	5.7	17.6	30.9	75.4	62.2
331: III.3.a. Trade Policies & Regulations	0.6	3.2	1.8	6.2	3.6	4.4	11.1	16.9
332: III.3.b. Tourism	0.5	0.7	0.8	2.7	1.6	1.9	4.5	22.0
400: IV. MULTISECTOR / CROSS-CUTTING	120.6	89.3	68.6	86.3	165.9	167.8	430.7	305.0

Source: OECD-DAC CRS, data extracted on 4 October, 2011.

Table 8. ODA Gross Disbursements by Sub-Sector with Gender Only as a Policy Objective, 2002 to 2009, (shares in percent)

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
450: V. TOTAL SECTOR ALLOCABLE (I+II+III+IV) Share to Total ODA	94.0%	94.9%	95.5%	90.6%	91.7%	88.6%	88.5%	90.9%
100: I. SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE & SERVICES (share to total sector-allocable)	77.6%	83.7%	85.7%	82.7%	81.8%	80.4%	78.4%	86.2%
110: I.1. Education (share to total social infrastructure and services)	43.4%	39.3%	37.9%	40.5%	47.6%	41.5%	38.9%	37.2%
120: I.2. Health	20.1%	25.2%	23.1%	22.7%	19.4%	17.2%	10.1%	11.7%
130: I.3. Population Pol./ Progr. & Reproductive Health	11.6%	13.0%	15.5%	17.7%	17.6%	21.3%	33.0%	38.8%
140: I.4. Water Supply & Sanitation	8.4%	7.6%	7.2%	3.5%	3.7%	3.1%	1.0%	0.9%
150: I.5. Government & Civil Society	9.3%	7.5%	8.2%	8.2%	4.8%	11.6%	8.0%	4.5%
160: I.6. Other Social Infrastructure & Services	7.3%	7.5%	8.2%	7.4%	6.9%	5.4%	9.0%	6.9%
200: II. ECONOMIC INFRASTRUCTURE & SERVICES (share to total sector-allocable)	9.2%	7.1%	6.8%	8.0%	8.9%	10.7%	11.7%	5.0%
210: II.1. Transport & Storage (share to total economic infrastructure and services)	41.8%	41.7%	34.0%	20.6%	26.0%	16.6%	10.3%	4.5%
220: II.2. Communications	1.8%	4.9%	1.5%	1.4%	1.6%	1.5%	1.2%	4.5%
230: II.3. Energy	5.7%	5.3%	3.4%	0.8%	9.3%	3.4%	1.8%	4.5%
240: II.4. Banking & Financial Services	41.6%	33.7%	49.3%	75.2%	56.1%	44.6%	45.9%	76.9%
250: II.5. Business & Other Services	9.1%	14.4%	11.9%	2.1%	7.1%	33.9%	40.7%	9.6%
300: III. PRODUCTION SECTORS (share to total sector-allocable)	7.3%	4.9%	4.1%	4.7%	4.1%	4.3%	4.7%	5.8%
310: III.1. Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing (share to total production sectors)	75.3%	72.3%	76.2%	83.4%	82.6%	75.8%	76.4%	82.5%
320: III.2. Industry, Mining, Construction	23.9%	23.9%	20.7%	6.5%	13.4%	20.1%	19.6%	10.7%
331: III.3.a. Trade Policies & Regulations	0.4%	3.2%	2.2%	7.1%	2.7%	2.9%	2.9%	2.9%
332: III.3.b. Tourism	0.4%	0.7%	1.0%	3.0%	1.2%	1.3%	1.2%	3.8%
400: IV. MULTISECTOR / CROSS-CUTTING	6.0%	4.3%	3.5%	4.6%	5.2%	4.7%	5.2%	3.1%

Source: OECD-DAC CRS, data extracted on 4 October, 2011.

Under economic infrastructure and services, ODA with gender equality as the only policy objective is concentrated on banking and financial services with an average share of 52.9 percent. Much of this aid supports micro-credit initiatives as can be seen by the high share of informal/semi-informal

intermediaries receiving the money and targeting gender equality (OECD-DAC 2011). Under the production sectors, ODA with gender equality as the only policy objective is concentrated in agriculture, forestry and fishing with an average share of 78.1 percent. OECD-DAC (2011) explains that a large share of agricultural education/research/services, forestry, and rural development have gender equality markers but agricultural inputs do not. The imbalance is feared to constrain women farmers' productivity (OECD-DAC 2011).

While these are the areas that receive much of the attention on gender equality, it is insightful to also look at the areas that are ignored. As mentioned in the introduction, Woods (2007) discussed how the War on Terror has influenced aid allocation. Attention has been given to fragile states, partly as a reaction to the integration of diplomacy, defense, and development by donor countries after 9/11 (Paducel and Salahub, 2011). "Fragile states" is a term that is broadly defined in Baranyi and Powell (2005) as a general failure to provide public goods and range in degree from nominal states to partial delivery and is often used to refer to states engaged in armed conflict, both within or across their borders, or to states that are in the process of rebuilding after conflict resolution. Paducel and Salahub (2011), which updates Baranyi and Powell (2005) and Hollander (2009), conclude that no new policies were developed by the donors included in their study since these were first released nor has there been any new policy for those donors that did not have any policy previously. It is not that there is no ODA focused on gender equality in fragile states but that there is very little, particularly when compared with the relatively greater needs of the people in those countries. A similar conclusion is reached by Patel, et al. (2009) in a study tracking ODA for reproductive health in eighteen conflict-affected countries between 2003 and 2006. Although these are not necessarily focused on gender equality, a large portion of reproductive health activities involve women and can still be informative. Two types of inequities were found by the authors: one involved greater disbursements to non-conflict countries and the other involved greater disbursements for HIV/AIDS-related activities compared to other reproductive health activities. Where there is ODA, the results have been less than expected. Abirafeh (2005), in discussing aid programming for gender in Afghanistan, echoes the difficulties of translating policy into practice. The analysis also highlights the disconnection that occurs between the women beneficiaries and the gender advisers and aid officers preventing effective communication from occurring despite policies highlighting the importance of participation and inclusion.

In sum, the ODA allocations are concentrated in education and health and, to a lesser extent, microfinance and the agricultural sector. It is possible that targeting women as beneficiaries is easier for these sectors at the same time that MDGs and other IDTs also focus on these sectors. Winship (2004) points to the number of gender strategies that were released after 2000 that referenced the MDGs and recognized that all goals have gender dimensions. The main issue is the identification of activities that promote gender equality since "not all expenditures targeted to women promote gender equality, and many programmes that are not specifically targeted to women have an equality-enhancing impact on women (Elson, 2006: 51)." Banerjee (2003) cited in Elson (2006) suggests 3 categories for classifying expenditures: expenditures targeted to women in distress; expenditures that support women's needs giv-

en their stereotypical roles; and, expenditures that promote equality or remove a gender-based handicap. The classification is not necessarily easier to implement and these require an even greater degree of analysis regarding the social context in which the expenditure is being undertaken (Elson, 2006).

The discussion in this section highlights the importance of improving<sup>8</sup> the tracking of aid allocations and disbursements for gender equality and the need for better evaluative measures to obtain a more accurate picture of the flows and, therefore, having a more solid foundation for analysis. In addition to improvements in tracking, there is a need to have reliable methods that link financial inputs with expected outcomes as mentioned above. One approach has been to look into monitoring and evaluation processes and the feedback mechanisms that will inform future allocations and disbursements. For example, some countries have a Performance Assessment Framework attached to the monitoring of general budget support and these contain a set of indicators agreed between donors and the recipient governments. As with the country strategy papers, however, Budlender (2008) found that only a few of those covered in her study have indicators that are specific to gender equality, at least sex-disaggregated, or that the gender indicators are a few in a very long list of indicators that need to be monitored. There other review mechanisms but the structures depend on the recipient country (Budlender, 2008). However, even with improvements in tracking, monitoring, and assessment, there will still be a requirement to specify a framework that reflects a theory of change—WID, WAD, GAD, rights-based, or any other—resulting in gender equality, which in turn helps with the recommended analysis of the social context in which the expenditures are to be made.

### Frameworks for Aid Allocation

Thus far the discussion has raised some of the challenges faced by gender mainstreaming efforts in ODA. Policy evaporation and an integrationist approach were highlighted as organizational constraints. Tracking and accounting for resources and linking with gender equality outcomes are another set of challenges faced by aid donors and recipients. These have been acknowledged by the ODA community and efforts have been expended to learn lessons by linking planning with results and improving aid management. The 2005 Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness offered a framework to respond to the challenges of managing aid but it definitely was not thought of as a response to the challenges of promoting gender equality through ODA. Gender equality advocates in the aid community, however, saw the Paris Declaration as an opportunity to improve aid delivery for gender equality. Authors such as Gaynor (2006) and Alami and Goetz (2006) discuss how gender equality can be built into the principles of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and attempt to show how each of the five principles (see Box 1) that the Paris Declaration hoped to promote in the aid community could include gender equality goals and be used to support the implementation of gender equality commitments.

Below are the five principles of the 2005 Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness as described in the OECD-DAC website dedicated to the Paris Declaration.

1. Ownership: Developing countries set their own strategies for poverty reduction, improve their institutions and tackle corruption.
2. Alignment: Donor countries align behind these objectives and use local systems.
3. Harmonisation: Donor countries coordinate, simplify procedures and share information to avoid duplication.
4. Results: Developing countries and donors shift focus to development results and results get measured.
5. Mutual accountability: Donors and partners are accountable for development results.

Source: OECD-DAC website

([http://www.oecd.org/document/18/0,3343,en\\_2649\\_3236398\\_35401554\\_1\\_1\\_1\\_1,00.html](http://www.oecd.org/document/18/0,3343,en_2649_3236398_35401554_1_1_1_1,00.html), accessed 5 January 2012.)

Box. 1 Principles of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness 2005

As the previous section has shown, there are also possibilities for learning from gender-responsive budgeting initiatives considering that many of the issues faced in aid allocations, tracking, and monitoring are also faced in gender-responsive budgeting. An approach that has brought this discussion closer to responding to the challenges raised in the previous section is found in Budlender (2008) that sought to respond to the question of how gender-responsive budgeting can enhance the gender-responsiveness of the aid effectiveness agenda. Budlender (2008) looks at the interface of aid, particularly new aid modalities such as general budget support, and national budgets by analyzing what happens in the recipient countries rather than what happens at the aid agency headquarters and focusing primarily on the results of ODA rather than on the aid delivery mechanisms. Of the many insights from the ten-country study, the most interesting one regarding the interface of aid and gender-responsive budgeting is that while donors were influential in getting the gender-responsive budgeting initiatives off the ground, very few of these initiatives engage with aid directly.

The country case studies have very few references to donors or aid. Nevertheless, virtually all the GRB initiatives have been funded by donor agencies. In some cases donors were among the key initial drivers and are still key drivers. Further, in most countries the GRB initiatives engage with processes and structures that have been influenced by, if not created for, international financial institutions and donors. Aid is thus definitely strongly present in the “context” even where the initiatives do not engage with it directly, in terms of analysing and influencing donor funds. But while GRB initiatives have generally been funded by donor agencies, the major donors involved in the “new” aid modalities have not always provided active encouragement at the country level. (Budlender, 2008: 42)

More importantly, these aid effectiveness papers avoided the question of macroeconomic policies and their implications on promoting gender equality. Macroeconomic policies are particularly crucial for

discussions around general budget support and poverty reduction strategies that donors often pledge to support. The importance of macroeconomic policies became central to aid discussions with the emergence of adjustment lending in the 1980s (Hjertholm and White, 1998).

… the emergence of adjustment lending was not a response to a ‘development crisis.’ In general there was no such crisis, although some African countries had begun a downturn. Rather it was a response (though not exclusively) to balance-of-payments and debt problems, and the attendant risk of financial crisis in developed countries (i.e. as a means to avoid collapse of the commercial banks involved). The experience thus clearly illustrates how the aid programme may readily respond to the needs and interests of major donors. The initial focus on macroeconomic policy also gave the World Bank and the IMF, particularly the former, a pre-eminence they had not enjoyed before (hence the expression the ‘Washington Consensus’). The World Bank is without a doubt the most important development institution, leading both policy dialogue and increasingly the research agenda. (Hjertholm and White, 1998: 13)

Rieffel (2003) also emphasises this absence of a financial crisis when the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) Initiative was formally launched in 1996. Rieffel (2003) goes on to state that “[t]he HIPC Initiative is more directly related to the machinery for delivering development assistance (aid) than the machinery for sovereign debt workouts (Rieffel 2003: 179).” The HIPC consolidated the World Bank and the IMF’s dominant position in macroeconomic policy and at the same time accorded these institutions and the regional banks with protection from outright debt reduction (Rieffel, 2003). The overlap in the use of the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) in the HIPC and the aid effectiveness processes should not be seen as surprising therefore.

During the same period the move towards direct budget support has been complemented by the adoption of Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs), a tool introduced by the World Bank in 1999 initially to ensure the proper use of debt relief under the enhanced Highly Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) Initiative. Since its introduction, the preparation of the PRSP has assumed a wider significance in terms of shaping development policy and the way assistance is allocated and delivered. There is now a distinct possibility that PRSPs may have a greater impact on development practice than on debt relief. (Ryan and Toner, 2003: 31)

Under the context described above, it becomes very important to understand the process of aid allocation, especially that driven by the World Bank. According to the World Bank, the Comprehensive Development Framework (CDF) describes the framework as the Bank’s “new way of doing business.” It is an important component of the aid effectiveness agenda since, in its own words, “[t]he CDF principles are embedded deeply in the international development agenda. For example, implementing the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness is tantamount to implementing the CDF” (WB website<sup>9</sup>). The CDF provides the basis for the PRS process and the PRS, in turn, is the basis for partnership in the aid effectiveness agenda, as can be seen in Table 9. Certainly, monitoring of the implementation of the

Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness uses the CDF Progress Report and its corresponding profiles as well as the Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA) that contains an economic core of macroeconomic and structural policies with peripheral concerns over governance and equity. These procedures ultimately define the rules and procedures that allocate aid across recipients of World Bank assistance<sup>10</sup>. According to van Waeyenberge (2004), "... while the CPIA conditions which countries have access to what, and the CAS rather than the PRSP prevails in determining the framework of engagement of the debtor country with the Bank, the PRS initiative fulfils an important function in the regulation of domestic understandings of policy options, in accordance with CPIA priorities" (van Waeyenberge, 2004: 21). These World Bank frameworks are able to influence the behaviour of other donors (Kanbur, 2005). Budlender (2008) confirms the key role that the World Bank plays among the donors at the country level in aid negotiations. Unfortunately, there are inconsistencies within the CPIA which are discussed in van Waeyenberge (2004), particularly between the economic core and the peripheral governance and equity components. Having an economic core in the CPIA also signals to potential recipients where the policy priorities lie.

Yet, at least as far as the aid disbursements are concerned, in Table 5 and 6 some proportion of commodity aid and general programme assistance has a gender policy marker. From these tables, a small proportion of about 3.0 percent of total aid in 2009 with gender only as the policy objective is categorized as commodity aid and general programme assistance. A closer look at the 2009 figures using the CRS microdata, which is a matrix of responses to the CRS questionnaire, reveals that most of the markers identify gender as a significant objective rather than the principal objective (See Table 9). This is understandable when the ODA is meant to support the budgets for the implementation of poverty reduction strategies or national development plans in which gender equality is only one of many policy objectives stated in the plans. What is interesting is that several donors classified some of their general budget support as having gender equality as the principal objective. Germany, for example, did this for their general budget support to Burkina Faso, Ghana, Malawi, Mali, Mozambique, Peru, Rwanda, Tanzania, Uganda, and Zambia for ODA disbursed in 2009. Another example is Europe's CEC that provided general budget support to Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cape Verde, and Zambia. Unfortunately, the CRS microdata did not provide additional text describing the nature of the support. Table 9 demonstrates the inconsistency further. It shows the aid agency, gives a short description of the ODA, the amount disbursed and the policy marker assigned to the programme. Even though all these agencies claimed that the aid activity was for general budget support, not all agreed that gender was a principal objective for the same recipient country.

In the case of Viet Nam, the Socio-Economic Development Plan (SEDP) contains the policy commitments of its government and ODA as poverty reduction support or credit is meant to support the implementation of Viet Nam's SEDP. Despite having a single document as the basis for policy commitments, donor agencies gave different markers. Canada CIDA, European Development Fund, Germany BMZ, and Switzerland SECO assigned "zero" to the gender marker. Denmark MFA, Spain, and UK DFID assigned "one" to the gender marker, while Japan JICA assigned a "two." Viet Nam's SEDP

has a section devoted to gender equality, youth movements, and the protection of children's rights in the plan under the chapter on the social sector, although it is only one of seventeen sections under the chapter (Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, 2006).

Table 9. Use of the Gender Policy Marker in Selected Recipient Countries Receiving General Budget Support, Gross Disbursements in million 2009 US dollars

Donor and Short Description	Gender Policy Marker	Amount
Recipient = Vietnam		
Canada CIDA through World Bank Group, Poverty Reduction Support Credit	0	4.8
Denmark, Support PRSC 8-9-10	1	9.7
European Development Fund, European Poverty Reduction Support Programme in Vietnam (EPRSC)	0	18.1
Germany, BMZ, SME Development Program Loan-Program for Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises	0	16.7
Japan, JICA, Eighth Poverty Reduction Support Credit; Eighth Poverty Reduction Support Credit (Economic Stimulus)	2	587.8
Spain MFA through the World Bank Group, Other Contributions to the World Bank; Supporting the Socio-Economic Development Plan (SEDP) of the Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam	1	8.5
Switzerland Seco (IBRD channel), Vietnam Cofinancing of the Poverty Reduction Support Credit	0	2.7
UK DFID, Poverty Reduction Support Credit 6-10	1	31.2
Recipient = Uganda		
EU-CEC, Crown Agents-Technical Assistance to the Public Procurement and Disposal of Public Assets Authority; Landell Mills-TA to Gov't Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation; IBM-for the identification study EPA related support- 10THEDF Macroeconomic Support; Programme Estimates N 3 UBOS 10/09/08 to 20/02/2010; Jasper SEMU & Associates-UBOS; First Fixed Tranche	0	43.1
Germany BMZ, co-financing of PRSC (Poverty Reduction Support Credit) VII-IX	1	19.5
Norway MFA, Budget Support 2009/2010 and 2008/2009	0	8.4
UK DFID, Poverty Reduction Budget Support	0	54.7
Recipient = Zambia		
Africa Development Fund, Poverty Reduction Budget Support II	no marker	23.0
EU-CEC, General Budget Support Tranches-MOFNP	1	41.8
EU-CEC, V-FLEX PRBS III-MDG-C Rider; Muleya Hakayuwa; HMIS Database (ECORYS Nederland BV 2006/129758); PEMFA-Budget Support Tranche Disbursements	0	47.4
Finland MFA, Poverty Reduction Budget Support of Zambia	1	7.0
Germany, BMZ, Poverty Reduction Budget Support II	1	13.9
IMF, General Budget Support (Semi-Aggregates)	no marker	243.5
Netherlands MFA, LUS PRBS 2008-2010	0	13.9
Norway MFA, Budget Support II	0	27.5
UK DFID, Gen budget support and P0034 for PRBS	1	49.2
US, AID, Basic Education-Cash Transfer-Cash Transfer	no marker	1.0

Source: OECD-DAC CRS, data extracted on 28 December, 2011.

In the case of Uganda, only Germany BMZ gave its budget support a gender marker of one while the other aid agencies assigned zero to the marker. Uganda's Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP) has a general commitment in its opening pages to gender equality in that importance is to be placed on distributional considerations on gender, children's rights, and environmental impacts (Uganda Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development 2000). There is no extensive discussion of gender equality although women are mentioned in relation to land rights, maternal mortality, education, poverty and the rural area's poor access to services. Budlender (2008) notes that there is the Uganda Joint Assistance Strategy that binds donors to support the implementation of the Uganda Gender Policy and its plan of action. On the other hand, there was a tendency for donors in Uganda to prefer using the World Bank's Poverty Reduction Support Credit as the basis for aid discussions.

Zambia also has a section on gender and development as part of the chapter discussing cross-cutting issues in the Fifth National Development Plan (FNDP) (Government of the Republic of Zambia, 2006). The other cross-cutting issues are governance, HIV/AIDS, environment, and food and nutrition. The FNDP takes gender mainstreaming seriously such that almost all the sector budget matrices have a budget line for this activity, although most of them are non-core budget items. Gender mainstreaming is part of the core budget only for the youth and child development sector as well as, and for obvious reasons, the gender and development sector. The aid agencies that gave their general budget support a score of one were EU-CEC, Finland MFA, Germany BMZ, and UK DFID; while Netherlands MFA, Norway MFA, and another budgetary support programme of EU-CEC assigned a zero. The latter shows inconsistency in scoring even with the same aid agency. The figures for Zambia also show that some aid agencies do not provide scores for the gender marker, namely Africa Development Fund, the International Monetary Fund and the US AID. The assignment of a code in the gender policy marker for general budget support implies a need to interpret the extent to which gender equality is a principal or significant policy objective in the poverty reduction strategy papers and national development plans underpinning the budget. This discussion, however, is based on an informal survey, and a systematic and in-depth study is required before any strong conclusions can be made.

In addition to noting the difficulties attached to using a gender policy marker for the major category of commodity assistance and general programme assistance, there needs to be another layer to the analysis of the social context of gender equality that takes into account the macroeconomic policy framework contained in the poverty reduction strategies or the national development plans. A similar approach would be needed for the category on actions relating to debt relief as these are also tied to the country strategies and national plans. These two categories accounted for 11.8 percent of total gross ODA disbursements in 2009 as shown in Table 2. What there is are specific gender issues raised in the country strategies or in the national plans but the macroeconomic component is generally left without analysis from a gender perspective. This is particularly important when noting that "feminist economists have identified numerous gender biases in structural adjustment and macroeconomic stabilization policies" (Floro, et al., 2004: 5). In other words, research and analysis on gender and

macroeconomics, including trade, abound but these have yet to be reflected or applied in many country strategies and national plans. In 2007, the OECD-DAC Network on Gender Equality released a Guide for Non-Economists to Negotiate Poverty Reduction Strategies. Further investigation is needed to understand the extent to which this guideline has changed, if at all, the way PRSPs are written since its release.

Zuckerman and Garrett (2003) analyzed thirteen PRSPs produced in 2002 for their gender content and found that a gendered analysis of macroeconomic policies was lacking or, if present, weak. Stotsky (2006), citing the World Bank (2004), however, contradicts this conclusion by pointing to the successful integration of gender in the PRSPs or in the process of writing a PRSP in South Asia. Zuckerman and Qing (2004) studied the World Bank's new gender strategy Integrating Gender in the World Bank's Work: A Strategy for Action that was launched in 2002 and conducted interviews with World Bank staff as well as analyzed some of their documents, and the study concluded that the institutional arrangements within the World Bank prevented a successful uptake of the strategy in country operations.

The Bank Gender Strategy centerpiece is the preparation of a Country Gender Assessment (CGA) for each client country. The Strategy is premised on the assumption that CGA priority gender issues will feed into Country Assistance Strategies (CASs) and other analytical and lending instruments. But this sequence might not unfold because a consistent track record demonstrates that Bank staff heed, albeit minimally, mandatory incentives such as the environmental safeguard policies and ignore non-mandated policies like that of gender. Staff responds to incentives that are clearly structured to get loans approved by the [World Bank] Board. (Zuckerman and Qing, 2004: 4) Unfortunately, Zuckerman and Qing (2004) do not provide an assessment of World Bank staff capacity, especially its gender experts, for analyzing macroeconomic issues from a gender perspective such that these can be incorporated into the country strategies as well as to influence the nature of the CDF and the CPIA. Developing this capacity is feasible given readily available literature demonstrating how such an analysis might be undertaken. A similar observation was made by Elson and McGee (1995) that provided an early analysis of policy-related program assistance having noted the shift of ODA from project-related assistance and the extent to which these incorporated gender equality objectives and approaches and used the Netherlands DGIS and US AID as case studies.

The study concluded that the key to ensuring that WID concerns are not marginalized with respect to program assistance lies in transforming current understanding of the interaction between gender relations and economic processes at national and sectoral level, and in operationalizing this new understanding at all levels of policy and procedures. A new policy perspective is needed, which will both be supported by, and give rise to, procedural innovations. (Elson and McGee 1995: 1991).

The use of gender-aware analysis in macroeconomic policy documents can also be led by the recipient countries but this would require their respective Ministries of Finance to cooperate with their counterparts in the national women's machineries as well as with women's organizations. Leadership,

or “ownership” to use the language of aid effectiveness, is itself difficult to execute when the objective of aid negotiations is to obtain approval for the aid being requested. The scenario is similar to that faced by gender equality advocates working with development cooperation agencies. In other words, national women’s machineries and women’s organizations in aid recipient countries need to engage with gender issues around the CDF as it is applied in their country context and, more specifically, around the macroeconomic policy frameworks relied upon by their governments. The capacity to do so appears limited thus far. There is potential in gender-responsive budgeting initiatives to discuss macroeconomic policies but this has not been widely implemented (Budlender, 2004). Budlender (2008) has shown that as far as the countries covered in her study where there were also gender-responsive budgeting initiatives, aid was not part of the conversation so that while some GRB discussions may include macroeconomic policy, aid processes were not part of it. If this is the case, then the gender-aware analyses of aid, including those analyzing the aid effectiveness agenda, have fallen short considerably because these have missed out on analyzing the frameworks for aid allocation.

### A Note on Macroeconomic Effects of Aid Flows

It is not only the frameworks for aid allocation that need to be analyzed. Aid flows themselves have macroeconomic effects that need to be understood from a gender-aware perspective. As an external financial flow, aid enters into the capital account of their balance of payments. The impact is felt in the governments holding of foreign reserves and in domestic money supply. Regardless of the exchange rate regime, very large inflows of foreign aid can lead to an appreciation of the domestic currency. If the appreciation is very large, this could lead to a reduction in exports as these will now be more expensive, a phenomenon called the Dutch Disease, and this could lead to an even larger trade deficit thus threatening macroeconomic stability (Chowdhury and McKinley, 2006). The Dutch Disease became a concern when there was a strong demand from the international community to scale up, particularly as a response to HIV/AIDS in 2005. The ultimate impact of the aid flow, however, depends on how the receiving government responds to the inflow through its public investment, credit allocation, and reserves management (Chowdhury and McKinley, 2006). It is especially important to understand how aid is used, whether it is spent resulting in a change in the budget deficit, and absorbed resulting in a change in the current account deficit. A gender-aware analysis will take this further by analyzing the social content of macroeconomic policies (Elson and Cagatay, 2000). There is even less attention given to analyzing aid flows in this way.

### Concluding Remarks

This paper sought to expand the analysis of ODA beyond the usual assessment of gender mainstreaming efforts in development cooperation agencies and the aid modalities and mechanisms. The integrationist and instrumentalist approach are factors that contribute to the inability to produce so-

cial transformation. Assessments have also shown a concentration of ODA for gender equality in health and education sectors as well as in micro-credit and agriculture since it is in these sectors that accounting for gender equality is easiest and strongest and is also very closely tied to the gender equality goals expressed in the MDGs and other IDTs. It is important, however, to note that tracking and monitoring aid remains a challenge. An even greater challenge is to link ODA resources with the desired outcomes and development goals. Gender-responsive budgeting offers interesting lessons in bridging aid tracking and monitoring of results but these have yet to be applied to the aid flows themselves.

While some attention has been given to ODA through gender mainstreaming efforts, there is less of an effort to interrogate the frameworks for aid allocation. In particular, the history of the effectiveness agenda points to the shift towards adjustment lending in the 1980s and consequent response to create new lending facilities that derives its impetus from the World Bank's CDF and its associated PRS. This has been accompanied by a shift in ODA from project-based assistance to program-based assistance, thus reinforcing the influential position of the World Bank in guiding where (countries or sectors) development cooperation agencies might provide counterpart support. Thus far these aid allocation frameworks do not give gender equality a heavy weight in its assessments. Furthermore, there is very little work available that supports a gender-aware formulation of macroeconomic policies, especially coming from the aid recipient countries. Finally, ODA as external financial flows has macroeconomic effects and these too need to be analyzed from a gender-aware perspective. There is even less attention being given to this type of analysis.

Gender mainstreaming and gender as a cross-cutting issue effectively means covering all the different aspects of ODA. This is a very expansive approach to gender equality. It requires from gender experts an understanding of the internal workings of a development cooperation agency, an understanding of the development cooperation architecture involving the relationships among the various agencies as well as their relations with the governments of the recipient countries, an understanding of macroeconomic policies that define aid allocation as well as provide predictions of the potential impact of aid flows. These layers of understanding also underscore the embeddedness of institutions within other institutions. If we are to respond to the question of ODA's role in promoting gender equality and women's empowerment, then these layers of understanding need to be fully revealed.

(Marina DURANO, Post-Doctoral Fellow, Universiti Sains, Malaysia)

## Notes

- 1 Comments from participants at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Congress of the Asian Association of Women's Studies in Penang, Malaysia and Public Seminar on Gender Issues in the Macroeconomy in Tokyo, Japan are appreciated.
- 2 Swiss (2011) argues that another set of literature explaining aid highlights the humanitarian motivation.
- 3 The International Monetary Fund (2003) defines official development assistance as "flows of official financing administered with the promotion of the economic development and welfare of developing countries as the main objective, and which are

concessional in character with a grant element of at least 25 percent.” White (2004) clarifies that these flows do not include military aid and export credits.

4 These are UK DFID, Canada CIDA, Swedish Sida, Inter-American Development Bank, Asian Development Bank, WB, UN Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM), UN Habitat, UN Children’s Fund (UNICEF), UNDP, ActionAid, Oxfam GB, Hivos, and ACORD.

5 For DFID, see Beall (1998), MacDonald (2003), Khan (2003), and COWI Evaluation Team and Jensen et al. (2006). For CIDA, see Bytown Consulting and C.A.C. Consulting (2008). For SIDA but with little discussion on specifics, see Danielson and Wohlgemith (2005). For Japanese ODA, see Sunaga (2004) and Kana (2011). For the EC, see Khan (2003). For IrishAid, see Murray, Swaine and Doody (2008). Winship (2004) provides an overview of the gender strategies of bilateral and multilateral agencies but offers very little in analysis.

6 This covers emergency response, reconstruction relief and rehabilitation, and disaster prevention and preparedness.

7 This covers general budget support, development food aid or food security assistance, other commodity assistance (includes import support of capital goods and commodities). Sector-wide approaches or SWAPs are coded as part of their respective sectors. For further details, see Annex 5 of DCD/DAC (2002) 21 entitled “Reporting Directives for the Creditor Reporting System—Addendum 2.” Updates to reporting guidelines are also available in DCD/DAC/STAT (2011) 12 entitled “Guidelines for Reporting in CRS++ Format.”

8 This discussion has not taken into account the inconsistencies in total aid, between commitments and disbursements on the side of the donors, and how these figures might match with the receipts, allocations, and actual spending of the recipients. There are other inconsistencies associated with aid estimates and some of these are discussed in Budlender (2008).

9 <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/PROJECTS/STRATEGIES/CDF/0,,contentMDK:20072662~menuPK:60746~pagePK:139301~piPK:261885~theSitePK:140576,00.html>, visited on 9 April 2007.

10 An influential publication particularly on aid effectiveness is the World Bank’s “Assessing Aid: What Works, What Doesn’t, and Why.”

## References

- Abirafeh, Lina (2005). “Lessons from gender-focused international aid in post-conflict Afghanistan... learned?” *Gender in International Cooperation* 7, Bonn, Germany: Friedrich Ebert Stiftung.
- Alami, Nisreen and Anne-Marie Goetz (2006). “Promoting gender equality in new aid modalities and partnerships,” UNIFEM Discussion Paper, March 2006. New York: UN Development Fund for Women.
- Baranyi, Stephen and Kristiana Powell (2005). “Fragile States, Gender Equality and Aid Effectiveness: A Review of Donor Perspectives,” Paper written for the Gender Equality Division (YWD), Policy Branch, Canadian International Development Agency. (Downloaded from [http://www.nsi-ins.ca/english/pdf/Gender\\_FS\\_Paper\\_Donor\\_Perspectives.pdf](http://www.nsi-ins.ca/english/pdf/Gender_FS_Paper_Donor_Perspectives.pdf), 2 December 2010).
- Beall, Jo (1998). “The Gender and Poverty Nexus in the DFID White Paper: Opportunity or Constraint?,” *Journal of International Development* 10: 235-246.
- Boyce, James K. (2002). “Unpacking Aid,” *Development and Change* 33 (2): 239-246.
- Department for International Development (1997). “Eliminating World Poverty: A Challenge for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century.” Cm. 3789. London: The Stationery Office.
- Budlender, Debbie (2004). “Expectations Versus Realities in Gender-Responsive Budgeting Initiatives,” Revised draft as of March 2005. Geneva: UN Research Institute for Social Development. ([http://www.unrisd.org/80256B3C005BCCF9/\(httpPublications\)/0D98E65D9D993D4AC1257013005440D1?OpenDocument](http://www.unrisd.org/80256B3C005BCCF9/(httpPublications)/0D98E65D9D993D4AC1257013005440D1?OpenDocument), accessed 5 January 2012)
- Budlender, Debbie (2008). “Integrating Gender-Responsive Budgeting into the Aid Effectiveness Agenda: Ten-Country Overview Report,” manuscript report. New York: United Nations Development Fund for Women.
- Bytown Consulting and C.A.C. Consulting (2008). “Evaluation of CIDA’s implementation of its policy on gender equality: executive report,” manuscript. ([http://w3.acdi-cida.gc.ca/INET/IMAGES.NSF/vLUIImages/GenderEquality3/\\$file/GE%20E](http://w3.acdi-cida.gc.ca/INET/IMAGES.NSF/vLUIImages/GenderEquality3/$file/GE%20E)

- xec% 20Report% 20FINAL% 2012% 20nov% 2008.pdf, accessed 13 December, 2011).
- Chowdhury, Anis and Terry McKinley (2006). "Gearing Macroeconomic Policies to Manage Large Inflows of ODA: The Implications for HIV/AIDS Programmes," Working Paper No. 17, Brasilia: International Poverty Centre, United Nations Development Programme.
- COWI Evaluation Team and Rikke Ingrid Jensen et al. (2006). "Evaluation of DFID's Policy and Practice in Support of Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment," EVSUM EV/669 (August 2006). London: DFID.
- Elson, Diane and Rosemary McGee (1995). "Gender Equality, Bilateral Program Assistance, and Structural Adjustment: Policy and Procedures," *World Development* 23 (11): 1987-1994.
- Elson, Diane and Nilufer Cagatay (2000). "The Social Content of Macroeconomic Policies," *World Development* 28 (7): 1347-1364.
- Gaynor, Cathy (2006). "Paris Declaration Commitments and Implications for Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment," DCD/DAC/GEN(2006) 1, paper presented for discussion at the 4<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the DAC Network on Gender Equality (5-7 July, 2006) and 8<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness (5-7 July, 2006).
- Government of the Republic of Zambia (2006). Fifth National Development Plan 2006-2010. Lusaka: Government of the Republic of Zambia. (<http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/scr/2007/cr07276.pdf>, accessed 5 January, 2012).
- Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam (2006). The Five-Year Socio-Economic Development Plan 2006-2010. Hanoi: Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam. ([http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTPRS1/Resources/Vietnam\\_PRSP\(July-2006\).pdf](http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTPRS1/Resources/Vietnam_PRSP(July-2006).pdf), accessed 5 January, 2012).
- Gupta, Sanjeev, Catherine Pattillo and Smita Wagh (2006). "Are Donor Countries Giving More or Less Aid?" IMF Working Paper WP/06/01. Washington, D.C.: International Monetary Fund.
- Hjerholm, Peter and Howard White (1998). "Survey of foreign aid: History, Trends and Allocation," Discussion Paper 00-04, Institute of Economics, University of Copenhagen.
- International Monetary Fund (2003). "External Debt Statistics: Guide for Compilers and Users—Appendix III, Glossary," Washington, D.C.: IMF.
- Jahan, R. (1995). *The Elusive Agenda: Mainstreaming Women in Development*. London: Zed Books.
- Jahan, R. (1996). "The Elusive Agenda: Mainstreaming Women in Development," *The Pakistan Development Review* 35 (4): 825-834.
- Kana, Takamatsu (2011). "Development Assistance Policy and Gender Equality," *Social Science Japan* 44: 19-25.
- Kanbur, Ravi (2003). "The Economics of International Aid," in the *Handbook on Economics of Giving, Reciprocity and Altruism*, Christophe-Kolm, Serge and Jean Mercier-Ythier (eds). Amsterdam: North Holland.
- Kanbur, Ravi (2005). "Reforming the Formula: A Modest Proposal for Introducing Development Outcomes in IDA Allocation Procedures," ([www.people.cornell.edu/pages/sk145](http://www.people.cornell.edu/pages/sk145), accessed 9 April, 2007).
- Khan, Zohra (2003). "Closing the Gap: Putting EU and UK Gender Policy into Practice—South Africa, Nicaragua and Bangladesh," London: One World Action.
- Kilby, Patrick and Kate Olivieri (2008). "Gender and Australian Aid Policy: Can Women's Rights Be Advanced Within a Neo-Liberal Framework?" *Australian Journal of International Affairs* 62 (3): 319-331.
- Levy, C. (1996). "The Process of Institutionalising Gender in Policy and Planning: The 'Web' of Institutionalisation," DPU Working Paper No. 74. London: UCL (Development Planning Unit).
- Longwe, Sarah (2003). "Workshop: Sector-wide Approach for Gender, Health and HIV/AIDS," Report of a workshop held at Protea Safari Lodge, Chisamba, Zambia on 16-19 September, 2003.
- MacDonald, Mandy (2003). "Gender Equality and Mainstreaming in the Policy and Practice of the UK Department for International Development: A Briefing from the UK Gender and Development Network," manuscript.
- Maral-Hanak, Irmi (2009). *Language, Discourse, and Participation: Studies in Donor-Driven Development in Tanzania*. Vienna: LIT Verlag Munster.
- Miller, C. and S. Razavi (1998). "Introduction," in C. Miller and S. Razavi (eds.) *Missionaries and Mandarins: Feminist Engagement with Development Institutions*. London: Intermediate Technology.
- Murray, Sinead, Aisling Swaine, and Aine Doody (2010). "Gender Equality Policy: Review Report," Dublin: IrishAid.

- Overseas Development Institute (2000). "Mainstreaming Gender through Sector-wide Approaches in Education: A Synthesis Report." A study carried out for DFID. London and Cambridge: ODI and Cambridge Consultants.
- OECD-DAC (n.d.). "Reporting Directives for the Creditor Reporting System—Addendum 2," Paris: OECD. Replaces Annex 5 of DCD/DAC (2002) 21. ([www.oecd.org/dataoecd/14/59/31738723.pdf](http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/14/59/31738723.pdf), accessed 5 January, 2012)
- OECD-DAC (2002). "Gender Equality in Sector-Wide Approaches: A Reference Guide," Paris: OECD. (<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/24/17/1956174.pdf>, accessed 5 January, 2012).
- Oppenheim Mason, Karen (2006). "The Approach of DAC Members to Gender Equality in Development Cooperation: Changes Since 1999." Draft report prepared for the DAC Network on Gender Equality. Paris: OECD-DAC GENDERNET.
- Paducel, Anca Hermina and Jennifer Erin Salahub (2011). "Gender Equality and Fragile States Policies and Programming: A Comparative Study of the OECD/DAC and Six OECD Donors," NSI Working Paper (February, 2011). Ottawa, Canada: The North-South Institute. (<http://www.nsi-ins.ca/english/pdf/PaducelandSalahubGEinFS.pdf>, accessed 14 December, 2011)
- Razavi, S. and C. Miller (1995). "Gender Mainstreaming: A Study of Efforts by the UNDP, the World Bank and the ILO to Institutionalize Gender Issues," United Nations Research Institute for Social Development Occasional Paper No. 4. Geneva: UNRISD.
- Reiffel, Lex (2003). *Restructuring Sovereign Debt: The Case for Ad Hoc Machinery*. Washington, DC, USA: Brookings Institutions Press.
- Ryan, Patrick and Anna Toner (2003). "Direct Budget Support and Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers: A Fundamental Shift or a Transitory Fashion?" in *Development Planning and Poverty Reduction*, David Potts (ed.). Gordonsville, VA, USA: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sharp, Rhonda (2003). *Budgeting for Equity: Gender Budget Initiatives within a Framework of performance oriented budgeting*. New York: United Nations Development Fund for Women.
- Sharp, Rhonda and Ray Broomhill (2002). "Budgeting for Equality: The Australian Experience," *Feminist Economics* 8 (1): 25-47.
- Singh, Ajit (2002). "Aid, Conditionality and Development," *Development and Change* 33(2): 295-305.
- Swiss, Liam (2011). "The Adoption of Women and Gender as Development Assistance Priorities: An Event History Analysis of World Polity Effects," *International Sociology* (2011): 1-24.
- Sunaga, Kazuo (2004). "The Reshaping of Japan's Official Development Assistance (ODA) Charter," FASID Discussion Paper on Development Assistance No. 3. Tokyo: FASID.
- Theobald, Sally, Rachel Tolhurst, and Helen Elsey (2002). "Sector-wide Approaches: Opportunities and Challenges for Gender Equity in Health," Uganda: Makerere University Gender Studies Department, Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Liverpool Associates in Tropical Health, and Gender and Health Group.
- Uganda Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (2000). Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper, Uganda's Poverty Eradication Action Plan: Summary and Main Objectives. Kampala: Uganda Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (<http://www.imf.org/external/np/prsp/2000/uga/01/>, accessed 5 January 2012).
- Van Waeyenberge, Elisa (2004), "The Missing Piece: Country Policy and Institutional Assessments at the Bank," manuscript, ([www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/csgr/.../bank/.../van\\_waeyenberge.pdf](http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/csgr/.../bank/.../van_waeyenberge.pdf), accessed 5 January, 2012)
- Winship, Joan (2004), "A Summary of Gender Strategies of Multilateral Development Agencies and Selected Bilateral Donors," report, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Agency for International Development. ([www.usaid.gov/our\\_work/cross-cutting.../donor\\_strategies.pdf](http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/cross-cutting.../donor_strategies.pdf), accessed 5 January, 2012)
- Woods, Ngaire (2007). "The Shifting Politics of Foreign Aid," GEG Working Paper No. 2007/36 (updated October 2007), Oxford: Global Economic Governance Programme.
- World Bank (1998). *Assessing Aid: What Works, What Doesn't, and Why*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.