



Council of the
European Union

Brussels, 29 January 2015
(OR. en)

5732/15

DEVGEN 8
SOC 41
ACP 17
ONU 10
RELEX 70

COVER NOTE

From:	Secretary-General of the European Commission, signed by Mr Jordi AYET PUIGARNAU, Director
date of receipt:	28 January 2015
To:	Mr Uwe CORSEPIUS, Secretary-General of the Council of the European Union
No. Cion doc.:	SWD(2015) 11 final
Subject:	COMMISSION STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT 2014 Report on the Implementation of the EU Plan of Action on Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment in Developement (2010 - 2015)

Delegations will find attached document SWD(2015) 11 final.

Encl.: SWD(2015) 11 final



EUROPEAN
COMMISSION

Brussels, 27.1.2015
SWD(2015) 11 final

COMMISSION STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT

**2014 Report on the Implementation of the EU Plan of Action on Gender Equality and
Women's Empowerment in Development (2010 - 2015)**

COMMISSION STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT

2014 Report on the Implementation of the EU Plan of Action on Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment in Development (2010-15)

1. Introduction

This is the fourth report on the implementation of the EU Action Plan on Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment in Development (2010-15), from here on referred to as the GAP.

Adopted by the Council in 2010, the GAP contains 9 objectives, 37 actions and 53 indicators. All are time bound. European Commission services and the European External Action Services (EEAS) at Headquarters and Delegations level, as well as EU Member States, are all committed to its implementation and to report progress annually. Indicators are selected each year for reporting, their selection depends on factors such as their target date for completion.

The indicators are all expected to track actions that in turn feed into the 9 objectives deemed necessary to strengthen the capacity of the European Union and EU Member States to improve gender equality mainstreaming in and contribute to women's empowerment through development cooperation. The indicators deal with those areas considered essential ingredients of effective mainstreaming, including: political dialogue, programme and project design and implementation, measurement, peace and security etc.

This report covers the period July 2013 to June 2014, and assesses progress against those indicators due to be achieved in this period and/or whose progress was slow in previous periods. It is informed by 78 EU Delegation Reports, representing 82 countries, by 20 Member States Headquarter level reports and by contributions from Commission services and the EEAS (see annexes for details).

Overall, this report shows some progress in areas such political dialogue, coordination, partnerships and on the post 2015 agenda. Disappointingly progress remains very slow on issues such as gender analysis, monitoring (indicators) and financial tracking.

Achievements for the period 2013-14 are summarised below:

- Overall, the level, regularity and amount of coordination and political dialogue on gender are all significant, be it through EU Delegations, Coordination Groups, Civil Society, or capitals and international organisations. The EU clearly has a strong convening power and is able to raise gender in a number of ways, through a variety of channels and with a wide array of stakeholders, including within and across regions. The civil society roadmaps were identified as key contributors to improved engagement with national stakeholders on gender. Relationships aren't always formalised, adapting mostly to context. However, and due to the nature of the indicator and of the reporting, the nature of the dialogue, its regularity, what it intends to achieve and its impact all remain difficult to assess.

- Indicators to track the impact of programmes on women and girls are increasingly being used, but remain for the vast majority in the more traditional sectors such as education and health. Private sector development for example remains a challenge, though recognised as important for gender equality and women empowerment (GEWE).
- The position of the Union on the post 2015 agenda that has been clearly expressed in the communication released in June 2014; "A Decent Life For All; from vision to collective action" (COM (2014) 335). A strong emphasis is given to gender equality as an objective in itself and as a crosscutting issue.
- The EU, in coordination with its Member States, reports in close collaboration with the UN and OECD DAC on advancing gender equality. They do so financially, though collaborations and lesson sharing, on joint programmes and through board memberships of some of the key international organisations such as UN Women.
- The development of targeted and sector specific training continues, with a significant amount of training being delivered across EU Delegations.
- Challenges remain to tracking financial contributions to gender mainstreaming, however and though still far off target, the European Commission has improved its performance, with 28% of all new proposals now scoring G2 or G1 on the OECD DAC Gender Marker. This is a significant leap, doubling its percentage in three years, within a context of increasing aid budgets. In real terms the amount of programmes screened may in fact be more significant. The indicator is nonetheless still far from being reached and further efforts are required.
- Violence against Women and Girls is high on the agenda of a number of EU Delegations, in coordination with Member States. This is happening in a number of ways, such as through thematic programmes with Non State Actors or at policy level through international dialogue. Support to the UNSCR 1325 and 1820 is also ongoing in fragile states, including in some very challenging contexts and at political and policy levels.
- Though there have been delays, the evaluation of gender mainstreaming in development cooperation 2007-13 is now underway, offering an ideal opportunity to inform thinking on any future tool that may succeed the current GAP.

Challenges underlined in the period 2013-14 are summarised below:

- Gender analysis and reporting remain a real challenge. Gender reporting is not happening to the degree anticipated, and has indeed been folded into the Human Rights Country Strategy reports in an effort to streamline. Only 6 EU Delegations use the Joint Annual reports to include gender analysis. As a result it is difficult to gather how well the situation of women and girls is being monitored. Only 26 delegations included a gender analysis in at least one of their annual reviews, far off the 80% target which was set for 2013. The Result Oriented Monitoring tools insufficiently address gender, and where they do recommendations are rarely followed through. Only 22 Delegations report having a gender country profile, which is reflected in the overall insufficiency or even lack of gender mainstreaming across the new National Indicative Programmes and Multiannual Indicative Programmes (NIPs and MIPs).

- Tracking financial results remains challenging. Though the use of the G-Marker is improving, there is a need for more consistency in how it is used and applied.
- Tracking results at project and programme levels remains challenging due to the lack of follow through from design to evaluation. Where indicators exist these are not always monitored, the approach to quality assurance is often tokenistic with no means of holding programmes to account on commitments, and the insufficient gender analysis means that baselines rarely exist. Guidance is available and developed but may need further outreach efforts to those sectors traditionally perceived as gender neutral (e.g. Climate Change, Infrastructures, Energy). On the other hand, and in some instances there are some strong examples of monitoring the gender impact of budget support.
- Reporting remains inconsistent across the board, not yet including all Members States nor EU Delegations, open to interpretation. Clear guidance for any future tracking tool will be needed, as well as tighter and more precise measurements.

A Successor to the GAP

Acknowledging its limitations, the GAP remains an important tool to promote and track gender mainstreaming. A successor to the GAP has been requested by the Foreign Affairs Council in its "Conclusions on the 2013 Report on the Implementation of the EU Plan of Action on Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment 2010-15" (adopted in May 2014). The Council calls upon the EU and its Member States to "develop an ambitious and robust successor to the current GAP, focused on results and taking into account the post 2015 agenda".

This fourth report comes at an important time in the process of developing a new instrument to improve gender equality and mainstreaming across EU development cooperation. Its findings, combined with previous ones and the ongoing evaluation, have raised a number of interesting and important issues to be considered in designing a new instrument. These are set out in the final section of this report.

2. Report on the 2013-14 Indicators

As regards the indicators under the responsibility of the EU Delegations, whenever possible in coordination with MS Embassies:

2.1 EU Delegations

Indicator 1.3.1 An EU donor is appointed as gender lead donor in each partner country for the period 2010-2015 and 3 Member States are associated to joint work on gender (functions of lead donor to be determined case-by-case).

Of the 78 reporting delegations (representing 82 countries), less than half (36) report that EU donors have been appointed as gender lead in their partner country/ies. Where gender coordination groups exist, their effectiveness is found to vary widely, based on the involvement of its members as opposed to the formality of the mechanism itself.

Out of the 78 reporting delegations, only 36 report that EU donors have been appointed as gender lead, and among them 17 are EU Delegations. Groups vary in membership and effectiveness. Some

are restricted to EU member states whilst others have a broader membership, which includes non EU actors. This is likely to reflect a wish to include others active in gender and/or to join existing mechanisms rather than duplicate them. The latter, combined with some EUDs having already reported on this indicator in 2013, may in part explain why only half of the reporting EUDs have achieved the target.

What is apparent throughout the reporting is that the formality of the group itself is not necessarily a contributing factor to its effectiveness. Indeed, the quality of membership participation and involvement is the most instrumental aspect. Where leadership is strong and members are active, the groups are better able to contribute effectively to dialogue with, and policy making of, partner countries. Informality can indeed lead to better results than "*proceduralised*" and formalised approaches.

In **Mozambique**, the EU gender group contributed to the joint review process set by the Government of Mozambique and donors/partners members of the multi-stakeholder group called G19. The group is expected to facilitate reporting on Gender issues through G19 Heads of Cooperation and EU Heads of Mission. It's the first time that such collaboration between donors and government is taking place on gender issues. A key ingredient of success is believed to have been the active participation of EU and MS gender focal points and the clear division of roles and responsibilities amongst them, allowing for a strategic and effective collaboration.

Of interest, would be to identify the incentives leading to active participation by members, whether these might relate to institutional commitments, personal interest or other factors and how such incentives might be institutionalised in the future. The formality of a mechanism appears to provide the shell for collaboration, but is far from being the key ingredient of its success (or failure). Such learning may be useful to those EUDs seeking to improve strategic coordination.

Indicator 3.2.1 By 2013, 50% of agendas for local political dialogue with partner countries shall include gender equality as a topic.

Dialogue on gender is frequently not formalised nor institutionalised as such. There rarely is a systematic inclusion of gender in 50% of all local political dialogue agendas; however this does not mean that it is not happening. Gender is discussed with partner countries within wider contexts and/or fora, . Beyond systematic and formalised inclusion into agendas, other entry points are being used such as high level visits, dialogue with civil society and more (see indicator 5.1.1. for example).

A majority of reporting delegations (66 out of 78) raised gender equality at least once within the framework of political dialogue with partner countries, compared to 57 in 2013. Twenty-nine of them estimate that they address the issue regularly, and others such as **Algeria, Afghanistan, Kazakhstan, Occupied Palestinian territories, and Senegal** report that they are addressing it systematically. However, this does not tell us whether it amounts to 50% of the agendas for local political dialogue. In some countries such as **Ecuador** and **Ethiopia**, this is definitely not the case. The EUD to **Ethiopia** reports raising gender only once a year in its political dialogue.

Beyond formalised agenda items, gender is included in dialogue with partners in a number of ways. Women's rights and gender equality are often discussed within the framework of the Human Rights dialogue. High level visits provide further and concrete opportunities for gender issues to be discussed. Commissioners, high representatives and ministers all provide additional means of raising

gender equality at the highest levels. On a more tangible and concrete level, a number of Delegations report that programming negotiations represent an entry point for dialogue on gender equality.

The visit of the **Swedish** Minister for Development Cooperation to the **Democratic Republic of Congo** in February 2014 provided a key opportunity to address gender equality and women's empowerment. Indeed, gender equality and sexual violence became key objectives of the high level dialogue. All meetings, and at all levels, were organised around these issues.

It can be challenging to assess the quality of the dialogue and to attribute it to tangible change. The GAP indicator does not request such reporting. Nonetheless, some EUDs have been able to point to outcomes.

In **Burkina Faso**, where gender equality was rarely discussed in political dialogue, and at the insistence of Member States, including **Denmark, France** and **Sweden** gender is now a priority and an outcome indicator in the performance matrix 2015-2017 of the Strategy for Accelerated Growth and Sustainable Development. It includes specific recommendations focussed on reforms and behavioural changes needed to ensure that women and girls also have access to their rights. This implies that development actors need to adopt a rights approach to their programming, including the rights of women and girls in all relevant sectors.

In a number of Delegations, the focus on gender and political dialogue cuts across a number of issues and a variety of opportunities are grasped beyond the inclusion on agendas for political dialogue.

In **Pakistan**, gender has been raised in dialogue with the Government in the following ways (and not limited to):

- Visiting delegation of the European Parliament Subcommittee for Human Rights (August '13)
- 2013 EU Election Observation Mission (the importance of women's participation in parliamentary elections was stressed)
- Measures to increase the participation of women in the electoral process (as recommended by the EU election observation mission)
- Discussions on Pakistan's application to the enhanced Generalised Scheme of Preferences (GSP+) for international trade .

Though overall, it would appear that gender is indeed raised in dialogue with partner countries by the majority of reporting delegations, the extent to which it is, the regularity and quality of the dialogue, and its contribution to change are all difficult to assess. As said, it is impossible to assess whether this amounts to 50% of all political dialogue, however and when taken in combination with other reporting through the GAP (such as indicator 5.1.1), it does point to gender being a regular feature of discussion.

Indicator 3.2.2 Starting in 2011, EU HOMS will prepare an annual report on the development of political dialogue with the corresponding partner country authorities on gender issues.

Last year, only 6 EUDs prepared a specific political report on gender issues. It was agreed that from 2014 the Human Rights Country Strategy would be considered the official political report on gender issues.

Reporting on political dialogue is mostly made within the framework of the Human Rights Country Strategies or more specifically within human rights reports. Indeed, 116 out of the 148 human rights

country strategies have prioritised gender issues. The only Delegation which prepared an additional political report specifically on gender issues is the EUD to **Morocco**. For that purpose, coordination has occurred between Member States and actions supported by the Delegation and the situation of gender equality in the country has been presented. Other Member States have chosen to report via the Human Rights Country Strategy.

Indicator 3.3.1 By 2011 EU encourages the creation of Gender Coordination Systems (GCS) where they do not already exist.

Nine new gender coordination groups have been created this reporting period, representing more than a 10% increase in a context where already some existed. Some point to achievements such as improved collaboration, lesson sharing and decentralised coordination supporting regional level work.

In 2013, at the initiative of Italy and the EU Delegation, an active gender working group was set up in **Occupied Palestinian territories**: “all Member States involved supported the initiative [...]. The main objectives of the group are to: define the implementation of the Cross-cutting Strategy Fiche on Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment and to monitor performance indicators”. [...] This exercise has been very helpful in better identifying ongoing actions and in establishing a basis for future joint ones. An online gender discussion group has also been established. It is managed by the “EU Gender Technical Working Group in Occupied Palestinian territories” and hosted by Capacity4Dev.

In **Thailand**, where a Gender coordination group already exists at capital level, the EU Delegation encouraged other coordination mechanisms in the provinces. As a result, three Vulnerable Women Networks in three provinces are being empowered and capacitated to prevent domestic violence.

Indicator 3.3.2. By 2012 EU participates in all existing Gender Coordination Systems in developing countries to discuss the implementation of gender mainstreaming in national policies, the improvement of economic and political empowerment, land and property rights, and how to encourage men to participate in GEWE activities.

Forty-three Delegations participate in gender coordination mechanisms but not all of the reporting Delegations fed back on this indicator. In some places, gender is addressed through sector thematic groups. These are found to help the division of work amongst partners. From the reports, it is difficult to tell what is discussed in the groups and whether, for example, men are indeed being encouraged to participate in GEWE activities.

As shown by the example of **Cambodia**, gender coordination groups can have a strong impact: “during the reporting period, Germany was able to encourage the Cambodian Government to include clear budget allocations from line ministries for the implementation of outputs included in the Joint Monitoring Indicators for 2014-18. The sub-group on gender-based violence decisively contributed to development of the Second National Action Plan to Prevent Violence against Women 2014-18.

Donor coordination: Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC)

Gender equality is a great challenge in the DRC. The country was ranked 147th out of 152 countries in the 2013 Gender Equality Index, 70% of Congolese women have been abused at least once in their life, and only 1% of land is owned by women.

Effective coordination is vital to making progress, even more so due to the high concentration of donors and others working on gender and in particular on sexual and gender based violence. In 2012, donors established a regular and informal group on Gender. The group is led by the UK and its members include: the EU Delegation, Sweden, Belgium, France, the Netherlands, Canada, Switzerland, the US and Norway.

The Group's aspirations for the DRC during 2014 were included in a Plan of Action:

- Gender and Sexual and Gender Based Violence on the agenda of the Government of DRC.
- A more influential and effective Ministry for Gender.
- Better donor co-ordination on Gender.
- Gender to be mainstreamed in the International Security and Stabilization Support Strategy and the Addis Ababa Peace, Security and Cooperation Framework for the Great lakes region
- Improved gender capacity in the United Nations Country Team & the UN stabilisation Mission in DRC
- An improved legislative environment on gender and women's rights.

The original Donor group has evolved (now closely aligned with the UN) and its action plan has progressed. It has been successful in terms of profiling objectives, in embracing coherence, sharing roles and tasks and assuming respective responsibilities. One concrete outcome of the coordination has been the publication of a Gender Profile for DRC (SE, EU, UK and CA).

In **Senegal**, EU partners have divided up tasks in relation to gender. On gender responsive budgeting; the joint EU- Spain and UN Women programme and sectoral support from Belgium, Italy and Luxembourg have allowed for the implementation of additional measures to integrate gender issues in the budgets of the Ministries of Environment and Sustainable Development, of Water and Sanitation and of Decentralisation. Under the New Alliance for Food Security and the National Programme for Agricultural Investment, Italy developed with the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Equipment, a matrix of specific gender indicators in the agricultural sector.

Though it appears that participation in groups can help coordinate Member States input and develop more effective strategies, it is impossible to say whether the target of all EU Delegations participating in existing Gender Coordination groups has been achieved. Reporting is ad hoc and varies in detail and quality. Interestingly, whilst some countries do not provide an explanation for not reporting on this indicator, **Botswana** does so by stating that no such group exists. However, **Botswana** doesn't report on the previous indicator that encourages the creation of such groups. This points to a lack of initiative and importance attached to gender equality as an issue that would benefit from better coordination and effectiveness.

Finally, such an indicator may not be particularly useful in ensuring certain issues are raised and encouraged (e.g. role of men and boys in achieving gender equality for all). Transformational topics for gender may differ according to countries so setting specific topics through defined indicators might not be helpful.

Indicator 3.4.1 By 2013 at least 80% of all annual reviews include a gender analysis.

Twenty-six Delegations included a gender analysis in at least one of their annual reviews. We are still far from the target and this impacts negatively on the consideration of gender issues in actual programming. This, combined with the limited number of gender country profiles, contributes to a lack of gender analysis across EU Delegations and has ripple effects across programmes and projects.

Annual reviews provide a vehicle for gender analysis, but delegations also use others. In **India**, joint 6 monthly review missions carried out by the Government and donor partners include a gender analysis and a review of gender related output and outcome indicators.

Including gender analysis in annual reviews is helpful and can indeed inform programming. In **Somalia**, the EU Delegation is increasingly undertaking a gender analysis as part of its reviews. The recent gender audit helped to assess current gaps including the following:

- Within the Delegation, and across sampled implementing partner documents, gender sensitive indicators or objectives are rare, as is sex disaggregated data collection;
- Gender-sensitive budgeting is not being practiced;

Actions are already being taken to address the above, including amongst others: the inclusion of gender sensitive indicators in the Annual Action Plan 2014; a gender analysis to be part of the progress review of the New Deal implementation.

Indicator 3.4.2. By 2015 all annual country programme reviews include a gender analysis

Although this indicator is set for 2015, some EU Delegations have already included a gender analysis in the country programme reviews.

There is an element of overlap with previous and subsequent indicators, but again the findings here highlight the importance of robust and thorough gender analysis to design and implement more effective EU funded development initiatives.

In **Benin**, a review of gender indicators happens during the Joint and Sector reviews. Partial conclusions of the 2014 Joint Review stressed the need to strengthen information systems, and monitoring and evaluation in the areas of gender, including the need to finalise indicators for monitoring and evaluating the Country Strategy Paper and to ensure the collection of data. It insists on the integration of gender in the preparation of the General Budget of the State. Additional efforts are needed for a systematic integration of the gender dimension in the performance of social sectors, and importantly also in those of productive sectors such as employment, microfinance, etc.

In **Cambodia**, the recently finalised joint European Development Cooperation Strategy for 2014-18 ensures that country programme reviews, common for all European partners active in Cambodia, will include gender analysis.

A number of donors have gender analysis as a compliance issue.

Following the “Gender and Development Strategy 2013-2017” of the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, **France** systematically includes a gender analysis in its annual programme reviews.

The **UK** has passed a Gender Equality Act which will inform future country programming processes, ensuring (by law) that the provision of aid gives meaningful consideration to gender equality before any development assistance is provided.

However, what remains unclear across the board is how systematically analysis informs, is applied and is followed through. Analysis is not sufficient where its findings are not reflected in programme design and followed through in monitoring and evaluation. This is a recurrent message from reporting EU Delegations when asked about analysis, regardless of the context (Results Oriented Monitoring, Country Profiles, reviews etc.).

Indicator 3.4.3 Next generation CSPs and NIPs have a gender country profile and gender is mainstreamed. At least 50% identify gender equality-related specific actions

*Twenty-two Delegations (compared to 12 in 2013) report that they have a gender country profile and it is foreseen soon in seven other Delegations, including **Cap Verde, Guinea Bissau, Lebanon, Malawi and Ukraine**. Forty-three Delegations say that they have mainstreamed gender in their National Indicative Programme (NIP)/Multiannual Indicative Programme (MIP) and nine have foreseen actions targeting gender equality.*

As touched on in earlier indicators, though gender country information and analysis is critical to effective programme design and subsequent implementation, the target of 50% has not been reached.

In **Burkina Faso**, Luxembourg sets out clear requirements before the drafting of an indicative cooperation programme and/or the identification of projects. A "gender assessment" identifies the gender equality commitments made by the partner government.

Information is collected on:

- Gender objectives in relation to targets set in national plans and policy frameworks;
- Possible gaps in the formulation and implementation of the national gender policy and the actions taken to address these gaps;
- Availability of national statistics, including the ones disaggregated by sex;
- National reports on CEDAW implementation and proposals for technical support on it ;
- National programmes related to the achievement of the MDGs 3 & 5 and progress reports;
- The different tasks and activities funded by other donors for gender equality and the empowerment of women.

It is difficult to ascertain from reports how far off the target we are. However, there is a definite indication that where gender analysis occurs, it is able to inform programming in tangible ways leading to improved measures to tackle gender inequality and to more generally mainstream gender throughout EU development work. However, the findings of these reports combined with recent Member States feedback on the MIPs and NIPS point to an insufficient attention being paid to robust gender analysis and/or funding specific actions.

Indicator 4.1.3 By 2015 all financing proposals for sector support programmes include gender-sensitive indicators

Fifty-eight Delegations reported on this indicator which is due by 2015. Overall there is a clear indication that gender sensitive indicators are increasingly being used, and this is confirmed when compared to last year's report (40). This also comes out in other indicators reported on this year (see indicators 7.2.1 and 7.3.2).

Across the reporting Delegations, gender-sensitive indicators are included in 20 different sectors (up from 18 last year): education (8), health (5), water (5), livelihoods (3), food security (3), justice (2) human rights (2), security (2), infrastructure (1), vocational education and training (1), social protection (1), rural development (1), trade (1), rule of law (1), energy (1), agriculture (1), nutrition (1), border management (1), social inclusion (1), transport (1). In addition, and in a number of Delegations, calls for proposals, thematic budget lines and general budget support contain gender-sensitive indicators.

In Malawi, the EU funded Gender and Women Empowerment Programme supports gender mainstreaming in agriculture, transport, education and health. The project has supported:

- the review of the transport sector performance Monitoring & Evaluation framework, resulting in the identification of 22 gender specific indicators now incorporated into the national Transport Sector Policy;
- making 25 existing indicators gender sensitive in the Monitoring & Evaluation of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security framework;
- The identification of 20 new gender specific indicators for the Agriculture sector, Gender, HIV and AIDS strategy launched in 2013.

In some partner countries, gender-sensitive indicators have clearly been included by Member States in sector support programmes, such as **Malawi** (above), **Ethiopia** (below) and **Bolivia**. Some Member States have established compulsory procedures or developed tools to promote the use of gender sensitive indicators throughout all their work (**Belgium, Denmark, Germany, and UK**).

In Ethiopia, gender sensitive indicators are proactively included in sector programmes.

The 11th European Development Fund (EDF) foresees a new sector Policy Support Programme in support of Ethiopia's Road Sector Development Programme. One of the specific objectives of the road sector is to enhance the involvement of women: specific gender indicators will be included.

In addition, the EU Delegation is also involved in multi-donors programmes such as the Productive Safety Net Programme (PSNP) and Household Asset Building Program (HABP). A report addressing Gender Mainstreaming in the next PSNP has been prepared and aims to improve performance of the next PSNP/ HABP in equally reaching out to, and empowering, poor women and men.

A health sector support programme is also planned in the 11th EDF. A number of indicators are clearly gender oriented. Moreover, support to the health sector will be complemented by addressing social and environmental determinants of health (including gender and harmful traditional practices).

However, and across EU Delegations and Member States it is often reported that - whilst indicators might be included - they do not always translate into effective implementation. The use of existing

indicators could be improved, as should their tracking by ensuring their monitoring and evaluation and that adequate qualitative and quantitative data is gathered and tracked.

Indicator 4.2.2 By 2011 gender equality issues feature on the agenda of sector/macro policy dialogue where relevant; elsewhere, they are discussed at regular EU meetings

Forty-five delegations report having included gender in one or several policy dialogues. There were 32 in 2011 and 49 in 2012. The domains where gender is addressed are broader than the traditional sectors included in reports. Combining this indicator with others in the GAP on dialogue, it is obvious that gender is increasingly mentioned by Member States and EU Delegations in the context of dialogue at country level, be it with civil society, governments, at sector level etc. What remains unclear is how often, how systematically, the quality of the dialogue and what it achieves.

For this particular indicator, the main domains reported on are education (12), health (11), governance (including justice and democracy) (9), agriculture (5), public financial management (3), private sector development (3), nutrition (3) but also natural protected areas, transport, Erasmus Mundus programme, land rights, entrepreneurship, employment and more.

In **Malawi**, for example, gender features in policy dialogues such as nutrition, land rights and crop production. In addition, the Ministry of Agriculture has a Technical Working Group which produced a gender policy for the ministry.

In **Honduras**, the Delegation supports gender equality in sector policy dialogue, through several programmes, including: i) the Human Rights Support Programme; ii) the Financing Agreement signed in 2013 for the implementation of the project "Promoting fair and accessible justice in Honduras"; iii) the EUROsociAL Program; and iv) the EU-funded UN Women/ITC-ILO programme "Increasing Accountability in Financing for Gender Equality".

Indicator 4.3.1 By 2013 all development projects are screened against their gender sensitiveness (quality insurance mechanisms)

Forty-eight Delegations declare using the gender checklist in all projects while seven pay special attention to the inclusion of gender in calls for proposals. As with reporting on previous indicators, where screening exists and is used, it is generally agreed that gender sensitivity and analysis could be further improved during the implementation and monitoring phases, including within sector budget support. Approaching these tools as a "tick box" exercise limits their potential. Some Delegations request "a more rigorous approach by Headquarters when assessing project/programme fiches in relation to gender equality issues".

Directorate-General for International Cooperation and Development (DG DEVCO) has gender checklists to guide programme identification and formulation. Unfortunately it is not used in a systematic way. The ongoing review of quality assurance procedures in DG DEVCO offers up new opportunities to improve the impact of gender checklists. In addition, the majority of EU Members States have their own quality assurance system. It is mandatory for almost all Members States to include a gender analysis in the appraisal process using the OECD DAC Gender Policy Markers as well as internal tools, in relation to both specific gender interventions and mainstreaming ones. For **Sweden**, for instance, all development projects are screened in relation to gender analysis and the likely effect/impact of programmes on both women and gender relations. Whilst gender is a standing point in all internal project committees, the gender focal point is also the chair of the Swedish

embassy project committee. **Germany** has a specific "Gender Equality Strategy", which is a mandatory process of project design and implementation, and in the preparatory phase of each project, a gender analysis needs to be done.

In **occupied Palestinian territories**, a Gender Mapping Study showed that around 60% of EU donors screen projects for gender sensitivity at design stage. During the reporting period all Action Fiches have been screened using the standard gender screening lists of DG DEVCO. In addition, following the staff training on gender mainstreaming organised by the EU Delegation in October 2011, gender equality concerns are taken into account in the actions, both under bilateral cooperation and under the thematic programmes targeting civil society organisations, notably under the local calls of Non State Actors-Local Authorities Programme and the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights. Operational staff has been encouraged to follow the online gender courses provided by the Commission.

As with previous indicators, there are strong messages on the importance of going beyond screening to ensure actual change at implementation level. These are voiced in a number of ways and through different indicators throughout the GAP reporting. Screening is clearly viewed as important, but as a first step and not as the means of achieving programmatic change if in isolation of other processes related to analysis, implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

Indicator 4.3.2 By 2013 until 2015 the Result Monitoring Reports provide information on the gender sensitiveness of implementation and make recommendations to improve gender performance.

The gender sensitivity and responsiveness of the Results Oriented Monitoring can be improved to better understand the relevance of projects and programmes for gender equality. When included, the recommendations help better define the programming.

Results Oriented Monitoring (ROM) is usually applied to all programmes and projects funded by the EU for more than EUR 1Million. The monitoring is realised by experts and their report is shared with the programme and projects managers. In this reporting period, thirty Delegations received ROM reports which included information on gender-sensitivity of the projects visited. They were 26 in 2013, which means that there is little improvement.

Some Delegations such as **Morocco** regret that there is no gender analysis in the ROMs they received whilst in **Chad** and **Kirgizstan** ROM reports only address the question when a gender approach is already present in the project. Others noted that at times there is information on gender but no recommendations. **Cambodia, Liberia, occupied Palestinian territories, Somalia** Delegations state that briefing the experts before the field visits and ensuring following-up on the issue helps having recommendations at the end of the process.

The ROM is potentially a powerful mechanism to inform future programming and strengthen them where needed, including on gender when it is taken into account. The recommendations can have an operational impact.

In **Honduras**, the EU Delegation worked closely with the monitored projects to implement the recommendations of the 2012 ROM on addressing gender. The Project "Para una vivienda saludable – calidad de aire y enfermedades respiratorias en hogares pobres de Honduras" (health sector) carried out an assessment of the ROM recommendations and generated a gender strategy to address them.

Through this exercise, the EU Delegation also generated a best practice that will be used as a reference model for future EU projects in Honduras.

Unfortunately, and as set out in the EU Headquarters section of this report on the same indicator, several evaluations have been carried out on the use of ROM and the results in relation to gender are not encouraging (see EU Headquarters section).

This indicator illustrates the fundamental difference that following through from analysis, to screening, to design, to implementation, to indicators and Monitoring & Evaluation can make to gender mainstreaming and to tackling inequality through EU programmes and projects. The ROM holds much potential to improve the gender impact of EC programmes, and at least to improve the tracking of their results for women and girls.

Indicator 4.4 By 2013 at least 75% of all new proposals score G-2 (gender as a principle objective), or G-1 (gender as a significant objective)

Despite still being far from the target of 75% of proposals having gender equality as a significant or principle objective, the European Commission's score continues to progress. According to the 2014 OECD DAC statistics, (based on information gathered in 2012), 28% of the proposals have at least G-1. This means that the European Commission has doubled its performance since its first GAP report (OECD 2010 data).

It is recognised that interpretation of the scores differs widely amongst OECD partners, which explains the discrepancies amongst them. There is an acknowledged need for training (**Honduras, Ukraine**) in the use of the G-Marker, despite the guidance developed by the Commission.

Also, there is a tendency for gender-sensitive projects to be mostly financed through the thematic budget lines, such as the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights or the Non State Actors-Local Authorities programme. This points to staff finding it less challenging to identify gender issues related to human rights protection and civil society reinforcement, and to a need for greater understanding of how gender equality and women's empowerment relates to other areas and ways of working.

Some Delegations provided their own percentage: **Afghanistan** 48% (70% of thematic budget lines) **Azerbaijan** 30%, **Brazil** 60% (of its budget lines but no bilateral fund scoring at least G-1), **Cap Verde** 70%, **Democratic Republic of Congo** 30%, **Egypt** 50%, **El Salvador** 90%, **Fiji** 30%, **Guatemala** 41%, **Guinea Bissau** 100% (with 4 projects), **Guinea Conakry** 40%, **India** 100%, **Kirghizstan** 50%, **Liberia** 65% (54.5% for sector budget support and 75% for thematic budget lines), **Morocco** 40%, **Mozambique** 65%, **Myanmar** 45% (thematic excluded), **occupied Palestinian territories** 70%, **Pakistan** 65%, **Paraguay** 100% for Human rights and governance projects, **Peru** 100%, **Philippines** 30%, **Senegal** 30%, **South Africa** 55%, **Sri Lanka** 44%, **Tajikistan** 25%, **Tanzania** 67%, **Tunisia** 100%, **Zambia** 60%, **Zimbabwe** 45%.

The **German** development cooperation developed measures to avoid projects scoring G-0: "the OECD/DAC Gender policy markers are binding for the implementing organisations of German development cooperation. Regular cross sectoral reviews are conducted to ensure that all G-1 and G-2 projects are correctly categorised and that there are adequate reasons given for this classification. If a project is to be classified as G-0, the Gender Desk at the Federal Ministry for Economic

Cooperation and Development must be involved in the review of the project proposal and give her written approval’.

Reporting on this indicator points to two important factors: i) a possible discrepancy in how the marker is applied and the need for consistency and ii) a need to support programme staff in understanding how gender is relevant beyond the thematic areas of Human Rights and Non State Actors/Local Authorities.

Indicator 5.1.1: By 2013 gender is regularly on the agenda in EU annual dialogues (gender policy forum) with civil society in each country

Eight of the reporting delegations do not address this indicator at all. However and overall, reporting on this indicator is encouraging and points to regular dialogue on gender occurring between civil society and EU Delegations at country level. The extent, fora, quality, depth and regularity remains somewhat unknown, the only certainty being that - in at least 58 EU Delegations - gender is formally included in the agenda of regular discussions with Civil Society Organisation (CSOs).

The level of detail in the reporting varies among Delegations. For example, it is not necessarily clear whether dialogues are annual and /or organised by the EU Delegation itself. Nor is it clear how "regularly" gender is raised. It is indeed difficult to tell from the reporting what the purpose of the dialogue has been, at what level it has occurred and who is being included as civil society. For some it is a formalised discussion, whilst others approach it differently (informal, sector level, through existing forums etc.). For some Delegations, gender comes up only in the context of programming (e.g. consultation on 11th EDF).

However, what is clear from the reports is that overall gender is a **regular and important topic for EU dialogue with Civil Society** at the country level. Nine EU Delegations report that gender is a fixed agenda item in their regularly organised forums, whilst another 28 state that they hold regular meetings on gender with CSOs (not necessarily in the context of an annual EU Delegation managed dialogue). In addition, a further 21 note that gender is increasingly raised and a recurrent issue, though not necessarily a formalised topic of consultation.

The EU Office to **Kosovo** has formalised its dialogue with civil society on gender and women rights. This regular forum with representatives of women organisations and key decision makers meets twice a year in order to discuss topics of joint interest and indent possible joint follow-up actions. Interestingly, and to its credit, the EU Office to Kosovo has produced a Gender Country profile that provides a baseline for political and policy dialogue, allowing for future progress tracking.

In some cases, having an EU Delegation managed system could duplicate existing and effective mechanisms already in place at country level, and therefore some Delegations have chosen to participate in existing fora.

The EU Delegation to **Vietnam** and a number of Members States participate in an existing coordination mechanism (the Gender Action Partnership) that brings together government, development practitioners and civil society. The partnership is supported by UN Women and is chaired by the government ministry of social affairs. Meetings are held at least twice a year, where information is shared and discussion occurs on a variety of topics such as legislation. The partnership aims to encourage coordination and the generation of synergies.

In a number of EU Delegations (9), dialogue on gender appears to be limited to the context of programming (e.g. Call for Proposals) or within consultations on programming (11th EDF consultations). Whilst on the one hand, limiting dialogue opportunities to programming discussion could narrow the scope for more strategic and policy level collaboration, programming might in some cases provide a useful entry point in tougher and more politically sensitive contexts. Projects can provide a legitimate forum for dialogue, which may be difficult to establish elsewhere in a less enabling environment.

In **Mozambique**, the AGIR programme has provided a platform for gender dialogue. AGIR is supported by a number of Member States which include Denmark, Netherlands and Sweden. AGIR intermediaries arrange the biggest annual Civil Society conference in Mozambique, where gender is an important topic of discussion and analysis. AGIR provides the opportunity to reach a wide number of local CSOs and to include capacity support such as training on key issues (gender being one).

Surprisingly, some of the EUDs that do not report on gender equality dialogue with CSOs are those in countries with a vibrant and active civil society, which could be an important partner in moving the dialogue forward, for example **Brazil**. Whilst others, in a far more challenging environment such as **Afghanistan** provide a progress report on their engagement with civil society on gender equality dialogue.

Interesting, additional findings have emerged from this year's reports on indicator 5.1.1. In particular, the new/recent Civil Society Roadmaps organised by EU Delegations, and in response to Headquarters requirements, have provided a clear channel for gender dialogue, both in terms of consulting CSOs on the matter but also for CSOs to highlight gender (and specific issues pertaining to gender equality) as important, in some cases raising awareness of the EU Delegations and Member States. At least twenty EU Delegations specifically mention the role that the Roadmaps have played in promoting gender dialogue. Furthermore, the Human Rights dialogues are also mentioned on a number of occasions as key processes that have informed gender dialogue and provided a space for it.

Indicator 5.1.2: By 2013, an annual report on gender equality dialogue is included in joint annual reports on development cooperation.

The Joint Annual Report does not seem to be the main or most appropriate channel, with only 6 EU Delegations using it to report on gender dialogue. However, reporting is taking place (a further 21 EU Delegations) but through other means such as the External Action Management Report (EAMR). Overall, the reporting on this indicator is unclear with some reporting on dialogue and others on general activities related to GEWE.

Of the reporting EU Delegations, only 6 report that they have included gender equality dialogue in joint annual reports (JAR) on development cooperation. The JAR is not the only mechanism through which EU Delegations can report on gender. Indeed some do not produce JARs or have decided that they are not the most appropriate channel to report through on gender equality dialogue. 21 Delegations use other means to report including: the External Assistance Management Report (EAMR), reports of thematic meetings on Human Rights and progress reports. This brings the total number of Delegations reporting on gender equality dialogue in some way or another to 27.

In **Cambodia**, the joint European Development Strategy for 2014-18 will incorporate an assessment of gender equality and related policy dialogue.

Somalia intends to include both a gender audit and gender country profile in future reports.

Thirty nine reporting Delegations have not addressed this indicator as requested by the GAP. It is unclear why, or even whether it is indeed a fair reflection of reality on the ground. Of the 39 Delegations that appear not to report, 16 state that this is because a JAR is not required by their Delegation or was not required this year. Again, it is difficult to tell whether other reporting may have happened.

Suggestions from Delegations:

The EU Delegation to **Bolivia** suggests that the GAP itself provides the space to report on gender equality dialogue (indicator 5.1.1).

EU Delegation to **Bangladesh** suggests adapting the EAMR to include gender reporting more systematically. Options suggested are:

- a) To insert a specific section in the report, where task managers can report on the developments of the gender equality dialogue from a horizontal and project-specific perspective;
- b) To include a box on overall gender equality and women empowerment achievements through programme implementation

Ukraine states that a proper template with questions and indicators would be helpful to frame the reporting and make it more user-friendly.

Reporting on this indicator raises another recurring issue; that of reporting and how to better streamline it with other requirements without losing the detail or quality.

Indicator 5.2.1: By 2011, the templates for the calls for proposals of all thematic programmes are reviewed with a view to making them more gender sensitive.

The 78 Delegation reports point to a clear split between those that do not report on this indicator (42, plus 4 that view it the role of HQ) and those that have made attempts, albeit to varying degrees, at ensuring more gender sensitive Calls for Proposal. Ten Delegations have made their locally managed Calls for Proposals explicitly gender-sensitive, whilst another 21 take account of gender issues in the management of their Calls, but not necessarily through explicit attention at the template stage. Underlying variations exist. A strong focus on the design stage of Calls for Proposals is obvious.

Variations occur within the group reporting progress on this indicator, with discrepancies in understanding of what gender-sensitivity might look like in practice, and confusion between screening proposals for gender sensitivity (once submitted) and making the actual templates more gender sensitive themselves (incentivising and facilitating gender sensitive submissions).

Throughout the reports, and in particular amongst those that do not explicitly address gender through the templates but report doing so in other ways, it is apparent that interpretations of gender sensitivity vary as do methods deemed appropriate to ensure it. The Delegation to **Mauritius, Seychelles & Comores** implies that including women in projects is sufficient to render them gender sensitive. Such

examples reinforce the need for greater knowledge and expertise at the level of delegations. At the other end of the spectrum, there are clearly thorough efforts at ensuring greater gender sensitivity and mainstreaming (including amongst those that do not explicitly do so through the templates).

The EU Delegation to **Moldova** seeks to ensure that at a minimum gender is presented in all CSO programming documents as a cross-cutting issue, and in many of them enhancing women and child rights is a direct component (e.g. female role models). Embedding gender in the selection criteria for Civil Society grants had two primary consequences. First, gender is now mainstreamed in most of the 31 selected projects and, secondly, 4 of them (13%) have a specific focus on women.

Overall, Delegations seem to focus more on the screening of proposals for gender sensitivity than on creating the incentives for it and its monitoring. Though screening is important, so is ensuring gender sensitivity throughout the project cycle. A number of Delegations mention that guidelines and screening occurs, but little follow up is mentioned to ensure that projects are actually being implemented and monitored in a gender sensitive way.

Indicator 6.2.1: By 2015, the G-Marker is applied for at least 80% of all EU projects and annually reported to OECD DAC.

Only 33 EU Delegations have reached, or are on track, to reach the target of 80% by 2015. It is unclear if underreporting on this indicator may be due to the 2015 target date. Nonetheless, it is clear that support is needed on understanding the marker, its importance and its relevance for a rapid acceleration to occur in time for 2015.

Of the reporting Delegations, 20 report having reached the target and a further 13 report having partially reached it (e.g. **Bangladesh** with 51.4% for G2 and 1.2% for G1), bringing the total to 33 Delegations having reached or on track to reach this target by 2015. Of the remaining 45 Delegations, 29 do not address the indicator. Surprisingly, a number of EUDs that report elsewhere in detail and more robustly on their work to promote Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment do not answer this indicator. These include, but are not limited to: **Afghanistan, El Salvador and Palestine**. This might be because of the 2015 target date, however this cannot be verified. A further 6 state that it is not applicable, again this may be down to the 2015 date (not clear) and 9 clearly state that the target has not been attained. Of these 9, **Honduras** and **Timor Leste** state that efforts will be accelerated to reach the 2015 target.

As Delegations repeatedly point out, the Common Relex Information System (CRIS) is clearly instrumental in facilitating the use of the G-marker. It is a requirement for all programmes uploaded on CRIS to be marked against the DAC policy markers.

The Gender Marker is indeed an important tracker, insuring transparency of EU aid. However, and as pointed out in other DAC marker related indicators by Member States and EU Headquarters, a number of EU Delegations point to the need for guidance on applying the marker. Others request guidance on extracting the percentages required for reporting against this indicator, in effect a number of them report that they are on track but are unable to provide precise percentages.

Indicator 7.2.1: The EU supported interventions in all thematic programmes on food security, education, health and climate change include gender-sensitive indicators.

Twenty five Delegations did not reply to this indicator in their GAP report. Of the Delegations that report against this indicator, there is a split between those that seek to mainstream gender throughout their work and those that have integrated the indicators in specific programmes.

Twenty five Delegations did not reply to this indicator in their GAP report. Only 5 of these gave a reason for not addressing it; stating that it was not applicable in their context. The latter may be because the EU Delegations have no such programmes as those listed in the indicator (food security, climate change etc.). A further five Delegations recognise the problem and outline that they anticipate including gender sensitive indicators in the near future.

EU Delegation to **Armenia** has developed a toolkit to assist its work to improve GEWE. It includes a gender mainstreaming methodology. The EUD plans to include gender indicators in all of its interventions.

EU Delegation to **Djibouti** will consider the indicators of the National Women Policy in ensuring that the formulation of each programme under the 11th EDF includes a gender approach.

Of the Delegations that report against this indicator, there is a split between those that seek to mainstream gender throughout their work (and Calls for Proposals) and those that have integrated the indicators in specific programmes. Though mainstreaming is ideal, in this case the six reports that use mainstreaming as their reply are vague. There is no sense of whether the "mainstreaming" has trickled down to programme indicators being gender sensitive.

Forty Delegations report that they deliver against this indicator, however it is not always clear whether they have included gender sensitive indicators or not, or are simply reporting on those projects that have girls and women as target beneficiaries. A number of Delegations chose to list their gender sensitive programmes without mentioning the use (or not) of gender sensitive indicators, rendering their interesting information obsolete in the context of the reporting against this particular GAP indicator. The EUD to **South Africa** lists programmes that do not include gender sensitive indicators but have a clear gender dimension (such as migrant children's rights). The EU Delegation to **Chad** is transparent about having a number of projects with women beneficiaries but that the delegation does not necessarily use gender sensitive indicators in its interventions.

As seen in indicator 4.1.3., gender sensitive indicators are included in 20 different sectors, which does provide some minimal information on actual indicators.

So, although over 50% of the reporting Delegations claim to deliver against the indicator, and assuming that this is the case (i.e. they use gender sensitive indicators), it still does not tell us much about the quality or type of indicators. It is apparent in reading the reports that there might be different interpretations of what constitutes a gender sensitive indicator. Indeed, this could vary from being an indicator to measure the attendance of girls in primary school to an indicator measuring the number of girls completing primary education with the equivalent reading age. Thus, we could be measuring processes that include girls rather than outcomes for girls.

Again, as mentioned by a number of EUD reports, gender sensitive indicators are not necessarily enough and gender mainstreaming should not stop at that (or at gender disaggregation).

In **Myanmar**, the EU Delegation participates in a number of multi-donor efforts, all of which address gender through more than indicators, ensuring strong gender analysis, strategic direction, specific targeting where needed and of course measurable indicators and targets.

The Livelihood and Food Security Trust Fund (LIFT), for instance, has a gender strategy and supports the Gender Equality Network. Moreover, sex-disaggregated data is collected and indicators are gender sensitive when necessary. Many projects supported through the LIFT have a particular focus on women. In addition, the MDG3 Fund ensures that all aspects of programming are informed by gender analysis and use every opportunity to promote gender equality and address gender discrimination and gender norms that undermine the rights of women. Moreover, sex-disaggregated data is collected and indicators are gender sensitive when necessary (18 out of 42). Finally, the Multi-Donor Education Fund has a gender approach and gender sensitive indicators are collected. Gender equality is one of cross-cutting themes.

Data quality and availability is essential, and national systems need strengthening to avoid project level silos of evidence that cannot be generalised or taken to scale, or utilised by others. Indeed, a recurring message in reports is that National Institutes of Statistics (or their equivalent) might need support to include gender sensitive data collection which can be used in tracking gender sensitive indicators of development projects, whilst building the national evidence base.

In **Guatemala**, it is anticipated that a gender approach will be taken into account during the identification/formulation of each new programme. It will do so by considering the indicators of the National Women Policy. The EU Delegation reinforces the message that it is very important for the EU to support national statistics (disaggregated by gender) in order to access and provide information concerning the specific situation of women and young girls, especially in the rural areas of the country.

In **Kyrgyzstan**, through the food security programme, a computer-assisted household interview system will contribute to accuracy and timeliness of gender-disaggregated household information. One of the outcomes is a new gender disaggregated statistics database in the forthcoming National Statistic Committee.

Indicator 7.3.2: By 2012 Gender-specific qualitative indicators are used to ensure that the gender dimension is taken into account in the EU approach and interventions in Private Sector Development (at macro, meso and micro levels).

*This indicator is one of those that seemed the most challenging to report on for Delegations. A total of 22 EU Delegations do not address the indicator in their report, and a further 14 state that it is non-applicable in their case as they do not have private sector development (PSD) programmes and 7 that they have not included such indicators and therefore have not achieved the target for the GAP. Only 12 out of reporting EU Delegations reply to the indicator in a way that implies a gender sensitive approach to EU private sector development. Of these, very few give details on what this means in terms of use of indicators, and none are able to detail whether they are qualitative as required and at what levels (output, outcome, impact). The few that report on the indicators refer to disaggregated data and only one (**Moldova** – see below) mentions how indicators [NB: not qualitative] are used.*

In **Moldova**, gender mainstreaming was taken into account when defining the Specific Conditions of the budget support programmes, establishing the number of women-owned business and women job

places to-be-created through: a) 2014-2016 Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement (DCFTA) – Component III (domestic and international market opportunities), b) 2015-2017 European Neighbourhood Agriculture and Rural Development – Component III (rural livelihoods and job creation) and c) 2014 ESRA EaPIC – Components I till III (various national programmes for Small and Medium Enterprises access to financing).

In **Tajikistan**, the EU-funded Enhanced Competitiveness of Tajik Agribusiness Project was launched in 2014 and will support agri-business related projects through blending grants to loans. It will measure the share of women-led farms, farmers-associations or food-processing enterprises that benefited from such investment grants.

In addition to the 12 that imply a gender sensitive approach to Private Sector Development (not directly addressing the indicator point), a further four report that women are "involved" in their PSD programmes and seven that gender mainstreaming throughout all EU Delegation interventions allows for PSD to become gender sensitive where relevant and needed. The latter are very vague and it is unclear what this means in practice and whether this has any implication on the use of indicators in PSD programmes, with the exception of **Pakistan** that refers to gender as mainstreamed but helpfully and openly recognises that this has not led to the use of gender specific qualitative indicators in EU Delegation PSD interventions.

Ten Delegations state their plans to address this indicator in the near future.

At central Headquarter level there are increasing efforts to raise the important role of women in PSD, and the possible gender impact of work in this area. The Communication "A stronger role of the private sector in achieving inclusive and sustainable growth in developing countries" COM (2014)263 states *"As part of its support to micro, small and medium-sized enterprises and the creation of an enabling environment for their development, the Commission will give particular attention to female entrepreneurship and employment. [...] The Commission will push for gender-sensitive business regulation, and will address the specific training and support needs of women as entrepreneurs and workers to ensure that recent improvements in girls' education are translated into real economic opportunities for women"*.

Indicator 8.1.2 By 2015 80% of the EU Delegations introduce specific measures on the role of external assistance and development cooperation in their local strategies for the implementation of the EU Guidelines on Violence against Women and Girls and Combating all Forms of Discrimination against them.

A number of EU Delegations seem active and engaged on seeking to combat and prevent Violence against Women and Girls (VaWG) and all Forms of Discrimination against them. 27 report activities and efforts in this area. They seem to do so on a number of levels and in a number of ways, ranging from dialogue, through specific action and projects, to country strategies to tackle VaWG and discrimination against them. The main focus in replies to this indicator is on violence, both its prevention and reduction.

Disappointingly 51 Delegations do not adequately address the indicator. This points to a high risk of not reaching the 80% target of all EU Delegations by 2015. Of the 27 that do, approaches vary. Five EU Delegations have developed their own country strategies on implementing the guidelines.

The EU Delegation to **Morocco** has its own strategy. A priority area for the EU in Morocco is to support the national plan on gender equality and the fight against VaWG and discrimination. There

has been intense political and sector dialogue around this. EU budget support now includes indicators relating to VaWG. Examples of these are:

- Law on domestic violence
- Penal reform related to VaWG
- 90% of regional action plans on gender equality elaborated
- Training of civil servants on VaWG

The approach of the EU Delegation in **Egypt** provides a clear illustration of the variety of approaches adopted, and often of the importance of adopting a varied and balanced palette of interventions to tackle this: a local EU strategy for the Implementation of EU guidelines on VaWG and all discrimination was adopted by EU Heads of Mission in 2010. Since 2012, EU Delegation is supporting the strategy through the implementation of three interventions: "Support the National Council of Women Ombudsman office in Promoting women right and Increasing its Efficiency", "Abandonment of Female Genital Mutilation and Empowerment of Families", and "Securing Rights and Improving Livelihoods of Women" project. At the same time, under the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR), nine projects have been funded aiming at combating VaWG & discrimination. Finally, dialogue through women's organisations & networks is promoted. They are invited to take part in the annual consultation process to define priority themes for annual Non-state Actors (NSA) Call for Proposals. Promotion of women rights has been among the priorities of the 2010/11/12/13 local NSA Call for Proposals & in the European Instrument for democracy and human Rights (EIDHR) 2014 call.

Indeed, EU Delegations tackle the issue through sector dialogues, projects with NSAs, campaigns (**Malawi**) and calls for proposals. The EIDHR is repeatedly mentioned as a key instrument to implement programmes in such thematic areas. Human Right strategies also emerge as key processes and instruments through which to include initiatives to protect and promote women's rights (e.g. **Benin**) and human rights groups as instrumental to raising awareness. In a number of cases Human rights Defenders are engaged too on the issue of violence against women and girls (VaWG).

In **Guatemala**, the EU Human Rights Strategy has a specific approach to reduce and sanction violence against women and children. This priority is part of the bilateral political dialogue with the national institutions.

In **Bangladesh**, a Human Rights focus is taken to tackle VaWG. Members of the EU Human Rights Task Force have at times investigated alleged cases of VaWG. The EU missions have supported reports and events concerned with the high levels of VaWG in Bangladesh. The Delegation has established, in its EIDHR Country Based Support Scheme strategy for the period 2011-2013, to include support for the implementation of a number of EU Human Rights Guidelines, among which the Guidelines on Violence and Discrimination against Women and Girls.

Though much positive work seems to be happening, the target of 80% by 2015 is unlikely to be achieved and it now seems overambitious.

Indicator 8.2 – 8.3 The thematic programmes and instruments (EIDHR etc.) will support Non-State Actors (NSAs) to implement the EU Guidelines on Violence against Women and Girls (VaWG) and Combating All Forms of Discrimination against them.

In comparison with the previous indicator, reporting on this one is far more positive and encouraging with clearly strong and extensive support to and use of NSAs to implement EU Guidelines on VaWG and Combating all forms of discrimination against them.

In some ways, reports on this indicator are relevant to the previous one and reassuring that more is happening in this field than apparent through the previous indicator. Only 20 do not report against it, vs. 50 in the previous indicator.

52 Delegations report that they support NSAs to implement the guidelines, in nearly equal measure through EIDHR and NSAs thematic programmes. A further 5 Delegations state their clear intention to do so in the near future.

In **Laos** for example, a review is taking place of compliance with international legislation and will provide recommendations to the EU Delegation on means and entry points to support the implementation of the Guidelines. In **Zambia**, VaWG and discrimination will be included in the guidelines for call for proposals under NSA / LA and EIDHR in 2015.

Variation exists on the type of support given. Without knowing the rationale behind such choices, it is difficult to make a value judgement on whether they are the most appropriate means. Some focus solely on including guidance in the Call for Proposals, others on including NSAs in defining thematic priorities and some on screening proposals. One uses a performing poet to raise awareness of Gender Based Violence at EU Delegation events (**Botswana**). Other Delegations take on a more holistic approach, looking at a basket of support and recognising that NSAs implementing such projects might also be strategic partners on VaWG.

In **Mozambique**, there are eight on-going projects resulting from EIDHR 2009/10 directly focusing on VaWG. The projects provide insights on gender challenges and help EU Delegation maintain an informed dialogue with advocacy organisations as well as grass roots organisations.

Indicator 9.1.1 By 2013 at least 60% of EUDs in fragile, conflict or post conflict countries develop a strategy to implemented the EU Comprehensive approach from the perspective of the sectors they are involved in and development cooperation

There are no reports stating that the Delegation has developed a strategy to implement the EU comprehensive approach. Overall, those that do report progress do so within the context of gender being mainstreamed (12) or projects to implement the Common Approach (9).

Fourteen (14) EU Delegations do not provide an update on the indicator and a further 36 claim that it is not applicable in their case, with 3 reporting that it hasn't been done. Reassuringly, clear efforts are made by fragile states and only 12 of these don't report are on the OECD fragile states' list, and of these only one on the EC crisis list (**Guinea Bissau**).

There are no reports stating that the Delegation has developed a strategy to implement the EU comprehensive approach specifically. Overall, those that do report progress do so within the context of gender being mainstreamed (11) or projects to implement the Common Approach (9). None address the indicator directly. Three plan to develop a strategy (but within different contexts, e.g. Human Rights Strategy). **Timor Leste** is the only reporting EU Delegation that intends to develop a specific country strategy.

Of the 22 reporting work to improve implementation of the common approach, be it via mainstreaming or target projects, 13 are on the OECD fragile states list, of which 8 are on the EC crisis list, pointing to clear efforts in fragile, conflict or post conflict countries to implement the approach. The fact that none have developed a strategy might point to such an approach not being the most useful or viable for EU Delegations.

Indicator 9.2 Continuous EU support for capacity building on SCR 1325 and 1820 in fragile states increases annually. This level of support will be annually monitored and reported on

Only 21 countries report work being done to build capacity on United Nations Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 1325 and 1820. Of the 21 reporting activities, 12 are on the OECD fragile states list, of which 7 on the EC crisis list. Most do so through a combination of dialogue and direct project support on the UNSCRs.

However, except for two EU Delegations, they do not provide details on the level of support and whether it has increased or not. Again, as with the previous indicator, reporting is not necessarily indicative of the progress being sought by the indicator. However, the work does contribute to the overall objective 9: to support partner countries in fully implementing UNSCR 1325 and 1820.

In **Kosovo**, this indicator is addressed through dialogue and programmes: on the occasion of the 12th Anniversary of UNSCR 1325 in 2012 the EU organised a thematic discussion, "The EU Policy for the Implementation of UNSCR on Women, Peace and Security". The overall objective was to highlight the importance of UNSCR 1325 and its subsequent resolutions for the construction of a peaceful, gender-sensitive society, through the EU policies for the implementation of UNSCR on women, peace and security. In addition, a joint project with UN Women has assisted the Agency for Gender Equality in the production of a National Action Plan for implementation of UNSCR 1325.

In **Iraq**, a mixed approach of dialogue and projects is also adopted. The EU Delegation supports gender equality and women's participation in political life as well as gender mainstreaming in Iraqi policies and constantly urges the Government to follow recommendations of UNSC Resolution 1325. Moreover, the Delegation is financing projects in the field of Human Rights that support implementation of the UNSCR 1325.

In **Afghanistan**, to promote implementation of UNSCR 1325 on women, peace and security, a National Steering Committee at Deputy Minister Level and a technical working group, which the EU participates in, has been formed. The EU provided technical support to the High Peace Council in drafting their work strategy for the implementation of 1325, which will feed into the national strategy that is currently being drafted. The EU also facilitated and funded mediation training for members of the High Peace Council and certain Provincial Peace Council, with a focus on the female representatives in line with the EU's objective to promote an inclusive peace process.

Reporting on this indicator remains problematic, due to a low level of EU Delegations responding to it (only 21) and due to reporting not addressing the indicator itself (level of support and its increase and monitoring). The lack of directly addressing the indicator raises questions on its usability and utility.

2.2 EU Headquarters

Indicator 1.1.1 An update on the progress of the Action Plan will be provided at least once a year.

This is the fourth annual report on the implementation of the Gender Action Plan. An update has been provided yearly since its inception. A successor to the GAP for the period 2016-20 is being considered.

A successor to the action plan has been requested by the Council in its “Conclusions on the 2013 Report on the Implementation of the EU Plan of Action on Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment in Development 2010-2015” (adopted in May 2014). The Council has called upon the Commission and the Member States “to develop an ambitious and robust successor to the current GAP, focused on results and taking into account the post-2015 agenda”. The Council has stated that the new GAP, 2016-20, should build on progress made and lessons learned, and should address existing shortfalls and challenges. It requests the establishment of a Taskforce to define the scope, objectives, indicators and reporting format of a new GAP.

Progress is ongoing. The taskforce is being set up, terms of reference have been drafted, a work plan defined and the first meeting of members (Member States, Commission services and EEAS and gender experts) will take place at the end of October 2014. There are some doubts surrounding both the regularity of GAP reporting (currently annual) and its timing (currently June). For any successor to the GAP, it will be important to consider how regular reporting needs to be taking account of how onerous it might be, how it might align / be streamlined with other reporting requirements and the length that measurable progress in gender mainstreaming can sometimes take to occur. On the other hand, regular reporting can galvanize efforts and insure that the GAP and its objectives stay visible and high on the agenda of those implementing it.

Indicator 1.2.2 The Annual report on the EU’s development and external assistance provides information on gender equality in development, and its data is disaggregated by sex where possible and relevant.

The 2014 Annual report provides information on gender equality under each topic and in each region. Gender equality is also addressed as a topic in itself. Sex-disaggregated data is available in an increasing number of sectors, such as water and sanitation, agriculture and forestry, regional development, environment and public financial reform, in addition to the more traditional sectors such as education, employment and political participation.

Indicator 1.4.1 In 2011, a medium term strategy of cooperation with the African Union on gender equality and women’s empowerment is established.

EU cooperation with the African Union (AU) happens in a number of ways, including at political and programming levels.

At the fourth Africa-EU Summit held in Brussels in April 2014, Heads of States and Government of the European Union and Africa reiterated their strong commitment to Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (GEWE). GEWE featured prominently in the Road Map 2014-2017 adopted at the summit to frame continent-to-continent cooperation. In the Road Map, the Africa Union (AU) and EU committed to ensure full and effective participation and representation of women in peace and security processes. The Road Map also highlighted the importance of creating decent jobs and of mobilising the entrepreneurial potential of women.

In the framework of the Pan-African programming, gender equality and women's empowerment are foreseen in the Multiannual Indicative Programme 2014-2017. Specific action will also be formulated to support Pan-African initiatives in the areas of governance, human rights and gender equality, with a special emphasis on strengthening the African Governance Architecture. A study to identify possible actions in areas such as FGM, support to institutions on women's rights and partnership with CSOs to promote gender equality at regional level is currently being finalised (June 2014).

Through the "African Union Support Programme", the EU supports the AU Commission's "Women, Gender and Development Directorate" to implement its work plan. In the reporting period, and through the Joint Africa-EU Strategy Support Mechanism, the EU also supported and promoted a number of strategic opportunities for high level dialogue on gender issues.

Indicator 1.4.2 During 2011 and 2012, cooperation is strengthened and concrete synergies are made with policies and programmes of organisations in other regions in Latin America, Africa, and Asia.

Regional synergies happen through gender mainstreaming efforts, political dialogue and targeted action. Of course targeted measures are easier to identify. Some regions are seeking operational coherence by developing regional approaches to gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE).

In **intra-ACP** funded programmes, gender equality and women's empowerment are cross-cutting issues. However, extrapolating gender information for reporting purposes is not a straightforward exercise. Targeted measures are easier to identify. In 2014, two programmes have been funded by the intra-ACP instrument. The first funds the Southern African Development Community (SADC) to contribute to the attainment of the 28 targets of the SADC Protocol on Gender and Development by 2015. The second is a lesson learning exercise to share best practice across ACP countries. The exercise produced learning materials aimed at promoting the role of women in key socio-economic sectors, disseminating best practices, and encouraging knowledge sharing.

Working towards a more ambitious **EU-ASEAN** political partnership, several high-level visits and meetings took place that reaffirmed the positive momentum, including the visit to Brussels of the ASEAN Commission on the Rights of Women and Children and the EU-ASEAN Ministerial Meeting in Brunei Darussalam (July 2013).

EU-ASEAN cooperation has been further strengthened through the implementation of the Bandar Seri Begawan Plan of Action, which includes the promotion of gender equality. It aims to enhance cooperation through, in part, the exchange of experience and best practices among ASEAN Member States and the EU.

Progress under the Plan of Action was reviewed at the 20th ASEAN-EU Ministerial Meeting in Brussels in July 2014. Foreign Ministers noted the progress made by the ASEAN Inter-governmental Commission on Human Rights (AICHR) and the ASEAN Commission for the Promotion and Protection of the Rights of Women and Children (ACWC), and agreed to continue to cooperate in this area including through the exchange of good practice, information, dialogues, seminars and other capacity building initiatives.

The EU's strategic partnership with **Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC)** is structured through biennial summit-level meetings and a joint Action Plan adopted in 2010, and expanded at the Santiago de Chile Summit, in 2013, to include gender as a new area of activity.

Several regional cooperation programmes funded in the financial period 2007-13 included specific actions targeting women. For example, the programme EUROsocial funded the opening of the first "Women's rights house" (Casa de Derechos para las mujeres) in the region of Upala in Costa Rica, to give support and legal advice to migrant women from Nicaragua.

At DG DEVCO Headquarters level, efforts are undertaken by some geographical desks to promote a coherent approach to gender quality and to identify needs and possible synergies.

In the **Neighbourhood East region (Eastern Partnership countries)**, the Commission is working on a three-step strategy based on analysis, skills development and in-house quality support. The main goal is to improve the quality of gender mainstreaming at sector level for the European Neighbourhood Instrument programming period 2014-20 and the capacity to report on concrete results in terms of gender equality and women's empowerment (which is regularly included in the ENP Progress reports of 12 ENP partner countries).

Within this programme, the gender profiles of the six Eastern Partnership countries were completed in September 2013. The profiles are living documents; they provide a synthetic overview of gender stakeholders in each country and highlight key gender-related challenges at sector level. The gender profiles are now used as basis for further reflection; for example, the Delegation to **Armenia** has developed a country-specific gender mainstreaming toolkit, adapted to their sectors of concentration. A training programme has also been planned¹, and will be completed by the end of 2014. It comprises 6 tailor-made workshops on gender mainstreaming (one for each Delegation in the region) and a wrap-up workshop. This activity aims at building a common understanding of EU commitments on gender mainstreaming; raising awareness about existing tools (e.g. role of the gender focal persons); discussing country-specific challenges for GEWE; and sharing ideas and best practices across sectors and delegations.

Similar activities are ongoing to improve the quality of gender mainstreaming at sector level for the ENI programming period 2014-2020 in the **Neighbourhood South region**, as well as to improve the staff capacity to report on concrete results in terms of GEWE. In particular, a desk review of ROM reports was completed in January 2014² (see indicator 4.3.2. below). Based on the findings of this study (and of the twin study for the Neighbourhood East), the Neighbourhood Directorate in DG DEVCO supports the inclusion of specific gender expertise in the next ROM contract. In June, service contracts have been launched to draft the gender profiles of the countries of the Mediterranean Region still without it: Algeria, Egypt, Israel, Lebanon, Libya and Syria, and for designing and delivering **tailor-made trainings** for both the staff in the delegations and in Headquarters.

In addition, a Senior Officials Meeting of the **Union for the Mediterranean (UfM)** is planned to take place at the end of 2014 in order to take stock of progress made in relation to the Convention to eliminate all forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW). The UfM Secretariat, in its project labelling mandate, is strongly encouraged to focus on actions which will raise GEWE issues in policy dialogue and policy making.

¹ The first 4 workshops took place in Azerbaijan (1-2 April 2014), Belarus (14-15 April), Georgia (26-27 June) and Armenia (30 June – 1 July). The remaining workshops will take place before the end of the year.

² Contract nr. EuropeAid/129674/C/SER/Multi: Special Report on ROM and gender mainstreaming (EU Delegations – Neighbourhood South) 2013 / Semester 2 – DEVCO/F2

Indicator 2a.1.2 By 2011, the efficiency of the current EC funding instruments in addressing GEWE is assessed in time for considering how to include GEWE priorities in External instruments in the new FFPP.

An evaluation of gender mainstreaming in development cooperation 2007-2013 started in 2013. Some measures have been taken to compensate for the delay.

The evaluation will contribute valuable learning and recommendations for the improved integration of gender across policies, sectors and aid modalities. The evaluation will also assess to what extent Commission assistance (policy, strategies, programmes/projects) has been relevant, efficient and effective in contributing to sustainable impacts on GEWE in partner countries.

The evaluation results were unfortunately not available for the 2014-20 new financial framework, but will be available by 2015, in time for the annual programmes. To compensate for this delay, a number of gender-sensitive indicators have been included in the guidelines for sector programming produced in July 2013. This initiative has not been fully successful as a considerable number of Multiannual Indicative Programmes have been considered weak on gender. Several Member States commented that gender in the political, social and economic country analysis as well as in the sector analysis was missing or insufficient, leading to an incomplete response in terms of programming. There is rarely a budget allocation to gender and the disaggregation of the indicators by sex and age are still too rare.

There have, nonetheless, been some good examples, where EU Delegations have efficiently integrated the gender perspective in their programming. One of them is **Djibouti** whose National Indicative Plan includes a Gender Equality Programme; the specific situation and needs of women and girls are addressed and a budget has been allocated accordingly. Other Delegations such as those in the **Democratic Republic of Congo, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Honduras and Nepal**, have all made efforts to better mainstream gender equality.

Indicator 1.2b.1.1 By 2013, gender training is part of the training for EEAS staff

EEAS gender-specific training is organised in the framework of the "Human Rights series". The aim of these training courses is to help staff identify and mainstream gender issues in their daily work, through interactive sessions and case-studies.

Trainees include staff from Headquarters, Delegations, Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) missions and Member States. Trainers are academics, EU and International Organisations' staff and civil society representatives. Training has included:

- "Gender equality priorities in EU external action" usually held in the autumn. In 2013, 46 participants attended the course, including 11 human rights focal points from EU Delegations and 10 Member States representatives. A one-day training module 'Gender-sensitivity in programme design' carried out in April 2014. It involved 90 EU staff from HQ and Delegations.

Also the Commission proposed training at delegation and headquarters' level (Angola, Bangladesh, Benin, Mozambique, Philippines, Sudan). In addition, training programmes are already underway in Neighbouring East countries and in preparation for Neighbouring South.

Indicator 2b.2.1 By 2013 gender perspectives are mainstreamed in the existing methodological training (PCM, new aid modalities, etc.) programmes for EU staff.

The development of sector specific training modules has continued. Modules on gender and energy, gender and climate change, gender and food security have been developed and shared with the support of the concerned units.

The checklists that have to be used for the integration of a gender perspective in all programming are currently being revised to make them more “non-gender-expert accessible”; the Result Oriented Monitoring future framework will include specific guidelines on the integration of gender expertise and a revision of the Gender Mainstreaming Toolkit is ongoing. The latter will continue to be the tool for the integration of gender awareness in programme and project cycle management.

Indicator 1.2b.5.1 In 2012 specific gender equality trainings are available on Train4dev.

The Gender group in Train4dev – now Learn4dev – is preparing to mainstream gender into all Learn4Dev trainings.

In the framework of the joint programme of the Commission, UN Women and ITC –ILO “Financing for gender Equality”, ITC-ILO is putting together a “Resource Package” which will contain international best practice material on gender equality and gender mainstreaming in development. The material will cover specific sectors (e.g. health, transport, food security, and infrastructure), aid modalities (e.g. budget support, thematic programme, project) and levels of intervention (policy making, programme design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation). The resource package will be ready by 2015 and available online.

Indicator 1.3.1.1 By 2011, guidance notes are sent regularly to EU HOMs that informs on all relevant gender equality issues and challenges.

Specific policy oriented introductory notes will be included in the new version of the “Toolkit for Gender mainstreaming in development cooperation”. It will be available in 2015. In addition, a general guidance note for Heads of Mission is being prepared on the importance of including gender perspectives in their policy and political dialogue with partner countries.

Indicator 4.3.1 By 2013 all development projects are screened against their gender sensitivity of implementation (quality insurance mechanisms)

The screening is done on all programmes and projects - every year - using the OECD DAC marker on gender equality.

Reflexion on a new quality assurance mechanism is taking place within the procedures’ simplification process that is on-going in the DG DEVCO. As mentioned earlier (indicator 2b.2.1), the gender checklists which have to be prepared at identification and formulation level - before submission of any new programme and project to the quality assurance mechanisms (Quality Support Group), are currently being revised to make them more user friendly and useful (possibly guidance notes instead of check lists, and recommendations according to type of programme).

Indicator 4.3.2 By 2013 until 2015 the Results Oriented Monitoring Reports provide information on the gender sensitivity of implementation and make recommendations to improve gender performance.

Several evaluations have been carried out on the use of Result Oriented Monitoring, in particular on the Neighbouring East and South activities, and on Latin America and Caribbean regional activities. The results in relation to gender are not encouraging.

The **LAC regional programmes** analysis reveals that the programmes do not integrate a gender approach and lack gender mainstreaming in their implementation.

A deeper analysis of the ROM results from the gender point of view has been conducted on programmes designed and implemented in the **Neighbourhood regions, east and south**. A key finding is that assessment of gender related issues is usually limited to the specific sections that refer to cross cutting issues; gender is not mainstreamed throughout the ROM and its conclusions provide very limited analytical insight into the gender impact and/or degree of gender mainstreaming of EU cooperation projects. In addition, in the rare cases where gender recommendations are provided, they are not picked up by EU task managers in Response Sheets, an indication that lessons learned and best practices are not being used to enhance the implementation of EU financed projects, or future subsequent. This is aligned with earlier comments from EU Delegations.

The value of ROM outputs to enhance gender equality performance in project design and projects implementation depends in great part on the gender expertise of the team, and the degree to which EU Delegation Task Managers can and do follow up on ROM outputs.

On the basis of the findings of the desk review of ROM reports received in **Neighbouring South region**, (and a twin study for the Neighbourhood East), the Neighbourhood Directorate supports the inclusion of specific gender expertise in the next ROM contract.

Indicator 6.3.1 By 2013 information on EC expenditure on gender equality is provided in the Annual report on the EU's development and External Assistance.

This indicator has not been achieved. The Commission has not developed the tools needed to reach this level of specificity in its funding and this remains a key challenge for its results measurement, transparency and accountability. The available data is that provided to the OECD and shows that in 2012, 28% of the Commission aid had a focus on gender equality. They are not published in the Annual report.

Indicator 6.4.1 By 2013, a mid-term evaluation is undertaken on EU gender mainstreaming in development cooperation.

The mid-term evaluation (GAP) and a full evaluation of gender mainstreaming in development cooperation are on-going. The outcomes are expected early 2015.

The Evaluation of EU support to gender equality and women empowerment was part of the 2013 evaluation programme as approved by the Commissioners for Development.

To respond to different needs, the evaluation has been divided in two parts:

- The first will answer specifically to the provision contained in this indicator (6.4.1). It is designed primarily to provide policy-makers at the Union level and in Member States with recommendations on strategies and tools for the integration of gender equality across policies, sectors and aid delivery methods (notably Budget Support).

- The second part includes all other key issues required to evaluate to what extent the Union's assistance (policy, strategies, and programmes/projects) has been relevant, efficient and effective in supporting sustainable impacts on GEWE processes in partner countries.

This evaluation seeks to be a forward looking and lesson learning exercise, as well as an accurate assessment of results. The identification of learning lessons will help the Commission to understand what has and what has not worked, what has driven progress and what impedes it, to feed future planning.

Indicator 7.1.1 The EU positions on MDGs and Aid effectiveness have a strong focus on GEWE.

The EU position on the post 2015 agenda has been clearly expressed in the Communication released in June 2014, “A decent life for all: from vision to collective action”³. A strong emphasis is given to gender equality as an objective in itself and as a cross-cutting issue.

The Communication reaffirms that gender equality, women's empowerment and the full enjoyment of rights by women and girls are essential conditions for sustainable development and poverty eradication. It emphasises that the “collection of gender-disaggregated data will contribute to the objective of gender mainstreaming” and lists among the potential target topics the prevention and elimination of all forms of violence and discrimination against women and girls; the increase of women’s representation, participation and leadership in decision-making at all levels and in all spheres; the universal and equal access to essential services for women and girls; the elimination of the gender wage gap in the public and private sector.

Indicator 7.1.2 Continue partnering with the UN and the OECD/DAC on advancing gender equality and women’s empowerment in the MDG and aid effectiveness agenda.

The Commission partners with the UN and the OECD/DAC on a number of levels.

The Commission attends the annual meetings of the OECD/DAC Network on gender equality - Gendernet. The last meeting focused on the progress towards the Sustainable development Goals and the post-2015 agenda, the global partnership and some reflections on the 58th session of the UN Commission on the Status of Women (March 2014).

The Commission coordinates closely with MSs and the UN on processes such as the post 2015 framework (ref: previous indicator) and the Commission on the Status of Women (CSW). The Agreed Conclusions of the 58th session of the UN CSW provided helpful “agreed language” for the formulation of targets, both for the gender equality focus (goal) area and for bringing a gender equality perspective into other focus areas.

Indicator 8.1.2. By 2015 at least 80% of EUDs introduce specific measures on the role of external assistance and development cooperation in their local strategies for the implementation of the EU Guidelines on Violence against Women and Girls and Combating all forms of Discrimination against them

³ COM (2014) 335 final.

EU Delegations have replied to this indicator, this section therefore focusses on HQ level initiatives and coherence, of which there are a number.

In June 2013, new Crisis Management Procedures (CMPs) for CSDP Missions and Operations were adopted. The new templates of EU planning documents include set parts for the analysis of the human rights and gender situation. Concept of operations (CONOPS) and Operation plans (OPLAN) include annexes on human rights and gender.

The European Commission's Staff Working Document on “Gender in Humanitarian Assistance: Different Needs, Adapted Assistance⁴”, adopted in July 2013, outlines the Commission's approach to gender and gender-based violence in humanitarian aid. The objective is to improve the quality of humanitarian assistance, through actions that effectively respond to the specific needs of women, girls, boys, men and elderly women and men, who have different needs due to the fact that crises do not affect them all in the same way.

EU Human Rights Strategies have now been adopted for all countries in which a Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) mission or operation is established. Human rights and gender advisers in CSDP missions have been consulted during the drafting and updating of these strategies. Each strategy includes an analysis of the situation of women's rights in the country concerned. In many countries where there is a CSDP mission, the strategies prioritize issues such a sexual and gender based violence, domestic violence, and women's participation in public life.

Indicators 8.2 and 8.3.1. The thematic programmes and instrument (EIDHR, Investing in People) will support NSAs to implement the EU Guidelines on Violence against Women and Girls and Combating all forms of Discrimination against them

As seen previously, EU Delegations are very active at country level on Violence against Women and Girls, especially through thematic programmes. A number of HQ level principles and strategies help sustain this, and are reflected on the ground through support to civil society, mostly through the EIDHR and NSA-LA thematic programmes.

In March 2014 the new Regulations establishing the new financing instruments for development cooperation have been adopted⁵.

The **EIDHR programme** 2014-20 (Regulation No 235/2014 of 11/3/2014), includes the principle “Gender equality, women's rights, including the empowerment of women, and non-discrimination are fundamental human rights and are essential for social justice as well as for fighting against inequalities. Their promotion should be a cross-cutting priority of this Regulation”. Women in addition are specifically targeted in a number of objectives.

The **DCI Regulation** 2014-20 (Regulation No 233/2014 of 11/3/2014), states that : "Respect for human rights, fundamental freedoms, the promotion of the rule of law, democratic principles, transparency, good governance, peace and stability and gender equality are essential for the development of partner countries, and those issues should be mainstreamed in the Union's

⁴ SDW(2013)290 final

⁵ See Official Journal of the European Union L 77 of 15.3.2014

development policy, particularly in programming and in agreements with partner countries", while on para12 there is a specific reference to this Action Plan.

The **DCI – thematic programme** “Global Public Goods and Challenges” 2014-20 includes a specific topic related to gender equality and women empowerment, in the frame of the chapter so called “human development”? The fighting against all forms of violence against women and girls and all forms of discrimination is listed among the priorities.

The **Regulation establishing an Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace (IcSP) 2014-20** (Regulation No 230/2014 of 11/3/2014), recognise the gender-based violence, as one of the elements that pose a risk to stability and security. It recommends that, whenever possible, cross-cutting issues like “...human rights including child and indigenous peoples rights, non-discrimination, gender equality and women's empowerment” shall be reflected in the IcSP programming. Finally, among the priorities to be funded by the programme, it includes the “support for measures to ensure that the specific needs of women and children in crisis and conflict situations, including their exposure to gender-based violence”.

Indicator 9.2. Continuous EU support for capacity building on UN SCR 1325 and 1820 in fragile states increases annually. This level of support will be annually monitored and reported on.

As seen in EUD reporting, specific actions are taking place at country level but are not necessarily annually monitored or reported on. This is the same centrally.

The **EU's comprehensive approach to external conflicts and crises** was adopted in December 2013. While it is not specifically aimed at implementation of the women, peace and security agenda, it does apply to EU efforts in this domain and seeks a coherent use of instruments able to tackle the root cause of crisis. The comprehensive approach strategy is based on needs of each country, and will capture civil society needs. This will include measures to better address gender issues.

Actions at HQ level have included:

- A **thematic factsheet on ‘Women’s Participation and Gender’** has been commissioned by the Mediation Support Team of the European External Action Service. The factsheet addressed within these processes”; 1) the role and inclusion of women as mediators and participants in processes of dialogue; and 2) the appropriate inclusion of gender perspectives in the outcomes of agreements from mediation and dialogue processes (such as peace agreements).

An **external evaluation of IcSP crisis preparedness** component in 4 priority areas, including Women, Peace and Security (WPS) and Gender mainstreaming as crosscutting issue, was finalized mid-2014. The evaluation noted that, despite a limited budget, the component contributes to fulfilment of EU commitments related to WPS. Evaluators also found evidence of increased gender concerns addressed in several IcSP actions. This specific support is currently implemented in 17 countries and 3 regions worldwide.

At country level, some examples include:

- The ongoing IcSP local call for proposals envisioned by the EU Delegation to **El Salvador** will focus on women, to contribute to peace and social stability, investing particularly in the rehabilitation and reinsertion of women in prison, and the empowerment of women activists/organizations-right defenders.

- The EU Delegation to **Peru** has just launched a local call for proposals that will fund actions aiming at the empowerment of women participating in dialogues processes in the cocaine areas of Satipo.
- In **Brazil**, recent IcSP support to Christian Aid aims to reduce and end violence against women in Sao Paulo.

2.3 Member States Headquarters

Indicator 2a.1.3 By 2010, MS identify and exchange information on financial resources for GEWE and GAP, both for bilateral and multilateral instruments

Table next page: OECD report 2014

Table 1 - Aid in support of Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Donor Charts - April 2014 Statistics based on DAC Members' reporting on the Gender Equality Policy Marker, 2011-2012)

2011-2012 average (2011 USD million)

Accessible at: <http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/documentupload/Aid-support-gender.pdf>

	Principal	Significant	Sub-total Gender Equality focused	as % aid screened	Not targeted	Total aid screened	Not screened	Sector allocable, total	Support to women organizations
	a	b	c = a + b	c / e	d	e = c + d	f		included in (a)
Australia	233	1,609	1,842	57%	1,370	3,213	407	3,619	18
Austria	7	53	60	13%	394	453	2	455	1
Belgium	86	490	576	62%	348	925	108	1,033	3
Canada	944	650	1,594	65%	869	2,464	0	2,464	6
Czech Republic	0	2	2	5%	45	47	1	50	0
Denmark	85	685	770	55%	636	1,405	0	1,405	20
EU institutions	241	2,827	3,068	24%	9,642	12,710	6,815	19,525	59
Finland	34	325	359	52%	334	693	0	694	13
France	1	1,943	1,944	29%	4,775	6,719	488	7,208	0
Germany	202	4,385	4,587	48%	5,050	9,636	1,410	11,047	28
Greece	0	79	79	80%	20	99	0	99	0
Iceland	2	10	12	78%	3	16	2	17	1
Ireland	14	156	170	45%	209	379	0	380	10
Italy	23	146	169	42%	233	402	70	472	3
Japan	136	2,267	2,403	20%	9,835	12,237	1,847	14,084	3
Korea	16	72	88	6%	1,496	1,584	0	1,584	2
Luxembourg	5	36	41	35%	76	117	69	186	0
Netherlands	495	728	1,223	35%	2,257	3,479	0	3,479	129
New Zealand	11	137	148	50%	150	299	0	299	1
Norway	254	570	824	32%	1,750	2,574	0	2,574	79
Poland	0...
Portugal	2	57	59	37%	101	160	0	160	0
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain	137	275	412	33%	833	1,244	87	1,331	55
Sweden	284	1,148	1,432	80%	363	1,796	68	1,863	45

Switzerland	31	331	362	25%	1,103	1,465	0	1,465	6
United Kingdom	166	827	993	52%	925	1,917	1,364	3,282	15
United States	46	233	279	1%	19,749	20,028	0	20,028	7
Total DAC Members	3,455	20,040	23,495	27%	62,566	86,061	12,738	98,803	504

Table 2 - Evolution of the EU Members States support to Gender Equality focused Aid

Aggregation of data from OECD report 2014 (data 2010-2011) and report 2013 (data 2011-2012)

	Sub-total Gender Equality focused Aid (mill USD)				Gender Equality aid in % of aid screened		
	Report 2013 *	Report 2014 **	Difference 2014-2013	% of difference	Report 2013 *	Report 2014 **	Difference 2014-2013
Austria	62	60	-2	-3%	16%	13%	-3%
Belgium	617	576	-41	-7%	57%	62%	+5%
Czech Republic	...	2	non relevant	non relevant	...	5%	non relevant
Denmark	725	769	+ 44	+6%	56%	55%	-1%
EU institutions	1,828	3,068	+1,240	+68%	17%	24%	+7%
Finland	426	359	-67	-16%	55%	52%	-3%
France	1,966	1,944	-22	-1%	34%	29%	-5%
Germany	4,213	4,586	373	+9%	47%	48%	+1%
Greece	86	79	-7	-8%	68%	80%	+12%
Ireland	183	170	-13	-7%	46%	45%	-1%
Italy	117	169	+ 52	+44%	31%	42%	+11%
Luxembourg	53	41	-12	-23%	39%	35%	-4%
Netherlands	694	1,222	+ 528	+76%	18%	35%	+17%
Portugal	42	59	+ 17	+40%	24%	37%	+13%
Spain	777	412	-365	-47%	30%	33%	+3%
Sweden	1,406	1,432	+26	+2%	82%	80%	-2%
United Kingdom	944	992	+ 48	+5%	46%	52%	+6%
Total EU MS	14,139	15,938	+ 1799	13%	42%	45%	3%
		15,940	<i>with new MS reporting</i>			43%	<i>with new MS reporting</i>

* OECD data 2010-2011 average

** OECD data 2011-2012 average

Table aggregated by the EU Commission with data from OECD reports.

Table 3 – Evolution of EU Member States Aid screened and not screened against gender equality

Comparison between data 2010-2011 and data 2011-2012 from OECD report 2013 and 2014

	Aid screened against gender equality		Aid not screened		Total allocable aid		% of aid NON screened against gender equality	
	Report 2013	Report 2014	Report 2013	Report 2014	Report 2013	Report 2014	Report 2013	Report 2014
Austria	387	453	2	2	389	455	1%	0.4%
Belgium	1,078	925	94	108	1,172	1,033	8%	10.5%
Czech Republic		47		1		50		2%
Denmark	1,295	1,405	0	0	1,295	1,405	0%	0%
EU institutions	10,812	12,710	28	6,815	10,840	19,525	0.3%	35%
Finland	780	693	0	0	780	694	0%	0%
France	5,834	6,719	351	488	6,185	7,208	6%	7%
Germany	8,874	9,636	1,289	1,410	10,163	11,047	13%	13%
Greece	126	99	0	0	126	99	0%	0%
Ireland	396	379	0	0	396	380	0%	0%
Italy	377	402	138	70	515	472	27%	15%
Luxembourg	137	117	47	69	184	186	26%	37%
Netherlands	3,940	3,479	0	0	3,940	3,479	0%	0%
Portugal	179	160	13	0	192	160	7%	0%
Spain	777	1,244	81	87	2,699	1,331	3%	7%
Sweden	1,406	1,796	25	68	1,732	1,863	1%	4%
United Kingdom	944	1,917	1,312	1,364	3,348	3,282	39%	42%
Total DAC Members	37,342	42,134	3,380	10,481	43,956	52,619	8%	20%

Report 2014

Country > 10% aid non screened	UK, EU, Italy, Germany, Luxembourg, Belgium	6 countries
Country < 10% aid non screened	Czech Republic, Austria, Spain, Sweden, France	5 countries
Country 100% aid screened	Denmark, Finland, Greece, Ireland, Netherlands, Portugal	6 countries

The best available common benchmark too measure financial contributions to Gender Equality & Women's Empowerment (GEWE) by EU Member States is the OECD DAC Gender Marker. Nonetheless, caution should be exercised: it does not include multilateral aid, general budget support, debt relief and emergencies. In addition, as reported by the EU Delegations, the application by Member States of the Gender Marker can vary greatly.

*Bearing these limitations in mind, the marker can still provide an indication of the extent to which Member States address gender equality through their development aid. Some donors, such as **Denmark**, have found ways to track the exact amount that they spend on GEWE per fiscal year through both bilateral and multilateral aid whilst others struggle to find the right methods and tools to track financial investment in mainstreaming.*

The DAC Marker's application and interpretation do remain a concern. For this reason, training needs continue to be addressed wherever possible. For example, in April 2014 a session of the Member States Gender Expert Meeting focussed on the G-Marker and how to ensure unified reporting and accurate findings.

Financial Resources

Though the pace is slower than anticipated and much improvement remains to be made, the figures point to some positive trends on GEWE financing and on the use of the G-Marker.

1. The **first finding** is that there is a significant increase in the amount of aid by EU Members States⁶ and by EU institutions which is focused on promoting gender equality. The figure has increased by 13%⁷ between 2010-11 and 2011-12⁸. The amount of all aid projects scoring G-1 or G-2 when using the Gender Marker rose. However, huge discrepancies can be found between Members States, with three major groups emerging:

- Countries that have made an outstanding effort to increase their gender equality focus; **The Netherlands** (+76%), **EU** (+68%), **Italy** (+44%) and **Portugal** (+40%).
- Countries that have increased their gender equality focus: **Germany** (+9%), **Denmark** (+6%), **United Kingdom** (+5%) and **Sweden** (+2%).
- Countries that have experienced a decrease, some slight (**France, Austria, Belgium, Ireland** and **Greece**) and others significant (**Finland, Luxembourg** and **Spain**). Reasons for a decrease might lie in a stricter or less flexible application of the G-marker, and/or in the difficult economic context. **Spain** is a paradoxical example with, on the one hand, a major decrease in its amount of gender equality focused aid (-47%), most likely due to austerity measures, and on the other hand a slight increase (+3%) in the proportion of gender equality focussed aid.

2. The second finding is that the proportion of aid projects scoring G-1 or G-2 out of the total amount of aid screened has increased a little, by 3% for Member States and the EU. Again, such slow progress might be explained by a better understanding of the G-Marker and how to apply it. However, some countries have shown significant improvements in their share of gender equality focused aid; **The Netherlands** (+17%), **Portugal** (+13%), **Greece** (+12%), **Italy** (+11%), **EU institutions** (+7%) and the **United Kingdom** (+6%). Others have improved more slowly or even diminished; **Belgium** (+5%), **Spain** (+3%), **Germany** (+1%), **Denmark** (-1%), **Ireland** (-1%), **Sweden** (-2%), **Finland** (-3%), **Austria** (-3%), **Luxembourg** (-4%) and **France** (-5%).

⁶ data available from 16 countries

⁷ + 1799 million USD

⁸ OECD reports 2013 and 2014 respectively

A number of countries have maintained or even improved efforts within a challenging economic context. Some countries that faced a major decrease in their aid budget have nevertheless improved the proportion of aid that is gender focussed (**Greece, Italy, Portugal and Spain**).

3. The third finding is a contrast between the share of aid screened and its share of gender focussed aid. Positively, the amount of aid screened for gender focus rose by 14%⁹. Greater efforts have been made to better evaluate the gender sensitivity of aid by the Union and its **Member States**. However, the amount of aid not screened drastically rose by 210 %¹⁰. This is mainly explained by the increase in total attributable aid¹¹ which has not been followed at the same pace by an increase in gender screening. In 2014, the percentage of aid not screened is 20% against 8% in 2013. There is a discrepancy here between Member States and the EU. The “0% cluster” - those member states that check all aid against gender equality - is composed of **Denmark, Greece, Ireland, the Netherlands** (2013 and 2014) and **Portugal** (2014). Those close to 0% are **Austria** (0.4%), **Czech Republic** (2%), **Sweden** (4%), **France** and **Spain** (7%). **Belgium, Germany and Italy** are above 10% of unscreened aid, and the **EU and Luxembourg** above 35%.

The EU

The amount of gender equality focused aid has impressively risen by 68%, reaching 3,068 million USD, with a significant increase in projects scoring G-1 and G-2. But this increase appears more relative - even if positive - in terms of percentage increase (+ 7 %) of the share of all EU screened aid between 2013 and 2014. An explanation is the increase of EU screened aid (nearly + 2 000 million USD). On the other hand, the high share of EU aid which is not screened against gender equality (35%) in 2014 is in stark comparison with the 2013 figure of 0.3%. This is very likely due to the significant increase in total EU attributable aid (nearly + 9,000 million USD between 2013 and 2014), making screening a huge task.

Tracking Resources and Exchanging Experience

The majority of EU Member States consider the OECD DAC Gender Equality Policy Marker as one of their main means of identifying, tracking and exchanging information on financial resources for GEWE. The G-Marker is viewed by many as essential to ensure transparency and accountability.

All countries identify specific resources for GEWE. However, as previously mentioned, this is not coherently done across Member States. In particular, variations occur surrounding the level of funding to support GEWE activities, the channels and instruments (bilateral / multilateral), the line ministries involved and how the marker is interpreted. **Sweden**, for example, has identified women and girls as a “special target group” in the government’s Bill of Appropriations for 2013, which has increased identification of GEWE funding for the next years. Whilst some countries do not have earmarked budgets allocated to gender but an obligation to mainstream gender throughout their work.

In **Germany**, the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ)'s new Policy on Gender Equality emphasises the need for reliable and transparent development financing mechanisms for gender equality. **Finland** is developing a database and information systems on development cooperation and gender equality related information, including funding. The **United Kingdom** published the results of its “Strategic Vision for Women and Girls” in two annual reports (2012, 2013) and a third one is under preparation. **Hungary** also contributes to the Transparency Index of the Publish What You Fund.

⁹ + 4,792 million USD for a total of 42,181 million USD

¹⁰ 10,482 million USD in 2014 OECD report against 3,380 million USD in 2013

¹¹ 52,669 million USD, + 20 %

Member States reports on the exchange of information on financial reporting are generally poor and lacking in detail. It is difficult to establish the cause of the weak reporting. It may be is a lack of channels for lesson sharing, be it formal or informal, or a lack of consideration. **Austria** mentions the EU coordination meetings in Brussels and at the UN headquarters as good opportunities for such exchange to happen, as are GENDERNET and EVALNET according to **Spain**.

Indicator 2b.3.1 By 2015, all EU Heads Of Missions receive gender equality training

Over two thirds of reporting Members States responded to this Indicator. In general, Member States are found to be integrating gender training for their staff in a more systematic way than in the past, but not all. It is difficult to gather how far off we are from the 2015 target set by the indicator. Many systematically offer gender training to newly appointed staff. Many Member States report in detail on their whole gender training approach, rather than limit it to Heads of Mission. Member States are at various stages and intensity of training, ranging from basic noncompulsory gender training to a more comprehensive approach to building staff capacity and knowledge on GEWE.

Some Member States such as **Latvia** are committed to organise online gender courses. In **Croatia**, all Ambassador-to-be receive information on the National Action Plan on Gender Equality and those prepared for mandates in recipient ODA countries undergo further training in order for them to identify programmes and projects specifically targeted towards gender equality to be funded. In **Romania**, specific training on gender does not exist but HoMs are provided with information on gender equality. In **Slovenia**, gender perspectives are mainstreamed into existing training and the Policy Guidelines on GEWE in International Development Cooperation, currently under preparation, will aim to increase the gender knowledge and capacity building of the Slovenian Ministry of Foreign Affairs staff. In **The Netherlands**, gender training for *Heads of Mission* exists but is not compulsory and, in **Belgium**, it is not systematic but a Gender Task Force has been initiated to address the policy and organisational challenges.

The **UK** does not make gender training mandatory but it can be proposed to Heads of DFID country offices. Moreover, gender issues are mainstreamed in DFID's core training courses - including new staff induction training, programme management training, human rights courses and conflict and stabilisation courses. In parallel, DFID is developing training and guidance for all staff in compliance with the International Development (Gender Equality) Act 2014. In **Germany**, training on cross-cutting issues encompassing gender equality are organised for new staff and policy advisers, and additional gender-related trainings are proposed upon request

Austria and Spain have developed a comprehensive policy towards gender equality training.

In the **Austrian** Ministry of Foreign Affairs), a session on gender mainstreaming and women's rights is included in the compulsory basic training for newcomers. New heads of cooperation offices are briefed on the Austrian Development Cooperation's (ADC) policy for GEWE and on the EU Gender Action Plan. The internal ADC strategy includes mandatory basic and specific gender training for all employees. Practical tools will be developed for the more systematic integration of gender dimensions into the ADC thematic focus (water and sanitation, energy...).

Spain offers both compulsory gender training for new civil servant and staff working abroad, and regular courses on gender in development for technical staff. Scholarships are proposed for Gender Focal Points in field offices; a Gender Experts Networks for field technical offices has been created; and gender instruments have been developed such as guidelines, checklists, etc.

France, a phased approach to gender equality training

In order to train its civil servants on gender equality, **France** developed a strategy leading up to 2017 to gradually achieve the objective of 100% trained staff dealing with implementation and monitoring of development actions. At the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the intention is to train 30% of employees at different hierarchical levels by 2014, 50% by 2015, 75% by 2016 and all staff by 2017. The French Development Agency validated the same approach in March 2014 by integrating gender equality into one of the 3 training axes on accountability. The objective is to have 90% of Heads of Projects and Managers trained by a European consortium of experts.

4.2.1 By 2015 all EU guidelines for Policy dialogue and sector/macro review include gender equality specific questions

Reporting by Member States is characterised by a lack of consistency, making it difficult to establish trends. Many Member States preferred to provide specific country examples on how and where they integrated gender in their sector/macro review and/or policy dialogue, but did not address the indicator directly.

A number of reporting Member States have integrated gender equality as an explicit priority in their policies and strategic documents. **Romania** has adopted the EU Commission guidelines for gender equality in its policy dialogue. In **Latvia**, gender equality has been included in the Strategy on Sustainable Development until 2030 and in the Public Health Strategy (2011 – 2017). The **Croatian** Law on Development Cooperation and External Humanitarian Aid and the National Strategy for Development Cooperation 2009 - 2014 clearly states the need for gender equality within planning and implementing development and humanitarian programmes and projects. Furthermore, all ODA programmes and projects implemented by inline Ministries and institutions strive to achieve gender equality as a cross-cutting issue. Gender equality is a regular topic on political agendas and discussions for Finland as well as at programme level for **Denmark**. The new Strategic Framework for Gender Equality, Rights and Diversity in Danish Development Cooperation, to be launched in August 2014, will reinforce the country's role as a strong advocate for gender equality - including sexual and reproductive rights of women and girls - in political dialogue at country level, with multilateral partners as well as in international negotiations. Gender analysis is integrated in all phases of political dialogue and programming in **Belgium**. In the **United Kingdom**, gender equality is a priority and central to the major Bilateral Aid Review and Multilateral Aid Review process and to the "Country Poverty Reduction Diagnostics". It is also regularly included in DFID's policy dialogue with bilateral and multilateral partners (including the EU institutions and other Member States). The new **German** Policy on Gender Equality applies a three pronged approach consisting of inclusion of GEWE matters in political dialogue, gender mainstreaming and specific actions to promote gender equality and women's rights.

Indicator 4.3.1 By 2013 all development projects are screened against their gender sensitiveness (quality insurance mechanisms)

Nearly all Member States that answered this indicator are equipped with formal and systematic processes for screening projects for gender sensitivity. Those that haven't yet are on track.

Croatia, Czech Republic, Latvia and **The Netherlands** reported that all of their projects are checked for gender sensitivity - **Latvia** at the activity, results and selection process, and **The Netherlands** through the Gender Marker. **Romania** reports that though this indicator is not fully implemented, projects are verified against the thematic and cross-cutting priorities included in the national strategy on development cooperation, in compliance with the UN and EU standards on gender equality. **Ireland** reported having clear criteria and appraisal standards on gender equality for the development of Country Strategy Papers (CSPs) and for grants to NGO partners.

For some Member States, gender is clearly articulated in the quality assurance procedures. In **Finland**, the standard model for presenting projects to the Quality Assurance Board requires that gender equality be assessed and addressed. DFID's Quality Assurance Unit (QAU) in the **United Kingdom** screens business cases against the agency compliance requirements and standards of best practice, containing a section on gender equality considerations. In **Austria**, the HQ gender expert is in charge of this task.

Decentralising gender expertise in Austria

The evaluation of the gender policy (2012) came to the conclusion that gender expertise needed to be “decentralised”. It was therefore agreed to transfer the responsibility for gender assessments to the coordination office level - instead of the HQ gender expert - in order to **increase ownership and accountability** on gender mainstreaming. This is accompanied by a series of trainings and the development of a practical toolkit to support the systematic integration of a gender perspective into policy dialogue and sector implementation (energy, water etc.).

In **Germany**, attention to gender equality is mandatory across the whole project cycle. It emphasizes the importance of gender-sensitive project management, including gender-sensitive project design, implementation, as well as monitoring and evaluation. Moreover, the application of the gender policy marker is obligatory for **Germany's** implementing agencies.

The Gender Budget Scan in Belgium

The Gender Budget Scan is designed to forecast expenses according of their estimated impact on women and men. It allows for monitoring during implementation and evaluation. As a result, of all the programmes engaged in 2013, 94% took gender into account. The Gender Budget Scan distinguishes between ‘gender neutral’, ‘gender sensitive’, ‘gender specific’ and ‘supporting gender machinery’ activities. Distribution of the funds is clearly colour coded in project and programme budgets.

For **Denmark**, gender equality issues are addressed both as an aspect of sector programme support as well as the subject of special programmes through targeted interventions. Danida's Gender Equality Policy mandates mainstreaming as well as special programmes/interventions as mutually supportive approaches for achieving the goal of gender equality.

The Gender Equality Rolling Plan (GERP) in Denmark

A Gender Equality Rolling Plan (GERP) is compulsory for every new sector and thematic programme. Its main objective is to (i) identify and provide a reference guide to gender equality issues (at international, national and sector level); (ii) specify how gender equality will be addressed in specific sectors or thematic programmes, and (iii) identify indicators to facilitate monitoring/evaluation of these programmes in terms of gender.

The GERP has usefully informed policy dialogue between partner countries and embassies/representations and has specified preparatory gender analysis to be undertaken if not already available. Finally, it provides an overview of the non-governmental stakeholders promoting gender equality and gender donor harmonisation. At the operational level the GERP outlines the specific strategy for ensuring that women participate and benefit from the planned interventions by identifying the purpose and specific activities to be included in the programme design. Finally it identifies indicators to monitor the implementation of the identified activities.

In **Spain**, gender mainstreaming, and therefore the inclusion of gender indicators and gender as a transversal priority is mandatory for Spanish Cooperation. Several instruments have been developed in order to achieve this. In **Sweden**, SIDA has a digital management system for preparation, follow-up and completion of contributions. At the

stage of initial appraisal, there is an obligatory question on the possible effects of the intervention on gender relations. At the level of in-depth appraisal there is a further obligatory question on whether gender analysis and integration of gender issues has been undertaken. For multilateral organisations, **Sweden** screens for GEWE in planning documents and implementation reports ahead of the establishment of levels of core support and participation in Board meetings, bilateral dialogue and other meetings.

Indicator 4.4 By 2013 at least 75% of all new proposals score G-2 (gender as a principle objective), or G-1 (gender as a significant objective)

Despite a continuous and accelerated improvement, the objective of 75% of all news proposals scoring G-1 or G-2 in 2013 is far from being met by most reporting Member States and for the EU institutions. This illustrates the necessity to continue to deploy efforts on the GAP and gender equality, articulated around realistic time-bound objectives with intermediary steps, as illustrated by France's strategy to 2017 for gender equality training (see indicator 2b3.1).

	Gender Equality aid in % of aid screened			Gender Equality aid in % of total allocable aid		
	Report 2013 *	Report 2014 **	Difference 2014-2013	Report 2013 *	Report 2014 **	Difference 2014-2013
Austria	16%	13%	-3%	16%	13%	-3%
Belgium	57%	62%	+5%	53%	56%	+3%
Czech Republic	...	5%	non relevant	...	4%	non relevant
Denmark	56%	55%	-1%	56%	55%	-1%
EU institutions	17%	24%	+7%	17%	16%	-1%
Finland	55%	52%	-3%	55%	52%	-3%
France	34%	29%	-5%	32%	27%	-5%
Germany	47%	48%	+1%	41%	42%	+1%
Greece	68%	80%	+12%	68%	80%	+12%
Ireland	46%	45%	-1%	46%	45%	-1%
Italy	31%	42%	+11%	23%	36%	+13%
Luxembourg	39%	35%	-4%	29%	22%	-7%
Netherlands	18%	35%	+17%	18%	35%	+17%
Portugal	24%	37%	+13%	22%	37%	+15%
Spain	30%	33%	+3%	29%	31%	+2%
Sweden	82%	80%	-2%	81%	77%	-4%
United Kingdom	46%	52%	+6%	28%	30%	+2%
Total EU MS	42%	45%	3%	32%	30%	-2%
		43%	<i>with new MS reporting</i>		30%	<i>with new MS reporting</i>

According to the table, **Greece** and **Sweden** are the only 2 countries having met and even reaching beyond the 75% objective, both in total of aid screened and in total of allocable aid, with an average of 80% of aid scoring G-1 or G-2. Under the cluster of countries within the margin 50% to 75% objective are **Belgium**, **Denmark**, **Finland** and **United Kingdom**. In the 25%-50% bracket are **France**, **Germany**, **Ireland**, **Italy**, **Netherlands**, **Portugal**, and **Spain**. Under 25% are **Austria** (13%) and the **EU** (24% of aid screened and 16% of total allocable aid).

This analysis should not discredit the slow but positive and constant improvement in percentage of gender equality aid (scoring G-1 or G-2 at G-Marker) out of all screened aid, with an average of + 3% for all Member States and EU institutions over 2013 to 2014. Ten countries witnessed an increase in their gender equality aid, ranging from + 1% to + 17%; the most noteworthy being **Italy** (+11%), **Greece** (+12%), **Portugal** (+13%) and **The Netherlands** (+17%).

Again, caution should be exercised when comparing figures. As mentioned before, a decrease in gender equality aid might be explained by a better and stricter application of the G-marker. An increase might be put into perspective

within a severe downturn in total aid. For the EU, the slow evolution is also explained by the major rise in aid budget, meaning that a noticeable effort has to be made to analyse all aid due to the rapid pace of increase. Finally, and as highlighted by **Germany**, the gender policy marker does not include funding for GEWE through multilateral channels.

The **United Kingdom** has disaggregated its data by G-scores by number of projects for UK spending and DFID spending. These tables show that in 2012:

- 38.8% of all UK project components were screened with the OECD gender marker;
- 19.0% of all UK project components were assigned a principal or significant gender marker;
- 99.9% of all DFID project components were screened;
- 47.4% of all DFID project components were assigned a principal or significant gender marker.

Indicator 5.1.1 By 2013 Gender is regularly on the agenda in EU annual dialogues (gender policy forum) with civil society in each country

All reporting Member States mentioned holding a dialogue with civil society on gender issues, even if it is not under an annual dialogue or a formal gender policy forum. As with Delegations, the regularity, quality and effectiveness of the dialogue are impossible to assess.

In **Romania**, gender issue has been introduced as a topical discussion by the Romanian MFA in their dialogue with civil society at national and international levels. **Slovenia** and the **Czech Republic** also support dialogue on gender issues with CSOs in partner countries and within MS, including through funding projects. In **Croatia**, the issue of gender equality is highly placed amongst themes discussed at the regional, national and international level. This is conducted through the meetings of the Inter-governmental Working Group on Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Aid, workshops, seminars and conferences organised by civil society organisations, side-events at major UN meeting, as well as through statements of high-level ranking officials. For **Belgium**, gender is not systematically on the agenda of dialogue with civil society but some specific events on this issue are organised. The **Lithuanian**, Ministry of Foreign Affairs initiated and sponsored the creation of an informal network, communicating via a specially created internet page.

Ireland and the Irish Consortium on Gender Based Violence (GBV)

Irish Aid is an active member of a consortium on GBV with the Irish Defence Forces and 11 Irish humanitarian, development and human rights NGOs. The overall aim of the Consortium is to build the capacity of members and to share learning on preventing and responding to gender based violence in international development and humanitarian contexts.

Germany and **Latvia** also engage with civil society on specific thematic issue, such as violence against women. **Spain** has organized specific seminars on gender issues with its civil society partners. An illustration is the March 2014 seminar that took place in Cartagena de Indias (Colombia) focusing on the promotion of gender equality and women's empowerment with local and Spanish women organisations, units for women's affairs within national governments and national equality mechanisms, gender focal points from AECID field offices and international organisations. **Sweden** developed a two pronged approach to gender and civil society. The Swedish cooperation agency (SIDA) contributes to the capacity-building of Swedish and international CSOs on gender equality by

making available to partners a range of gender tools and manuals. In the implementation of the Country Strategy for support to civil society in developing countries 2010-2014, SIDA maintains a continuous dialogue on gender equality and women's empowerment with these organisations.

Indicator 7.1.1 The EU positions on MDGs and Aid Effectiveness have a strong focus on GEWE

There is an absolute consensus between Member States about the necessity to support and promote jointly a strong international focus on gender equality and women empowerment as a priority in any position on MDGs, post-2015 agenda, the Sustainable Development Goals and all other issues linked to aid effectiveness.

Furthermore, many EU countries have pushed for a stand-alone goal on gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls during the discussions for the post-2015 agenda in the Open Working Group for Sustainable Development adding to the mainstreaming of gender specific targets and indicator across all goals in the post 2015 development framework. A gender stand-alone goal being proposed, this illustrates the success of the joint EU-position for negotiations at the UN level.

A number of EU Member States were actively involved in the 58th session of the Commission on the Status of Women (CSW): **Germany** was strongly involved in the EU negotiations and participated actively in expert panels and side events. **Slovenia** co-organised a side event in the margins of CSW, dedicated to addressing gender equality across the life course in the post-2015 framework. The **United Kingdom** deployed specific efforts in strengthening political will for increasing transparency and accountability in financing for gender equality and women's rights, through its former position as co-chair of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (GPEDC). **Belgium** has identified sexual and reproductive health and rights as a priority under its human rights approach. The country will focus its effort on access to health care through universal health care coverage and social security systems with autonomy for women.

Indicator 7.1.2 Continue partnering with the UN and the OECD/DAC on advancing gender equality and women's empowerment in the MDGs and aid effectiveness agenda

Member States are partnering in a number of ways and through a number of means with the UN and the OECD DAC. All reporting Member States appear to be strongly promoting the GEWE agenda in their interactions and partnerships with both sets of institutions.

Denmark, Romania and Slovenia reported their continuous effort to promote gender equality at every multilateral forum including the UN. **Belgium** collaborates with the Gendernet and takes part in meetings with the UN Inter Agency Network on Women and Gender Equality. **Latvia** has strongly supported the creation of UN Women, being on its Executive Board 2013-2015.

Ireland's multi-pronged approach

Ireland continues its support to UN Women as a member of the Executive Board and as a financial donor. Ireland co-chaired the OECD DAC Gender Network from 2012-13. Improving development effectiveness, including on gender equality, is a core priority for Dublin, notably through support to UNDP's work on Capacity Development for Aid Effectiveness. Ireland is also actively engaged as member of the Nordic+ group to advance Busan commitments at country level.

In **Austria**, all programmes and projects, including with the United Nations and the OECD/DAC, are required to make a contribution to gender equality. The country is one of the rare OECD countries to report to on Gender Indicator of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation. Austria has continued its support to UN Women and the OECD development centre for the development of the Social Institutions and Gender Index.

The **United Kingdom** has developed strong and comprehensive advocacy work with the UN in order to advance on GEWE in the international agenda. The UK reports having taken every opportunity to influence the outcomes of UN high level meetings and conferences on gender equality and girls and women's empowerment, be it with a leading role at the 58th Commission on the Status of Women, UN Human Rights Council annual-day on women's rights and Universal Periodic Review mechanisms, support to the work of UN mandated Special Representatives/Rapporteurs and the Expert Working Group on Laws and Practices that Discriminate Against Women, and through the constant reaffirmation of the major international agreements such as CEDAW and Beijing Platform for Action for Women.

UN Women remains an important strategic partner for **Germany**, contributing core and non-core resources and specific support to the UN Trust Fund to End Violence against Women and the Fund for Gender Equality. **Sweden** reports having increased its level of activity in the OECD and DAC with regards to gender equality and women's empowerment, by promoting policy coherence for GEWE over all OECD areas, participating in gender events and giving financial support to the OECD-wide study "Closing the Gender Gap". The country is an active member of OECD DAC Gendernet, with the SIDA Lead Specialist on Gender Equality elected as Gendernet chair from 2015.

Indicator 7.2.1 The EU supported interventions in all thematic programmes on Food Security, Education, Health and Climate Change include gender-sensitive indicators

As with the EU Delegations that reported on this indicator, there is an attempt amongst reporting Member States to ensure a gender sensitive approach to food security, education, health and climate change programmes but this doesn't necessarily translate into indicators that track the impact on women and girls.

At one end of the spectrum is **Denmark**, with gender sensitive indicators in all programmes under the listed sectors. Other Member States have a different approach or do not necessarily address the indicator issue. **Germany** and **Spain** have a two pronged approach, supporting both targeted interventions and gender mainstreaming across all programmes. **Germany** supports numerous gender-sensitive programmes under the listed sectors, such as in **Ethiopia** (sustainable land management works for small-scale farmers with a stress on women's access to innovative cultivation techniques, advisory services, information and skills) or **Kenya** (improvement of the national health system with a focus on training healthcare providers to respond to the needs of women and young people affected by violence). **Spain** developed a similar approach with gender equality issues included under rural development (including food security), education, health and climate change, as well as a gender mainstreaming checklist for all the projects implemented in these areas. Gender is also a cross-cutting issue in the sector strategies on education, fight against poverty, health and environmental sustainability. **Finland** has a special programme and fund on gender and climate change. Food security policy also has a strong emphasis on gender. Education and health have gender related objectives and are monitored against gender disaggregated data.

Others Member States report that the focus is not necessarily on indicators, but instead on gender mainstreaming and some focus on very specific targeted projects. Whether such approaches translate into indicators is unclear. **Croatia** has identified the health and education sectors, primarily targeted towards women and girls, as key sectors in its development cooperation programme. In Afghanistan, for instance, it is funding the Midwife Training Centre and a secondary school. It also supports women economic empowerment strengthening of women's small and medium entrepreneurship in the field of carpet weaving. **Lithuania** supports projects on gender and the specific issue of democracy, in Belarus on women's rights and women's social integration, in Ukraine on women's participation in political and social life and empowering disabled women.

The **Netherlands** aims to mainstream GEWE across the focus areas of development policy (food-security, water, health, security and the rule of law) and prioritises education and sexual and reproductive health and rights. Gender-responsiveness and women's meaningful participation and leadership are cornerstones of the Dutch climate policy. In addition, the country aims to mainstream GEWE across private sector development (PSD), focusing on women

entrepreneurship and more decent jobs for women, such as Syrian women's refugee access to economic opportunities (UN Women) and the "Women, business and the law project" of the World Bank Group.

The Dutch Good Growth Fund – a focus on women in private sector development

The new Dutch Good Growth Fund that finances international projects in upcoming markets in **Africa, Latin America** and **Asia** will start in 2014. This revolving fund has a budget of 750 million Euros and pays special attention to women and women-owned small and medium enterprises. All proposals for financing from the fund are reviewed from a gender perspective and monitoring and evaluation is gender-sensitive.

Indicator 9.2 Continuous EU support for capacity building on SCR 1325 and 1820 in fragile states increases annually. This level of support will be annually monitored and reported on

Reporting on this indicator was very detailed and comprehensive, indicating a special attention by Member States to women, peace and security issues and violence against women in and after conflicts in fragile states. A majority of Member States have developed specific cooperation strategies to support programmes and activities in line with UNSCR 1325 and 1820. Others have also developed clear National Action Plans (NAPs) and monitoring frameworks.

A number of Member States reported on specific projects that support the aims on UNSCRs 1325 and 1820. **Belgium** has a thematic and country focus action to support the UNSCR 1325, through projects on women's participation and fighting violence against women in Mali, Burundi, DRC and OPTs and women's access to justice in DRC. **Croatia** just started a pilot project to enhance the role of women in peacebuilding in Myanmar, and has a gender advisor to mentor Afghan female military and police (since April 2014). **Hungary** and **Lithuania** are supporting projects for women and children through the Provincial Reconstruction Teams - Female Engagement Teams - in Afghanistan. The **Czech Republic** supports projects in South Sudan, Yemen and DRC. **Romania** provides training on gender to its national staff involved in capacity-building missions in fragile states. The **Italian** cooperation is developing the Afghan National Development Strategy which, among other actions, analyses the main problems affecting Afghan women and sets out policies, outcomes and benchmarks for measuring progress. **Slovenia** has been active in NATO, OSCE and the Council of Europe on the issue of women, peace and security. This was the main topic of several events by the country. **Slovenia** also has specific projects in Afghanistan and Montenegro to support capacity building on UNSCRs 1325 and 1820.

A core cluster of countries (**Austria, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Netherlands, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden**, and the **United Kingdom**) report having adopted National Action Plans on Women Peace and Security, dedicated to the implementation of the UNSCRs both internally and through their international humanitarian and development cooperation, and accompanied by monitoring mechanisms. All provided details, but unfortunately it is impossible to reflect them all here. Only a small selection can be included in this report.

National Action Plans:

- Through the second NAP 2012-2016 **Finland** supports both politically and financially several UNSCR 1325 related activities (Afghanistan, Kosovo and Nepal), including a joint UN action on sexual violence in conflict.
- **France's** NAP is articulated around 2 axes: women's participation in conflict resolution and the protection of women in conflict situations.
- In **Sweden**, the NAP is implemented by six different agencies (SIDA, the Folke Bernadotte Academy, the Armed Forces, the Police, the Prison and Probation Service, and the Civil Contingencies Agency) achieving a great number of actions for the implementation of UNSCRs 1325 and 1820. On humanitarian aid, Sweden

has taken a strategic decision to only fund Consolidated Appeal Processes (CAPs) that include objectives that give specific attention to gender equality and women's situation and empowerment.

The UK Approach

- In its NAP 2014-2017, the **United Kingdom** adopted a comprehensive approach to women, peace and security through development cooperation and other external assistance. UK development assistance contributes directly to the implementing of UNSCRs 1325 and 1820, improving women's security, access to justice and political participation, and preventing violence against girls and women, including in conflict situations.
- The UK is playing a leading role in global efforts to tackle violence against women and girls, protect them in emergencies and prevent sexual violence.
- DFID continues to scale up its violence against women and girls work, with targeted programmes in over 20 countries, as well as violence against women and girls mainstreamed in sector programmes.
- The UK is investing €31.2 M over five years (2013-2018) in a pioneering violence against women and girls research and innovation fund 'What works to prevent violence'. This will drive innovation, generate ground-breaking new evidence, and support new prevention programmes on the ground.

Austria's NAP includes dedicated support to projects and programmes in conflict and post-conflict situations and in line with the UNSCRs. For example, Austria is active in Egypt, Mali, Nigeria and South Sudan through funding to Oxfam's Gender Justice Programme "Amplifying the Voices of Women and Building Agency for Addressing Sexual and Gender Based Violence in Conflict Situations".

Spanish-Dutch cooperation on gender capacity in defence missions

At the end of 2010, the Spanish and Dutch Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Defence agreed to collaborate on enhancing operational effectiveness by creating civilian and military gender capacity and expertise in international missions. They did so through practical and scenario-based training. This responds to an increasing international demand for such expertise in CSDP, NATO and UN missions.

3. Lesson Learnt and Recommendations

The GAP progress report for 2013/14 comes at an interesting time for the EU and its Member States. Over the course of 2014/15, the Commission services and the EEAS, in coordination with Member States, will be working on designing a successor to the GAP, as required by the Council Conclusions in May 2014.

Findings, of relevance to a future instrument to improve gender mainstreaming across EU development cooperation, are already being identified through the 2014 GAP progress report. These come out through recurring messages and common difficulties and challenges, as expressed in Commission's reports. They are summarised below.

Mainstreaming at all stages of programme and project cycle management:

Strong and robust gender analysis is a prerequisite to informed, relevant and effective programming that is better able to deliver results for both men and women and to promote gender equality. The GAP report 2014 points to insufficient inclusion of gender analysis in EUD decision-making and in programming processes (ref: indicator 3.4.1, 3.4.2. and 3.4.3.).

The EU Delegations, in particular, reiterate the message that, though compliance at design stage (e.g. indicators, gender country profiles, Quality Assurance checklists etc.) is important, it is not sufficient and cannot be in isolation of follow up, monitoring and evaluation. Screening is clearly viewed as essential, but as a first step only and not as the means of achieving programmatic change, when in abstract of other processes. At evaluation stage, the message is similar. For example ROMs, though potentially powerful mechanisms to inform and strengthen programming, are found to lack in gender analysis and in follow-up even where required. Approaching such tools as a “tick box” exercise limits their potential. Some Delegations request *“a more rigorous approach by Headquarters when assessing project/programme fiches in relation to gender equality issues”*.

This message from EUDs is fundamental in terms of both i) transparency and accountability of EU aid and ii) programme effectiveness and results for women and girls. It also points to the fact that the GAP cannot be taken in isolation of other core procedural elements of Union's development cooperation, such as the QSG, ROM, NIPs and MIPs programming, EC Results framework and more.

To note, and of interest, is the fact that the GAP itself is not set up to track commitments expressed from one year over to another (e.g. where EUDs have not delivered on an indicator but foresee doing so in the future).

Therefore, a future GAP will need to do more in terms of tracking where analysis has had an impact on programme design and monitoring, but importantly will also need to fully integrate itself with other relevant procedures, to ensure the necessary follow up and to improve accountability. It will need to consider how to, on the one hand incentivise follow-through and, on the other hand, hold those responsible for programmes accountable to the relevant findings and commitments on gender mainstreaming.

Gender Mainstreaming and Human Rights:

Protecting, promoting and ensuring the respect of Human Rights is fundamental to ensuring gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls. Human Rights can often be an entry point for dialogue and action. In promoting the close links between Human Rights and gender equality and the empowerment of women, it is important to also retain a standalone approach to gender mainstreaming.

In future, a successor to the GAP may need to consider how to delink Human Rights and Gender Equality in terms of i) reporting, ii) training, iii) political dialogue and iv) programming, whilst recognising that country context needs to inform the appropriate entry point for gender equality work. Ensuring that in the long term gender is addressed through human rights, but also within issues such as trade, macroeconomic policy, power relations, social norms and other sector specific issues (e.g. private sector development, agriculture, energy...) will be important for the new action plan.

This will require building the capacity of staff to better understand how gender equality and women's empowerment relates to other areas and ways of working, and how supporting these issues can happen over and beyond thematic programmes on Human Rights.

Sectors that can make a transformational difference vs. gender equality mainstreaming:

Responses, actions and strategies reported on in indicators 8.1.2, 8.2, 8.3, 91.1 and 9.2 focus in the vast majority on violence against women and girls (VaWG). There is little mention of other forms of discrimination against, e.g. no access to resources, to land ownership, limited inheritance rights, limited role in decision making processes, etc.

It is certainly commendable that there is such a strong operational and policy focus on tackling VaWG: keeping up such efforts is fundamental to ensuring that women and girls can live free from violence and abuse. What is telling in

the current GAP reporting is that EUDs find it more straightforward to report on VaWG than on other types of discrimination. This is probably due to the fact that VaWG is often higher profile and visible at a national level, though obviously very hard to measure and hidden at the individual level. This tells us that current EC instruments may be best placed to tackle gender through sector / issue approaches (such as VaWG / FGM / Girl's education) but less so on the "harder to measure" issues such as changes in social norms and the enabling environment.

For a future GAP instrument, this might mean pushing those sectors where the EC is well placed to implement programmes that can have long term transformational effects on gender equality (e.g. girls' education) whilst providing messages and guidance on the interaction with other forms of discrimination and their role in perpetuating a society that undervalues women and girls, and how these might need to be tackled. It will also mean supporting efforts to work on gender equality out with the more traditional sectors and to understand for example the role of gender in private sector development, climate change, public funding management etc.

DAC Gender Marker - its importance and relevance:

The DAC gender marker is an instrument of fundamental importance to donors such as the EU and Member States to track their spending on gender mainstreaming. It remains imperfect, and recurrent concerns are raised, however it offers great potential if used coherently and systematically across EU members. Tracking finance is key to improving effectiveness, and of course transparency and accountability. It is a challenge faced by many Member States and by the Commission.

A future GAP-like instrument will need to retain the Gender Marker, but consider how to improve its tracking, use and understanding. Moreover, sharing learning on tools used by Member States to track their spending and the compliance implications would be helpful.

When, how often and how to report on gender mainstreaming

How to report on gender mainstreaming effectively and without it being too laborious or onerous for those concerned is an issue. There is a strong desire to streamline reporting and procedures, combined with a need to retain the right level of detail and quality. Especially the political level reporting is confused and not harmonised.

A new action plan will need to consider this issue carefully, both in terms of timing and regularity. Some suggestions have included aligning it in some way with the External Action Management Report (EAMR) already ongoing for the Commission. Others propose that a more guided template for the GAP is what is needed. Expectations and methodology for the next reporting tool must be set out to ensure consistency.

A baseline for a new GAP-like instrument

A number of challenges exist to assessing the degree of progress from one GAP to another. A number of these lie in the indicators themselves, the lack of baseline and the lack of guidance on tracking and reporting.

The GAP successor could potentially start on a sounder and more robust footing than its predecessor. Indeed, the information accumulated over the 5 years of the 2010-15 GAP reporting could be analysed and quality assured, and where deemed robust enough used to develop a baseline of gender mainstreaming in the EC. This does not mean that the same indicators should be used year on year; however a data mining exercise could inform the development of a baseline (at country or institutional level).

Leadership & Incentives

The EUDs reports clarify that where change is really occurring, it's because of management and political leadership at the level of Delegation and Headquarters' middle- and top-management.

The EU has clear and strong commitments on GEWE, however the slow progress on the GAP in some countries, sectors or Member States may reflect a lack of ownership and commitment at the middle management level, combined with a lack of understanding about its implications and know-how on its implementation.

Setting out a clear vision for GEWE and what is sought to be achieved concretely (e.g. through the results framework, post 2015 agenda, sector programmes, political dialogue) might help improve the incentives, understanding and leadership needed for institutional change in the longer term. The new GAP may wish to consider a narrative that clearly states this and consider high level leadership to raise its profile.

Annex 1: GAP Report 2014 from EU Delegations

Afghanistan	YES	Colombia	YES
Albania	YES	Comoros	YES
Algeria	YES	Costa Rica	NO
Angola	YES	Cuba	NO
Argentina	NO	Democratic Republic of Congo	YES
Armenia	YES	Djibouti	YES
Azerbaijan	YES	Dominican Republic	YES
Bangladesh	YES	Ecuador	YES
Barbados	YES	Egypt	YES
Belarus	YES	Eritrea	NO
Belize	YES	Ethiopia	YES
Benin	YES	Fiji (EUD for the Pacific) ¹²	YES
Bhutan	NO	Gabon	NO
Bolivia	YES	Gambia	NO
Bosnia and Herzegovina	NO	Georgia	YES
Botswana	YES	Ghana	YES
Brazil	YES	Guatemala	YES
Burkina Faso	YES	Guinea-Bissau	YES
Burundi	YES	Guinea (Conakry)	YES
Cambodia	YES	Guyana	YES
Cameroon	NO	Haiti	NO
Cape Verde	YES	Honduras	YES
Central African Republic	NO	India	YES

¹² Fiji EUD covers 11 countries and 3 Overseas Countries and Territories: Fiji, Tonga, Kiribati, Samoa, Tuvalu, Niue, Nauru, Cook Islands, RMI, FSM, Palau, as well as the Pacific OCTs: New Caledonia, French Polynesia, Wallis et Futuna and Pitcairn.

Chad	YES	Indonesia	NO
Chile	NO	Iraq	YES
China	YES	Israel	NO
Ivory Coast	YES	Niger	NO
Jamaica	YES	Nigeria	NO
Jordan	YES	occupied Palestinian territory	YES
Kazakhstan - Astana	YES	Pakistan	YES
Kenya	YES	Panama	NO
Korea (Republic of)	NO	Papua New Guinea	NO
Kosovo	YES	Paraguay	YES
Kyrgyz Republic	YES	Peru	YES
Lao PDR	YES	Philippines	YES
Lebanon	YES	Republic of Congo	NO
Lesotho	NO	Rwanda	YES
Liberia	YES	Salvador	YES
Madagascar	NO	Seychelles	YES
Malawi	YES	Senegal	YES
Malaysia	YES	Sierra Leone	YES
Maldives	YES	Solomon Islands	NO
Mali	NO	Somalia	YES
Mauritania	NO	South Africa	YES
Mauritius	YES	South Sudan	NO
Mexico	NO	Sri Lanka	YES
Moldova	YES	Sudan	YES
Morocco	YES	Suriname	NO
Mozambique	YES	Syria	NO

Myanmar	YES	Swaziland	NO
Namibia	YES	Tajikistan	YES
Nepal	NO	Tanzania	YES
Nicaragua	YES	Thailand	YES
Timor-Leste	YES	Uruguay	NO
Togo	NO	Vanuatu	NO
Trinidad and Tobago	NO	Venezuela	NO
Tunisia	YES	Vietnam	YES
Turkey	NO	Yemen	YES
Uganda	YES	Zambia	YES
Ukraine	YES	Zimbabwe	YES

Annex 2: 2014 GAP Reporting from Member States (Capital level)

Austria	YES	Italy	YES
Belgium	YES	Latvia	YES
Bulgaria	NO	Lithuania	YES
Croatia	YES	Luxembourg	NO
Cyprus	NO	Malta	NO
Czech Republic	YES	The Netherlands	YES
Denmark	YES	Poland	NO
Estonia	NO	Portugal	NO
Finland	YES	Romania	YES
France	YES	Slovakia	YES
Germany	YES	Slovenia	YES
Greece	NO	Spain	YES
Hungary	YES	Sweden	YES
Ireland	YES	United Kingdom	YES