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Summary

Conclusions

To what extent has Norway contributed to development results for women’s rights and gender equality in selected partner countries?

Reporting on WRGE has increased in the reports from the Embassies. However, the reporting format does not allow for the Team to answer “to what extent” this has happened. The findings are rather similar to earlier reports and the findings in the Evaluation of 2005.

To what extent has Norway changed its political priorities so women’s rights and gender equality have a central place in political dialogue and initiatives?

The Evaluation of 2005 documented that WRGE was high on the political agenda. There is a continued high Norwegian WRGE visibility in the external arena, and Norway has a reputation for being one of the drivers of WRGE in global and multilateral meetings. It has been difficult for the Review Team to assess WRGE’s place in policy dialogue with partner countries and at the country level. Norway no longer has annual country meetings with written mandates and minutes. In several countries Norway engages in Joint Assessment Strategies where the main policy dialogue with the partner country seems to be related to General Budget Support, and where WRGE is not a prominent topic, although it is included in the policy markers. In general it should be said that there is less visibility of WRGE’s work in Norway and in bilateral aid than in multilateral meetings and arenas.

Has Norway increased its relative funding to projects and programmes supporting women’s rights and gender equality?

The 2007 and 2008 statistics show an increase in relative funding to programmes and projects, part of which is due to changes in the statistical registration system. The marker on gender as a main objective showed a stagnation from 2007 to 2008, but the overall relative use of the gender marker increased from 20% in 2005 to 30% in 2008. This is however still a relatively low score. However, one should consider that the score on the gender marker depends greatly on the composition of aid. Governance and human development generally score high on the gender marker, while other sectors such as infrastructure, energy, etc., score low. This should encourage even stronger work on gender mainstreaming in these important sectors of development cooperation.

Has Norway increased gender mainstreaming in its development cooperation?

The Evaluation of 2005 pointed to the fact that gender mainstreaming was the main challenge for the MFA and Norad. This challenge remains, and evidence of gender mainstreaming is weak. This is clearly the weakest part of the WRGE work, and both the MFA and Norad admit that this is a subject/topic that they have not worked on consistently. The Gender budget line was designed to support the implementation of the GEAP, but the guidelines mainly focus on women targeting projects and programmes, and not on promoting gender mainstreaming in an innovative and catalytic way. Guidelines and management systems for the gender budget line will be revised spring 2009, and should take this into consideration. The Team also believes there is still substantial under-reporting of good gender mainstreaming. The MFA and Norad therefore need to look at reporting formats to better cover the substantial good work that has been done.

Has Norway improved the organisation of its development cooperation, to ensure the necessary capacity, competence and governance in its work on women’s rights and gender equality?

The GEAP was never operationalised into annual plans and reports, even if this was stated explicitly in the GEAP itself. The Evaluation of 2005 documented a weak administrative capacity, lack of staff, and weak training efforts, as well as weak planning and reporting systems for WRGE. The staffing has been strengthened; there are more gender advisers, and small teams of gender advisers in FLID and in GIL. However, we agree with the findings of the latest OECD/DAC peer review (OECD/DAC 2003) that staffing is still weak and thinly spread in the organisation. Training has not found a relevant form to
attract staff, and governance systems are still weak when it comes to holding the system accountable for reporting on implementation of the GEAP and results of WRGE work.

General recommendations

The review team believes that the implementation of the GEAP is in a critical phase. The GEAP document itself is a good and relevant document, but lacks an annual planning and reporting systems, line of accountabilities, etc. The development cooperation system, i.e. the MFA, the embassies and Norad, is advised to act on this information and turn/make the GEAP into a working document, and ‘make the action plan come into life’.

Our recommendations focus on a few factors that we strongly advise action on and that we are confident will give results for the commitments made in the GEAP.

Recommendation 1: Establish an operative management system for the GEAP at the political and administrative leadership levels

The MFA is advised to establish a GEAP project with clear roles and mandate for MFA and Norad gender units and other departments. The MFA is also advised to designate a management system for the Action Plan, and make use of available advisory capacity in Norad for such a system.

Recommendations 2: Improve the quality of the gender work and report on results

The team recognises the importance of tracking resources for WRGE, both in donors’ aid budgets, and in partner country budgeting through gender budget principles. The team however recommends that the focus on financing and volume be supplemented with a much stronger focus on improving the quality of WRGE aid and report on the result.

Closely related to this is a general recommendation of investing in more and better knowledge production, also at ‘home’. Knowledge production that is relevant for WRGE work covers a broad spectrum, not only analysis of development cooperation and programming, but also better understanding of the dynamics of change and local and national barriers to WRGE. Creating more synergy between multilateral aid and knowledge production and bilateral ones is important.

Recommendations 3: GEAP 2007-2009, there may be a need to adjust, and further operationalise the GEAP, rather than the new GEAP?

The GEAP has been in operation for two years, and is valid until the end of 2009. This MTR has pointed out several weaknesses in the operationalisation of the plan and in its management and reporting systems. Rather than start to work on a new action plan or strategy, the MFA should consider if a better alternative is to make adjustments in the plan and prolong its life to put the necessary measures in place, and therefore postpone the evaluation to a date later than the end of 2009. In the longer term the MFA needs to discuss on a principle level what kind of policy documents it should rely upon. The usual number of policy documents on WRGE is for an organisation to have a Gender Policy as an overarching policy goal, to have a Gender Strategy to instruct its staff on how to go about WRGE work, and a time-bound Action Plan to put certain measures in place and achieve planned results and give the organisation a boost in its work in WRGE.

Conclusions and recommendations for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA)

Recommendations M1: Decide on a management system for the Gender Action Plan that allows systematic planning and reporting, and sets priorities and asks for results

Continuing the current management system for the implementation of the GEAP will not allow the MFA to work systematically and document results, as well as to document where there are barriers to improved WRGE work.

Recommendations M2: Give clear mandates to the gender unit on how wide their rights and duties to report on the Action Plan are, but place overall responsibility for the Action Plan at a higher management level.
The mandates for the Gender Unit in GIL are not clear. The current system of placing responsibility in the departments themselves for mainstreaming policy issues, such as WRGE, is sound and should be continued. What are lacking are good reporting systems, and systems for holding management in the departments accountable.

**Recommendations M3: Regional Department important as flagship, need to develop improved methods for capturing WRGE work in partner countries**

Regional state-to-state aid is currently less than 20% of the Norwegian development cooperation, but overall bilateral aid is close to 50%. Bilateral aid and the Regional Department, MFA, has an important role as a flagship for informing and communicating Norwegian aid policies, including WRGE, and for results reporting. It is clear from the latest report back to the embassies that the Regional Department has identified WRGE as an area for more concerted effort and more funding. This work need to be strengthened and consolidated.

**Recommendations M4: Set up a gender focal network on the management level, to supplement the focal network of gender-knowledgeable persons in current (loose) network.**

There is a gender focal point in several of the departments in the MFA, but no functioning network, and no mandates for the gender focal point or their potential network. The Review Team would advise the MFA to put in place a proper focal point network, and ensure that when members leave their positions, new members are recruited to the network. At the same time the Review Team can see the value of a more formal network of senior management to oversee the implementation of the GEAP. This could be placed at the top level, the Director General of the Departments or their deputies, with a mandate to approve plans for the implementation of Action Plans including GEAP, and also to review annual reports, and prepare the meetings with political leadership of the MFA on WRGE. We can see no other ways to ensure full top management commitment to the GEAP.

**Recommendations M5: Improve guidelines and management systems for the gender budget line.**

GIL/GU has stated in their work plan for 2009 that new guidelines and a management system for the Gender budget line shall be approved during the spring 2009. The Review Team supports this. From the current reporting system there is no way one may conclude whether the Gender budget line has acted in an innovative and catalytic way, or what results it has achieved. Such systems have to be put in place, and both planning and reporting should also emphasise the innovative and catalytic aspects of the project, as well as the results in the reports.

**Recommendations M6: Increase knowledge production and synergy between bi- and multilateral investments**

The Gender budget line has funded interesting and valuable analytic work that is not shared often with partners in Norway and partner countries. The MFA and Norad should use this opportunity to organise the work so that information and new knowledge is shared. Norad, which is the MFA’s directorate for technical support, and quality assurance for Norwegian development cooperation, has not been involved in this work to a great extent. One contributing factor to this is also that the budget for analytical work has been relatively diminished the last few years, and the MFA decided that the Gender budget line should have a clause that none of the funds could be spent in Norway or with Norwegian partners, such as consultants, researchers, and NGOs. This definitely has hampered the development of relevant analytical work that could assist in improved mainstreaming and WRGE work.

The MFA is advised to assess new ways of increasing the synergy between bilateral and multilateral investment in knowledge production, and bring some of the work they are funding globally back to Norway for discussions.

**Conclusions and recommendations for Norad**

**Recommendations N1: Norad should play a more strategic and defined role in the implementation of the Action Plan. This could include WRGE analytic work and knowledge generation. Norad has an important role in knowledge production for improved quality in WRGE work.**
Norad has improved its own staffing and capacity on WRGE, which is placed in FLID. The gender team has concentrated its capacity on meeting individual requests for support from the Embassies and MFA. However, Norad has not been able to pursue the GEAP on a more strategic level in the development cooperation. The MFA should consider delegating responsibility with a clear mandate, for certain aspects of the GEAP to Norad. This should be combined with re-establishing a GEAP project consisting of high level representatives from both the MFA and Norad, which meet regularly to plan and report on the GEAP.

Recommendations N2: Norad could be systematic in mainstreaming WRGE into appraisals and reviews commissioned and take action to pursue gender mainstreaming in all technical departments.

Analytical work on WRGE should go beyond single programme/project technical support, and synthesise knowledge into larger knowledge pieces, such as the Gender reviews. Analytical work should be shared and discussed. The regular seminars on women’s rights and gender equality for a broader gender network are a step in the right direction, but invitations should be expanded to include more men, and consultants and researchers. Today it mainly targets gender advisers in the NGOs.

WRGE analytical work is also to a large extent seen as the responsibility of FLID/Gender Unit, and there have been few attempts to integrate WRGE into the technical work in the other departments, especially into environment and climate, energy and infrastructure, economic activity and business, and agriculture and natural resources management. Norad is advised to act much more strategically in its own activity planning (VP process), and identify areas for mainstreaming gender in technical work in departments other than FLID on an annual planning basis. The planned “mini gender review” from autumn 2009 of the different Norad technical departments is a promising step in this regard.

Recommendations N3: Norad is advised to consider establishing some sort of reports on the gender work in their Activity Plans (VP), consolidating the annual report based on the individual department’s own annual report highlighting learning and achievements, but also weaknesses, and unfinished business. This could assist Norad in being more accountable to the MFA and the public in disclosing what their work plans are and what is achieved.

Recommendations N4: WRGE dimensions should be strengthened in evaluations, and should be mainstreamed into evaluation guidelines and ToR.

Evaluation is an important instrument for documenting results and the barriers against achieving the planned results. The Evaluation Department has made a good start by developing guidelines for mainstreaming gender into ToR of evaluations, and examples of ToR show that some of them have included substantial requests for documentation of WRGE work, but there does not seem to be consistent use of the Guidelines. The Evaluation Department is advised to be even more stringent in using the Guidelines, and also in enforcing this when receiving the draft evaluation reports. The Evaluation Department is advised to include the guidelines in their Evaluation Handbook when it is revised and until then, make the Guidelines public, and put them on the Norad web page. The Annual Evaluation Report could also benefit from having a WRGE section each year, as part of the implementation of the GEAP.

Recommendations N5: Results reporting on WRGE weak. Should be a priority area for Norad/MFA.

Results reporting is weak in the MFA and Norad system, as well as for WRGE. A first step has been made by publishing the Results Management in Norwegian Development Cooperation: A practical guide. WRGE is an area which may be particularly difficult to report results on, and where there needs to be analytic work on how results are to be reported throughout the MFA, Norad and in consolidated reports. Country-specific reporting is vital, and could be improved by donors harmonising their efforts to strengthen in-country competence and reporting as a common base for donor work on WRGE.

Concluding remark: Making a difference – time for new thinking

This review has documented once again that mainstreaming is an uphill struggle and requires top management commitment, middle managers’ priority setting and dedicated staff on the ground, and good management systems. However, system improvement of plans and procedures cannot solve the
issue of improving the WRGE work alone. The development cooperation system also has to address the question of what can make a substantial and lasting difference for women and their rights and improve gender equality and justice in a time where women in many countries face a worsening situation. It is time to work more systematically with identifying change agents for WRGE and their networks and supporting these in a situation where harmonisation seems to limit funding to these agents. There might even be time now for a concerted effort of donors that believe in funding of WRGE to make large funds available for WRGE work, with ambitious goals, in fashion similar to the climate and forest grants that were (already) designed. Substantial funding of in-country capacity for sex-segregated statistics and research and analysis capacity is needed as part of such package, and regional collaborations should be encouraged.

Several models already exist for such funds to be established and managed; creativity and innovativeness should be mobilised to find solutions and models should such an idea be contemplated.

Another opportunity for improved quality of the WRGE work, and more effective work, is to improve the knowledge basis by also enlisting gender researchers, consultants and NGOs as part of the wider knowledge community base for effective WRGE work. Such efforts should be complemented by a strong effort to bring the voices and the experience of competent women and men and organised WRGE work from the partner countries into the discussions in partner country work and in Norway.
1 Introduction

1.1 Background

8 March 2007 the new *Action Plan for Women's Rights and Gender Equality in Development Cooperation* (for short, Gender Equality Action Plan - GEAP) (MFA 2007a) was presented to the public. The Action Plan had been developed by an internal resource group in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) during 2006 and 2007. It replaced the old policy document which had been the Strategy for Women and Gender Equality in Development Cooperation 1997-2005. This Strategy was evaluated in 2005 (Norad, 2005), and two of the members of the current team for the Mid-Term Review of the GEAP were also members of the Evaluation Team of 2005. The Evaluation of the ‘Strategy for Women and Gender Equality in Development Cooperation 1997-2005’, for short, the Evaluation of 2005, will serve as a ‘baseline’ for this Mid-Term Review.

The Evaluation had criticised the strategy for lacking an operational action plan to put the strategy into action. It was therefore an important step forward when MFA launched its new GEAP. The GEAP states/stated explicitly that there should be a mid-term review and an end evaluation. The Mid-Term Review was put on a limited tender by Norad/FLID in November 2008, the contract was awarded to NIBR, and work started shortly thereafter.

The Review Team consists of four researchers from the Norwegian Institute of Urban and Regional Research (NIBR):

- Berit Aasen, sociologist, team leader. Aasen has had the overall responsibility for the MTR and the Report.
- Siri B. Hellevik, political scientist. Hellevik has reviewed the Embassies’ Action Plans (VP) and three-year rolling plans, and Norad results reports 2007 AND 2008 to document results reporting.
- David. C. Lier, human geographer. Lier has reviewed the MFA’s interaction with UN agencies, and conducted interviews in the UN section with the team leader.
- Sigrid Skålnes, political scientist. Skålnes took part in the ‘gender review’ in Ethiopia, and also reviewed the other ‘gender review’ reports to document gender mainstreaming in the embassies.

Norad established a resource group for the MTR consisting of representatives from the MFA and Norad. The group has met four times, the last one to discuss the draft report. The Review Team presented preliminary findings at an open meeting 9 March 2009 in Norad. The PowerPoint presentation of the preliminary findings presented at the 9 March meeting has been widely circulated in the MFA and Norad. The invited members of the Resource Group have been:

- Fredrik Arthur, MFA, GIL/GU
- Anne Havnør, MFA, GIL/GU
- Øystein Lyngroth, MFA, UN Section, Department for Global Affairs
- Elin Graae Jensen, MFA, REG/Afrika 2,
- Odd Magne Ruud, MFA
- Jostein Leiro, MFA
- Hans Jacob Frydenlund, MFA,

---

1 Including the team leader, who was team leader of both studies, and Hellevik.
1.2 Scope of work

The Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Mid-Term Review of the Action Plan for Women’s Rights and Gender Equality in Development Cooperation identifies five key questions which the MTR is asked to investigate and present findings on:

- To what extent has Norway contributed to development results for women’s rights and gender equality in selected partner countries?
- To what extent has Norway changed its political priorities so women’s rights and gender equality have a central place in political dialogues and initiatives?
- Has Norway increased its relative funding to projects and programmes supporting women’s rights and gender equality?
- Has Norway increased gender mainstreaming in its development cooperation?
- Has Norway improved the organisation of its development cooperation, to ensure the necessary capacity, competence and governance in its work on women’s rights and gender equality?

For each of these questions the ToR has defined data sources and “indicators” that the MTR Team should consult. However, the Team has in certain cases not been able to access these sources, or the Team has selected to look into other sources as well. This concerns especially when looking forward to the relevance and challenges for implementing the GEAP in a changing aid architecture and changing development cooperation procedures in the MFA.

This report is a MTR of the GEAP. The purpose of conducting an MTR is usually to determine to what extent the implementation of the plan is up-to-date, whether the plan has been operationalised, implemented and reported on, whether the GEAP is still relevant or does it need to adjust to changes in the policy environment; in short, is it on the right track. An MTR also often prepares the material for a more comprehensive evaluation at a later stage. In addition this action plan is only valid for less than three years; it was launched 8 March 2007 and is valid until the end of 2009. In the recommendations we will come back to the issues concerning a full evaluation and the alternatives for the future of the GEAP.

This MTR is about development cooperation and its procedures and systems for managing aid and work on WRGE and mainstreaming of GE in this work. It is about systems and procedures, and political dialogue and commitment, or the lack thereof. However, a note of caution is necessary. The struggle for WRGE is not governed by development cooperation and their systems and procedures. It is a result of actors’ and groups’ own struggles for their rights, and also a result of the major social and economic transformations that are taking place. Development cooperation may have a positive role in these struggles by assisting organisations and legislations that need to be in place, and supporting civil society and women’s organisations in their struggle to exercise these rights. However, development cooperation may also make things worse by ignoring WRGE and working in favour of old gender stereotypes and power relations. Development cooperation is not neutral. Such analysis of development cooperation and its influence on WRGE development in the partner countries is beyond the ToR for this review.
The Terms of Reference (ToR) states that the Mid-Term Review (MTR) should be based on existing documentation that the development cooperation itself produces for monitoring and reporting data. The review has made much use of such information both on how WRGE is reported in plans and reports and budgets, but also of internal documentation relating to results reporting, more effective administration of embassies and other documents that influence the work of WRGE. The approach of the Review Team is that WRGE cannot be analysed and understood in isolation, but must be understood in relation to an overall understanding of the management system and results reporting in the development cooperation system. Assessing gender mainstreaming implies that the team must have a sound understanding of the planning and reporting system and decisions-making within the MFA and Norad.

Existing documentation has included the three-year rolling plans 2008-2010 from all embassies, activity plans (VP) from 2005 and 2008, and the response letters from the MFA back to the embassies. It has also included statistics on the gender marker of Norwegian bilateral aid and on the Gender Budget Line (2007 and 2008), and letters of approval for funding UN agencies in the period 2006-2009.

The written documentation used is referred to under each of the five chapters. Most of this documentation was identified in the ToR, but some additional sources have been consulted. A full list of data sources is included in the literature list as an aid to future evaluation of WRGE work in the MFA and Norad.

In addition to existing documentation, the team has based itself on interviews with staff in Norad, and in the MFA, both in the Section for Global Initiative, the UN Section and the Regional Department, and others. There have been no interviews or soliciting of opinion from partners in the South.

Norad conducted a ‘gender review’ of part of the embassy’s portfolio in Ethiopia during the period of the MTR. One of the team members, Sigrid Skålnes, participated in that ‘gender review’. The focus was on the embassy’s natural resources management portfolio, which was channelled partly through Norwegian NGO and partly through multilateral agencies, and through research cooperation between universities in Norway and Ethiopia.

Many of the MTR questions ask “to what extent has there been an improvement”, assuming we can measure changes before and after and attribute these changes to the GEAP. As we will document in this report we can observe some changes, but in many of the areas we also look into the activity level before the GEAP has been high on WRGE. Many of the new initiatives were also taken before the GEAP was developed and implemented. Reinvigorating the WRGE work already started during the evaluation in 2005 of the former Gender Strategy. Therefore, rather than thinking of the GEAP as a cutting-off point, the GEAP should be understood as positioned in a continuum of change for more active WRGE work in MFA and Norad.

1.4 The Outline of the MTR Report

The report is organised according to the five main questions presented in the ToR, which are discussed in the Chapters 2 to 6. Chapter one gives the background, scope and method for the MTR, and chapter 7 the conclusions and recommendations.
2. To what extent has Norway contributed to development results for women’s rights and gender equality in selected partner countries?

The indicator in the ToR is: Development results in the five priority areas

The ToR has identified the following sources to be consulted for this question:
- Analysis of the results reports from the embassies for 2005 and 2007.
- Analysis of gender equality in the results reporting of selected UN agencies and the World Bank. One should select organisations that Norway provides substantial funding to.
- Provide examples from the embassies of relevance to the Mid-Term Review

The ToR asks to what extent has Norway contributed to development results for women’s rights and gender equality in selected partner countries? The question “to what extent” is difficult to answer. Both the reports from the embassies and the Norad Results Report document that there have been considerable efforts made for Women’s Rights and Gender Equality (WRGE) by Norway. However, this was also the situation before the GEAP was launched.

We have analysed both the three-year rolling plans 2009-2011, which include a report in their first part, and the activity plans for 2005 and 2007.

2.1 Analysis of the reports from the embassies 2005 and 2007

In 2005, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs requested the Norwegian embassies managing development aid to include a section describing the work on women and gender equality within their annual reporting to the MFA. This request was repeated in 2006 and 2007.

This section reviews the focus on Women’s Empowerment and Gender Equality (WRGE) in the reports on results from Norwegian development aid coming from 26 of the Royal Norwegian Embassies to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for the years 2005 and 2007. The embassies selected were the countries of cooperation for Norwegian development cooperation, but only included Nicaragua in Latin America.

The section is divided into three parts, one part with general comments to the review of the results reporting from the two years, followed by comments related to the embassies in African countries and Asian countries, respectively.

**General comments**
There is an increase in the number of countries reporting on WRGE activities from 2005 to 2007. Several of the countries, in particular in Asia, have reported activities related to WRGE in 2007 while in 2005 they had none. In addition, the Gender budget line seems to have raised the activity level somewhat, but since the reporting is anecdotal and brief, it impossible to assess the relative increase in activities more accurately.

In 2005 as well as in 2007, there was a tendency towards reporting more activities oriented towards women-targeted activities instead of activities related to gender mainstreaming. Examples of support directed specifically towards women include supporting organisations working on women’s rights, and working against FGM. Most reports have included WRGE in reporting on the embassy’s main priorities, such as education, good governance, and health, but the extent to which WRGE is included in this reporting varies considerably.
Example 1: Angola - women’s political participation

In Angola the support towards good governance had a special focus on women’s political participation, with support going to three different projects, all with a particular focus on women. One of them was the Norwegian People’s Aid Women’s Programme which, according to the report from the embassy strengthens the role of the women’s organisation LIMA within the opposition party UNITA, enabling LIMA to negotiate and agree with the party on reserving 30% of seats on all elected units within the party.

As concerns the thematic areas identified in the Action Plan, that is, political participation, economic participation, sexual and reproductive health and rights and violence against women, as well as the areas in which the gender perspective is to be included, WRGE seems to be mentioned mostly in relation to education, human rights (FGM, trafficking), violence against women, political participation/good governance, and health (more specifically in 2007 with reference to the MDG 4&5 programme).

Example 2: Ethiopia - FGM

The Embassy of Ethiopia reports substantially on their work against FGM (a pilot country) in the report from 2007:

- The extensive work against Female Genital Mutilation and other related practices/praxis that hurt women continued in 2007 through the Norwegian civil society organisations and their Ethiopian partners. Studies confirm that the decrease in the number of girls mutilated in the Amhara, Southern region, Afar and Somali continues. In some areas, there has been a registered transition from the worst method of FGM, infibulations, towards a less harmful/negative method, that of sunna. A 2007 study undertaken by EGLDAM (an organisation for the fight against female genital mutilation and other violent traditions) demonstrate substantial changes compared to a study from 1996 (both financed by embassy funds).

This reporting is quite thorough compared to most other reports. The example from Madagascar is more descriptive as to the extent of reporting from the embassies. In the special section reporting on WRGE, the 2007 report states that “increasing the enrolment of girls in school and improving the quality of their schooling is an important goal for the substantial support Norway gives the education sector (in Madagascar)”. Another example of mainstreaming is the following: “Norway supports a programme for the construction of schools, organised by the ILO.” This programme includes the building of separate latrines for girls and boys. Such separate latrines give girls who experienced difficulties in finishing school, due to cultural and hygienic obstacles, a better chance of completion.

The Report to the White Paper No. 11 (2007-2008) “On Equal Terms” (MFA 2008) has diagrams showing the representation of WRGE as either a main priority or as part of other thematic areas within bilateral aid (including actors receiving multi-bilateral support). These diagrams include good governance, HIV/AIDS, economic development, trade, health, education and other activities within the social sector, as well as emergency assistance. Our review of the results reports from 2005 and 2007 confirmed the picture that health and education support has more emphasis on WRGE than other sectors. While 43% of the bilateral aid within health and education has WRGE either as a main priority or as one of several priorities, only 20% of the aid directed towards good governance, economic development and trade has WRGE as a main priority/one of the priorities. Violence against women and human rights are not among the thematic areas in this oversight. In the results reports of 2007, six countries as well as the SADC region have defined WRGE as one of their three main priority areas.
Turning to the Oil for Development Programme, several of the countries included in this review of the Action Plan are among the receivers of funding from this programme. Among the countries reviewed in this section that are involved in the Oil for Development Programme, only the reports for East Timor and Nicaragua mentioned WRGE. Despite supporting the search for oil, developing national competence, etc., it is still possible to include WRGE more specifically within this support. In addition, within two other areas of development cooperation -- environment and sustainable development, and economic participation -- there is little reporting on efforts related to WRGE.

**The format of reporting**

As already mentioned, the MFA guidelines for reporting in 2005 and 2007 specify a request to the embassies of including a special report on the work done on WRGE and the environment. The guidelines, however, state that in reporting on these two issues, the embassies are not to exceed half a page. The MFA states/exemplifies their view on relevant reporting in the document on guidelines in the following way: “In 2007, 31,000 girls enrolled in primary school in X country. In 2007, 50 latrines were built at primary schools in X country” (MFA 2007b). In 2007, the embassies were also requested to illustrate gender in reporting on the recipient countries’ achievements of national targets.

We believe that the format of reporting that is suggested calls for fragmented and anecdotal reporting on WRGE, which makes it difficult to systematically assess the embassies’ focus on WRGE. In some cases it is evident how the results reported are related to interventions and how WRGE was mainstreamed in programming, but in several cases, it is not well documented how and to what extent WRGE is mainstreamed in the embassy’s work and its programming. The brief reporting makes no room for analysis of the overall approach in an embassy’s work towards WRGE and how the issue is mainstreamed within the organisation, management and procedures in the embassy or in different projects or programmes supported.

We believe that it would be relevant to include a short assessment of how the activities have contributed to mainstreaming in order to highlight the underlying thoughts on this issue within the activities supported. As is found in the 2005 evaluation, it still seems as if there is some underreporting on WRGE. In addition, the brief reporting seems to favour reporting on women-specific activities rather than activities involving mainstreaming, because it is easier to list such activities. Activities which involve mainstreaming require, in several cases, more explanations concerning what way they are intended to lead to mainstreaming.

**Partners**

As concerns the WRGE partners selected, the main group seems to be civil society organisations, NGOs and multilateral organisations. There is little focus on working with the government sector on WRGE, although this sector was identified as important in the report to the White Paper No. 11 ‘On Equal Terms’ (2008a).

**New aid modalities: challenges for reporting?**

There are also challenges for reporting on WRGE in relation to the new aid modalities (Joint Assistance Strategies, harmonisation of aid, and budget support, etc.), as pointed out in the NIBR Evaluation of the Gender Strategy (Norad 2005) and in NIBR Summary Evaluation of Lessons Learned from Gender Evaluations (Norad 2006). One example of such challenges is reporting on budget support, as the indicators to be reported on should be few and simple to monitor, and shall be placed within the agreement for budget support at the country level. Therefore indicators to date have included the percentage of women parliamentarians and the percentage of girls in schools. There are possibilities for agreeing on a broader set of indicators, but to date the guidelines for budget support do not include any reference to WRGE. In GEAP it was stated explicitly that the revisions of the Guidelines for Budget Support (in 2007) were to include references to how to report on WRGE, but this was not done (MFA 2007b).

---

2 Angola, Madagascar, Mozambique, Nigeria, Kenya, South-Africa, Tanzania, Zambia, Nicaragua, Timor-Leste, Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Palestine, Sudan,
If WRGE is not included in the budget support agreements, and not in the indicators identified for reporting, this important arena for policy dialogue between donors and countries will easily miss the opportunity to include policy dialogue on WRGE.

The GEAP stated that the new Guidelines should integrate WRGE. This was not done when the Guidelines were revised, but the issue about how to address WRGE in General Budget Support is still on the agenda in the MFA and Norad, even if progress has been slow. The topic was raised for the first time in a coherent manner in the latest Annual Meeting of the Country Economists in spring 2009, where the participants expressed an interest in pursuing this topic in the future. The budget support matrix for Malawi is an indication of this; the current matrix has the usual gender policy markers of percent women in parliament and percent girls in schools. The assessment of the matrix (MFA 2008) states that this is not sufficient for a policy dialogue on WRGE and states that the Matrix will be revised in the future with the objective of finding more gender policy markers or assessments that may facilitate gender policy dialogue.

The new GBS Guidelines from the EU, emphasising results reporting in line with the MDG, may also offer an interesting venue for gender policy dialogue, although the new Guidelines may also be problematic in the sense of the countries themselves are not necessarily able to control the factors that influence results on MDGs.

The Gender budget line
According to the accounts of expenditure in 2007 (in the Norad assessment of embassies 2009-2011 strategic plan documents) (Norad 2008), 12 out of the 26 countries had applied for and received funds from the Gender budget line earmarked for WRGE-related activities. It seems as if this fund has stimulated some more activity related to WRGE, but among the countries in which there was no reported activity on WRGE in 2005 (India, Indonesia, China, and Timor-Leste), only India has received funding from the Fund in 2007. Part of this can be explained by use of earmarked funds related to the SCR 1325 on Gender and conflict which were used in Indonesia and Timor-Leste.

African countries
As concerns African countries, it appears that there was more reporting on WRGE in 2007 than in 2005, especially related to women-targeted activities. The countries in which a substantial improvement can be noted are Nigeria, Angola, Eritrea and Ethiopia. In Tanzania, Malawi, South Africa, and Uganda the reporting is at about the same level as in 2005. However, when it comes to Uganda, the overall focus on WRGE is likely to be higher than reflected in the report, because the embassy has made substantial efforts towards building competence among the embassy staff on WRGE by hiring a local WRGE consultant for nine months, a process which may be expected to amount in more overall focus on WRGE in all support from the embassy, but which is not easily shown in results reporting due to the format of reporting which requires the embassies to illustrate their efforts with concrete examples of output.

Asian countries
Some countries which did not have any activities related to WRGE in 2005 had initiated WRGE-related efforts by the end of 2007. New countries reporting in 2007 were Timor-Leste, Indonesia, India, China (with minor/minimum reporting for China). In 2005, the reports from Nepal and Afghanistan seem to have substantially more on WRGE than several other countries, while in 2007, Nepal and Pakistan report more activities than Afghanistan and other countries. Despite this improvement in reporting, it seems as if there are substantially more activities targeting women than gender mainstreaming in the overall programme.

NORAD’s results reports 2007 and 2008
The results report of 2007 has a separate chapter on WRGE. In addition, WRGE is discussed in Chapter 1, as well as in Chapter 2 on health. In Chapter 5, the separate chapter on WRGE, there seems to be more emphasis on support channelled specifically towards women or girls than towards mainstreaming. As concerns gender equality, there is a valuable schematic overview of gender equality
with relation to broader societal impacts of gender equality, that is, progress in women’s total share of seats in national assemblies, the increase in women working outside the agricultural sector, women’s income compared to men’s in selected countries of cooperation, and the enrolment rate of girls in primary school compared to that of boys.

The results report of 2008 focuses on three thematic areas (i.e., electrification, girls’ education and good governance) and three focus countries (Nepal, Mozambique, and Southern Sudan). Evidently, most reporting on WRGE is in the chapter on girls’ education. However, WRGE is included in the chapters on electrification and good governance as well, and also in the chapters on the three countries.

Southern Sudan reported on support to girls’ education, but also mentioned the Southern Sudanese authorities’ policy of 25% representation of women in the SPLM (p. 82). Within the support towards peace building and good governance, the total share that goes to women’s organisations is identified on page 26, demonstrating that there has been a marked increase in the level of support from 2006 to 2007. Apart from this diagram, women are only mentioned one more time in the chapter on good governance and only twice in the chapter on electrification. In the chapter on Nepal, several results are listed with gender-specific statistics.
3 To what extent has Norway changed its political priorities so women’s rights and gender equality have a central place in political dialogues and initiatives?

The indicator in the ToR is:
Women’s rights and gender equality are some of the main elements in political dialogue

The data sources identified are:

- Studies of minutes and Norwegian presentations from relevant international arenas, including the UN General Assembly, OECD-DAC, ECOSOC, HR Council, UNHCR, UN trade and environment organisations, UNDP and UNICEF, in 2005 and 2008 to see how Norway performs concerning its advocacy role.
- Analysis of country meetings.

We have not been able to consult the second data source, as we have not been able to access information on international delegations and meetings appointed by the MFA, and their gender balance and gender equality mandates.

3.1 Minutes from meetings and presentations in international arenas

The team believes that the question needs rephrasing. Gender has been high on the political agenda for many years when Norway makes presentations in global arena. It is therefore more a question about continuity. We have reviewed a number of the speeches that are presented on the MFA web page/website.

3.2 Analysis of country meetings

Annual country meetings between the embassies and representatives from the partner country are no longer held as a general rule. In those embassies with budget support, most of the policy dialogue takes place in connexion with meeting related to the budget support.

We have not been able to access information relating to policy dialogues on Joint Assistance Strategies (JAS) and General Budget Support (GBS). However, we have accessed a few Country Agreements, for Mozambique, Malawi and Tanzania, which all belong to the five large embassies (in addition to Zambia and Uganda). The country agreements do not refer in any of the cases to WRGE as a priority sector, but mention it as a cross-cutting theme in line with environment, anti-corruption and HIV/AIDS. No measures pertaining to WRGE or on how this topic should be reported were discussed. This is in line with the findings from the Evaluation of 2005.

The Review Team has also accessed a few other country policy papers. The country strategy papers for both Liberia (MFA 2009c) and Ethiopia have a strong focus on WRGE. The mandate for the first annual country dialogue meeting with Ethiopia also included a strong reference to WRGE, and not only as a cross-cutting issue. However, even when WRGE was discussed in the meeting in early 2009, it was not recorded in the minutes from the meeting, something the embassy apologised for.
3.3 Analysis of the MFA’s interaction with UN agencies on WRGE

This section deals with the UN system as an arena for advocacy on WRGE issues in relation to Norwegian development cooperation. Based on the targets and means outlined in the Action Plan for Women’s Rights and Gender Equality in Development Cooperation 2007-2009 (MFA 2007a), the main channels of influence will be assessed. These are defined as conditional financial contributions – and the Letters of Allocation and programme activities related to these – as well as board representation, secondment and other (informal) channels of influence. Based on a selection of some of the UN funds, programmes and specialty organisations that receive substantial funding from Norway – UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA and ILO – similarities and differences will be highlighted in the MFA’s approach.

Sources and methods

The data used for this review are mainly based on two types of sources: interviews with MFA representatives in charge of relations with the UN system, and documentary analysis of Letters of Allocation, framework agreements, Programme Cooperation Agreements, as well as statements to meetings in the governing bodies of the UN organisations and to other UN forums. Most of the interviews were conducted in January 2009, based on semi-structured open interviews. The interviews lasted for approximately one hour each, and covered topics such as board representation, reporting procedures, lobbying activities and other forms of influence exerted by the MFA officers in the UN system. In addition, some key governmental documentation has been consulted in this process: the Action Plan for Women’s Rights and Gender Equality in Development Cooperation 2007-2009 (MFA 2007a), White Paper No. 11 (2007-2008) ‘On Equal Terms’ (MFA 2008a) and the Budget Proposition (Stortingsprop. No. 1.) to the Parliament from the MFA 2008-2009 (MFA 2008b). Internet resources, particularly the MFA website and the websites of the various UN organisations, have also been instrumental in the analysis.

Background

The 2007-2009 Action Plan sets targets and stakes out a course of action for realising women’s rights and gender equality (WRGE) through Norwegian development policy. To achieve these goals, the action plan states that Norway must have a “clear political message in international forums” and “contribute to increased attention and acceptance” around WRGE issues (MFA 2007a:10-11). The Action Plan also states that, by the end of the period, Norway should be assessed in terms of its ability to use its position – as a political and developmental actor – to realise WRGE aims.

In relation to its four thematic areas, the Action Plan identifies UNDP (and UNIFEM) as a key partner on issues of women’s political participation; ILO, UNDP and UNIFEM as partners on women’s economic participation; on issues of reproductive and sexual health/rights, WHO is identified as a political authority, while UNFPA is important at the country level; and UNIFEM, UNFPA and UNICEF are named as key players in relation to violence against women.

The Action Plan states that a holistic approach to development policy requires more than targeted WRGE policies. Mainstreaming and integration of WRGE perspectives are important in broader sectors such as:

- Peace, human rights and humanitarian assistance
- Good governance, institution-building and anti-corruption policies
- Environment and sustainable development
- Oil and energy
- Education and health

To achieve successful integration of these perspectives in a broader development agenda, the Action Plan highlights cooperation with UNICEF, UNGEI, UNESCO, WHO, UNAIDS, and UNFPA.

The Action Plan includes a detailed agenda for Norwegian policy in multilateral organisations.
One of the main points on this agenda is to work for a consolidation and expansion of the UN organisational components working on WRGE issues, which would entail merging UNIFEM with other parts of the UN organisation.

Outside the UN organisation, Norway will prioritise GENDERNET in OECD-DAC.

Norway aims to be a protagonist for integrating WRGE perspectives in the core activities of development partners, both in the UN system and with other multilateral partners.

More specifically, Norway will promote and support: an independent UN unit on WRGE; UN gender equality profiles at the country level; integration of WRGE issues in partner policies; financial initiatives from multilateral banks and funds to intervene on gender sensitive services and needs.

In terms of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), Norway will “hold the multilateral organisations accountable for progress with particular focus on MDG 3 on gender equality and the empowerment of women, MDG 4 on reducing child mortality, and MDG 5 on improving maternal health.” (MFA 2007:38)

Norway will strategically use its influence through board representation and letters of allocation, and set demands for systematic activities, monitoring and evaluation.

Reporting and documentation are emphasised in the Action Plan, to ensure transparency and accountability. From all partner organisations, including multilateral organisations, Norway will demand the following:

- document the allocation of both economic and human resources for both targeted action and mainstreaming of the gender perspective;
- present their gender-related policy commitments, results areas and targets, and how they will report and evaluate them;
- ensure that their leadership shows explicit commitment to gender equality and demands results from all levels of staff;
- present the measures and mechanisms that are in place to ensure gender-sensitive implementation of their activities in the field;
- present the targets and mechanisms for promoting gender balance at all levels of the organisation, with emphasis on recruiting women from developing countries;
- report results in terms of the gender-specific indicators for the MDGs, with particular emphasis on MDGs 3, 4 and 5.

Letters of allocation to multilateral partners are identified as important tools to demand reporting procedures and initiatives on WRGE issues. Norway should play an advocacy role on WRGE issues in networks and forums nationally, in the Nordic countries and internationally. This watchdog role entails making WRGE issues visible and given systematic follow-up in the international policy-making. The Action Plan’s focus on multilateral institutions is also seen in relation to other actors. Norway’s advocacy role is also stressed in relation to bilateral support, especially in forums and arenas where Norway already has legitimacy. Furthermore, Norwegian civil society organisations are assigned an advocacy role, also in relation to the UN system.

### 3.3.1 Financial contributions

The Gender Team in the Section for Global Initiatives and Gender Equality (GIL) has identified a stronger focus on the budget lines as one of the most important ways to influence Norwegian efforts to promote WRGE issues through its development cooperation. This section will focus on how this is done in relation to Norwegian contributions to the UN system. By looking at the budget for 2009, there are several budget lines which are relevant to WRGE in the UN system. There are three main channels of Norwegian contribution to the UN agencies and programmes:

1. Assessed contributions, which are calculated according to an international acknowledged formula,
2. Core funding to UN organisations,
3. Soft- or hard-earmarked funding.
The channels used for promoting WRGE are: (1) core funding to UN organisations and, (2) earmarked extra budgetary contributions to various UN programme activities concerned with WRGE issues, including the use of the WRGE allocation from the Section for Global Initiatives and Gender Equality.

Core funding and Letters of Allocation
In the 2009 budget, a total of NOK 4.1 billion is allocated to UN organisations via the MFA’s UN section. Almost NOK 1.6 billion of these funds are defined as core funding to the three main recipients of Norwegian donor assistance in the UN system: UNDP (NOK 860 million), UNICEF (NOK 400 million) and UNFPA (NOK 332 million). Norwegian contributions to core funding can promote WRGE issues in the UN system in different ways: While, for instance, NOK 75 million of the UNDP contribution is specified for United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM), the Norwegian contributions can also have an impact on the core activities of the UN’s funds and programmes.

Norway influences the way in which the core activities of UN organisations incorporate and mainstream WRGE issues through their board representation. The allocations to the major UN organisations are accompanied by a Letter of Allocation which specifies Norwegian priorities in the work of the respective UN organisations. Since 2006, Norway has been open to making multi-year indicative pledges to three UN organisations: UNDP, UNICEF and UNFPA. These pledges are made on a four-year basis and should be understood as the MFA’s response to the UN organisation’s four-year strategic plans, which secure long-term predictability and set the political priorities of the organisation on a four-year basis. Insofar as the Strategic Plan is in line with Norway’s development policy, Norway can make multi-year pledges to the UN organisation. Hence, Norway’s multi-year pledge can influence UN policies on important issues (such as WRGE) while at the same time support a coherent financial and strategic management of the organisation. These pledges are subject to annual Storting approval and to whether the UN organisation’s policies are in line with its strategic plan.

The Letters of Allocation from the MFA to the main UN organisations in the 2006-2009 period were signed by the Minister of the Environment and International Development. In general these letters stressed the following issues in relation to Norwegian core funding contribution:

- Commitment to UN reform;
- human rights-based approaches to programming;
- focus on gender and equality;
- recruitment of qualified Norwegian candidates;
- improving results-based reporting and monitoring procedures.

Norway has, since this practice was introduced in 2006 already refrained from making multi-year pledges to one UN organisation, UNDP, on the grounds that the issues listed above had not been satisfactorily attended to. This suggests that the conditionality represented by the Letters of Allocation is real, and that these documents act as political tools in Norwegian development policy.

Extra budgetary contributions and programme activities
More than NOK 1.5 billion of these funds are defined as extra budgetary contributions to the UN system. The biggest recipient of extra budgetary contributions is UNICEF which was allocated NOK 580 million in the 2009 budget, of which 86.2 per cent was specifically designated for UNICEF’s Basic Education and Gender Equality (BEGE) focus area. From a WRGE perspective, the UNICEF contribution is therefore the most relevant extra budgetary contribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total extra budgetary contribution from MFA (in millions)</th>
<th>Extra budgetary contribution to UNICEF</th>
<th>Allocation to Basic Education and Gender Equality (BEGE)</th>
<th>BEGE allocation as percentage of total extra budgetary contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1 532</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>26.11 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 budgeted</td>
<td>1 507</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>33.18 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Extra budgetary contributions to UN organisations are subject to written agreements, Programme Cooperation Agreements (PCAs), between the two parties. In the MFA’s PCAs with International Labour Organisation (ILO) and UNICEF, Norway’s focus on WRGE issues has been explicitly emphasised, and concrete WRGE programmes have been targeted for contribution.

Norway’s contribution to ILO represents a slightly different approach, as ILO is a specialised agency in the UN system. The contributions to ILO’s core funding from member states are ‘assessed contributions’, according to the size of the donor state economy. These contributions will be used according to the resolutions made by the International Labour Conference and the ILO Executive Council. Therefore, there are no Letters of Allocation with political signals such as the ones sent to UNICEF and UNDP. This constrains the potential for active influence through core funding for a relatively small economy like Norway. Recently, however, ILO has developed a system – the Regular Budget Supplementary Account (RBSA) – which allows members to contribute to ILO’s activities at a country level under the auspices which bridge the political resolutions of the ILO Executive Council with the priorities of donor countries. Instead of the extra budgetary contributions allocated to UNICEF and UNDP (‘temafond’), Norway is therefore allowed to allocate contributions to RBSA with a so-called “soft earmarking” related to their strategic objectives and cross-cutting themes. Whereas the US, which is the single biggest donor, overwhelmingly earmarks their contribution to ILO’s campaign against child labour, since 2008 Norway has used this option actively in promoting WRGE issues through tying contributions to ILO’s cross-cutting theme “Equality and discrimination”, and hereunder “Gender Equality”. This can, in part, explain why MFA representatives characterise ILO as becoming increasingly proactive on WRGE issues.

The Gender budget line
Since 2007, the MFA has operated with a separate allocation to “Women’s rights and gender equality”. Allocated under Programme Category 03.20: “Global initiatives” in the 2008-2009 Budget Proposition to the Parliament (MFA 2008b), the Gender budget line has been administered in the beginning by the gender team in the GIL section. From approximately NOK 200 million in 2007, and a similar budget in 2008, there was an increase to NOK 300 million in the proposed 2009 budget. This allocation is explicitly tied to the Action Plan and the key target areas identified in this. In 2007, almost half of this contribution went to multilateral agencies. The Gender budget line has allowed the MFA to support earmarked WRGE initiatives in the UN organisations, on demand. It seems the Gender budget line has been particularly important in allowing for extra budgetary funding for UN Agencies (as well as for the embassies). However, current reporting systems of the use of the Gender budget line do not allow the Review Team to assess the quality and results of these contributions.

Norwegian financial contributions and WRGE issues
In conclusion, Norway has, over the period reviewed, maintained and increased levels of funding to WRGE-related activities by the key developmental organisations in the UN system. Norway use these contributions to influence WRGE priorities in the UN organisations through varying levels of core funding and programme cooperation, depending on the type of UN organisation involved. Financial allocations are accompanied by political signals through Letters of Allocation and other contractual agreements; these documents often explicitly stress WRGE as a political priority of Norway, either in a general way or through highlighting particular issues such as sexual and reproductive rights or gender-sensitive reporting. Norwegian development policy in the WRGE area seems to attempt to balance between a mainstreaming approach, on the one hand, and specific gender-targeted initiatives and programme activities, on the other hand. Whereas UNICEF is the organisation where Norwegian WRGE funding is most clearly linked to a substantial amount of extra budgetary contributions, Norway tries to influence UNFPA and ILO through core funding and/or ‘softly earmarked’ allocations.

3.4 Other channels of influence

Board representation
The Action Plan states that “Norway will utilise the opportunities it has through representation on boards” to promote WRGE (MFA 2007a:38). This channel of influence, of course, is only open insofar as Norway is actually represented on the boards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UN organisation</th>
<th>Recent Norwegian board representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>2007-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>2004-2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>2004-2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>2002-2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MFA representatives emphasised that representation on the board represents the form of influence which is most in line with the ideals of multilateralism and the organisational democracy of the UN organisations. Norway influences policy-making in these forums through statements (sometimes joint statements with other donor countries) and through informal communication. In a joint guideline for Norwegian board representation in UNICEF, UNDP and UNFPA written in 2007, the MFA states that Norway will emphasise the importance of a more targeted commitment towards female participation in development, women’s formal rights and economic opportunities, gender mainstreaming and incorporation of WRGE in the strategic plans of the UN organisations.³

UNICEF and UNDP are two of the organisations where Norway has played an active role in board meetings. Based on the documentation provided by Norwegian statements and joint statements where Norway is represented,⁴ it can be concluded that Norway has been proactive in pushing gender issues on the general agenda of the UN organisation, and critical and constructive in calling for a rights-based approach and better reporting quality in those forums specifically concerned with WRGE issues (e.g. UNIFEM, or the meetings of Gender Equality Evaluations). Some issues have repeatedly been discussed in the Norwegian statements. In Norwegian statements to UNDP board meetings, for example, WRGE has also been linked to a renewed commitment to gender mainstreaming in the UN organisation, which should be seen in light of the criticism put forward in the 2005 Evaluation of Gender Equality and Gender Mainstreaming in UNDP. Another recurring theme has been how linking WRGE issues to a rights-based approach can be a controversial issue in the UN system, given the sensitive politicised rhetoric around human rights. Still, Norway has been vocal in their advocacy of woman’s rights as human rights, and called for a rights-based approach to programming. Norway has championed a more explicit stance on sexual and reproductive rights, issues where there is a lack of geopolitical consensus.

Norway’s visibility on these issues is in line with one of the key principles of the Action Plan, namely that “Norway will play a proactive as well as supporting role in the fight against all forms of discrimination on the basis of gender, including in areas that are controversial” (MFA 2007). It is also in line with the ambition of the Minister of International Development Erik Solheim, as stated in the preface of the Action Plan: “Norway will be a fearless champion of women’s sexual and reproductive rights” (7). However, White Paper No. 11 (2007-2008) ‘On Equal Terms’ (MFA 2008a), stressed that a clear message must sometimes be articulated in a soft-spoken fashion to have the intended effect. This is not least the case with UNICEF, where a strong US donor presence has posed some challenges for Norway’s commitment to sexual and reproductive rights, given the conservative social policies of the Bush administration (2001-2009). One way of exerting influence in this climate has been to actively promote a closer cooperation on a country level between UNICEF and UNFPA, the latter organisation having a more comprehensive and less constrained practice concerning sexual and reproductive issues in the activities.

³ Letter: “UNICEF, UNDP og UNFPA årsmøter 2007 – fellesinstruks”; From the UN Section (O Lyngroth; E Schwabe-Hansen) to the Minister of Environment and International Development; Saksnr.: 07/03854-13; 24.05.2007.
⁴ See Annex: Document list of Norwegian statements to UN organisations’ board meetings.
Personal commitment and informal channels of influence

Several MFA representatives interviewed in this review have stressed the importance of the personal commitment that is being shown by individuals located in strategic locations in the MFA bureaucracy. The capacity of key people is decisive when the principles of an Action Plan are to be put into practice. These pertinent observations highlight the balance between appropriate procedures and structures, on the one hand, and the individual agency of the officers in charge of UN relations. Moreover, several informants noted that it was not only through formal statements, letters and agreements that this influence was exerted; ongoing informal communication between MFA representatives and representatives of the various UN organisations was instrumental in following up on important policy areas, such as WRGE.

Recruitment of Norwegian experts to UN agencies

Even though pressure on the UN system to recruit Norwegian expertise is not regarded as ideal, as it could be said that it bypasses the organisation’s own internal procedures and organisational democracy, it is still being used on occasion by the MFA. This strategy can even be a means to enforce a stronger focus on WRGE in the UN system. Funding of JPOs and APOs, for example, can be used as an additional bonus when particular UN funds and programmes show a commitment to employ qualified Norwegian expertise through their internal recruitment mechanisms.

From 2007 to 2009, the MFA funded an Associate Professional Officer to the Gender Equality unit of ILO; and from 2007-2009 a Junior Professional Officer to the Gender Unit in UN-Habitat. UNDP’s 2008-2011 Strategic Plan was supplemented by a Gender Equality Strategy (GES) 2008-2011. The responsibility for the GES was given to the Gender Team at UNDP’s Bureau for Development Policy. The Gender Team assigned a Task Force to assist them in this work. Norway funded one expert on gender issues to this Task Force. The members of the Task Force attended three working group meetings and some of the expert group meetings, and offered the Gender Team expert advice.

3.4.1 Reporting on WRGE

For the MFA to pursue a coherent strategy on WRGE issues in relation to the UN system, it is important for the MFA that the UN organisations have reporting procedures in place which thoroughly document their activities and results on WRGE issues back to the donor countries. Norway states clear requirements in their Letters of Allocation on particular areas of action. If the MFA is to be able to hold the UN organisation accountable on these issues, it follows that the reporting of the UN organisation must be specific enough to detail the progress made on particular WRGE issues. In all of the UN organisations reviewed, the key document in this regard is the annual report of the UN organisation. In addition, financial audits, bilateral and multi-donor consultations and reports from the executive boards can assist MFA officers in this process. In some cases, for instance in their communication with UNICEF, the MFA has criticised the lack of gender-sensitive data in some of these reports.

There is, in other words, no separate reporting to Norway on WRGE issues. However, some of the organisations have in recent years prepared thematic reports on WRGE. These are relevant to the MFA representatives responsible for assessing Norway’s strategy on WRGE in the UN system. When asked whether there were procedures in place to ensure that the reporting of the UN organisation was thoroughly reviewed to make informed decisions about the WRGE policy of the following year, MFA representatives ensured that sufficient information was being gathered.

It was not possible, however, for this Review Team to document whether routines are in place to ensure that reporting from the UN organisations is being reviewed and incorporated into the advocacy work that Norway does in multilateral forums. This might be the result of (i) a lack of routines or (ii) a lack of documentation of existing routines. In the first case, this would entail that whether or not reporting from UN organisations stands in a reciprocal relationship with Norwegian responses and statements in board meetings relies on individual officials and their commitment to actively engage with these reports. In the second case, this would mean that these routines might well exist, but that documentation of these routines for an external reviewer would be impossible. The Review Team recommends that the
MFA adopts a conscious approach to routines relating to reporting from UN organisations across the UN Section, and on whether these routines should be documented.

3.4.2 Similarities and differences between different UN organisations

The UN organisations reviewed in this report are different, both in terms of mandate, constitution and the degree to which Norway is dominant in its policy-making. On the basis of the documents reviewed and interviews conducted for this review, we can identify certain similarities and differences between the different organisations.

Important similarities across the UN system

Norway’s approach to the UN system can be characterised as relatively coherent, and there are many similarities in the way the MFA approaches the UN system, both in terms of funding and advocacy. Certain thematic issues – sexual and reproductive rights, gender mainstreaming, rights-based programming and results-based reporting, among others – tend to surface in Norway’s communication with several UN organisations. Moreover, the MFA has taken a strong stance, both rhetorically and in practice, favouring multilateral practices in the UN system. This means that Norway tends to prefer working politically through the internal organisational framework of the UN organisations: e.g. board representation, joint statements and core funding contributions. However, this practice is not wholly consistent, as exemplified by the use of secondment and politically charged Letters of Allocation.

Several respondents interviewed for this review emphasised that Norway aimed to act as a ‘good multilateralist’, a stance which is in line with the intentions of the Action Plan. At the same time, Norway’s ambitions to be a fervent advocate for women’s rights and gender equality forces MFA practices to ‘steer off’ the multilateralist track. Doing so can be interpreted as a strategy to bypass multilateralist processes when these are seen to fail to deliver on WRGE. This strategy can potentially delegitimise the multilateralist processes in the long run, even though they can carry immediate rewards in relation to WRGE. However, extra measures can also be interpreted as a way of keeping the UN organisations accountable on WRGE policies which have formally been adopted, but which fail to materialise in actual practices. Neither of these strategies is necessarily at odds with the intentions of the Action Plan, and the Review Team found that MFA representatives adopted a pragmatic approach which bridged multilateralist ideals with WRGE advocacy in their cooperation with UN organisations.

Core funding vs. extra budgetary contributions

While all UN organisations receive core funding from Norway, the importance of the Norwegian contribution – and hence the ability of the MFA to exert influence on the policy direction of the the UN organisation through this allocation – varies. On the one hand, ILO’s hybrid funding arrangement, the RBSA, allows additional sums of money to the core activities, but with a certain level of ‘soft earmarking’. This enables Norway to exert additional pressure on an organisation which is already making steps in a progressive direction on issues of WRGE. Core funding to UNICEF, on the other hand, is possibly secondary to extra budgetary contributions in terms of WRGE impact. In fact, the NOK 500 million to Basic Education and Gender Equality might represent the single most significant contribution to WRGE in Norwegian development cooperation.

WRGE policies in the UN system

Another important factor shaping Norway’s stance on WRGE advocacy vis-à-vis the different UN organisations is the degree to which the organisation itself has moved towards a political stance around WRGE issues which is in line with Norwegian development policy. The contrast between UNFPA and UNICEF exemplifies this point. Whereas Norway regards the former organisation as proactive on these issues, and supports the general direction of the UNFPA on WRGE issues through the work the organisation does on a country level on sensitive issues like sexual and reproductive health, this is not necessarily the case with UNICEF. Here, Norway has chosen to get involved in programme activities where the scope for earmarking and political guidelines arguably is greater. In another organisation, ILO, MFA representatives argue they saw a potential for influence which led to a stronger engagement concerning WRGE than before, using what they saw as a ‘window of opportunity’. External and
internal evaluation, such as the 2005 Evaluation of Gender Equality and Gender Mainstreaming in UNDP, can also represent ‘windows of opportunity’ for change agents, and create a responsiveness for renewed efforts on, for example, gender-targeted policies or gender mainstreaming.
4 Has Norway increased its relative funding to projects and programmes supporting women’s rights and gender equality?

The Indicator for this question is:
Changes in proportion of the budget marked with OECD/DAC gender markers

The ToR has identified the following sources to be consulted for this question:
- The use of the OECD/DAC gender marker on sectors, partners, and countries/regions.
- The Gender budget line as a catalytic instrument

4.1 Funding for WRGE has increased

Table 1: WRGE in the budget measures by OECD/DAC gender markers, in 1000 NOK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM - Gender and equality</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main objective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>505 779</td>
<td>567 471</td>
<td>1 402 000</td>
<td>1 316 779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>4,2</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant objective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1 847 301</td>
<td>2 136 941</td>
<td>2 930 000</td>
<td>3 519 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>15,5</td>
<td>16,9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>9 564 024</td>
<td>9 924 803</td>
<td>11 089 000</td>
<td>11 193 195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>80,3</td>
<td>78,6</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>69,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>11 917 104</td>
<td>12 629 215</td>
<td>15 421 000</td>
<td>16 029 123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding for WRGE, measured by the OECD/DAC Gender Marker has increased, from 4,2% in 2005 to 8,2% in 2008 for gender equality as main objective, and from 15,5% to 22% on significant objective. This is a large increase. One should, however, take notice that the score for gender as main objective seems to have stagnated, and there is even a slight decline from 2007 to 2008.

The budget assessment of the 2009-2011 three year rolling plans of the embassies show a slight declining trend for aid targeting women, as low as 2-2,5% (MFA 2008c). This is alarming, especially as other priority areas have seen steep rise in their score, for example aid to energy is increasing from ca. 6,5% to 14%, while education, which is now mainly channelled through multilateral channels is expected to decline from ca. 14% to 5%. One should be able to expect that policy changes will influence budget plans. The Regional Department in its note on the Three year 2009-2011 Plans (MFA 2007c) also note that the embassies WRGE work is not satisfactory and has to be given higher priority by the embassies. The Regional Department, MFA, states that they in dialogue with the GIL/GU and Norad will come back to the embassies with suggestions for follow up on improved work on WRGE. They also state very explicit that it is a goal to increase the funding to WRGE in the embassies budget beyond what the embassies already have done in their 2009-2011 plans.

Funding of WRGE as targeted projects for women certainly is important in a time where many of the women organisations in the partner countries experience a declining trend in funding, and a general donor fatigue with funding civil society, including women’s organisations. On the other side, the Review Team recognises that WRGE has certain specific characteristics as a policy field, and where gender mainstreaming still remains the main challenge.
However, there are also debates on how well suited the gender markers are to measure WRGE progress. High scores on significant objective often reflect the sector profile, i.e. it is easier to achieve a high score on gender as significant objective in health and education, than in infrastructure and economics development.

Given that there is a strong movement on Norwegian development cooperation towards climate change, clean energy and sustainable infrastructure and budget support, there were some concern that this development could lead to a decline in the gender marker for gender as significant objective. This indicator to a large extent measure changes in the composition of aid; when health and education is high on the agenda the gender marker gives a high score. Looking at the overall score it is therefore a good sign that the gender marker still increases its total score, from 20% in 2005 to 30% in 2008. However, this implies that 70% of Norwegian Aid is still not captured by the gender markers.

Some of the increase in the score of the gender marker seems to result from new areas, such as humanitarian aid, being better captured by the markers. When analysing the trend in individual partner countries over the period 2005-2008, there are countries where the gender markers show a declining trend and this in countries where one could have expected the opposite trend.

Countries with a substantial increase in funds captured by the gender marker are Afghanistan, with an increase from 150 Mill NOK in 2005 to 412 Mill NOK in 2008, and Sudan which increased from 42 Mill NOK in 2005 to 343 Mill NOK in 2008.

Countries which have seen little or no increase; and even declining trends are Democratic Republic of Congo, which receive as little as ca. 50 Mill NOK in 2005, which increased to ca. 85 Mill NOK in 2007, and declined again to 65 Mill NOK in 2008. Similar trends can be seen for Guatemala and Eritrea.

### 4.2 The Gender budget line (Kvinnebevilgningen)

The Gender budget line (Kvinnebevilgningen) was introduced in the MFA budget for 2007. Norad had managed a similar budget line in the 1990s, but this budget line was discontinued after an evaluation that found that it did not improve mainstreaming. When the evaluation of the Gender Strategy recommended reintroduce a Gender budget line, the Evaluation Team did so in spite of no support from the people interviewed. The arguments the Evaluation Team presented was that WRGE was so invisible, that one needed to have specific earmarked Fund to make the thematic area visible again.

The Evaluation of 2005, envisaged a gender budget line that would mainly be directed towards gender mainstreaming; stating “It is recommended that MFA and Norad consider to establish a separate time-limited fund for analytical work and catalytic activities for mainstreaming and innovative efforts on W&GE. This should not to be a fund for women’s projects, but for strengthening W&GE mainstreaming in overall development cooperation, with an emphasis on innovative practices and with a special focus on new aid modalities. A carefully organised and managed gender fund could improve the mainstreaming of gender into planning, implementation and M&E of projects and programmes, including budget support.” (Norad 2005:58).

The GIL/GU argued against such a Gender budget line, arguing that this would take too much of their time. The decision on the Gender budget line was taken when the budget was prepared in the spring/summer of 2006, as a response to the evaluation and its recommendations. Guidelines for the

---

5 In the Environmental Action Plan one has completely left the option of measuring progress by using OECD/DAC environmental markers, after several years with criticism from the environmental NGOs about the marker being a weak tool for measuring investment in environment and sustainable development.
use of the Gender budget line was developed, with specific and more detailed guidelines for the UN Section’s use of the Gender budget line for extra budgetary support to UN agencies. The guidelines state explicitly that the Gender budget line is designed to support the implementation of the GEAP, but the guidelines mainly focus on women targeting projects and programmes, and leave out any reference to gender mainstreaming, disregarding the advice from the Evaluation of 2005. According to GIL/GU other means and funding is used for promoting gender mainstreaming. Guidelines were revised in 2007/2008. The Guidelines and management systems for the gender budget line will also be revised spring 2009, and is advised to take the issue of gender mainstreaming into consideration.

4.3 What has the gender budget lines been used for?

For the year 2007 ca. half of the budget has been spent on multilateral organisations, mainly UN agencies, but also the World Bank and on international NGOs, while half the budget has been used by the embassies, for catalytic work. Funding for the embassies are demand driven, the embassies apply to the Regional Department for funds. The Gender budget line seems to work as an incentive to the embassies, to discuss, and to increase and improve embassy WRGE work; and it gives those embassies with particular committed and active staff and leadership to have additional funding opportunities for WRGE work.

The selection criteria for the Gender budget line are the four priority areas in the GEAP, and state explicitly that the budget line should not replace the other budget lines as sources for WRGE work.

According to GIL/GU the Gender budget line for 2008 had the following profile:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008 Funding in 1000 NOK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Department/Embassies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norad (UFO⁶ and SIVSA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Department, GIL, Bank Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that this is referring to development cooperation channels for the budget line, and not recipients of the funds. The embassies may fund UN-agencies work at country level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008 funding according to recipients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NGO/CSO/Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public authorities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic distribution of the Gender budget line 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual and reproductive health and rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence against women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building, incl. research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁶ UFO is the Department for Education, including research and higher education, Norad.
More than 50% of the Gender budget line has been used by the embassies, and this proportion has increased from 2007 to 2008. Several of the embassies have made active use of the budget line, among them Afghanistan, Pakistan, Nepal, Palestine authority, Kenya, Malawi and Mozambique.

**Development cooperation (incl. multi-bi) Gender budget line (kap.post 168) 2007 and 2008 (NOK 1000)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recipient country</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>15 068</td>
<td>15 000</td>
<td>30 068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa Regional</td>
<td>10 250</td>
<td>12 800</td>
<td>23 050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America Regional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>3 423</td>
<td>3 110</td>
<td>6 533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>2 000</td>
<td>2 500</td>
<td>4 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Timor</td>
<td>2 000</td>
<td>1 500</td>
<td>3 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>69 640</td>
<td>37 312</td>
<td>86 952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7400</td>
<td>7 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGO</td>
<td>20 255</td>
<td>18 585</td>
<td>38 840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, not Norway</td>
<td>3 963</td>
<td>3782</td>
<td>7 745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Norway</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8600</td>
<td>8 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>2 000</td>
<td>1 200</td>
<td>3 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>4 801</td>
<td>6 172</td>
<td>10 973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>7 776</td>
<td>5 889</td>
<td>13 665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>2 000</td>
<td>1 994</td>
<td>3 994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>9 955</td>
<td>21 391</td>
<td>31 346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>9 306</td>
<td>11 637</td>
<td>20 943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>9 000</td>
<td>11 000</td>
<td>20 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>3 000</td>
<td>3 600</td>
<td>6 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>9 999</td>
<td>5 184</td>
<td>15 183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestinian Admin. Areas</td>
<td>4 825</td>
<td>7 650</td>
<td>12 475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of Sahara Regional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 988</td>
<td>2 988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>4 000</td>
<td>9 998</td>
<td>13 998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td>1 500</td>
<td>1 500</td>
<td>3 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>3 988</td>
<td>4 888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1 035</td>
<td>1 935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>195 599</strong></td>
<td><strong>207 171</strong></td>
<td><strong>383 732</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Embassies</strong></td>
<td><strong>103 703</strong></td>
<td><strong>131 492</strong></td>
<td><strong>235 195</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global</strong></td>
<td><strong>91 896</strong></td>
<td><strong>75 679</strong></td>
<td><strong>167 575</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The embassies mainly fund new trust funds and extra budgetary activities in UN agencies, especially UNIFEM programmes in the country in question, and national NGOs. UN agencies were large recipients in 2007, but are less dominant in 2008, and it is expected that many of the UN programmes may be funded over other budget lines in the years to come. In 2007 60% of the Gender budget line was awarded to UN agencies, including funding via the embassies. International NGOs (INGOs) have received ca. 10% of the funds in 2007, and somewhat less in 2008. Research in Norway was included for the first time in 2008, through the NUFU financing mechanism, and through a research programme in the Norwegian Research Council7.

The guidelines for the budget line state explicitly that the budget line may not be used for Norwegian NGOs or researchers, but that they may enter as partners to applicants from partner countries. An

---

7 These funds have been allocated to the research Council, but not yet advertised, the funds will therefore most probably not be used until 2009.
example of this is the Christian Michelsen Institute (CMI), which is a partner to research organisations in Mozambique on a joint research project of gender and poverty analysis, and Centre for International Health (CIH), University of Oslo, which is a partner in a joint research project on maternal health in Malawi.

There is no way the review team can make a sound judgement as to what extent the Gender budget line has contributed to increased gender equality financing in other budget lines, or has replaced such funding.

The State Auditor General (Riksrevisjonen) is conducting a review of the gender budget line in 2009, and more information will then be available. What we can see is that although over 300 Mill NOK in total has been funded for WRGE through the gender budget line in 2007 and 2008, there are no indications of a general reduction of gender markers on the other budget lines. There was a slight decrease in the gender maker for gender as main objective, and we have not been able to substantiate what caused such a decline.

4.4 Is the Gender budget line catalytic?

It is impossible to give a clear answer on this question given the limited documentation available. To answer this question would require much more in-depth analysis of individual projects. It seems from the overall picture given by the list of approved projects that most of the individual projects target one of the priority areas in the GEAP, but that they do so by providing funding for women’s rights. As gender mainstreaming has not been a target for the budget line, or criteria for allocation of funds, it is difficult to use the concept of catalytic in the sense of gender mainstreaming. Catalytic would then have to mean developing projects that may mature to full scale projects that can be funded by other budget lines. This is an interesting question, but not one that can be answered with current data and time lines. The MFA is advised to develop more detailed guidelines, and designate what they mean with catalytic and innovative.

Since 50% of the funds go to or through the UN\textsuperscript{8}; one could imagine that these funds could have been provided over other budget lines. This is not studied in detail, and the conclusion could also be that the gender budget line has given MFA the necessary flexibility for rapid response to requests. However, there are budget items that one would expect to have been funded by other budgets lines had the gender budget line not existed, such as the UNFPA/UNICEF FGM and Fistula Funds. GIL/GU has expressed the view that UN probably will decrease in importance as recipient as other recipients will be positioned to apply for funds form the budget line.

The embassies have mainly funded UN/UNIFEM or local NGOs, while a few of them have funded research. The embassies do not seem to have used the funds for developing activities that may mature into projects and programmes that may be funded over other budget lines; nor have they funded activities for gender mainstreaming in programme activities as this was not included in the criteria for allocation of funds.

It is also impossible to state clearly to what extent the Gender budget line replace other funds, or compliment other budget lines. For the funds that go through the embassies, there is an indication that women targeted projects are moved from the regional budget line to the Gender budget line, and according to Norad summing up note (May 2009) only 1,5% of the embassies budgets now target women and gender equality\textsuperscript{9}. The reason for this might be that the embassies are under great pressure from MFA to reduce the number of projects and agreements. Moving the women targeted projects to the Gender budget line might be a way of protecting funds for these projects. The alternative might be a more drastic reduction in women targeted projects at embassy level.

\textsuperscript{8} This includes both funds directly to UN agencies, and through embassies allocation of the gender budget line to UN country programmes.

\textsuperscript{9} The Review Team has not looked into the details of this, as the information came late in the review process.
Another interpretation of such findings might be that gender sensitive staff of the embassies perceive the Gender budget line as any other budget line, and seek funding where it is meet the less resistance. Knowing that new women targeted agreements and projects may come up against the general rule of a concentrated portfolio, they may prioritise the Gender budget line as a source of funding. It may be a dilemma and an irony that the current system of aid policies and management might counteract and work against the guideline for the Gender budget line, which explicit states that this budget line should not replace WRGE in other budget line, but complement them.

Such findings, and different interpretation of what dynamics the gender budget line actually instigates, seems to underlie the importance of reviewing the guidelines for the budget line, and discussing the wider implications the budget line has for overall funding of WRGE. For the Review Team it also highlights the need to assess to what extent the budget line should be used for encouraging gender mainstreaming in the development cooperation.
Has Norway increased gender mainstreaming in its development cooperation?

The ToR has identified the following indicator:
Gender assessment and obligatory gender reporting is part of the project and programme design.
Gender Equality/gender dimension is included in embassies’ governing documents.

The ToR has identified the following sources to be consulted for this question:
- “Review of the development portfolio and work with women’s rights and gender equality. Norwegian Representative Office Al- Ram 2008”.
- Analysis of the embassies three-year strategic plans 2009-2011.

What do the ‘gender review’ reports tell about gender mainstreaming?

The question of “increased gender mainstreaming” might not be documented, by available documentation. However, the ‘gender review’ may be a new instrument with a potential to improve GM in the embassies' work. The Evaluation of 2005 found that GM was also done before, but not systematically (missed opportunities) – and that what was done, was underreported.

The review of the development co-operation in Al-Ram (Norad 2008a) and Zambia (Norad 2008b) was carried out in 2008, and the one in Ethiopia in January 2009 (Norad 2009). A somewhat similar review was conducted in Angola in 2006 (Norad 2006b).

Angola

The review of the implementation of Women and Gender Equality Aspects in the Norwegian Development Co-operation with Angola was carried out in August 2006 (Norwegian Consulting Group and Norad).

This review is a review of activities in two of three sectors of the ongoing cooperation between Norway and Angola, namely education and good governance, democracy and human rights. The review concludes that the Norwegian Embassy should improve its dialogue on women and gender equality both with its present and new partners and pay special attention to these issues in the dialogue with the Government of Angola. The UN should take a lead in the dialogue with national authorities.

The Norwegian Representative Office, Al-Ram

This review was carried out in autumn 2008 by Norad in co-operation with Nordic Consulting Group. The review of the development portfolio and work with women’s rights and gender equality focuses on how the cooperation between the Norwegian Representative Office (NRO) and the Palestinian Territories (PT) address women’s issues and gender concerns as defined in the Norwegian policy documents. Six programmes and projects were selected, covering major, but different fields of cooperation. The selected partners are the Ministry of Education and Higher Education, The Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics, AMAN (anti-corruption), Independent Commission for Human Rights, EUPOLCOPPS (Civil Police) and Palestinian Women’s Centre for Research and Documentation.

According to the review, the partners are considered to give rather low priority to the work on women’s rights and gender issues. The Review Team found that the cooperating partners underestimate the importance of women’s rights and gender equality, also in the police sphere. Better management and procedures for reporting on gender from the partners to the embassy should be in place.

Zambia
The review was carried out autumn 2008 by Norad in cooperation with Regional Swedish-Norwegian HIV/AIDS team and one local consultant.

The selected areas of the portfolio were budget support, human rights, LRF and Legal Aid Clinic, Conservation Agriculture and Gender UN.

The review conclusion is that mainstreaming remains a challenge, both when it comes to gender mainstreaming and HIV/AIDS mainstreaming. Gender analysis capacity at the embassy was not used by the other desk officers, and more emphasis could be placed on working on gender issues in the general budget support implementation and policy dialogue.

**Ethiopia**

The review was carried out in January 2009, and looked at GM in natural resources management and the environment portfolio of the embassy as well as university collaboration. The review found that GM was in place for most of the projects in the design phase of the programmes, but that they were weaker on actual implementation and reporting on WRGE.

The embassy staff seemed to work too independently from each other, not benefitting from in-house competence in WRGE. This led to a situation where the embassy missed out on opportunities to promote WRGE more systematically.

**Common findings:**

- **Mainstreaming as a problem.** The following points were mentioned in the review from Zambia, but are more or less also relevant for the other two reviews.
  - The responsibility for mainstreaming must be placed at the management level
  - Sufficient and relevant gender/AIDS expertise at the embassy level with a clear mandate and organisational location, a gender adviser must know the development cooperation system, be proactive in putting gender and AIDS on the agenda. Everyone has the responsibility for mainstreaming, not just the gender adviser
  - Internal and external demand for results on gender and AIDS
  - The general experiences - the work on women and gender equality is not systematically institutionalised and the organisations are dependent on individual expertise and efforts.
    (Reduction in staff – mainstreaming of gender/AIDS will suffer)

- **Emphasis on gender** - There should also be a stronger emphasis on women and gender, and there is a need to strengthen the implementation of the policies and increase the resources towards women’s rights and gender equality. This should be done by including women and gender concerns within all sectors of cooperation and visualise this in the project documents, Annual Reports, Strategic Plan, Activity Plan and in project reviews.

- **Integration of gender aspects** - The embassies should facilitate better cross-fertilisation and integration of gender issues in the work, both within the embassy itself and with partners. The recommendations from the Zambia review could also be useful for others:
  - Peer review: in this way different programme officers could use their own competence to give input to documents and discussions in different sectors, and thematic meetings could stimulate cross-fertilisation between programmes
  - Facilitate dialogues on practical examples on how to enhance gender integration into other programmes, for example in relation to agriculture and human rights’ organisations.

- **Internal cooperation:** need for proper backing and competence-building regarding mainstreaming, trying to avoid that each programme officer works more or less in isolation. Better mainstreaming requires good internal cooperation. Need for training in gender, sexual and reproductive rights and HIV, and on tools and approaches that may be used in order to enhance mainstreaming and analyse the effect of gender and AIDS on the different programmes
• **Training needs:** The embassies experienced needs for gender training to strengthen the capacity and competence to work more systematically in the field. Improved gender mainstreaming methodology should be incorporated in MFA’s training courses and in the Programme/Project Cycle Manual.
  
  o Use gender-disaggregated statistical data (if available)
  o Arrange gender seminars
  o Better mainstreaming requires good internal cooperation. Sharing of competence between colleagues. Need for training in gender, sexual and reproductive rights and HIV, and on tools and approaches that may be used in order to enhance mainstreaming and analyse the effect of gender and AIDS on the different programmes.

• **Report the results better** – the results achieved should be reported better than today. This also involved results from different project and programmes, as well as from the embassies.

### 5.2 Gender Mainstreaming in embassies’ strategic plans

Norad made a review of the embassies three-year rolling strategic plans and found that WRGE was not well mainstreamed into the country level planning. In their note to the Development Cooperation Minister about the 2009-2011 strategic plans, the regional department is clear on the fact that gender mainstreaming is not implemented according to the goals in the GEAP. This was repeated to the team in interviews with the Regional Department. One of the problems is the format and template for the report and plans from the embassies. There is a need for the MFA and Norad to analyse this situation and find solutions, and to develop improved templates for more informative reporting from the embassies on results of WRGE work at the country level.

In order to move forward on this issue and break difficult barriers it could be useful to do more analysis of country level WRGE planning and implementation. It still seems like we do not know the real barrier to improved GM, and that some of the barrier is embedded in the development cooperation system itself. Uganda has used the Gender budget line to hire a national consultant to review the embassy’s portfolio and make an embassy Gender action plan. It is too early to see the result of this work yet, but it could be valuable to follow up this case, and see if the case also has relevance for other embassies in their attempts to work more coherently and systematically on Gender Mainstreaming and WRGE.
6 Has Norway improved the organisation of its development cooperation, to ensure the necessary capacity, competence and governance in its work on women’s rights and gender equality?

The indicator identified in the ToR is: The embassies with development cooperation, MFA and Norad have sufficient gender equality competence and capacity, and also management embedded routines, to ensure women’s rights and gender equality in all their work.

The ToR has identified the following sources to be consulted for this question:
- Desk study of existing documentation, supplemented by key interviews on organisation, capacity, resources, competence and management in the work on women’s rights and gender equality in development cooperation.
- OECD-DAC Peer Review 2004 and 2008

There also needs to be a discussion of what kind of WRGE capacity the embassies need, and how they should work with national WRGE competence in the partner countries. The OECD/DAC Peer Review of 2004 criticised Norway for not working systematically enough on WRGE. The 2008 Peer Review is much less critical, it notes that there have been improvements in staffing and refers to the new policy documents, but that competence is still thinly spread, and that polices are not followed up at the country level. The Tanzania case study in the Peer Review could not find any references to WRGE in the embassy’s plans and reporting to MFA. On the background of the Tanzania case study, the Peer Review asks for improved documentation of WRGE in plans and reports from the embassies.

6.1 MFA polices and plans

The GEAP is seen as an important step towards strengthening WRGE work in MFA, the Embassies and Norad, in addition to White Paper No. 11, and the Soria-Moria Declaration of the Labour/Centre/Left Government that was elected in September 2005.

Other policy documents such as the Guidelines on Norwegian Humanitarian Policy have a strong WRGE focus. On the other hand the latest White Paper on Norwegian Development Policy had left out WRGE as a specific focus, and instead highlighted Capital, Climate and Conflict (MFA 2009a).

WRGE is mentioned as important issue under each of these three headings, but only in a ‘rhetorical argument’ and more substantial issues about how and with whom one will work on WRGE in relation to the three themes is not stated. One interpretation is that WRGE again is delegated to being a non-communicated cross-cutting issue, with little political significance. Another interpretation could be that WRGE is seen as covered by the former White Paper No. 11, and that the new White Paper did not want to repeat what was written there. However, most interestingly White Paper No. 11 has no references to climate change or very little to capital, except increasing women’s access to assets and economic participation.

There also needs to be a contextualisation of how to work on WRGE in the current development cooperation system in Norway, and what the different roles are. Furthermore there is no real gender network with GE focal persons in the different departments. There is also no system wide reporting, except for the budget text. The reporting systems, and its shortcomings as a political tool, will be discussed.
To understand current conditions for working on WRGE in MFA, one has to analyse the context and recent reforms.

6.2 Improved WRGE capacity, but systemic approach still missing

There has been improved gender specialist staffing both in the MFA and Norad. In the MFA the Gender unit is placed in the Section for Global Initiative in the Department of Global Affairs. It has three staff members, headed by an ambassador/senior adviser on gender issues. All three are new to the unit since the evaluation in 2005. One was recruited in 2006, and the two others, including the ambassador, in 2008.

When the GEAP was formulated in 2006-2007, the Gender Unit in the MFA institutionalised an internal resource group to develop the GEAP and to be responsible to oversee the implementation of the report. A mandate was formulated and approved by the management in MFA. The group had members from all main departments of development cooperation, but the members acted in a personal capacity, not as representatives of their Departments. The underlying idea was that the members should act as a gender focal network in the organisation. However, after the GEAP was approved, the Resource Group was not called on a regular basis, and was only called on a sporadic basis to discuss applications for the Gender budget line. When people left their positions, new members were not appointed. There are no agendas and few minutes from the meetings. The Resource Group has not been able to exercise their mandate as supporting gender mainstreaming in the organisation.

Today each department is asked to establish a gender focal point, but this does not constitute as yet a gender focal point network, with proper communication, and management procedures. The Section for Global Initiatives (GIL)/Gender Unit (GU) has stated in interviews that establishing a proper gender focal point is high on the agenda, but that this will be done as part of a process whereby GIL/GU organise meetings with the various departments in the MFA on their WRGE work. However, today there is no proper gender focal network with a clear mandate.

In Norad the Gender Team consists of three gender advisers and is located in the Department for Peace, Gender and Democracy. There has been a rapid turnover of staff, and of the current three gender advisers, two were recruited since March 2009, and one in August 2008. There have also been gaps in staffing, which has meant a lack of momentum and capacity to carry the gender equality work forward.

An effective and well-functioning focal gender network would assist in effective knowledge-sharing and in creating a critical mass of experience that can inform an improved practice and policy implementation in the field of WRGE.

Training

It is recognised that it is difficult to find a format for training in WRGE that is appreciated by the general staff in MFA and Norad. A training course on SCR 1325 was organised, which was well attended, while the general WRGE training attracted only four people from MFA and Norad, but several outsiders. The evaluation of 2005 did not recommend separate gender training courses, but women’s rights and gender equality should be integrated as relevant topics in the other courses, when and if relevant, and to improve the training.

The peace and conflict training had at the time of the evaluations of 2005 already integrated gender issues into the course. It seems that no further systematic work has been undertaken to integrate gender where and when relevant. This indicates that one has to continue to work on training programmes that are seen as relevant and useful by the staff. This might include more “on the job” training in the connection with the gender reviews, and training “in-country”, as joint training events for several donors. The Review Team is not of the opinion that gender training should be made compulsory. Training, especially at the embassy level, is important as the staff in the embassies often expresses an interest in WRGE, but is somewhat at a loss on how to approach the issues and implement effective gender mainstreaming in programmes.
One could also consider strengthening the WRGE component in obligatory training for new staff, and for staff who shall start to work in the embassies. The training could address how to work on crosscutting issues, both on WRGE as a cross-cutting issue but also other cross-cutting issues.

6.3 Web pages

The MFA web page has separate pages for each of the working areas. On the web page for development cooperation there was as late as March 2009 no link/pointer to WRGE. This was surprising when all the other areas mentioned in the policy documents had their own sub-pages. None of the other work areas had links/pointers to WRGE, and there was generally little information on the topic on the MFA website. The only place one could find a direct sub-page on WRGE was under the speeches of the minister. This situation changed in April/May 2009, and WRGE is now one of several policy fields presented under the MFA/Development Cooperation.

The Norad web page is supposed to be restructured and updated during summer 2009. The Norwegian version is informative, although not updated with the names of the gender specialist. The English version states that it was last updated September 2005, and names of gender advisers or recent publications have not been updated.

Web pages are important instruments for providing information and transparency on what Norad is doing on WRGE. Updated web pages should be an integral part of implementation of all development cooperation, and action plans in particular, to provide information and accountability of action (and non-action), and for knowledge sharing and creating a constituency on the policy objects of WRGE.

6.4 WRGE tools and analytical work

Gender marker and the Sustainability Elements in the Development Co-operation Manual (DCM)

The most important tools still remain the same as when the evaluation was done, i.e. the use of the gender marker, and the Development Co-operation Manual (DCM) that state that the sustainability elements, including gender equality, should be consulted.

Norad management reviews of the embassies

Norad is instructed by the MFA to conduct Management Reviews (Forvaltningsgjennomganger) of a number of embassies each year. The template and the ToR of these are not made public, nor are the reports. There are internal teams that conduct the reviews under the leadership of the Department for Quality Assurance AMOR/Norad, which has a special section for Management Processes.

The teams spend approximately one week at the embassies, reviewing a selection of projects that have been agreed upon beforehand/upfront, and on which the embassies have written their own assessment concerning the management. The mission also includes a training section and an end report, and the embassies’ plans of action to rectify shortcomings.

These management reviews included from circa 2006/2007 a section on the embassies adherence to policies and instruction governing WRGE as well. The Review Team has had no access to these reports and does not know how many embassies have been covered by this new template, but the team recommends that a future evaluation also access these management reviews of the embassies. The Review Team also recommends that MFA and Norad consider whether it is useful for Norad to make a summary report of the findings on the embassies’ adherence to guidelines for gender work.

Gender reviews

---

10 Information from AMOR. The Review Team had no references to this in written documentation, but in the State Auditors’ report (Riksrevisjonen 2006:10) it refers to the Embassy Management Review template from 2006, which was included as a pilot project that the review could also assess when the concern for the environment was conducted in relation to the Development Cooperation Manual (DCM).
The new tool that Norad has developed is the ‘gender review’. Norad took a decision in a management meeting in 2006 that they would introduce a review (‘wash’) of embassies’ portfolios, or parts of them, in four areas: climate, gender, anti-corruption and conflict sensitivity. The underlying idea was that such exercises were to be offered to the embassies, as part of Norad’s technical support, and as a means to get beyond the single-activity technical support that Norad mainly provides as a response to a demand-driven system. The idea was also that relevant web pages would be established to allow for easy access to the reports. Communication has also been sent from Norad to the embassies offering this exercise.

The Review Team finds the concept of ‘gender review’ highly relevant. It responds to one of the criticisms of the evaluation of 2005, that Norad’s technical support was single-activity directed and that Norad neither provided more comprehensive advice at country level programming nor had any role in the follow-up and continued technical support in gender mainstreaming. It also responds to the criticism that budget support was not scrutinised for gender mainstreaming. It also responds to the findings from the evaluation of 2005 that even the embassies that were interested in doing more WRGE work were concerned that they did not possess the necessary competence and know-how to accomplish it, what approaches to use, etc.

Up to now three ‘gender reviews’ have been conducted, two in 2008, in the Al Ram Office and Zambia (Gender and HIV), and one in 2009, Ethiopia. From 2009 there have been more requests from the embassies than Norad is able to meet. A ‘gender review’ will be conducted in Mozambique in May 2009, and one is planned to take place in Nepal in autumn 2009.

However, the Review Team sees the ‘gender review’ as a tool in the making. There are several issues that need to be clarified.

One is the role of the MFA/Regional Department in the ‘gender review’. Currently the ‘gender reviews’ are technical support instruments that Norad offers to the embassies. It is not an accountability instrument for the Regional Department to hold the embassies accountable for their WRGE work. A revised format for ‘Gender review’ might have such a role, but these alternative uses of the instrument are not necessarily compatible.

Team composition is another issue. If it is a technical support mission, the teams should have local consultants on board. If they are to have more the role of gender audits, they will be more similar to the management audit teams (forvaltningsgiennomganger) and would consist of internal staff of the MFA and Norad.

Norad has been concerned that as a technical support, it has to be fine-tuned to the needs of the embassy. It should not be ‘policing’, but advice and support. Norad has therefore been concerned that the format should allow for flexibility. Although this makes considerable sense, it should be balanced with the need to find corporate strategies to address GM at the embassy level.

Requests from the MFA to Norad for technical services on WRGE

Each year the MFA presents a consolidated list of requests for technical service to Norad. This is based on preparatory meetings that the Norad Director and his staff have with various relevant departments in the MFA. The Review Team has scrutinised the consolidated list that Norad makes, and has the following comments. The overwhelming impression is that WRGE is still seen as something gender specialists do. The requests mainly come from the UN section and from GIL/GU and are directed to FLID, but they also come from the HR/Democracy Department and the Bank Section. There is little evidence of requests from the MFA to Norad’s technical departments on integrating gender perspectives in development cooperation work. In short, the MFA does not ask Norad to assist in analytical work that can improve gender mainstreaming. This is something the MFA and Norad need to raise as an issue and find a common understanding of and solutions to. The Review Team sees this as a major shortcoming in supporting gender mainstreaming in the Norwegian development cooperation system.

The Evaluation Department – learning arenas
The Evaluation Department did develop guidelines for mainstreaming Gender in evaluation design: *Guidelines: women and gender equality as cross-cutting themes in evaluations*, as a response to the evaluation of 2005. The guidelines are used by staff when the staff designs the ToR. It is not given to the evaluation teams that are contracted. The guidelines are internal notes, and they are not placed on the Norad intranet. It is however placed in the Evaluation Department’s folder on the server, so it should be easily accessible for the Evaluation Department Staff. The Review Team did a search in the electronic archives for the guidelines, but could not find it. The Review Team believes such guidelines are valuable and should be made public and placed both on the Norad Intranet and external internet pages.

The Evaluation Department also publishes an Annual Evaluation Report (AER), which for some years has substantially presented the WRGE findings from the evaluations. However, this report could also be used to hold the Evaluation Report accountable for their WRGE work, as the AER could report on to what extent this theme was included in the evaluations, and what the findings could tell us about WRGE work in development co-operation.

6.5 WRGE reporting systems

The most significant weakness in the GEAP implementation is the lack of proper planning and reporting systems. This was a surprise to the Review Team. Both the Evaluation of 2005 and the Office of the General Auditor (Riksrevisjonen) Report of 2006 (Riksrevisjonen 2006a) point to the weakness in integrating WRGE in programme and project planning and weaknesses in reporting.

The mandate for the WRGE project within the MFA 2007-2010 was clear on the need to develop annual plans and reports on the GEAP. This was never done. One reason for this was that there seems to be resistance to such separate planning and reporting, and that a decision was taken that one should rely on management lines ("følge linjen") and not develop separate plans and reports. The idea is fine in principle; each department and section was to be responsible for their own WRGE work in relevant areas, and to do so in their regular planning and reporting. This has not worked, no accountability system has been put in place, and no consolidated reports have been made. Using regular management lines seems not to be easy when one wants to introduce new innovative thinking and practices/praxis.

Many donors struggle with the right format for reporting on their commitments and action plans. DFID has decided to present an annual report to the public based on a comprehensive monitoring system, involving the management system in DFID. It is a detailed and informative report and gives valuable information to the public. It is however not a report that is made in order to hold the system accountable internally, as there is no management response to the report and no political or administrative response procedures when the report is presented.
7 Conclusions – recommendations for adjustments in the implementation

7.1 General recommendations

The Review Team believes that the implementation of the GEAP is in a critical phase. The GEAP document itself is a good and relevant document, with valid and relevant areas of interventions. However, it does lack a number of those characteristics one would expect from an action plan, such as more annual planning and reporting systems, line of accountabilities, etc. The development cooperation system, i.e. the MFA, the embassies and Norad, is advised to act on this information and develop/expand/modify the GEAP into a working document, and ‘make the action plan come into life’.

There is a very good basis for such action to be taken; it is a political will, a large number of committed and knowledgeable staff in the system, in Norad, the MFA and the embassies, gender units in place and a general supportive attitude in most of the MFA, Norad and in the embassies. However, these positive elements for success lack leadership and a functioning management system. Our recommendations therefore focus on a few factors that we strongly advise action on and that we are confident will give results for the commitments made in the GEAP.

Recommendation 1: Establish an operative management system for the GEAP at the political and administrative leadership levels

The MFA is advised to establish a GEAP project with clear roles and a mandate for the MFA and Norad’s gender units and other departments. The MFA is also advised to designate a management system for the Action Plan and make use of available advisory capacity in Norad for such a system.

Generally the system needs to work more systematically and thereby lessen the “missed opportunities”. Many of the recommendations presented in the Evaluation of 2005 are still valid and should be revisited.

Norway is in a good position to improve their results from WRGE-directed activities and gender mainstreaming. WRGE has been high on the agenda for decades, and the MFA and Norad have a large number of well-informed and committed staff. Norway is in the forefront of being a strong state concerning WRGE, which is also a good basis for the staff when working on WRGE. However, unless work is done more systematically, we will continue to see ‘missed opportunities’. WRGE has to be present in policy dialogue, programming, and when identifying aid for WRGE agents that bring about most significant change.

Recommendations 2: Improve the quality of the gender work and report on results

The team recognises the importance of tracking resources for WRGE, both in donors’ aid budgets and in partner country budgeting through gender budget principles. However, the team recommends that the focus on financing and volume be supplemented with a much stronger focus on improving the quality of WRGE aid and report on the result(s).

Closely related to this is a general recommendation of investing in more and better knowledge production, at ‘home’ as well. The Review Team recognises that donor agencies produce considerable knowledge work that is not made use of. It is therefore pertinent that emphasis is made on the relevance and use of analytical work for WRGE work. However, this covers a broad spectrum, not only analysis of development cooperation and programming, but also better understanding of the dynamics of change and local and national barriers to WRGE. Creating more synergy between multilateral aid and knowledge production and bilateral ones is important.

Recommendations 3: GEAP 2007-2009, may be a need to adjust, and further operationalise the GEAP, rather than the new GEAP?
The GEAP has been in operation for two years and is valid until the end of 2009. This MTR has pointed out several weaknesses in the operationalisation of the plan and in its management and reporting systems. Rather than start to work on a new Action Plan or Strategy, the MFA should consider whether a better alternative is to make adjustments in the plan and prolong its life to put the necessary measures in place, and therefore postpone the evaluation to a date later than the end of 2009. In the longer term the MFA needs to discuss on a principle level what kind of policy documents it should rely upon. The usual number of policy documents concerning WRGE is for an organisation to have a Gender Policy as an overarching policy goal, to have a Gender Strategy to instruct its staff on how to go about WRGE work, and a time-bound Action Plan to put certain measures in place and achieve planned results, and give the organisation a boost in its work in WRGE.

7.2 Conclusions and recommendations for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA)

Recommendations M1: Decide on a management system for the Gender Action Plan that allows systematic planning and reporting, and sets priorities and ask for results

Continuing the current management system for the implementation of the GEAP will not allow the MFA to work systematically and document results, nor to document where there are barriers to improved WRGE work.

Recommendations M2: Give clear mandates to the gender unit on how wide their rights and duties to report on the Action Plan are, but place overall responsibility for the Action Plan at a higher management level.

The mandates for the Gender Unit in GIL are not clear. The current system of placing responsibility in the departments themselves for mainstreaming policy issues, such as WRGE, is sound and should be continued. What are lacking are good reporting systems and systems for holding management in the departments accountable.

Recommendations M3: Regional Department important as flagship, need to develop improved methods for capturing WRGE work in partner countries

Regional state-to-state aid is currently less than 20% of the Norwegian development cooperation, but overall bilateral aid is close to 50%. Bilateral aid and the Regional Department, MFA, has an important role as a flagship for informing and communicating Norwegian aid policies, including WRGE, and for results reporting. It is clear from the latest report back to the embassies that the Regional Department has identified WRGE as an area for more concerted effort and more funding. This work need to be strengthened and consolidated.

Recommendations M4: Set up a gender focal network on the management level, to supplement the focal network of gender knowledgeable persons in a current (loose) network.

There is a gender focal point in several of the departments in the MFA, but no functioning network, and no mandates for the gender focal point or their potential network. The Review Team would advise the MFA to establish a proper focal point network and ensure that when members leave their positions, new members are recruited to the network. At the same time the Review Team can see the value of a more formal network of senior management to oversee the implementation of the GEAP. This could be placed at the top level, the Director General of the Departments or their deputies, with a mandate to approve plans for the implementation of Action Plans including GEAP, and also to review annual reports, and prepare the meetings with political leadership of the MFA concerning WRGE. We can see no other ways to ensure full top management commitment to the GEAP.

Recommendations M5: Improve guidelines and management systems for the Gender budget line. Results reporting on WRGE weak. Should be priority area for Norad/MFA. Annual Report on the Gender budget line.

GIL/GU has stated in their work plan for 2009 that new guidelines and a management system for the Gender budget line shall be approved during the spring 2009. The Review Team supports this, and also the development towards a responsible unit for the selected recipient(s) to manage their part of the
funds. However, a proper system for planning and reporting should be in place, whereby units such as the UN section and the Norad/SIVSA, plan and report according to relevant templates, to facilitate consolidated reports, and also report on results. From the current reporting system there is no way one may conclude whether the Gender budget line has acted in an innovative and catalytic way, or what results it has achieved. Such systems have to be established, and both planning and reporting should also emphasise the innovative and catalytic aspects of the project, as well as results in the reports.

Recommendations M6: Increase synergy between bi- and multilateral investments

The Gender budget line has funded interesting and valuable analytic work, for example with the OECD/DAC Development Centre on social institutions for women’s empowerment, and the Oxford Policy Management on Gender and inclusion in the implementation of the Paris Declaration. that is not often shared with partners in Norway; the Review Team also assumes that it is not often shared with partner countries, However, some of the work, such as the work with IDEA on Gender, Elections and Political Participation, with UNIFEM and UNDP on Governance and Gender, are still in a preliminary phase, and where main project activities are just starting, which gives the MFA and Norad an opportunity to organise the work so that information and new knowledge are shared.

Norad, which is the MFA’s directorate for technical support and quality assurance for the Norwegian DC, has not been much involved in this work. One contributing factor is also that the budget for analytical work has been relatively diminished the last few years, and the MFA decided that the Gender budget line should have a clause that none of the funds could be spent in Norway or with Norwegian partners, such as consultants, researchers, and NGOs. This definitely has hampered the development of relevant analytical work that could assist in improved mainstreaming and WRGE work.

The MFA is advised to assess new ways of increasing the synergy between bilateral and multilateral investment in knowledge production, and bring some of the work they are funding globally back to Norway for discussions.

7.3 Conclusions and recommendations for Norad

Recommendations N1: Norad should play a more strategic and defined role in the implementation of the Action Plan. This could include WRGE analytic work and knowledge generation. Norad has an important role in knowledge production for improved quality in WRGE work.

Norad has improved its own staffing and capacity on WRGE, which is placed in FLID. The gender team has concentrated its capacity on meeting individual requests for support from the embassies and MFA. However, Norad has not been able to pursue the GEAP on a more strategic level in the development cooperation. The MFA should consider delegating responsibility with a clear mandate, for certain aspects of the GEAP to Norad. This should be combined with re-establishing a GEAP project consisting of high level representatives from both the MFA and Norad, which meet regularly to plan and report on the GEAP. This would give a clearer division of labour between Norad and the MFA, give strategic direction for the GEAP and allow for the systematic work towards results for gender equality and women’s rights that currently are lacking in the Norwegian development cooperation.

Recommendations N2: Norad could be systematic in mainstreaming WRGE into appraisals and reviews commissioned and take action to pursue gender mainstreaming in all technical departments.

Analytical work on WRGE, except for the ‘gender review’ and regional seminars for the embassies carried out by FLID, has been mostly single programme/project technical support. There have been few attempts to synthesize knowledge into larger knowledge pieces. One exception was the relevant work done on summing up anti-trafficking work (Norad 2008). The regular seminars on women’s rights and gender equality for broader gender networks are also a highly welcomed initiative by FLID. However, the circulation of invitations is still limited and should be expanded to include more men, consultants and researchers. Today it mainly targets gender advisers in the NGOs.

WRGE analytical work is also to a large extent seen as the responsibility of FLID/GU, and there have been a few attempts to integrate WRGE into technical work in the other departments, especially into
the environment and climate, energy and infrastructure, economic activity and business, and agriculture and natural resources management. Norad is advised to be much more strategic in its own activity planning (VP process), and identify areas for mainstreaming gender in technical work in departments other than FLID on an annual planning basis. The planned “mini-gender review” from autumn 2009 of the different Norad technical departments is a promising step in this regard. Such initiatives need to be followed up closely, as earlier attempts to do so have failed. The Development Cooperation Manual (DCM) (Norad 2007a) and the Guidelines for Assessment of Sustainability Elements (Norad 2007b) could be the foundation for much more systematic inclusion of WRGE in ToR for appraisals and reviews, carried out/conducted by Norad staff and commissioned from outsiders.

Recommendations N3: Norad is advised to consider establishing some sort of report on the gender work in their Activity Plans (VP), consolidating the annual report based on the individual department’s own annual report highlighting learning and achievements, but also weaknesses and unfinished business. This could assist Norad in being more accountable to the MFA and the public in disclosing what their work plans are and what is achieved.

Recommendations N4: WRGE dimensions should be strengthened in evaluations, and should be mainstreamed into evaluation guidelines and ToR

Evaluation is an important instrument for documenting results and the barriers against achieving the planned results. The Evaluation Department has made a good start by developing guidelines for mainstreaming gender into the ToR of evaluations, and examples of ToR show that some of them have included substantial requests for documentation of WRGE work, but there does not seem to be consistent use of the guidelines. The Evaluation Department is advised to be even more stringent in using the guidelines, and also in enforcing this when receiving the draft evaluation reports. The Evaluation Department is advised to include the guidelines in their Evaluation Handbook when it is revised and until then, make the guidelines public, and put them on the Norad web page. The Annual Evaluation report could also benefit from having a WRGE section each year, as part of the implementation of the GEAP.

Recommendations N5: Results reporting on WRGE weak. Should be a priority area for Norad/MFA

Results reporting is weak in the MFA and Norad system, as well as on WRGE. A first step has been made by publishing the Results Management in Norwegian Development Cooperation: A practical guide. WRGE is an area which may be particularly difficult to report results on, and where analytic work needs to be done on how results are to be reported throughout the MFA and Norad, and in consolidated reports. Country-specific reporting is vital and could be improved by donors harmonising their efforts to strengthen in-country competence and reporting as a common base for donor work on WRGE.

7.4 Conclusions

To what extent has Norway contributed to development results for women’s rights and gender equality in selected partner countries?

Reporting on WRGE has increased in the reports from the embassies and is also included in the Norad Result Report 2007 and 2008. However, the reporting format does not allow the team to answer “to what extent” this has happened. The findings are rather similar to earlier reports and the findings in the evaluation of 2005.

To what extent has Norway changed its political priorities so women’s rights and gender equality have a central place in political dialogue and initiatives?

The review has documented that WRGE is high on the agenda for international meetings, and that there is much WRGE-related activity in multilateral aid forums. Also the evaluation of 2005 documented that WRGE was high on the political agenda and in political statements. There is a continued high Norwegian WRGE visibility in the external arena, and Norway has a reputation for being one of the drivers of WRGE in global and multilateral meetings. There have also been several
initiatives in Norway, the launch of the GEAP itself, and one year later of the White Paper On Equal Terms which were important events in themselves.

It has been difficult for the Review Team to assess WRGE’s place in policy dialogue with partner countries and at the country level. Norway no longer has annual country meetings with written mandates and minutes. In several countries Norway engages in Joint Assessment Strategies, where the main policy dialogue with the partner country seems to be related to General Budget Support, and where WRGE is not a prominent topic, although it is included in the policy markers. In general it should be said that there is less visibility of WRGE’s work in Norway and in bilateral aid, than in multilateral meetings and arenas. It seems to the Review Team that it is easier for the gender advisers to push for WRGE work in multilateral meetings and donors than inside their own system.

Has Norway increased its relative funding to projects and programmes supporting women’s rights and gender equality?

In 2007 and 2008 statistics show an increase in relative funding to programmes and projects, part of which is due to changes in the statistical registration system. The marker on gender as a main objective showed a stagnation from 2007 to 2008, but the overall relative use of the gender marker increased from 20% in 2005 to 30% in 2008. However, this is still a relatively low score. One should consider that the score on the gender marker depends considerably on the composition of aid. Governance and human development generally score high on the gender marker, while other sectors, such as infrastructure, energy, etc., score low. This should encourage even stronger work on gender mainstreaming in these important sectors of development cooperation.

Has Norway increased gender mainstreaming in its development cooperation?

The Evaluation of 2005 pointed to the fact that gender mainstreaming was the main challenge for the MFA and Norad. This challenge remains, and evidence of gender mainstreaming is weak. This is clearly the weakest part of the WRGE work, and both the MFA and Norad admit that this is a subject/topic that they have not worked on consistently. Few efforts and resources have been invested into analytic and catalytic efforts for gender mainstreaming. The Gender budget line was designed to support the implementation of the GEAP, but the guidelines mainly focus on women targeting projects and programmes, and not on promoting gender mainstreaming in an innovative and catalytic way. Guidelines and management systems for the gender budget line will be revised spring 2009, and should take this into consideration. The Team also believes there is still substantial under-reporting of good gender mainstreaming. The MFA and Norad therefore need to look at reporting formats to better cover the substantial good work that has been done.

Has Norway improved the organisation of its development cooperation, to ensure the necessary capacity, competence and governance in its work on women’s rights and gender equality?

The GEAP was never operationalised in the annual plans and reports, even if this was stated explicitly in the GEAP itself. A three-year internal project on WRGE was established in the summer of 2006 in the MFA, but evaporated shortly after the GEAP was launched. The Internal Gender Resource Group for the project became more or less non-functional after the GEAP was launched and has had no role in the follow-up of the GEAP, except in review applications for the Gender budget line; this is in spite of having a proper mandate for such work.

The evaluation of 2005 documented a weak administrative capacity, lack of staff, and weak training efforts, as well as weak planning and reporting systems for WRGE. The staffing has been strengthened; there are more gender advisers, and small teams of gender advisers in FLID and in GIL. However, we agree with the findings of the latest OECD/DAC peer review (OECD/DAC 2003) that staffing is still weak and thinly spread in the organisation. Training has not found a relevant form to attract staff, and governance systems are still weak when it comes to holding the system accountable for reporting on implementation of the GEAP and results of WRGE’s work. The Review Team has not had the opportunity to compare the MFA’s and Norad’s capacity for implementation of other action plans or priority areas, but there is a clear impression from discussing the issue with staff that other priority areas, such as environment and climate change, and cleaner energy technology, are given more resources, such as the redefinition of a number of councillor positions at the embassies as energy and climate councillors.
Concluding remark: Making a difference – time for new thinking

This review has documented once again that mainstreaming is an uphill struggle and requires top management’s commitment, middle managers’ priority setting and dedicated staff on the ground, and good management systems. However, system improvement of plans and procedures cannot solve the issue of improved WRGE work alone. The development cooperation system also has to address the question of what can make a substantial and lasting difference for women and their rights and improve gender equality and justice in a time where women in many countries face a worsening situation. It is time to work more systematically on identifying change agents for WRGE and their networks and supporting these in a situation where harmonisation seems to limit funding to these agents. There might even be time now for a concerted effort of donors that believe in funding WRGE to make substantial funds available for WRGE work, with ambitious goals, in a fashion similar to the climate and forest grants that were (already) designed. Substantial funding of in-country capacity for sex-segregated statistics and research and analysis capacity is needed as part of such a package, and regional collaborations should be encouraged.

Several models already exist for such funds to be established and managed; two of them will be mentioned here, but these two do not exhaust the options, and creativity and innovativeness should be mobilised to find solutions and models should such an idea be contemplated.

The first model is based on the regional HIV/AIDS team which is co-funded by Norway and Sweden, with Norwegian aid delegated to Sweden. The team of 12 staff is co-funded by both donors, but organised as a separate division placed in the Swedish embassy in Lusaka, which reports to the Division for Long-Term Cooperation in Sida, Stockholm. The team funds regional initiatives and organisations, such as NGOs and intergovernmental organisations.

The second model is the Forestry Carbon Fund to the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC). The fund was developed under the African Development Bank (AfDB), initially with funding from DFID. The MFA is channelling the funds to the AfDB through a Joint Financing Agreement with DFID. The Norwegian Embassy in Angola has the overall responsibility to oversee aid to DRC.

To improve the quality of the WRGE work, MFA and Norad needs to invest in a community of knowledge including researchers, consultants and NGOs. This community of knowledge should include the voices and the experience of competent women and men from the partner countries.
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Annex 1: Terms of Reference

Oppdragsbeskrivelse for
Midtveisvurdering av Handlingsplan for kvinners rettigheter og likestilling i utviklingssamarbeidet (2007 – 2009)


1. Bakgrunn


2. Formål og avgrensninger for midtveisvurderingen


Midtveisvurderingen skal besvare følgende spørsmål:

A. I hvilken grad har Norge bidratt til utviklingsresultater for kvinners rettigheter og likestilling i utvalgte samarbeidsland?

B. I hvilken grad har Norge endret politiske prioriteringer slik at kvinners rettigheter og likestilling har fått en mer sentral plass i politisk dialog og initiativ?

C. Har Norge endret pengebruk slik at en økt andel av bistandsmidlene brukes til tiltak for kvinners rettigheter og likestilling?
D. Har Norge i større grad inkludert kvinnens rettigheter og likestilling i bredden av utviklingssamarbeidet (gender mainstreaming)?

E. Har Norge i større grad innrettet organisering av utviklingssamarbeidet slik at vi har kapasitet, kompetanse og ledelse i arbeidet med kvinnens rettigheter og likestilling?

Midtveisvurderingen skal gi relevant, tilstrekkelig og kvalitativt god informasjon, men skal ikke gjøres for omfattende og vil av tids- og kapasitetshensyn hovedsakelig baseres på informasjon som allerede foreligger i den rutinemessige rapporteringen.

Arbeidet skal resultere i en rapport med anbefalinger. Anbefalingene skal være relevante for politiske valg/prioriteringer og kunne operasjonaliseres i utenrikstjenestens konkrete arbeid både mht å oppnå utviklingsmål for kvinner og i integreringen av et kjønnsperspektiv i bredden av norsk innsats.

Rapporten skal formidles bredt internt og legges også frem for det bistandsinteresserte publikum, for eksempel i forbindelse med markeringen av Kvinnedagen 8. mars 2009.

Baseline og kilder for resultatmåling
For å begrense ressursbruken og for å integrere denne problemstillingen i den ordinære bistandsforvaltningen foreslås det å primært benytte seg av eksisterende/planlagte rapporter og annen dokumentasjon for etablering av en baseline og dokumentasjon av endringer.

Ang. utviklingsresultater
Handlingsplanens korte tidsperspektiv og det faktum at Stortingsmeldingen er 8 mnd. gammel, legger begrensninger på muligheten for å se utviklingsresultater direkte knyttet til disse styringsdokumentene. Det er likevel viktig så langt det er mulig å inkludere resultatdimensjonen for målgruppen, dvs. kvinner i samarbeidslandene, jfr. Handlingsplanens kapittel 1 og 2. Baseline og dokumentasjon om endringer for dette vil være bistandsforvaltningens egen resultatrapportering. Svakhetene ved denne rapporteringen er at den i i mindre grad er faktabasert og det vil være vanskelig å kunne påvise attribusjon, dvs. i hvilken grad Norge har bidratt til utviklingsresultater.

Ang. innretningen av utviklingssamarbeidet
Handlingsplanen legger stor vekt på å endre utviklingssamarbeidets retning, prioriteringer og organisering jfr.planens kapittel 3, 4 og 5. NIBR-evalueringen fra 2005 legges til grunn som baseline for disse delene av handlingsplanen, dvs. hvordan og i hvilken grad norsk bistandsforvaltning har tatt opp i seg de politiske styringssignalene. Dokumentasjon på endringer vil være ordinær rapportering, samt noen egne studier.

3. Målformuleringer, indikatorer og dokumentasjon
Arbeidet/rapporten struktureres rundt følgende målformuleringer, indikatorer og dokumentasjon. Disse vil muligens måtte justeres noe underveis hvis det viser seg at det er for svake grunnlagsdata på noen felt. Disse justeringene må gjøres i samråd med konsulent og prosjektgruppen.

A. Målformulering: I hvilken grad, og hvordan, har Norge bidratt til utviklingsresultater for kvinnens rettigheter og likestilling i våre samarbeidsland

Indikatorer. De fire første knytter seg til Handlingsplanens tematiske satsningsområder, mens den siste knytter seg spesielt til St.meld. 11.

Kvinnens økte politiske deltakelse
Kvinner økte økonomiske deltakelse
Kvinner bedrede seksuelle og reproduktive helse og styrkede rettigheter
Redusert vold mot kvinner
Kvinner og jenters økte tilgang til utdanning

Dokumentasjon:
- Analyse av resultatrapporter for 2005 og 2007 fra ambassader med bistandsansvar. **Utfører:** konsulent.
- Studie av likestillingsdimensjonen i resultatrapportering av noen utvalgte FN-institusjoner og Verdensbanken. Ved valg av multilaterale tiltak bor man fortrinsvis velge organisasjoner hvor Norges innsats for kvinners rettigheter og likestilling er betydelig i form av penger og faglig/politisk interesse. **Utfører:** konsulent.
- Konkrete eksempler fra ambassadene som belyser spesiell tematikk eller satsningsområder. **Utfører:** NORAD/konsulent

Det foreligger ingen baseline som på en metodologisk tilfredsstillende måte kan dokumentere endringer på flere de foreslåtte indikatorene, selv om de er holdt generelle. Rapporteringen av måloppnåelse vil derfor være av noe mer anekdotisk karakter.

B. Målformulering: I hvilken grad har kvinners rettigheter og likestilling en sentral plass i norsk utviklingspolitikk.

**Indikator:**
Kvinner rettigheter og likestilling er et av hovedelementene i politisk dialog.

Dokumentasjon:
- Analyse av referater fra landmøter. **Utfører:** konsulent

C. Målformulering: Er en økt andel av bistandsmidlene brukt til tiltak for kvinners rettigheter og likestilling?

**Indikator:**
Endring i OECD - DAC markør kvinners rettigheter og likestilling.

Dokumentasjon
- Fordeling av kvinnebevilgningen og andre kap.poster som har fått øremerkete midler til kvinner og likestilling fordelt på sektorkoder, land og mottakere. **Utfører:** AMOR.
- Oversikt over hvor integrert kvinner og likestilling er i den bilaterale bistanden ved å ta utgangspunkt i policymarkøren for kvinner og likestilling. Denne viser i hvilken grad

D. Målformulering: I hvilken grad, og hvordan, er kvinners rettigheter og likestilling inkludert i alle tiltak i utviklingssamarbeidet.

Indikatorer:
Likestillingsvurdering og krav om rapportering er lagt inn i tiltakene. Likestillingsaspektet /kjønnsdimensjonen er integrert i bistandsstasjonenes styringsdokumenter.

Dokumentasjon
- "Review of the development portfolio and work with women's rights and gender equality. Norwegian Representative Office Al-Ram 2008" ("Likestillingsvask"). Utfører: NORAD/FLID.
- Rapport fra eventuell "Likestillingsvask" ved ambassaden i Etiopia, planlagt desember 2008. Utfører: NORAD/FLID
- Analyse av bistandsstasjonenes strategiske planer 2009-2011. Utfører: NORAD/FLID.

E. Målformulering: I hvilken grad er utviklingssamarbeidet er organisert slik at det fremmer kvinners rettigheter og likestilling som selvstendig mål og som tverrgående dimensjon11.

Indikatorer:
Ambassader med bistandsansvar, Utenriksdepartementet og Norad besitter tilstrekkelig likestillingskompetanse og likestillingskapasitet, samt ledelsesforankrede rutiner til å ivareta kvinners rettigheter og likestillingsaspektet i alt sitt arbeid.

Dokumentasjon

4. Organisering og tidsplan
Utarbeidelsen av rapporten gjøres som et prosjekthvor Norad/FLID koordinerer arbeidet. Det opprettes en prosjektgruppe som ledes av Norad/FLID og betsår av Norad/AMOR og UD ved GIL, REG og evt. andre avdelinger/sekssjoner i UD.


11 Handlingsplanens kap. 5 er grunnlaget for dette resultatområdet. I innledningen til kap. 5 står det: "Utenrikstjenesten skal prioritere kvinnerrettigheter og likestilling som et selvstendig mål og integrert i alt utviklingssamarbeidet. Organisasjon og ledelse, kunnskap og kompetanse skal styrkes med dette siktemålet."
Annex 2: An overview of the MFA and the UN Agencies

This section will outline the relationship between the Norwegian MFA, and in particular the UN Section and the Section for Global Initiatives and Gender Equality, and some selected UN organisations. These organisations have been selected according to their relevance for WRGE policies and Norway’s relative significance to their financial basis and policy-making processes.

United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)

UNFPA is a UN fund with voluntary contributions from member states. Following the Netherlands and Sweden, Norway is the biggest donor of voluntary contributions to UNFPA, mostly as core funding. UNFPA has a strong presence at country level, and the Action Plan identifies the organisation as a key actor “in the promotion of women’s sexual and reproductive rights, family planning, and information measures on health and sexuality”, referring to political issues that can be sensitive in the multilateral development institutions (MFA 2007:23).

Comments made by MFA representatives and documentation seems to indicate that Norway views UNFPA as a proactive advocate of WRGE issues through their work. Even so, Norway has – through their Letters of Allocation – called on UNFPA to have an “ongoing process” and “a robust approach” on these issues.

Board representation and other channels of influence. UNFPA’s joint Executive Board meetings with UNDP represent the most direct form in which Norway can exert influence on UNFPA policies. The Executive Board meets for three regular session per year, including their annual session. UNFPA is headed by what MFA representatives characterise as a “strong leader”, Thoraya Obaid.

Internal evaluations. According to their Strategic Framework on Gender Mainstreaming and Women’s Empowerment for their Strategic Plan 2008-2011 (UNFPA 2007), an internal assessment had found uneven levels of success in the organisation’s mainstreaming efforts and reporting procedures. Consequently, their 2008-2011 Strategic Plan incorporate these points, and aim to ensure stronger commitment and procedures for WRGE issues in UNFPA.

Norwegian financial contribution. Norway’s contribution in 2006 totalled NOK 290 million, of which NOK 262 million (90 per cent) was core funding. In the 2009 budget, the MFA proposed NOK 332 million as core funding to UNFPA. There is a small amount allocated on humanitarian assistance every year, and some contributions through Norwegian embassies. There are also some resources allocated to UNFPA on the WRGE allocation. But from the UN section, the Norwegian contribution is restricted to core funding. This means that Norway’s potential for

---

12 MFA has newly, in September 2008, appointed a person responsible for Norwegian relations with UNFPA, following the death of the person previously occupying this position. As a result of this, there is limited institutional knowledge on Norwegian relations with UNFPA in the MFA organisation.
influence on the policies of UNFPA is different from those UN organisation which receive large amounts of extra budgetary contributions to programmes and funds.

Although MFA announced to the UNFPA in its 2006 Letter of Allocation that it would consider making multi-year pledges, Norway waited until 2008 with making its first multi-year pledge. This was to ensure that the cycle of the Strategic Plan and the multi-year pledges follow each other. MFA specifies in their LoA to UNFPA that the organisation should maintain a strong focus on sexual and reproductive rights. This represents a sensitive and controversial political issue in the UN system, but at the same time a field wherein the UNFPA plays a particularly active role on a country level. Women’s rights as human rights, a controversial in certain other UN organisations (such as UNICEF), is explicitly incorporated into UNFPA’s policies and their strategic plan.

**Reporting**. There is no separate reporting to Norway from the UNFPA. The main source of documentation on the priorities and results of UNFPA activities is the organisation’s annual reports. The distinction between mainstreaming and gender targeted programming in the UNFPA is difficult, as a substantial part of the organisation’s work is directly linked to women’s rights.

**United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)**

UNDP is a key programme in the UN system, and Norway has a strong commitment to the activities and policies of UNDP through board representation and financial contributions. UNDP targets WRGE issues through the United Nation’s Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM), which is in autonomous association with UNDP. However, a successful mainstreaming of WRGE issues in UNDP could potentially strengthen have knock-on effects on the entire UN organisation, due to its coordinating role between the central UN organisation and UN’s developmental activities at a country level.

**Board representation and other channels of influence**. UNDP has joint Executive Board meetings with UNFPA. UNIFEM is also governed by this board. According to MFA representatives, the content of this Action Plan is very well embedded in the MFA’s relationship to UNDP through routines and the active advocacy of key people. The Norwegian delegation always meet with the UNDP Gender Team and its Director Winnie Byinyima during their visits to New York, and through these meetings apply pressure on UNDP to incorporate WRGE issues more actively.

**Internal evaluations**. In the wake of the very harsh criticism of UNDP’s efforts to mainstream gender equality in a 2005 evaluation, MFA representatives describe a successful turnaround operation in the UNDP organisation. Specifically on WRGE, the 2008-2011 Strategic Plan is supplemented by a Gender Equality Strategy (GES) 2008-2011. The responsibility for the GES was given to the Gender Team at UNDP’s Bureau for Development Policy. The Gender Team assigned a Task Force to assist them in this work. The members of the Task Force attended three working group meetings as well as some of the expert group meetings, and offered the Gender Team expert advice. Norway seconded one expert on gender issues to this Task Force, Kristin Sorung Scharffscher. She was one of the members most actively involved in the development of the GES. In her evaluation of this process, she notes that this work had a direct impact on the final shape of the GES. While this work “behind the scenes” has been an important way in which Norway has influenced the content of UNDP’s gender strategy, she also states that in presenting these policies to the wider UNDP system represents a political challenge.

**Norwegian financial contribution**. Norway’s contribution in 2006 totalled NOK 1.2 billion, of which NOK 690 million was core funding. In the 2009 budget, the MFA proposed a NOK 860 million contribution to UNDP’s core funding. Norway sends annual Letters of Allocation, signed by the
minister, on the Norwegian contribution to UNDP’s core funding. In addition Norway sign a Programme Cooperation Agreement on a 2-year basis. From 2006 an onward, Norway has opened for multi-year pledges (4-year). Thus far, however, “outstanding issues concerning UNDP’s strategic plan for the period 2008-2009 and other key challenges” have kept the Norwegian MFA from making such a pledge. At the time of writing, however, MFA are sufficiently satisfied on these issues and will make a multi-year pledge for 2009.

From 2008 and onwards, UNDP will commit to a Strategic Plan, which ensures a long-term coherent coordination of the organisation’s activities and details the goals of UNDP in a four-year perspective. Strategic Plans will become the basis of Norway’s multi-year pledges. Until then, the UNDP Multi-Year Funding Framework (MYFF) constituted the long-term strategy of the Norwegian Contribution. The MYFF is on a 3-year basis, and is less result-oriented than the new, proposed Strategic Plan. The Draft Strategic Plan was finalised in June 2007, accepted on a preliminary basis before it was finally accepted in August 2008.

Reporting. The reporting which constitutes the basis for Norway’s assessment of UNDP is, according to Solheim’s 2006 Letter of Allocation, “UNDP’s regular reporting, including your MYFF reports“. MFA representatives identify UNDP annual reports, financial audits, reports from the UNDP Executive Board and bilateral and multi-donor consultations as the main source of reporting, which form the basis of Norway’s assessment of their UNDP contributions.

United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM)
Norway has become a significant donor to UNIFEM throughout the last few years. From NOK 20 million in 2006, the MFA proposed a contribution of NOK 75 million in the 2009 budget. Consequently, MFA is also administering their relations with UNIFEM more closely, monitoring their operations through the reporting mechanisms of the UN organisation and engaging with their strategic plan. UNIFEM, although a part of UNDP, has its own annual report and strategic plan.

The main themes that Norway have been advocating in UNIFEM are:

- UNIFEM’s role in the process of UN reform, which is in line with the Action Plan and its emphasis on the link between reform of the UN system and increased attention towards WRGE issues. The integration of UNIFEM, as an operational component with the normative component, The Office of the Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women (OSAGI), and other relevant UN institutions, represents a delicate task of organisational realignment and policy harmonisation.
- Linking the activities of UNIFEM more closely to an explicit poverty orientation.
- Lack of qualified Norwegian expertise. There are now Norwegian staff both at a senior and junior level of the UNIFEM organisation.
- Broadening the donor base of UNIFEM. This issue has been raised in UNIFEM forums, as Norway is of the opinion that a broadened donor base would increase UNIFEM’s legitimacy globally.

Extending the arrangement of multi-year pledges to UNIFEM remains an outstanding issue in the MFA. At present, Norway almost matches its core funding through extra budgetary contributions. The allocation of these are solely made on the basis of applications received. The

---

13 Letter from Director General, Department for UN, Peace and Humanitarian Affairs, Royal Ministry of Foreign Affairs to Mr. Kemal Dervis, Administrator UNDP entitled "Norwegian Contribution to UNDP for 2008", dated 9 June 2008.
MFA also plans to make financial contributions to a trust fund on support to gender equality authorities in donor countries through the WRGE allocation.

**United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF)**

UNICEF is a UN fund which receives voluntary contributions from member states. Norway has been heavily involved in UNICEF’s programme activities, and promoted this as a flagship involvement on WRGE issues. The cooperation with UNICEF is founded on a Framework Agreement, governing all other agreements. The Framework Agreement was signed in 2003. Although the content of this agreement is general in its nature, it does specify that selection and implementation of activities shall have “particular emphasis on […] ensuring that gender considerations are fully taken into account” (MFA 2003, Article III:1).

**Board representation and other channels of influence.** Norway is the single biggest contributor of funds to UNICEF’s programme activities. This attributes authority to Norway in their board representation and consultation with various parts of the UNICEF organisation. It also allows Norway to play a role on WRGE issues in this forums. One of the key foci of the Norwegian team has been the quality of reporting on WRGE issues in the UNICEF programme activities. During the last meeting between donors and the team responsible for Basic Education and Gender Equality (BEGE) – one of five UNICEF focus areas – Norway raised concerns around the lack of gender-specific reporting.

**Internal evaluations.** A joint statement put forward by Canada on the Evaluation Report on UNICEF’s Gender Equality Policy calls for a comprehensive management reponse on how to “move forward with decisive leadership and commitment to gender equality as an institutional priority at all levels in UNICEF” in a systematic and results-based approach. This exemplifies how Norway has been engaged in advocating for institutional reform on gender equality and mainstreaming, alongside their strong emphasis on WRGE issues in program activities. With regards to mainstreaming an Evaluation of UNICEF’s Gender Policy Implementation was conducted in 2007-2008. It identified shortcomings in UNICEF’s mainstreaming approach, and suggested several follow-up responses. A Gender Action Plan and a Gender Policy Revitalization Task Force were the results of this evaluation. The MFA representatives notes that UNICEF, which used to be in front on gender mainstreaming, were no longer ahead of other UN agencies.

**Norwegian financial contribution.** Norway’s contribution in 2006 totalled NOK 1.145 billion, of which NOK 300 million was core funding. The UN section contributed NOK 845 million to UNICEF in 2006 – of these resources, NOK 300 million as core funding and NOK 545 million as extra budgetary contribution. Of the extra budgetary contribution, NOK 445 million was channeled through UNICEF’s initiative on Basic Education and Gender Equality (BEGE). In addition, embassies and other parts of the MFA did in total contribute NOK 300 million to UNICEF, either as bilateral support, humanitarian assistance or support for peace and reconciliation projects. The total Norwegian Contribution to UNICEF for 2006 totalled NOK 1.145 billion.

---

14 Draft Joint Statement on Gender Equality Evaluation (Canada, joined by Australia, Belgium, Denmark, Italy, Spain, the UK and Norway), 3 June 2008.
In the budget for 2009, the UN section will contribute NOK 400 million as core funding and NOK 580 million as extra budgetary contribution. The Norwegian Contribution for 2009 (excl. contributions from embassies, humanitarian assistance and peace and conciliation projects) totals NOK 1.080 billion, an increase of 28 per cent from the 2006 contribution. In the same period, UNICEF has experienced a 13 per cent increase in Norway’s contribution to WRGE issues through the BEGE focus area (from NOK 445 million in 2006 to NOK 500 million in 2009). These NOK 500 million are explicitly linked to Millennium Development Goals 2 and 3 in the Programme Cooperation Agreement.

Programme contributions from MFA to UNICEF are subject to the contractual framework of the Program Cooperation Agreement, which is signed on a two-year basis, the current covering the 2008-2009 period.

Reporting. Norway does not get individual reports from UNICEF, but relies on the general UNICEF reporting. When MFA receives annual reports, these are sent to Norad for professional assessment. After it has been assessed by Norad and MFA, Norway reports back to UNICEF in the annual sessions of the Executive Board. Norway also gives feedback through the Letters of Allocation.

International Labour Organisation (ILO)
ILO is a specialised agency in the UN system. The contributions to ILO’s core funding from member states are ‘assessed contributions’, according to the size of the donor state economy. The main responsibility for Norwegian relations with ILO lies with the Ministry of Labour and Social Inclusion (AID). Norwegian relations to ILO are also maintained through tripartite consultations between the Norwegian industrial relations partners (NHO, LO and AID). By targeting the gender and equality units of the ILO through so-called ‘soft earmarking’ of programme cooperation contributions, the Section for Global Initiatives and Gender Equality in the MFA intends to strengthen WRGE issues at a country level. By allocating financial resources to this (otherwise poorly funded) unit, those responsible for WRGE are empowered and attract more attention to their work. The emphasis on WRGE issues in MFA’s approach to the ILO is not representative of MFA’s relationship to other UN specialty organisations. Rather, there has been a concerted effort to play an active role towards ILO because MFA representatives saw possibilities in this particular part of the UN system.

Board representation and other channels of influence. In addition to periods of board representation, Norway influences the policy-making of ILO through informal channels of communication, financial contributions and secondment of staff. Although secondment is a way of securing Norway’s priorities in development cooperation, the MFA team regards this practice as a thing of the past. Ideally, Norwegian concerns and recruitment of Norwegian expertise in the UN system should be done through the internal dynamics of the multilater institutions – not through ‘external interventions’ such as secondment. However, in cases where the extra effort will not be put in without direct action, they still use this as a way of getting WRGE expertise and Norwegian representatives into the ILO system. ILO has a committee in charge of WRGE issues, and Norway will be forwarding a candidate to the leadership of this committee.

Norwegian financial contribution. Mandatory contributions to the ILO (Norway: NOK 12 million in 2006) will be used according to the resolutions made by the International Labour Conference and the ILO Executive Council. Therefore, there are no Letters of Allocation with political signals such as the ones sent to UNICEF and UNDP. Instead of the extra budgetary contributions allocated to UNICEF and UNDP (‘temafond’), ILO has developed a system – the Regular Budget Supplementary Account (RBSA) – which allows members to contribute to ILO’s activities at a
country under auspices which bridge the political resolutions of the ILO Executive Council with the priorities of donor countries. According to MFA representatives, between 8 and 10 countries use the RBSA system as per January 2009. While there is a lack of coordination between these different RBSA contributions, joint donor country consultations are being planned – with countries such as the Netherlands and the UK represented – and RBSA contributions will be a key topic in these meetings.

Contributions over the 2006-2007 Programme Cooperation Agreement (PCA) from the MFA totalled NOK 70 million (NOK 35 million per year) as extra budgetary contributions. The 2008-2009 PCA increased the contribution to NOK 100 million over 2 years (NOK 35 million and NOK 65 million in 2008 and 2009, respectively) as contributions to the RBSA. Much of this increase was directly targeting WRGE issues. During the 2006-2007 period saw, around NOK 7 million per year were divided between WRGE, discrimination and policy coherence. In addition, around USD 1 million were during this period allocated outside the PCA to finance WRGE as a key theme at the 2009 International Labour Conference. Of the NOK 100 million allocated to ILO in the 2008-2009 period, NOK 40 million were ‘softly earmarked’ WRGE issues at a country level, and an additional NOK 10 million was allocated to WRGE work in the central organisation of ILO.

**Reporting.** ‘Soft earmarking’ present some challenges in relation to reporting procedures. MFA representatives stress that it is not a priority for Norway to track the precise distribution and effect of the Norwegian contribution. Rather, MFA expects to see documentation of ILO’s efforts in the field of WRGE through their general reporting systems, in which Norway has played a key role. ILO has a process-based reporting policy, which will be reviewed during the 2009 International Labour Conference. It was agreed by the MFA representatives that there are challenges in reporting results through this system. ILO will produce thematic reports ahead of the 2009 International Labour Conference, and one of these will be on WRGE and consequently of help to MFA in their assessment of the RBSA contributions.

MFA representatives also emphasise that in addition to the formal meetings, reporting procedures and policy forums, a lot of the communication between MFA and various parts of the ILO organisation is done through informal communication: phone calls, meetings and email contact. This continuous dialogue is extremely important for the monitoring of ILO’s work. There is also a reporting channel that goes through the Norwegian embassies, which hold in-depth knowledge of ILO’s work at a country level.
Annex 3: Financing Women’s Rights and Gender Equality

Much of the discussion of measurement and indicators in aid in recent years has been related to the area of result reporting, and ways to measure results. It is important to bear in mind that this has raised the issue of how to measure results of single programmes and accumulated results of donor programming, versus measuring results of all aid in partner countries in the South. The trend among academics and most donor agencies is a greater interest in measuring cumulated effects and results in partner countries, and also to improve the ability of partners in the South to analyse country level results. The development of the MDGs and measuring MDG fulfilment has also contributed to this. As far as I know there has been little discussion of financing MDG except for the last MDG that is about increasing overall funding to development.

The problem remains however of measuring donor country aid in relation to its stated policy in various development policy areas, such as women empowerment and gender equality. One possibility that has been used is measurement of financing, i.e. input. OECD/DAC assisted in developing common policy markers for cross sectoral work in addition to agreed sector and sub-sector codes. This system of markers and statistics is developed also to make aid from different OECD countries comparable, and to analyse trends in development aid. The new development architecture with the Paris declaration and more emphasis on budget support, development policy lending and harmonisation, pose new challenges to this system of input statistics and this has not been dealt with adequately yet.

The simpler the system for policy markers and statistics is the more reliable it is, i.e. it is more simple to use and you get a more uniform behaviour of those who code the development budget, and also to ensure that it is possible to make comparative analysis between OECD countries. There is therefore a balance one has to attain between having a robust simple system, that is made use of and that one van rely on the figures generated within it; and the wish of many specialised bureaucrats to develop more specific and detailed indicators for policy relevant discussions. These more specific indicators and analysis should be done outside the main statistical system, but may still be discussed in international forum to see if it is possible to develop more comparative studies relying on these indicators.

The paper uses data from Norad statistical base from 2000, 2001, and 2006, 2007, 2008. The aid included in this data base is bilateral aid, including aid through NGOs and multi-bi aid, i.e. earmarked aid to multilateral organisations. The gender marker was introduced in 1999, and 2000 is the first year we do have statistics using the gender marker.
Policy marker Gender and Equality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM - Gender and equality</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main objective</td>
<td>431 281</td>
<td>5,1</td>
<td>341 639</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>373 944</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>505 779</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>567 471</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1 402 000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 316 779</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant objective</td>
<td>1 245 775</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>1 297 175</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>1 757 429</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>1 847 301</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>2 136 941</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>2 930 000</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3 519 149</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>6 816 069</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>8 006 913</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>7 430 326</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>9 564 024</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>9 924 803</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>11 089 000</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>11 193 195</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>8 493 125</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9 645 727</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9 561 699</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11 917 104</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12 629 215</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15 421 000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16 029 123</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Norway’s aid budget has had a rapid increase during this period, but overall the gender maker has kept pace with the increase. The percentage of aid covered by Policy marker gender as main objective had a substantial increase in 2007, but saw a slight decline in 2008. However, significant objective (mainstreaming) is up from 15 % in 2002 to 22 % in 2008, and an almost tripling in absolute terms. The general trend for the period is that progressively more of Norway’s bilateral aid is captured by gender markers.

What does this show? We do not have a full data set here to explain it, but there might be two reasons to be discussed.
1. there has been a gradual change in the type of aid given by Norway, to sectors where gender markers score higher, or
2. there is a greater pressure and ability in the system to programme in women empowerment and gender equality into the programmes; i.e. to include gender sensitive policies, objectives and activities into programming, or
3. the system might have become more systematic and stringent in its work in using the gender markers, and thereby capturing more of the development cooperation. Evaluations have shown some level of underreporting of support to women empowerment and gender equality.

Most likely it is a combination of these three factors.

Until a more specific analysis is made of this one should be careful about what conclusions to draw. It would however be useful if such an analysis was made of the budget and the use of gender markers, including analysis within certain sectors and country programmes and budget lines.
Bilateral aid (incl.multi-bi) to DAC sector 151.64 Women’s equality organisations and institutions (earlier 420 - Women in development (WID)), 2002-2008 (NOK 1000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAC Main sector (code+name)</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>151.64 Women’s equality organisations and institutions</td>
<td>81 446</td>
<td>103 642</td>
<td>100 369</td>
<td>125 259</td>
<td>129 237</td>
<td>328 177</td>
<td>262 874</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding marked with the WID-code is and will remain small, it will mainly capture projects and support to “pure” women’s groups, and will be far below aid which is marked with main objective by the gender policy marker. For example the funding for WID in 2008 was 262 mill NOK, while funding marked with main objective was 1316 Mill NOK. It seems that the introduction of the Gender budget line 2007, contributed to the marked increase in the figures. However, the decline in 2008 is difficult to explain, and a cause for concern. The Review Team does not have sufficient data to explain this decline, but it may be related to steep decline in aid with gender as main objective in aid to Asia and in humanitarian aid (see the next tables). It may also be a result of the strong pressure on the embassies to concentrate their portfolio, and limit the number of projects and agreements.
Bilateral aid coded with policymarker women and gender equality on different budget lines in Proposition to the Storting no1, 2008 (NOK 1000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter (code+name)</th>
<th>Main objective</th>
<th>Significant objective</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Total 2008</th>
<th>Sum main and significant objective</th>
<th>% of aid with gender marker main and significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>150 – Aid to Africa</td>
<td>111 628</td>
<td>851 091</td>
<td>1 716 345</td>
<td>2 679 064</td>
<td>962 719</td>
<td>35,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151 – Aid to Asia</td>
<td>87 709</td>
<td>436 349</td>
<td>292 659</td>
<td>816 718</td>
<td>524 059</td>
<td>64,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152 – Aid to Middle East</td>
<td>6 600</td>
<td>26 177</td>
<td>212 350</td>
<td>245 127</td>
<td>32 777</td>
<td>13,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153 – Aid to Central America</td>
<td>21 922</td>
<td>80 543</td>
<td>143 244</td>
<td>245 709</td>
<td>102 465</td>
<td>41,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160 - Civil society and democratic development</td>
<td>173 530</td>
<td>512 640</td>
<td>999 807</td>
<td>1 685 976</td>
<td>686 169</td>
<td>40,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161 – Business and economic development</td>
<td>7 442</td>
<td>12 156</td>
<td>809 112</td>
<td>828 711</td>
<td>19 599</td>
<td>2,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162 – Transition aid (GAP)</td>
<td>37 887</td>
<td>203 284</td>
<td>444 454</td>
<td>685 625</td>
<td>241 171</td>
<td>35,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163 – Humanitarian aid and human rights</td>
<td>87 556</td>
<td>442 821</td>
<td>1 945 573</td>
<td>2 475 951</td>
<td>530 378</td>
<td>21,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164 – Peace, reconciliation and democracy</td>
<td>75282</td>
<td>223 746</td>
<td>1 468 299</td>
<td>1 767 327</td>
<td>299 028</td>
<td>16,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165 – Research, competence building and evaluation</td>
<td>7 818</td>
<td>142 203</td>
<td>495 317</td>
<td>645 337</td>
<td>150 020</td>
<td>23,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166 – Various support</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>1 615</td>
<td>397 653</td>
<td>399 843</td>
<td>2 190</td>
<td>0,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167 – Refugees in Norway approved as ODA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>805 993</td>
<td>805 993</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168 – Women's rights and gender equality</td>
<td>140 830</td>
<td>55 302</td>
<td>11 000</td>
<td>207 133</td>
<td>196 133</td>
<td>94,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169 – Global health and vaccination initiatives</td>
<td>65 979</td>
<td>308 170</td>
<td>320 749</td>
<td>694 898</td>
<td>374 149</td>
<td>53,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170 – UN-organisations etc.</td>
<td>459 020</td>
<td>91 350</td>
<td>545 526</td>
<td>1 095 896</td>
<td>550 370</td>
<td>50,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171 – Multilateral finance institutions</td>
<td>33 000</td>
<td>125 166</td>
<td>279 605</td>
<td>437 771</td>
<td>158 166</td>
<td>36,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172 – Debt relief</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>146 908</td>
<td>146 908</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>051 – State Auditing office (Riksrevisjonen)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 537</td>
<td>6 537</td>
<td>6 537</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 316 779</strong></td>
<td><strong>3 519 149</strong></td>
<td><strong>11 193 195</strong></td>
<td><strong>16 029 123</strong></td>
<td><strong>4 835 928</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Bilateral aid (incl. multi-bilateral) with Policy marker (PM) Gender and Equality, 2000-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAC Main sector (code+name)</th>
<th>Percentage of total PM gender and equality by DAC-sectors</th>
<th>Percentage of DAC-sector with PM gender and equality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>111 - Education, level unspecified</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112 - Basic education</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113 - Secondary education</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114 - Post-secondary education</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121 - Health, general</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122 - Basic health</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130 - Population policies/programmes and reproductive health</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140 - Water supply and sanitation</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151 - Government and civil society, general</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152 - Conflict prevention and resolution, peace and security</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160 - Other social infrastructure and services</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210 - Transport and storage</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220 - Communications</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230 - Energy generation and supply</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240 - Banking and financial services</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 - Business and other services</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311 - Agriculture</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312 - Forestry</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313 - Fishing</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321 – Business and econ. dev.</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322 - Mineral resources/ mining</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323 - Construction</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331 - Trade policy and regulations</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332 - Tourism</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Certain trend that can not be explained unless one do a more detailed analysis merge, and certain of these findings are somewhat surprising and may be explained by new types of funding (sector programs, SWAP etc.), but this warrant more in-depth analysis. Generally the gender markers capture an increasing part of the development cooperation budget. The gender marker score high on sectors such as health and education and governance. It still scores low on energy, infrastructure and environment, but score above average on agriculture. Norway does not use policy markers on general budget support.
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