



Photo: Farmer, Khek Keou (left) poses in front of her granary full of rice seed for sale, along with her friends Chin Pak (center) and Chhay Heng in Cambodia. *Savann Oeum/Oxfam America*

ARE THEY REALLY GENDER EQUALITY PROJECTS?

An examination of donors' gender-mainstreamed and gender-equality focused projects to assess the quality of gender-marked projects

Aria Grabowski and Parker Essick

Oxfam Research Reports are written to share research results, to contribute to public debate and to invite feedback on development and humanitarian policy and practice. They do not necessarily reflect Oxfam policy positions. The views expressed are those of the author and not necessarily those of Oxfam.

CONTENTS

Executive Summary	3
Key Terms	4
1 Introduction	6
2 Background	7
3 Methodology	10
Design	10
Project Selection and Evaluation	13
Limitations	14
4 Findings	15
Overall	15
Gender Equality Main Objective vs. Mainstreaming	16
OECD Minimum Criteria	17
Gender Inclusion Criteria	19
Access to Information and Transparency	21
Future Research	22
5 Recommendations	23
6 Conclusion	26
Notes	27
Annex 1: Comparison of Scorecard Scores across Donors	29
Annex 2: Scorecard Scores for Individual Donors	34
Bibliography	55

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The past decade has brought an increased focus on gender equality in development and humanitarian aid including increases in self-reported contributions to gender equality. More policies and laws are calling for an increased focus on gender equality, and some nations are even calling for feminist aid or foreign policy—all positive steps to address one of the world's largest challenges, gender equality.

While there has been recent progress, achieving gender equality will take over 100 years to solve at the current rate of change, which means very few people alive today will ever actually experience it. However, if donors invest in tackling gender inequality, perhaps the rate of change can be increased. Within a lifetime, there is the potential that all people could be seen as equals, there could be less food insecurity, better health outcomes, fairer and more inclusive economies, and more stable nations. After all, gender equality impacts *everyone*, and we cannot tackle poverty without tackling gender inequality.

Unfortunately, while self-reported gender equality funding figures have increased, it is unclear if the funding is actually for gender equality work. Evaluations of donor equality policies suggest the policies are inconsistently implemented, and until recently, it was difficult to link the reported funding figures to more detailed project information necessary to assess the quality of gender equality projects. This research sought to take advantage of this progress and use publicly available information to assess whether major donors' self-reported gender equality projects include the key components necessary to qualify as high-quality gender equality projects.

Using publicly available information, this research examined 72 projects from seven donors across various sectors that provided over \$6 billion worth of gender equality funding. Sadly, none of the donors consistently included enough gender equality components for their projects to be considered high quality. Only two of the 72 projects we examined included all the minimum criteria Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) advises should be included to be marked as a gender equality project, and about a quarter of projects were mis-marked with the incorrect policy marker therefore calling into question if the funding amounts reported are accurate representations of gender equality funding. The findings also raise serious concerns around the ability to tackle gender equality and create a more equal, safe, and prosperous world if key components are not included in projects seeking to be part of that change.

Only about 20 percent of the projects examined identified or addressed unintended negative consequences, potentially putting women and girls at increased risk of experiencing gender-based violence, increasing gender gaps, or many other unintended consequences. Women's participation and leadership were also seldom addressed, and gender-disaggregated data and gender equality objectives and indicators were only found in about 50 percent of the projects examined. On average, only 39 percent of the components identified as being necessary for gender equality projects were included. If this was a school project, the average project would need to improve by 21 percent to receive a barely passing grade.

These findings suggest there is a major gap between self-reported funding and high-quality gender equality projects. This is especially concerning given the massive challenges to achieve gender equality and the incredible gains that could come from it. Donors and other partners need to act to fix these deficiencies in their gender equality projects by gender marking projects in the pre-design phase, and not allowing projects to be counted as gender equality projects if they do not include

critical components. Donors should also ensure there is detailed guidance that is widely socialized and that staffs are incentivized at all levels to ensure quality gender equality projects are being done.

KEY TERMS

Gender equality policy marker: Used by Development Assistance Committee (DAC) members as part of the reporting on their development activities to the DAC. Markers indicate whether aid activities target gender equality. The data provides the most comprehensive measure available for development finance that supports gender equality work.

Principal: Gender equality is the main objective of the project or program and is fundamental to its design and objectives. The project or program would not have been undertaken without this objective.

Significant: Gender equality is an important and deliberate objective but not the principal reason for undertaking the project or program. Usually this is used in referring to a gender-mainstreamed project.

Gender uninformed: Projects that do not take into account the needs, views, challenges, insights, or power dynamic of different genders.

Gender mainstreamed: Ensures the needs, views, challenges, insights, or power dynamic of all genders are built into all stages of a program design and implementation.

Gender analysis: Gender analysis is a variety of methods used to understand the relationships between genders, their access to resources, their activities, and the constraints they face relative to each other.

Gender equality main objective: The top-level ambition of the project is to advance gender equality and women's empowerment; this more than targeting women or girls as the main project beneficiaries.

Gender equality projects: Projects that aim to increase gender equality. This can be either as a project's main focus or interwoven through the project design and implementation of a project that has a focus beyond gender equality, also known as a gender mainstreamed project. For this research, any donor self-reported gender equality project was chosen to be included in this grouping as a starting point.

OECD minimum recommended criteria: Created by the OECD-DAC Network of Gender Equality (GENDERNET) to provide guidance to donors on what should be reported with a significant or principal gender equality policy marker. This research used the significant policy marker criteria for consistency.

Gender inclusion criteria: Created for the purpose of this research based off of a collection of scorecards from a range of sources for gender equality assessments. They are more detailed and a specific list of gender equality components that could largely fall under the broader areas noted in the OECD minimum recommended criteria.

International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI): Brings together governments, multilateral institutions, private sector and civil society organizations and others to increase the transparency and openness of resources flowing into developing countries.

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD): The OECD is an international organization that works with policymakers, governments, and citizens to establish international norms and find evidence-based solutions to a range of challenges.

Development Assistance Committee (DAC): Is made up of 30 members that are some of the largest aid donors. Its aim is to promote development co-operation to contribute to sustainable development. Members currently do not include non-traditional bilateral donors or most multilateral donors.

1 INTRODUCTION

In the past few years, humanitarian and development donors have increased their rhetoric on the need for gender equality. This rhetoric has included feminist foreign policies, calls for feminist aid, a special gender focus at meetings of the Group of Seven (G7), and new gender equality initiatives.¹ As donors talk about the importance of gender equality work, they are backing up their rhetoric with increases in self-reported funding for gender-related initiatives—a critical step for driving change. At the same time the rise of the global #MeToo movement and women’s marches around the world have pushed more conversations about gender equality into the mainstream, building on the foundation of feminist movements over generations. This raises a question: Are donors doing more than giving lip service to gender equality with their rhetoric and self-reported funding? In the past few decades, evaluations have shown that donors struggle to implement their gender policies, raising scepticism about whether they have succeeded in turning their rhetoric into action.² Are donors now implementing high-quality gender projects? Can we assess their performance using publicly available information?

The effectiveness of gender equality projects is not a niche concern, but a global issue that affects everyone. Women and girls make up half of the world’s population, but there is still a large gap in ensuring that societies include people of all genders. The World Economic Forum estimates that at the current rate of change, closing the gap will take more than 100 years.³ The disparities in legal structures that women and girls around the world face can also make the task of achieving gender equality seem like a far-off dream, given that 104 countries have laws limiting women’s ability to work certain jobs, 36 countries do not have laws or aggravated penalties for domestic violence, and in 31 countries married women do not have the same freedom that married men do to choose where they live.⁴ To have any chance at speeding up the timeline for closing the gender gap, an increased focus on high-quality gender equality humanitarian and development assistance is an important step in the process. Speeding up that timeframe means not only that 50 percent of the world’s population would finally be seen and treated as equals for the first time—a massive and important accomplishment in its own right—it also means a safer and more prosperous world for everyone. With gender equality, food insecurity could be reduced, health and education outcomes could improve, fairer and more inclusive economies could grow, and peace agreements could last longer.⁵

The large scale of the problem, the evidence that gender equality can be a catalyst for change, and donors’ increased commitment to gender all make it clear there is a need for high-quality gender equality projects.⁶ But are the needs, challenges, insights, and power dynamics of all genders actually taken into account in development and humanitarian assistance projects? This research, based on publicly available information, was designed to provide insight and assess whether donors are implementing high-quality gender projects.

The research examines seven different donors that publicly report having gender equality projects. It uses publicly available documentation to assess the quality of those projects based on a scorecard that includes a variety of key components for gender equality projects. Unfortunately, based on the projects and donors examined, none of the donors examined have high-quality gender equality projects. Even the best performer on average included only slightly over half of the necessary components. The following sections will provide background on the key components of this research, the methodology used to conduct the research, and the findings that led to the conclusion that, based on the projects examined, donors are failing to adequately include gender equality in their projects.

2 BACKGROUND

One of the largest challenges in monitoring gender equality commitments is tracking the relevant funding and programming globally. Because gender equality work is frequently a crosscutting issue that applies across sectors, it does not have a sector code or standardized label that enables a quick search for everything in that category. To allow for easier tracking of gender equality funds, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)⁷ created gender equality policy markers (along with policy markers for other crosscutting issues) using three different categories:

1. Principal: “gender equality is the main objective of the project/program and is fundamental [in] its design an[d] expected results. The project/program would not have been undertaken without this objective.”
2. Significant: “gender equality is an important and deliberate objective, but not the principal reason for undertaking the project/program.” Usually this is a gender-mainstreamed project.⁸
3. Not targeted: “the project/program has been screened against the gender marker but has not been found to target gender equality.”⁹

In its *Handbook on the OECD-DAC Gender Equality Policy Marker*, the OECD provides guidance on what should be reported as a gender equality project and the criteria for each type of gender equality policy marker (see Text Box 1 for the minimum criteria a project must meet to earn a score of “Significant”).¹⁰ As you can see from Text Box 1, all of the criteria the OECD handbook notes should be included for the policy marker, not just one or two components. The OECD gender policy markers are limited to DAC donors. (The World Bank is not included in the OECD’s gender equality policy marker tracking; however, the World Bank, among others, uses its own gender markers.)¹¹ Donors self-report on the projects, focusing largely on financial information and providing limited details about what projects actually do.

Text Box 1: Minimum criteria for achieving an OECD gender equality policy marker of “Significant”

To earn an OECD gender equality policy marker of “Significant,” a project must meet all of the following criteria:

- A gender analysis of the project/program has been conducted.
- Findings from the gender analysis have informed the design of the project/program, and the intervention adopts a do-no-harm approach.
- The presence of at least one explicit gender equality objective is backed by at least one gender-specific indicator (or a firm commitment to do so if the results framework has not been elaborated at the time the project is marked).
- Data and indicators are disaggregated by sex where applicable.
- There is a commitment to monitor and report on the gender equality results achieved by the project in the evaluation phase.

According to OECD DAC financial reporting, gender equality funding has shown an upward trend since 2006, rising from less than \$15 billion committed in 2006 to more than \$45 billion committed in 2017 (these figures are in constant prices and, therefore, account for inflation).¹² Most of the

funding is marked “Significant.” Projects marked “Principal” average less than 5 percent of assistance across DAC donors. Additionally, more than 60 percent of funding remains un-targeted and gender uninformed, according to donors’ self-reporting.¹³ (Table 1 displays the specific financial commitments for the DAC donors examined in this research and the DAC average.) This fact means there is much work to do to speed up the closing of gender gaps, to ensure that women have voice and power in decision making, and to hold donors to account for meeting their gender equality commitments.

Table 1: Financial commitments to OECD aid projects targeting gender equality and women’s empowerment, 2017

Donor	Millions of \$				Percentage		
	Projects marked “Principal”	Projects marked “Significant”	Total gender-marked projects	Screened, not targeted	Projects marked “Principal”	Projects marked “Significant”	Total gender-marked projects
DAC members, total	4,550.157	41,816.910	46,367.068	73,364.859	3.8%	34.9%	38.7%
Canada	288.640	1,665.438	1,954.077	297.226	12.8%	74.0%	86.8%
EU institutions	536.485	10,153.301	10,689.786	10,625.165	2.5%	47.6%	50.2%
France	275.696	1,970.010	2,245.706	4,564.611	4.0%	28.9%	33.0%
Sweden	524.906	1,690.191	2,215.097	324.484	20.7%	66.6%	87.2%
United Kingdom	181.201	2,915.373	3,096.573	3,556.636	2.7%	43.8%	46.5%
United States	1,265.840	4,470.979	5,736.818	21,619.813	4.6%	16.3%	21.0%

Source: OECD 2019e; data extracted on July 24, 2019.

It is important to note that projects marked “Significant” do not focus solely on gender equality. Instead, these projects—regardless of sector—ensure that the needs, challenges, insights, and power dynamics of all genders are included. For many donors, all of their assistance is required by policy or law to include these components. Arguably, then, most donor funding should be marked at least as “Significant.” This funding would also be targeted at specific sectors like energy or health. The OECD handbook lists an example of a “Significant” project as “a project aimed at providing drinking water to a district or community, which has specific objectives and activities to ensure that women and girls have safe and easy access to the facilities.”

For projects that are gender marked, it is unclear whether they adequately include gender equality components. As mentioned, OECD reporting lacks detailed information on programming. Consequently, these data cannot be used to assess whether the projects marked for gender equality actually include key gender equality components, have a main objective of gender equality, are gender mainstreamed, or were incorrectly marked because they include women as project recipients with no objectives or activities aimed at addressing gender-specific barriers, needs, challenges, insights, or power dynamics.

The creation of the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) created the potential for linking more detailed documentation to funding-focused policy markers. When IATI updated a user tool in 2018 (d-portal.org), it made IATI projects more easily searchable by policy markers.¹⁴ Before this update, users had to manually search large coded files, making it much more difficult to find gender equality-marked projects.¹⁵ For the first time, there was a simple way to match project documentation with policy markers. This update made it more feasible to assess whether gender-marked projects met the minimum OECD policy marker criteria and other key components for gender equality.

A gender equality focus is not just an OECD-driven initiative but also an area that donors themselves have identified as a focus of their work. All of the donors examined in this research have some kind of gender equality policy or strategy, and six of the seven donors have gender equality policies that apply to their entire portfolios.¹⁶ For these six donors, according to their own policies, nearly all of their projects should be marked as “Principal” or “Significant.” Three donors have pushed gender equality commitments a bit further: the Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA), Global Affairs Canada (GAC), and the Agence Française de Développement (AFD) have called for feminist international assistance or foreign policies. Two other donors—USAID¹⁷ and DFID—have a legislative mandate to include gender in their assistance (see Table 2).¹⁸ Additionally, all of the donors have committed to transparency and are members of IATI.¹⁹

Table 2: Gender equality policies of seven donors

Policy	DFID	USAID	GAC	SIDA	EC	WB	AFD
Has a gender policy/strategy	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Has a gender policy that applies to all assistance projects	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
Has a legal mandate to include gender	✓	✓					
Has made calls for a feminist foreign policy or international assistance			✓	✓			✓

3 METHODOLOGY

DESIGN

Background desk research was conducted to inform the selection of donors and sectors and to create initial questions for a gender equality scorecard. Oxfam and external gender experts were then consulted to ensure a robust set of viewpoints. This research led to the selection of seven key donors out of a selection of larger ODA donors, based on the public availability of detailed donor information and their gender commitments (see Text Box 2 for the list of donors). Donors with rhetoric on feminist assistance were selected even if they were not the largest donor or struggled to make detailed information publicly available. Some of the larger donors were not selected, in part, because of limitations in the number of donors that could be analyzed, lack of information available in IATI, less rhetoric on gender commitments, and Oxfam’s own priorities.

Text box 2: Donors selected

1. Agence Française de Développement (AFD)
2. European Commission (EC)
3. Global Affairs Canada (GAC)
4. Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA)
5. United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID)
6. United States Agency for International Development (USAID)
7. World Bank (WB)

A variety of sectors were also selected (see Text Box 3) so that findings would be representative of the areas where gender equality work is happening. Projects from all sectors were gender marked and regardless of sector should have had key gender equality components. Education, health, and agriculture were selected because they are commonly associated with gender equality work. Emergency response and conflict prevention were selected because they are known to have disproportionate impacts on women and girls and because the inclusion of women in the process can lead to longer-lasting results.²⁰ The infrastructure/energy and financial sectors were selected because they historically have a smaller percentage of their funding marked for gender.²¹ Inclusion of all of these sectors allows findings and subsequent recommendations to be more widely applied across foreign assistance portfolios from a range of markets, because gender equality is a crosscutting issue that affects all sectors, donors, and partners and an issue that they in turn can affect.

Text box 3: Sectors selected

- Health
- Education
- Agriculture
- Emergency response
- Conflict prevention/peace and security
- Infrastructure/energy
- Financial

A key piece of this research is the gender equality scorecard, which was based on the OECD minimum recommended criteria and a variety of other gender equality scorecards created by other institutions—including donors, multilateral institutions, and implementing organizations—for slightly different purposes.²² The contents of these scorecards were merged, edited, and adapted to fit the needs of this research before the scorecard was shared with internal and external gender experts for comments and edits. As a result of the feedback, the OECD minimum recommended criteria were separated out to make it clear that those criteria were specific to identifying projects with the policy markers. These questions were edited based on the criteria in Text Box 1 so that each question had only one component and was about publicly available information. To assess whether projects should have been marked as “Principal,” there was a question on whether the main objective of the project was gender equality. This question, however, did not factor into the scoring of the project. The other section of the scorecard, containing the gender inclusion criteria, is a more detailed and specific list of gender equality components that could largely fall under the different areas noted in the OECD minimum recommended criteria. All criteria were designed to be applicable to any project marked “Principal” or “Significant,” regardless of the sector, donor, or location, or whether the donor reports policy markers to the OECD DAC. (See the Gender Equality Scorecard below for more details.)

Table 3: Gender Equality Scorecard

Project background information				
Name of project:		Sector:		
Donor:		Link:		
Policy marker for gender equality:		Years:		
Total funding:				
Correct policy marker identification audit			Yes	No
Is project marked as gender “Principal”?				
Is the main objective of the project or program to advance gender equality or women’s empowerment?				
A	Minimum OECD policy marker requirement as significant*		Included (yes = 1)	Not included (no = 0)
A1	Planning stage (1 point): Gender analysis			
A1.a	<i>Is a gender analysis available or is one referenced in any planning documents?</i>			
A2	Project design/implementation (3 points): Applying gender analysis to project design			
A2.a	<i>Do documents discuss how the project will incorporate findings from the gender analysis in the design, or if gender analysis was not referenced in documents, is there reference to how the project will address different needs or inequalities between genders?</i>			
A2.b	<i>Do documents mention that the intervention will use a “do-no-harm” approach regarding gender inequalities?</i>			

A2.c	<i>Is there at least one gender equality objective?</i>		
A3	Monitoring, evaluation, and reporting (3 points)		
A3.a	<i>Is there a gender-specific indicator?</i>		
A3.b	<i>Are indicators/data disaggregated by gender, where applicable?</i>		
A3.c	<i>Has the project assessed its results toward gender equality, or does it have a plan to do so?</i>		
	Total minimum requirement score (7 points possible)		

* Based on OECD 2016, p. 10.

B	Gender inclusion criteria	Included (yes = 1)	Not included (no = 0)
B1	Planning stage (11 points): Gender analysis		
B1.a	<i>Do documents identify opportunities to promote women's leadership?</i>		
B1.b	<i>Do documents identify opportunities to promote women's participation/leadership in project design, implementation, and evaluation?</i>		
B1.c	<i>Do documents mention specific inequalities between genders?</i>		
B1.d	<i>Do documents mention different needs of various genders?</i>		
B1.e	<i>Do documents indicate or explain potential causes of these inequalities?</i>		
B1.f	<i>Do documents identify potential unintended negative consequences, including gender-based violence, that could occur as a result of the project/intervention?</i>		
B1.g	<i>Do documents reference relevant differences in gender roles within the particular context of the project?</i>		
B1.h	<i>Do documents identify the gender relations, dynamics, and inequalities within political, legal, geographic, economic, or social contexts?</i>		
B1.i	<i>Do documents identify how other identities (e.g., race, religion, sexual orientation, ability) interact with gender?</i>		
B1.j	<i>Do documents identify the different challenges across genders in gaining access to services, goods, trainings, etc.?</i>		
B1.k	<i>Does any planning research/analysis collect relevant, outcome-orientated data disaggregated by gender and age?</i>		
B2	Project design/implementation (11 points): Applying gender analysis to project design		
B2.a	<i>Does the project address challenges and constraints people may face due to gender, including time constraints due to household or unpaid work responsibilities, access to finance, access to education, or other constraints or challenges identified in the gender analysis?</i>		
B2.b	<i>Do documents discuss how the project will address inequalities between genders?</i>		
B2.c	<i>Do documents describe how the project will address different needs of various genders?</i>		
B2.e	<i>Does the project work to address challenges around unintended negative consequences, including gender-based violence, that may occur during implementation?</i>		

B2.f	<i>Does the project identify and call for staff or partners with experience in gender integration or other gender-relevant technical expertise?</i>		
B2.g	<i>Do documents describe plans to ensure women are in leadership roles and empowered?</i>		
B2.h	<i>Do documents discuss how gender roles and power relations will be taken into account in the project design?</i>		
B2.i	<i>Do documents mention plans to address the interaction of different identities and the needs/gaps of marginalized populations including sexual and gender minorities?</i>		
B2.j	<i>Do documents mention the ability for groups—including marginalized populations and women—affected by the project to participate in the planning, design, implementation, and evaluation phases of the project?</i>		
B2.k	<i>Do documents indicate that project targets/beneficiaries include a proportionally appropriate number of women?</i>		
B2.l	<i>Where relevant, do documents include non-binary genders (look at more than just men and women)?</i>		
B3	Monitoring, evaluation, and reporting (5 points)		
B3.a	<i>Is there mention of plans to be able to monitor for unintended consequences (e.g., gender-based violence)?</i>		
B3.b	<i>Are there indicators or other reporting mechanisms to note the extent to which relevant gender gaps were closed?</i>		
B3.c	<i>Were data collected on participation disaggregated by gender?</i>		
B3.d	<i>Were the viewpoints of women collected during the evaluation of the project?</i>		
B3.e	<i>Is there any plan to share reporting or evaluation with the communities in question, including women and women's rights organizations?</i>		
Total for this section (27 points possible)			
TOTAL OVER TWO SECTIONS (34 points possible)			

PROJECT SELECTION AND EVALUATION

The research evaluated 10 projects per donor²³ across seven sectors²⁴ using only publicly available information (see Text Boxes 1 and 2 for the full list). The selection of projects followed a simple procedure: The search features on d-portal.org were used to access IATI data.²⁵ Then, the specified sectors (the year range from 2017 to present) and the gender equality policy marker (“Principal” or “Significant”) were added to the list of filters for the donor, and the largest projects within each sector were selected.²⁶ If the largest project did not contain documents on IATI, the second-largest project was tried, and so on. However, this process required that the donor (1) provided sufficient documentation on IATI and (2) gender-marked its projects, which not all donors did. Where these criteria were not met, it was necessary to create additional search criteria.

For donors that gender-marked projects but did not provide documents on IATI, the process was largely the same, but documentation was sought through alternative methods (such as partner web sites and web searches). For donors that did not gender-mark projects on IATI but reported to the OECD (France and USAID), it was necessary to pull gender-marked data from the OECD Credit

Reporting System (CRS) and cross-check projects listed in the CRS against those with available documents in IATI. This process was tried for up to 10 projects per sector. If no project was available with sufficient documents after these 10 searches, the sector was abandoned and replaced with a project from another sector.²⁷ Regardless of the sectors selected, however, the analysis evaluated at least 10 projects per donor. Because the World Bank does not report to OECD or IATI with policy markers, projects were pulled from its gender site.²⁸ While this approach resulted in a slightly different set of criteria for projects, all gender projects are based on self-reporting, and the World Bank project selection method was deemed to be not too far outside the scope of the other donors.

Once projects were selected, the publicly available information was searched for the different components and received a point for that component on the scorecard; no weighting was applied to the scores. Projects received no additional points for more frequent mentions of the components, and receiving a point for a component did not mean that it was incorporated into every section or element of the project.

LIMITATIONS

Owing to time and capacity constraints, the number of projects examined per donor was limited, and only publicly available information was used. This work, therefore, represents a sample of gender-marked projects—not conclusive results applicable to all donor projects. To help compensate for the small sample size, the research selected projects with relatively large budgets. The 72 projects that were examined had a collective financial commitment of more than \$6.28 billion. For reference, in 2017 about \$48 billion was reported to the DAC as gender equality-funded projects, not including the World Bank funding, which was included in the \$6.28 billion.²⁹

While capacity constraints limited the scope of the research to publicly available information, this approach was also intentional, because marginalized groups do not always have inside access or the ability to request information directly from donors. If donors really focus on gender equality work, access to information must be a key component. The lack of access to comprehensive detailed information related to projects means that some projects may have incorporated certain components, but the components were not mentioned in publicly available information.

Finally, projects were not examined in-country, so it is impossible to know whether projects' implementation matched their documentation. Similarly, the research is unable to comment on the projects' effects on gender equality.

4 FINDINGS

OVERALL

None of the donors examined consistently and comprehensively included gender equality components in their gender equality projects. While all the donors performed better on the OECD minimum recommended criteria than on the gender inclusion criteria, even the donors with the highest scores in that section performed relatively poorly. For the overall gender equality scores—the score of the OECD minimum criteria and the gender inclusion criteria combined—every single donor would receive a failing grade for including gender equality components in their gender equality projects (see Table 3 for the scores by donor). The higher scores for the OECD minimum recommendations make sense because those criteria are broader and less specific, providing a basic frame for what any gender-mainstreamed project should include, regardless of whether it is reported to the OECD. All criteria in both sections of the gender scorecard were deemed necessary for high-quality gender equality projects. Ideally, all projects would receive an overall score of 100 percent, so the low scores are concerning. Table 3 also includes the Aid Transparency Index scores for the respective donors to highlight that even some of the donors with high transparency scores (all information was gathered via publicly available information) still did not receive high gender equality scores, so the scores cannot simply be explained as an issue around the lack of transparency.

Table 3: Scores on scorecard sections by donor as a percentage of the total points possible for the section and Aid Transparency Index score

Donor	OECD minimum criteria	Gender inclusion criteria	Overall gender equality	Aid Transparency Index 2018*
AFD (France)	36%	18%	22%	46%
EC/DEVCO (European Commission)	54%	31%	36%	66%
GAC (Canada)	49%	26%	30%	80%
SIDA (Sweden)	61%	43%	47%	71%
DFID (United Kingdom)	70%	43%	49%	91%
USAID (United States)	43%	30%	32%	69%
World Bank	70%	50%	54%	86%
Overall	55%	34%	39%	n/a

* These data are from Publish What You Fund 2018.

Of the donors and projects examined, the World Bank included more components at least once than any other donor did, with slightly over half of the components included on average in the projects examined. More of the World Bank's projects had gender equality as their main objective, which may have biased the overall results (see Table 4 for a breakdown of projects by main

objective). The World Bank is followed by DFID (49%), SIDA (47%), DEVCO (36%), USAID (32%), GAC, (30%), and AFD (22%). It is important to note that these scores do not address how frequently or holistically each gender equality component was included, just that it was included. The research found that DFID and the World Bank included gender more systematically in their reporting; however, DFID seemed to more fully explore gender dynamics, including more detail when the component was present. Although USAID and DEVCO at times included gender components, they were less consistent within their methodology across the projects examined. The two lowest-scoring donors—GAC and AFD—may be able to justify lower scores as an issue of data and document availability, especially in the case of GAC, which did seem to have more gender components in its available information. AFD, however, did a poor job of mainstreaming gender even in available information, often completely failing to mention various genders in projects marked “Significant.”

GENDER EQUALITY MAIN OBJECTIVE VS. MAINSTREAMING

In the projects examined, those with gender equality as a main objective scored higher than gender-mainstreamed projects and projects whose main objective was not gender equality (see Table 4). Overall, the projects did not necessarily align with the policy marker noted; about one-quarter of the projects examined were marked with the incorrect policy marker. Fourteen projects were marked as “Principal” projects but did not have gender equality as the main objective and, therefore, should not have counted as “Principal” projects. Conversely, three projects marked as “Significant” did have gender equality as a main objective. This suggests that funding levels reported to the OECD for “Principal” projects may be an overestimate. For comparison’s sake, more projects were mismarked (17) than had at least six of the seven OECD minimum project components (13).³⁰ Because of this mismarking of projects by donors, we decided to break down the different overall scores both by the reported policy markers and by whether our review of project documents determined that gender equality was a main objective.³¹ From our analysis, it seems that a driver for more robustly including gender equality components is that the project has a gender equality main objective. Of the 25 projects with gender equality as the main objective, on average these projects had about five out of the seven minimum components and about 50 percent of all the components. The lowest scores belonged to the projects classified as “‘Significant’ not main objective.” However, the “Not main objective” scores on average were very close to the “‘Significant’ not main objective” scores, so it is not clear whether the difference is just a result of sample variation. For both of the groups, these projects on average have about three of the seven minimum components and about one-third of all the components (Table 4).

Table 4: Scores on scorecard sections by project objective and/or policy marker as a percentage of the total points possible for the section

Objective	OECD minimum criteria	Gender inclusion	Overall gender equality
“Principal” and main objective (n = 22)	72%	47%	52%
“Principal” not main objective (n = 14)	50%	32%	36%
“Significant” and main objective (n = 3)	76%	42%	49%
“Significant” not main objective (n = 33)	43%	27%	30%
Reported “Principal” (n = 36)	63%	41%	46%
Reported “Significant” (n = 36)	46%	28%	32%
Main objective (n = 25)	73%	46%	52%
Not main objective (n = 47)	45%	28%	32%

Note: Because the World Bank does not report policy markers to the OECD DAC, its projects for which gender was the main objective were included in the projects scored as “Principal,” and its gender equality projects for which gender was not the main objective were scored as “Significant.”

OECD MINIMUM CRITERIA

Of the 72 projects examined, only two—one from DFID and one from the World Bank—met the OECD’s minimum recommended criteria that is provided in the OECD DAC handbook on gender markers (see Text Box 4).³² On average, projects scored 3.8 out of 7 for these criteria (see Annex 2 for a more detailed breakdown). With the exception of the World Bank, which does not report to the OECD DAC,³³ all of these projects were self-reported to the OECD as gender equality projects; they should have scored 100 percent, since the OECD recommends that every project marked as “Significant” or “Principal” meet these criteria (see Text Box 1). Another 11 projects were missing only one of the seven components; even then, less than one-fifth of all the projects examined had at least six of the seven minimum components to be scored as “Principal” or “Significant” (see Table 5). This finding suggests that among the projects examined, almost none of them should have been marked with a gender policy marker, calling into question the accuracy of the spending figures reported by donors on gender equality. Table 6 provides a list of the OECD minimum criteria questions that were adapted from the criteria in Text Box 1 to be used for the purposes of this research. None of the criteria include any OECD-specific components; instead, they provide a broad set of criteria that could be applied to any gender-mainstreamed project.

Text box 4: Projects that met OECD's minimum recommended criteria

1. DFID's Significant marked project,

"Livelihoods and Food Security Trust Fund for the rural poor and vulnerable in Burma"

This activity was the component marked gender significant and is part of the Livelihoods and Food Security Trust Fund for Burma (NUTSEM) reported by DFID. This project is focused on a collection of sectors including water, sanitation, social protection, agricultural development, and environmental policy.

2. World Bank's gender equality main objective project, "Women's Economic Empowerment Rural Development Project" is a project in Afghanistan focused on increasing economic and social empowerment of rural women.

Table 5: Share of projects that included six or seven of the OECD minimum criteria

Number of OECD minimum criteria included	Share of projects
All seven	3%
At least six	18%

Table 6: Average project score for OECD minimum criteria questions

OECD minimum criteria questions	Share of projects that include component
Is a gender analysis available, or is one referenced in any planning documents?	72%
Do documents discuss how the project will incorporate findings from the gender analysis in the design, or if gender analysis was not referenced in documents, is there reference to how the project will address different needs or inequalities between genders?	79%
Do documents mention that the intervention will use a "do-no-harm" approach regarding gender inequalities?	21%
Is there at least one gender equality objective?	57%
Is there a gender-specific indicator?	54%
Are indicators/data disaggregated by gender, where applicable?	51%
Has the project assessed its results toward gender equality, or does it have a plan to do so?	47%

The research also provides insight into which components of gender equality donors are less likely to include in their projects. Of the OECD minimum recommended criteria, the lowest-performing component was including a "do-no-harm" approach. Only about one-fifth of all the projects included language outlining this type of approach or safeguard (see Table 6). To ensure that "do-no-harm" components that used alternative vocabulary were included in this score, other related key words (such as "consequences," "unintended," "harm," "negative") were also searched for in publicly

available documents. Any use of harm-related vocabulary would have earned a point for the project being examined.

The components most frequently included in the projects examined were use of a gender analysis and the incorporation of findings from the gender analysis into the design of the project. These were the only two components included by more than 70 percent of projects. The scorecard question about integrating gender analysis into project design received a higher score than the question about the use of gender analysis, probably because the integration question was designed to give credit to projects that incorporated different needs or inequalities across genders even if project documents did not refer specifically to a gender analysis. This approach was designed to address the potential lack of information available on a specific gender analysis.

The data and measurement-related components were included in only about one-half of the projects (at least once per scorecard question). Table 6 provides the scores for each of the four questions related to objectives, indicators, and measurement (Annex 1 provides a comparison across donors). Of the projects examined, the use of gender-disaggregated data occurred in only 51 percent of projects, although SIDA and USAID included it in about three-quarters of their projects examined (see Annex 2 for the individual donor breakdown). It is important to note that even when a project received credit for gender-disaggregated data, it does not mean that all indicators that could have been disaggregated were. Additionally, slightly under one-half of the projects examined assessed the results toward gender equality—a problematic finding for projects that claim to be about gender equality.

GENDER INCLUSION CRITERIA

Although the OECD minimum criteria scores were low, the gender inclusion scores were even lower. With an overall average score of 34 percent (see Table 3) for the gender inclusion criteria, it is clear that the gender equality projects examined did not include the more specific criteria throughout projects, or even at the same rate as the broader OECD minimum criteria (55 percent). The reason for the lower score is likely that the gender inclusion components were more specific. Multiple components could count toward the OECD minimum criteria, and only one would be needed to earn a point. For example, the OECD minimum criteria on conducting or incorporating the findings of a gender analysis scored over 70 percent, but the highest-scoring gender inclusion component scored only 65 percent. This question—B2.a—was also related to incorporating gender analysis into a project, but it asked not just about a broad incorporation of such an analysis, but specifically about gender challenges and constraints.

B2.a: “Does the project address challenges and constraints people may face due to gender, including time constraints due to household or unpaid work responsibilities, access to finance, access to education, or other constraints or challenges identified in the gender analysis?”

Only two other questions in the gender inclusion section received a score higher than 60 percent (B1c and B2b). Thus, even for the highest-performing specific gender equality components, less than two-thirds of gender equality projects examined included them. If these projects were in school, even the highest performers would receive a failing grade.

B1.c: “Do documents mention specific inequalities between genders?”

B2.b: “Do documents discuss how the project will address inequalities between genders?”

All three of the highest-scoring gender inclusion questions are related to conducting and incorporating gender analysis, and all are found in fewer projects than the broader OECD criteria for gender analysis. This finding highlights the importance of specificity when defining criteria for expectations in gender equality projects, even for relatively high-scoring components.

On the other end of the spectrum, the lowest-scoring component was the lack of inclusion of nonbinary people. None of the projects examined for any donors mentioned the inclusion of nonbinary genders. This gap leaves people excluded and uncounted.

The three more detailed “do-no-harm” questions also earned some of the lowest scores and scored worse than the OECD minimum requirements “do-no-harm” question (Table 7). Less than one-fifth of the gender equality projects examined considered, addressed, and/or monitored the unintended negative consequences that could result from a project. This meant that projects could unintentionally harm people, and there would be no project specific mechanisms to address the harm within the project. In an industry aimed at improving the quality of life, and in a subgroup of projects intended to create more equality, this was a large and potentially dangerous oversight.

Table 7: “Do-No-Harm” Questions

Question number	Question	Share of projects that include component
B1.f	Do documents identify potential unintended negative consequences, including gender-based violence that could occur as a result of the project/intervention?	18%
B2.e	Does the project work to address challenges around unintended negative consequences, including gender-based violence that may occur during implementation?	17%
B3.a	Is there mention of plans to be able to monitor for unintended consequences (i.e., gender-based violence)?	15%

Gender equality organizations and women’s participation and leadership were also infrequently included in projects, but there was a bit more variation across projects depending on the question (see Table 8 for the specific questions and scores). The question about projects calling for gender equality staff, experts, or partners had the highest score in the gender inclusion section of the scorecard, with 53 percent of projects mentioning this component (B2.f in Table 8). While this score may seem positive in comparison with other scores, the fact that one-half of gender equality marked projects do not call for staff or partners with gender expertise is concerning at best and alarming at worst. The research also found that while 38 percent of the projects examined identified opportunities to promote women’s leadership (B1.a in Table 8), only 21 percent of the projects described plans to ensure that women are in leadership roles (B2.g in Table 8). Additionally, only about one-quarter of projects examined the power dynamics between genders (question B2.h in Table 8). These results suggest that projects identify opportunities to promote women’s leadership, but they struggle to incorporate those opportunities into project design and to address the power dynamics that impede women’s leadership and participation.

Table 8: Average project scores for women’s participation and leadership questions

Question number	Question	Share of projects that include component
B1.a	Do documents identify opportunities to promote women’s leadership?	38%
B1.b	Do documents identify opportunities to promote women’s participation/leadership in project design, implementation, and evaluation?	25%
B2.f	Does the project identify and call for staff or partners with experience in gender integration or other gender-relevant technical expertise?	53%
B2.g	Do documents describe plans to ensure women are in leadership roles and empowered?	21%
B2.h	Do documents discuss how gender roles and power relations will be taken into account in the project design?	26%
B2.i	Do documents mention plans to address the interaction of different identifies and the needs/gaps of marginalized populations including sexual and gender minorities?	26%
B2.j	Do documents mention the ability for groups—including marginalized populations and women—affected by the project to participate in the planning, design, implementation, and evaluation phases of the project?	38%
B3.e	Is there any plan to share reporting or evaluation with the communities in question, including women and women’s rights organizations?	14%

ACCESS TO INFORMATION AND TRANSPARENCY

Many of the donors examined made detailed project information publicly available, making it unlikely that greater transparency would drastically change the majority of project scores. However, even if information gaps contribute to less than optimal scores, donors should not be given a pass; access to information is linked to gender equality and women’s empowerment.³⁴ Public availability of information is especially important for women, given that social, legal, and cultural rules and norms may make it more difficult for women and other marginalized groups to engage with authorities or public systems.³⁵ With those caveats, it is possible that scores for AFD and GAC could increase if more information were available because they both lacked publicly available detailed documentation.

While GAC receives a higher transparency score in the Aid Transparency Index than in the two other measures of gender policy (see Table 3), it frequently failed to share detailed project documents through IATI or other publicly accessible sources. This failure made it difficult to assess the details of projects, where many gender components may be found, especially in projects scored as “Significant” for gender. In the information that was available for GAC, there seemed to be an attempt to integrate gender equality components. AFD scored only “fair” in the Aid Transparency Index and did not publicly share detailed project information.³⁶ It is unclear whether additional information would raise its scores because gender equality components were not

consistently included in available documentation. Other donors provided extensive planning and/or monitoring and evaluation documents publicly, though not consistently. Even from one project to the next within donor organizations, donors did not consistently make public the same types of relevant documentation.

Although more information can be helpful in trying to answer questions, users must be able to find it. The easier this is, the less time and expertise users must take to access and use the information. Not all relevant documentation found about the projects studied here was on available on IATI via the d-portal user interface; thus, more time had to be spent looking for the information elsewhere. As mentioned, all donors examined are members of IATI and so their information should be available there. In some cases, links for multiple documents for a project on d-portal seemed to suggest that adequate information was available, but the documents were duplicates or triplicates, or the links to web pages were broken, led to non-project specific pages, or included no additional information.

A few challenges arose with the detailed documentation that was available. Language could be a barrier to using documents and search features. Documents were usually in the donor country's national language. Some donors included a second language like English or French, but this was not done consistently across donors, nor were the additional languages necessarily the languages spoken in the project countries. This barrier could pose large challenges for use in project countries, making it harder for civil society, including women's rights organizations, to use this information. Additionally, most of the detailed information came from non-machine-readable formats. While having the information available is a critical first step and non-machine-readable formats are definitely better than having less information, this shortcoming can make searching for information incredibly time consuming, creating another barrier for users.

FUTURE RESEARCH

Because of capacity limitations, this report leaves unaddressed some additional angles of this research with regard to both additional analysis of data collected and collection of additional data. For information already available, the data could be broken down further by a larger combination of factors: for example, by question, sector, and donor; by question, scoring as "Principal" or "Significant," and sector; or even just by percentages by donor and question. Owing to the small sample size, including more variables in the breakdowns, would make it harder to draw any kind of conclusion, so more detailed analysis may require examining more projects per donor.

If future research examines more projects, it would be interesting to determine whether the lack of gender equality components results partly from the large size of projects. Future research should include a cross-section of different project sizes to gain insight into whether the scale of a project is positively or negatively correlated with more gender-inclusion components. In addition to having a larger and more diverse sample, future research could use in-country comparisons to assess whether publicly available information matches reality, whether projects actually did more or less than claimed when they were implemented, or whether results of evaluations of gender-inclusion components were over- or understated. This research could be done with the same projects examined here or a different sample, but it would provide additional insight into how gender is addressed throughout the entire implementation chain and whether information shared publicly is consistent with the reality at project sites.

5 RECOMMENDATIONS

Action should be taken to rectify the findings that projects across donors and sectors consistently fail to include criteria for adequately addressing gender dynamics in programs and are marked with incorrect policy markers. If, however, the task of including and addressing gender dynamics in projects is everyone's responsibility, it can become no one's, and thus the principles or policies around gender equality do not always translate into practice.³⁷ Along these lines, this research has shown that on average the **gender-mainstreamed projects scored much lower (32 percent) than the projects whose main objective was gender equality (52 percent)**. Yet, even for the projects whose main objective was gender equality, key components were missing, highlighting the need to ensure that all projects do a better job of adequately including gender. The following recommendations are aimed to help ensure that donors improve the quality of their gender equality projects. Beyond the donors examined in this research, these recommendations can provide guidance to practitioners, partners, and other donors, as well.

- 1. Gender-mark projects in the pre-design phase:** Donors should mark projects with a gender marker in the project pre-design phase. The marking of a project should then trigger an examination of the project elements and plans to see whether the project incorporates key components. When gender marking their projects, donors should not only use the OECD minimum recommended criteria but also include key points from the gender inclusion criteria listed in this report. Before a project is able to move forward with a gender marker, donors should apply a threshold, so that at a bare minimum no project should receive a gender marker that does not meet OECD's minimum recommended criteria. For donors and implementers that do not report to the OECD, these broad criteria should still serve as minimum standards for every gender equality project. Donors could apply a higher set of minimum standards but not a lower one. For donors that have policies or laws stipulating that all projects should take gender into account, they should adopt procedures to assign a gender marker in the pre-design phase for every project to ensure they are adhering to the policy or legislative mandate. Evidence suggests that using a gender marker can help create an enabling environment to ensure that gender is included and can help donors learn what works for gender equality.³⁸ This practice may also help ensure more consistent reporting to the OECD.
- 2. Detailed guidance on gender equality criteria that is widely socialized:** More detailed and specific guidance about what counts as a gender equality project is needed to reduce the subjectivity in applying gender markers. Although the OECD provides gender guidance in its handbook, for a non-gender expert it may not go far enough. For example, the handbook highlights that a gender analysis should lead to a project design that will "overcome barriers to women's full participation in a project" but offers no further explanation.³⁹ The research findings suggests that donors may not have a clear understanding of what that recommendation means, given that only about one-quarter of projects attempted to address gender power relations or promote women's participation and leadership. More detailed guidance could come from both the OECD and any donor using any kind of gender marker. The guidance should be socialized across donors, sectors, and staff so that they clearly understand the requirements of gender equality projects. The finding that about three-quarters of the projects examined here used a gender analysis and incorporated it into their design suggests some general understanding of gender equality components; however, the lower scores for the more nuanced indicators suggests a need for more clarity. The language used needs to be clearly defined in terminology that is understandable to non-gender experts. For example, the guidance should explain what a gender equality objective is and describe the key components it could include. The use of a

more detailed scorecard, like the gender inclusion section of the scorecard for this research, and a glossary could help. For gender to be successfully incorporated into all types of development and humanitarian programs, no one working at any level of any organization or agency should think gender equality is just about having women as project participants. Rather, workers in these fields should understand that it is about structural, cultural, and social norms that can create different experiences for people of different genders.

3. **Sufficient resources, buy-in, gender expertise, and staff incentives at all levels:** The overall low scores suggest that donors may lack sufficient expertise, buy-in, and high-level gender staff to ensure that projects across sectors include and address key gender equality components. If gender equality components are to be included in a high-quality manner, a policy alone is not enough. Donors need to invest in institutional mechanisms, structures, rules, and norms that are driven by senior-level management with financial and human resources committed to implementing gender equality policies.⁴⁰ Not only are technical experts needed (gender expertise does not just equal female staff but is a technical expertise, like health), but non-gender staff need to ensure that gender issues are included in all activities, as well. These roles cannot be only for lower-level staff, but also for high-level staff with more influence and power.⁴¹ Incentives should be used to encourage staff to incorporate gender equality in a high-quality way into project design, implementation, and evaluation.⁴²
4. **Identify and mitigate unintended negative consequences:** Since “do-no-harm” components were frequently left out of projects, it is critical to ensure that project design, implementation, and evaluation identify and mitigate an activity’s potential unintended negative consequences. While all risks cannot be predicted or completely mitigated, donors should identify potential unintended negative consequences and attempt to mitigate them so that projects do not increase the risk of gender-based violence, widen gender gaps, increase the unpaid care work burden, or unintentionally cause other negative consequences.⁴³ This effort could help improve women’s quality of life, ensure respect for their rights, and improve results.
5. **Women must be included and have the power to lead, influence, and make decisions:** To be effective and successful, gender equality projects must do more than focus on women as recipients of services. Women and other marginalized populations need to be included in leadership, in decision-making structures, and in the design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of projects. Only about one-quarter of projects mentioned plans to address power relations between genders, identify opportunities for women’s participation, or ensure that women held leadership roles; even in gender equality projects, women are not given power, voice, and agency. Donors must ensure that women’s leadership and participation through all phases of projects are core components in all gender equality or gender-mainstreamed projects, not in just a small fraction of them.
6. **Always use gender equality indicators and gender-disaggregated data:** If gender-disaggregated information is not used and measured along with gender equality indicators, it is not feasible to assess whether a gender equality project was effective or whether gender was successfully mainstreamed. Donors must ensure that if people are a part of an indicator, it is disaggregated by gender, especially when it is being collected as part of the project. Gender-disaggregated data cannot appear only in plans, but in end-line reporting, as well. About one-half of the projects assessed included this information, and that rate must be improved to ensure that projects are effective for all genders, do not unintentionally harm one gender or the other, and leave no one behind. These data should be publicly available and reported through IATI.

7. **Detailed documents should be publicly available and include gender analysis and components:** For publicly available project information to be used, research shows that a wide cross-section of actors need to know what the project is doing.⁴⁴ Users need those details to hold donors accountable for gender equality commitments, but they also need to understand how gender is incorporated for learning. If separate gender analysis documents are created, they should be added to the IATI document files by donors so they can be easily found. This information will help raise awareness and support learning by donors and partners. Donors and the aid transparency community should also work to provide detailed information in a more machine-readable format so that users can search for information more easily across projects and donors. This task faces numerous obstacles, like the challenge of standardizing terminology, so while a solution is being created donors should work to include detailed project information in the most accessible format feasible.
8. **Gender projects should be marked with a gender policy marker in IATI:** Any IATI publisher can and should use the OECD gender policy markers, which should make it easier to track projects. For donors that report to OECD in addition to IATI, these projects should match in both reporting mechanisms. Not being able to search by policy marker in IATI made it significantly more difficult to find detailed documents that matched projects identified with a gender marker on OECD.
9. **Projects should include considerations for non-binary people:** Not a single project publicly mentioned non-binary people. Donors need to create space to include and consider non-binary individuals.

6 CONCLUSION

Overall, gender equality projects across donors and sectors fail to include the key components necessary to effectively address gender inequality. While some donors perform better than others—which may be correlated with the level of detail in their publicly available information—none of the donors received an overall score over 55 percent, this means that on average none of the donor’s projects examined include more than 55 percent of the criteria on the scorecard. While there is room for improvement across all components, special attention needs to be paid to the use of “do-no-harm” principles, the promotion of women’s leadership, and the inclusion of non-binary people. Not only are these components most consistently missing, but their absence may result in projects that are less effective and may hurt the very people they were intended to help.

At a bare minimum, all projects should incorporate all of the OECD minimum recommended criteria; ideally, they would also include all of the components on the scorecard. Only two projects out of 72 examined here included the OECD minimum criteria—that is, met the bare minimum threshold to be counted as a gender equality project. Donors are failing to implement high quality gender equality projects. They must do more to ensure that the increased rhetoric around the need to emphasize gender in aid and development finance—which should be applauded—is turned into practical change on the ground. The recommendations given here provide guidance for donors on how they can improve the quality of their gender equality projects. Given the urgent need to accelerate the rate of change so that gender equality can happen in our lifetimes, these findings must be taken seriously, and steps must be taken to turn policy into practice to help create a gender just world.

NOTES

- 1 Government Offices of Sweden 2019; Government of Canada 2017; Le Drian and Schiappa 2019; UK DFID 2018; US White House 2019; Reuters 2017; Wright 2019.
- 2 UK DFID 2006; CIDA 2008; Byron et al. 2010; UNDP 2015; USAID 2012; European Commission 2015a, 109.
- 3 World Economic Forum 2018.
- 4 World Bank 2018.
- 5 Brown 2010; O'Reilly et al. 2015; Woetzel et al. 2015; FAO 2011; World Bank 2017.
- 6 In this context gender equality projects include both projects in which the main focus is gender equality and projects in which gender is mainstreamed.
- 7 The OECD is an international organization that works "with governments, policy makers and citizens, we work on establishing international norms and finding evidence-based solutions to a range of social, economic and environmental challenges" (OECD 2019a).
- 8 OECD 2016.
- 9 These three definitions are from OECD 2019b.
- 10 OECD 2016.
- 11 The Development Assistance Committee (DAC) has "the overarching objective ... to promote development co-operation and other relevant policies so as to contribute to implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, including sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, poverty eradication, improvement of living standards in developing countries, and to a future in which no country will depend on aid" (OECD 2019c). DAC donors do not include nontraditional bilateral donors or multilateral donors besides the European Union institutions.
- 12 OECD 2019d.
- 13 Calculations of percentages are based on the total aid marked with the respective policy marker divided by the total aid screened. The total screened figure may be smaller than the total aid a country provided if all of it was not screened for gender equality policy markers.
- 14 D-portal 2019a.
- 15 Cohen and Mekuria 2018.
- 16 European Commission 2015b; Bank 2015; European Commission 2018; Government Offices of Sweden 2018; French Ministry for Europe and Foreign Affairs 2018; UK DFID 2018, 22; AFD 2019; USAID 2012, 28.
- 17 USAID's legislative mandate became law until January 2019 and has a year implementation process; therefore, for the projects examined in this research they law did not apply.
- 18 Government Offices of Sweden 2019; Government of Canada 2017; Le Drian and Schiappa 2019; U.S. Congress 2019; UK Parliament 2014.
- 19 IATI 2019.
- 20 UN Women 2019a, 2019b.
- 21 OECD 2018.
- 22 OECD 2016; ADB 2010; African Union Commission 2016; USAID 2016; Zuckerman et al. 2018; Inter-Agency Standing Committee 2018; CARE International 2019. UNDG 2008, 25.
- 23 USAID and SIDA had 11 projects each because the search for humanitarian projects included conflict prevention and emergency response in one search; this search resulted in no emergency response projects being selected, so emergency response projects were subsequently selected to take the total to 11 projects.
- 24 Agence Française de Développement (AFD) had projects selected from other sectors because gender equality marked projects could not be found for them for the sector categories of Emergency Response, Conflict Prevention/Peace and Security, or Financial. For all other donors, two health, education, and agriculture projects were selected, and one project each from the remaining four categories. USAID and SIDA each have an extra conflict prevention project.
- 25 D-portal.org is an IATI data user tool that allows for quick searches of IATI data that do not requiring coding skills.
- 26 This process was completed for projects marked as both "Principal" and "Significant." For example, the Gender Principal-marked project with the highest funding within the Education sector was selected; then

the Gender Significant-marked project with the highest funding within the Education sector was selected. Thus, for each sector (when possible) two projects were selected: one Gender Principal and one Gender Significant. If documents from 2017 projects were not available projects from 2015 or 2016 were selected.

- 27 This was only an issue for Agence Française de Développement (AFD) and resulted in three other sectors being selected
- 28 Since this research was completed, the World Bank appears to have restructured its website, so the specific link used to find projects (<http://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/gender/projects>) is no longer available; it is unclear if the a search was conducted using a different way to accesses World Bank gender projects if the same projects would be found due to this website change.
- 29 OECD 2019e.
- 30 The five criteria in the OECD DAC Handbook on Gender Markers (see Text Box 1), were broken into 7 criteria (see Table 6) for this research because there were criteria that had multiple components, so for scoring purposes there was a need to have only one component per criteria.
- 31 According to the OECD, a project that had a main objective of gender equality would advance women's empowerment and gender equality or reduce sex-based discrimination and inequalities. If these objectives were not part of the project, the project would not exist.²² Targeting female participants does not automatically mean gender equality is the main objective of a project.
- 32 D-portal 2019b; D-portal 2019c; World Bank 2019.
- 33 Even though the World Bank does not report to the OECD, it scored the highest on these criteria; however, more of its projects had gender equality as the main objective, which may have pushed its score up.
- 34 Hafkin 2017; Article 19 2019.
- 35 Article 19 2019.
- 36 Publish What You Find 2018.
- 37 Tiessen 2007.
- 38 Foran, Swaine, and Burns 2012.
- 39 OECD 2016.
- 40 Tiessen 2007; Mukhopadhyay, Steehouwer, and Wong 2006.
- 41 Tiessen 2007.
- 42 UNICEF 2011.
- 43 Adamson 2017; Tejada and Mortimer 2018; Humanitarian Practice Network 2012.
- 44 USAID 2015; InterAction 2016; Grabowski 2017.

ANNEX 1: COMPARISON OF SCORECARD SCORES ACROSS DONORS

A	Minimum OECD policy marker requirement (Was this project correctly marked with a gender equality policy marker?)*	Number of projects that include component, by donor						Total share of projects that include component	
		DFID	SIDA	AFD	USAID	WB	GAC		EC
A1	Planning stage: Gender analysis								
A1.a	<i>Is a gender analysis available or is one referenced in any planning documents?</i>	9	8	7	7	10	2	9	72%
A2	Project design/implementation: Applying gender analysis to project design								
A2.a	<i>Do documents discuss how the project will incorporate findings from the gender analysis in the design, or if gender analysis was not referenced in documents, is there reference to how the project will address different needs or inequalities between genders?</i>	9	8	5	7	10	9	9	79%
A2.b	<i>Do documents mention that the intervention will use a “do-no-harm” approach regarding gender inequalities?</i>	2	5	2	2	3	1	0	21%
A2.c	<i>Is there at least one gender equality objective?</i>	8	8	1	4	8	7	5	57%
A3	Monitoring, evaluation, and reporting								
A3.a	<i>Is there a gender-specific indicator?</i>	7	7	2	4	7	7	5	54%

A3.b	<i>Are indicators/data disaggregated by gender, where applicable?</i>	8	5	5	8	6	1	4	51%
A3.c	<i>Has the project assessed its results toward gender equality, or does it have a plan to do so?</i>	6	6	3	1	5	7	6	47%
	Percentage of the minimum recommended criteria	70%	67%	36%	43%	70%	49%	54%	55%

* Based on OECD 2016, p. 10.

B	Gender inclusion criteria	Number of projects that include component, by donor							Total share of projects that include component
		DFID	SIDA	AFD	USAID	WB	GAC	EC	
B1	Planning stage: Gender analysis								
B1.a	<i>Do documents identify opportunities to promote women's leadership?</i>	3	5	1	8	6	2	2	38%
B1.b	<i>Do documents identify opportunities to promote women's participation/leadership in project design, implementation, and evaluation?</i>	2	3	2	3	6	1	1	25%
B1.c	<i>Do documents mention specific inequalities between genders?</i>	10	8	3	4	8	3	9	63%
B1.d	<i>Do documents mention different needs of various genders?</i>	5	7	2	2	6	3	1	36%
B1.e	<i>Do documents indicate or explain potential causes of these inequalities?</i>	4	2	2	2	5	2	6	32%

B1.f	<i>Do documents identify potential unintended negative consequences, including gender-based violence that could occur as a result of the project/intervention?</i>	1	4	0	2	5	1	0	18%
B1.g	<i>Do documents reference relevant differences in gender roles within the particular context of the project?</i>	4	3	0	3	2	2	3	24%
B1.h	<i>Do documents identify the gender relations, dynamics, and inequalities within political, legal, geographic, economic, or social contexts?</i>	6	3	2	3	4	3	5	36%
B1.i	<i>Do documents identify how other identities (e.g., race, religion, sexual orientation, ability) interact with gender?</i>	4	8	2	4	3	3	3	38%
B1.j	<i>Do documents identify the different challenges across genders in gaining access to services, goods, trainings, etc.?</i>	8	8	1	3	9	2	6	51%
B1.k	<i>Does any planning research/analysis collect relevant, outcome-orientated data disaggregated by gender and age?</i>	4	4	3	1	5	1	4	31%
B2	Project design/implementation: Applying gender analysis to project design								
B2.a	<i>Does the project address challenges and constraints people may face due to gender, including time constraints due to household or unpaid work responsibilities, access to finance, access to education, or other constraints or challenges identified in the gender analysis?</i>	8	9	3	3	10	7	7	65%

B2.b	<i>Do documents discuss how the project will address inequalities between genders?</i>	7	7	4	4	7	6	8	60%
B2.c	<i>Do documents describe how the project will address different needs of various genders?</i>	5	4	3	3	6	5	0	36%
B2.e	<i>Does the project work to address challenges around unintended negative consequences, including gender-based violence that may occur during implementation?</i>	1	4	0	1	5	1	0	17%
B2.f	<i>Does the project identify and call for staff or partners with experience in gender integration or other gender-relevant technical expertise?</i>	6	10	0	7	6	4	5	53%
B2.g	<i>Do documents describe plans to ensure women are in leadership roles and empowered?</i>	2	5	0	5	2	1	0	21%
B2.h	<i>Do documents discuss how gender roles and power relations will be taken into account in the project design?</i>	3	2	1	1	4	4	4	26%
B2.i	<i>Do documents mention plans to address the interaction of different identities and the needs/gaps of marginalized populations including sexual and gender minorities?</i>	5	4	1	1	2	3	3	26%
B2.j	<i>Do documents mention the ability for groups—including marginalized populations and women—affected by the project to participate in the planning, design, implementation, and evaluation phases of the project?</i>	1	5	3	5	8	2	3	38%

B2.k	<i>Do documents indicate that project targets/beneficiaries include a proportionally appropriate number of women?</i>	9	7	4	3	7	2	2	47%								
B2.l	<i>Where relevant, do documents include non-binary genders (look at more than just men and women)?</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%								
B3	Monitoring, evaluation, and reporting																
B3.a	<i>Is there mention of plans to be able to monitor for unintended consequences (e.g., gender-based violence)?</i>	2	3	0	1	3	1	1	15%								
B3.b	<i>Are there indicators or other reporting mechanisms to note the extent to which relevant gender gaps were closed?</i>	5	5	3	1	4	7	6	43%								
B3.c	<i>Were data collected on participation disaggregated by gender?</i>	6	5	5	8	6	1	4	49%								
B3.d	<i>Were the viewpoints of women collected during the evaluation of the project?</i>	4	2	2	7	4	1	2	31%								
B3.e	<i>Is there any plan to share reporting or evaluation with the communities in question, including women and women's rights organizations?</i>	1	1	2	3	2	1	0	14%								
	Total for this section	116	43%	128	43%	49	18%	88	30%	135	50%	69	26%	85	31%	670	34%
	TOTAL OVER TWO SECTIONS	165	49%	175	51%	74	22%	121	36%	184	54%	103	30%	123	36%	945	39%

ANNEX 2: SCORECARD SCORES FOR INDIVIDUAL DONORS

Department for International Development (DFID)

Correct policy marker	Yes	No
Is project marked as gender "Principal"?	6	4
Is the main objective of the project or program to advance gender equality or women's empowerment (including projects that were mismarked)?	4	6

A	Minimum OECD policy marker requirement (Was this project correctly marked with a gender equality policy marker?)*	Number of projects with component	Share of projects with component
A1	Planning stage: Gender analysis		
A1a	<i>Is a gender analysis available or is one referenced in any planning documents?</i>	9	90%
A2	Project design/implementation: Applying gender analysis to project design		
A2a	<i>Do documents discuss how the project will incorporate findings from the gender analysis in the design, or if gender analysis was not referenced in documents, is there reference to how the project will address different needs or inequalities between genders?</i>	9	90%
A2.b	<i>Do documents mention that the intervention will use a "do-no-harm" approach regarding gender inequalities?</i>	2	20%
A2c	<i>Is there at least one gender equality objective?</i>	8	80%
A3	Monitoring, evaluation, and reporting		
A3a	<i>Is there a gender-specific indicator?</i>	7	70%
A3b	<i>Are indicators/data disaggregated by gender, where applicable?</i>	8	80%
A3c	<i>Has the project assessed its results toward gender equality, or does it have a plan to do so?</i>	6	60%
	Total minimum requirement score	49	70%

* Based on OECD 2016, p. 10.

B	Gender inclusion criteria	Number of projects with component	Share of projects with component
B1	Planning stage: Gender analysis		
B1.a	<i>Do documents identify opportunities to promote women's leadership?</i>	3	30%
B1.b	<i>Do documents identify opportunities to promote women's participation/leadership in project design, implementation, and evaluation?</i>	2	20%
B1.c	<i>Do documents mention specific inequalities between genders?</i>	10	100%
B1.d	<i>Do documents mention different needs of various genders?</i>	5	50%
B1.e	<i>Do documents indicate or explain potential causes of these inequalities?</i>	4	40%
B1.f	<i>Do documents identify potential unintended negative consequences, including gender-based violence, that could occur as a result of the project/intervention?</i>	1	10%
B1.g	<i>Do documents reference relevant differences in gender roles within the particular context of the project?</i>	4	40%
B1.h	<i>Do documents identify the gender relations, dynamics, and inequalities within political, legal, geographic, economic, or social contexts?</i>	6	60%
B1.i	<i>Do documents identify how other identities (e.g., race, religion, sexual orientation, ability) interact with gender?</i>	4	40%
B1.j	<i>Do documents identify the different challenges across genders in gaining access to services, goods, trainings, etc.?</i>	8	80%
B1.k	<i>Does any planning research/analysis collect relevant, outcome-orientated data disaggregated by gender and age?</i>	4	40%
B2	Project design/implementation: Applying gender analysis to project design		
B2.a	<i>Does the project address challenges and constraints people may face due to gender, including time constraints due to household or unpaid work responsibilities, access to finance, access to education, or other constraints or challenges identified in the gender analysis?</i>	8	80%
B2.b	<i>Do documents discuss how the project will address inequalities between genders?</i>	7	70%
B2.c	<i>Do documents describe how the project will address different needs of various genders?</i>	5	50%

B2.e	<i>Does the project work to address challenges around unintended negative consequences, including gender-based violence, that may occur during implementation?</i>	1	10%
B2.f	<i>Does the project identify and call for staff or partners with experience in gender integration or other gender-relevant technical expertise?</i>	6	60%
B2.g	<i>Do documents describe plans to ensure women are in leadership roles and empowered?</i>	2	20%
B2.h	<i>Do documents discuss how gender roles and power relations will be taken into account in the project design?</i>	3	30%
B2.i	<i>Do documents mention plans to address the interaction of different identities and the needs/gaps of marginalized populations, including sexual and gender minorities?</i>	5	50%
B2.j	<i>Do documents mention the ability for groups—including marginalized populations and women—affected by the project to participate in the planning, design, implementation, and evaluation phases of the project?</i>	1	10%
B2.k	<i>Do documents indicate that project targets/beneficiaries include a proportionally appropriate number of women?</i>	9	90%
B2.l	<i>Where relevant, do documents include non-binary genders (look at more than just men and women)?</i>	0	0%
B3	Monitoring, evaluation, and reporting		
B3.a	<i>Is there mention of plans to be able to monitor for unintended consequences (i.e., gender-based violence)?</i>	2	20%
B3.b	<i>Are there indicators or other reporting mechanisms to note the extent to which relevant gender gaps were closed?</i>	5	50%
B3.c	<i>Were data collected on participation disaggregated by gender?</i>	6	60%
B3.d	<i>Were the viewpoints of women collected during the evaluation of the project?</i>	4	40%
B3.e	<i>Is there any plan to share reporting or evaluation with the communities in question, including women and women's rights organizations?</i>	1	10%
	Total for this section	116	43%
	TOTAL OVER TWO SECTIONS	165	49%

Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA)

Correct policy marker	Yes	No
Is project marked as gender "Principal"?	6	5
Is the main objective of the project or program to advance gender equality or women's empowerment (including projects that were mismarked)?	3	8

A	Minimum OECD policy marker requirement (Was this project correctly marked with a gender equality policy marker?)*	Number of projects with component	Share of projects with component
A1	Planning stage: Gender analysis		
A1.a	<i>Is a gender analysis available or is one referenced in any planning documents?</i>	8	73%
A2	Project design/implementation: Applying gender analysis to project design		
A2.a	<i>Do documents discuss how the project will incorporate findings from the gender analysis in the design, or if gender analysis was not referenced in documents, is there reference to how the project will address different needs or inequalities between genders?</i>	8	73%
A2.b	<i>Do documents mention that the intervention will use a "do-no-harm" approach regarding gender inequalities?</i>	5	45%
A2.c	<i>Is there at least one gender equality objective?</i>	8	73%
A3	Monitoring, evaluation, and reporting		
A3.a	<i>Is there a gender-specific indicator?</i>	7	64%
A3.b	<i>Are indicators/data disaggregated by gender, where applicable?</i>	5	45%
A3.c	<i>Has the project assessed its results toward gender equality, or does it have a plan to do so?</i>	6	55%
	Total minimum requirement score	47	61%

* Based on OECD 2016, p. 10.

B	Gender inclusion criteria	Number of projects with component	Share of projects with component
B1	Planning stage: Gender analysis		
B1.a	<i>Do documents identify opportunities to promote women's leadership?</i>	5	45%
B1.b	<i>Do documents identify opportunities to promote women's participation/leadership in project design, implementation, and evaluation?</i>	3	27%
B1.c	<i>Do documents mention specific inequalities between genders?</i>	8	73%
B1.d	<i>Do documents mention different needs of various genders?</i>	7	64%
B1.e	<i>Do documents indicate or explain potential causes of these inequalities?</i>	2	18%
B1.f	<i>Do documents identify potential unintended negative consequences, including gender-based violence, that could occur as a result of the project/intervention?</i>	4	36%
B1.g	<i>Do documents reference relevant differences in gender roles within the particular context of the project?</i>	3	27%
B1.h	<i>Do documents identify the gender relations, dynamics, and inequalities within political, legal, geographic, economic, or social contexts?</i>	3	27%
B1.i	<i>Do documents identify how other identities (e.g., race, religion, sexual orientation, ability) interact with gender?</i>	8	73%
B1.j	<i>Do documents identify the different challenges across genders in gaining access to services, goods, trainings, etc.?</i>	8	73%
B1.k	<i>Does any planning research/analysis collect relevant, outcome-orientated data disaggregated by gender and age?</i>	4	36%
B2	Project design/implementation: Applying gender analysis to project design		
B2.a	<i>Does the project address challenges and constraints people may face due to gender, including time constraints due to household or unpaid work responsibilities, access to finance, access to education, or other constraints or challenges identified in the gender analysis?</i>	9	82%
B2.b	<i>Do documents discuss how the project will address inequalities between genders?</i>	7	64%

B2.c	<i>Do documents describe how the project will address different needs of various genders?</i>	4	36%
B2.e	<i>Does the project work to address challenges around unintended negative consequences, including gender-based violence, that may occur during implementation?</i>	4	36%
B2.f	<i>Does the project identify and call for staff or partners with experience in gender integration or other gender-relevant technical expertise?</i>	10	91%
B2.g	<i>Do documents describe plans to ensure women are in leadership roles and empowered?</i>	5	45%
B2.h	<i>Do documents discuss how gender roles and power relations will be taken into account in the project design?</i>	2	18%
B2.i	<i>Do documents mention plans to address the interaction of different identities and the needs/gaps of marginalized populations, including sexual and gender minorities?</i>	4	36%
B2.j	<i>Do documents mention the ability for groups—including marginalized populations and women—affected by the project to participate in the planning, design, implementation, and evaluation phases of the project?</i>	5	45%
B2.k	<i>Do documents indicate that project targets/beneficiaries include a proportionally appropriate number of women?</i>	7	64%
B2.l	<i>Where relevant, do documents include non-binary genders (look at more than just men and women)?</i>	0	0%
B3	Monitoring, evaluation, and reporting		
B3.a	<i>Is there mention of plans to be able to monitor for unintended consequences (e.g., gender-based violence)?</i>	3	27%
B3.b	<i>Are there indicators or other reporting mechanisms to note the extent to which relevant gender gaps were closed?</i>	5	45%
B3.c	<i>Were data collected on participation disaggregated by gender?</i>	5	45%
B3.d	<i>Were the viewpoints of women collected during the evaluation of the project?</i>	2	18%
B3.e	<i>Is there any plan to share reporting or evaluation with the communities in question, including women and women's rights organizations?</i>	1	9%
	Total for this section	128	43%
	TOTAL OVER TWO SECTIONS	175	47%

Agence Française de Développement (AFD)

Correct policy marker	Yes	No
Is project marked as gender "Principal"?	0	0
Is the main objective of the project or program to advance gender equality or women's empowerment (including projects that were mismarked)?	1	9

A	Minimum OECD policy marker requirement (Was this project correctly marked with a gender equality policy marker?)*	Number of projects with component	Share of projects with component
A1	Planning stage: Gender analysis		
A1.a	<i>Is a gender analysis available or is one referenced in any planning documents?</i>	7	70%
A2	Project design/implementation: Applying gender analysis to project design		
A2.a	<i>Do documents discuss how the project will incorporate findings from the gender analysis in the design, or if gender analysis was not referenced in documents, is there reference to how the project will address different needs or inequalities between genders?</i>	5	50%
A2.b	<i>Do documents mention that the intervention will use a "do-no-harm" approach regarding gender inequalities?</i>	2	20%
A2.c	<i>Is there at least one gender equality objective?</i>	1	10%
A3	Monitoring, evaluation, and reporting		
A3.a	<i>Is there a gender-specific indicator?</i>	2	20%
A3.b	<i>Are indicators/data disaggregated by gender, where applicable?</i>	5	50%
A3.c	<i>Has the project assessed its results toward gender equality, or does it have a plan to do so?</i>	3	30%
	Total minimum requirement score	25	36%

* Based on OECD 2016, p. 10.

B	Gender inclusion criteria	Number of projects with component	Share of projects with component
B1	Planning stage: Gender analysis		
B1.a	<i>Do documents identify opportunities to promote women's leadership?</i>	1	10%

B1.b	<i>Do documents identify opportunities to promote women's participation/leadership in project design, implementation, and evaluation?</i>	2	20%
B1.c	<i>Do documents mention specific inequalities between genders?</i>	3	30%
B1.d	<i>Do documents mention different needs of various genders?</i>	2	20%
B1.e	<i>Do documents indicate or explain potential causes of these inequalities?</i>	2	20%
B1.f	<i>Do documents identify potential unintended negative consequences, including gender-based violence, that could occur as a result of the project/intervention?</i>	0	0%
B1.g	<i>Do documents reference relevant differences in gender roles within the particular context of the project?</i>	0	0%
B1.h	<i>Do documents identify the gender relations, dynamics, and inequalities within political, legal, geographic, economic, or social contexts?</i>	2	20%
B1.i	<i>Do documents identify how other identities (e.g., race, religion, sexual orientation, ability) interact with gender?</i>	2	20%
B1.j	<i>Do documents identify the different challenges across genders in gaining access to services, goods, trainings, etc.?</i>	1	10%
B1.k	<i>Does any planning research/analysis collect relevant, outcome-orientated data disaggregated by gender and age?</i>	3	30%
B2	Project design/implementation: Applying gender analysis to project design		
B2.a	<i>Does the project address challenges and constraints people may face due to gender, including time constraints due to household or unpaid work responsibilities, access to finance, access to education, or other constraints or challenges identified in the gender analysis?</i>	3	30%
B2.b	<i>Do documents discuss how the project will address inequalities between genders?</i>	4	40%
B2.c	<i>Do documents describe how the project will address different needs of various genders?</i>	3	30%
B2.e	<i>Does the project work to address challenges around unintended negative consequences, including gender-based violence, that may occur during implementation?</i>	0	0%
B2.f	<i>Does the project identify and call for staff or partners with experience in gender integration or other gender-relevant technical expertise?</i>	0	0%
B2.g	<i>Do documents describe plans to ensure women are in leadership roles and empowered?</i>	0	0%

B2.h	<i>Do documents discuss how gender roles and power relations will be taken into account in the project design?</i>	1	10%
B2.i	<i>Do documents mention plans to address the interaction of different identities and the needs/gaps of marginalized populations, including sexual and gender minorities?</i>	1	10%
B2.j	<i>Do documents mention the ability for groups—including marginalized populations and women—affected by the project to participate in the planning, design, implementation, and evaluation phases of the project?</i>	3	30%
B2.k	<i>Do documents indicate that project targets/beneficiaries include a proportionally appropriate number of women?</i>	4	40%
B2.l	<i>Where relevant, do documents include non-binary genders (look at more than just men and women)?</i>	0	0%
B3	Monitoring, evaluation, and reporting		
B3.a	<i>Is there mention of plans to be able to monitor for unintended consequences (e.g., gender-based violence)?</i>	0	0%
B3.b	<i>Are there indicators or other reporting mechanisms to note the extent to which relevant gender gaps were closed?</i>	3	30%
B3.c	<i>Were data collected on participation disaggregated by gender?</i>	5	50%
B3.d	<i>Were the viewpoints of women collected during the evaluation of the project?</i>	2	20%
B3.e	<i>Is there any plan to share reporting or evaluation with the communities in question, including women and women's rights organizations?</i>	2	20%
	Total for this section	49	18%
	TOTAL OVER TWO SECTIONS	74	22%

United States Agency for International Development (USAID)

Correct policy marker	Yes	No
Is project marked as gender "Principal"?	6	5
Is the main objective of the project or program to advance gender equality or women's empowerment (including projects that were mismarked)?	1	10

A	Minimum OECD policy marker requirement (Was this project correctly marked with a gender equality policy marker?)*	Number of projects with component	Share of projects with component
A1	Planning stage: Gender analysis		
A1.a	<i>Is a gender analysis available or is one referenced in any planning documents?</i>	7	64%
A2	Project design/implementation: Applying gender analysis to project design		
A2.a	<i>Do documents discuss how the project will incorporate findings from the gender analysis in the design, or if gender analysis was not referenced in documents, is there reference to how the project will address different needs or inequalities between genders?</i>	7	64%
A2.b	<i>Do documents mention that the intervention will use a "do-no-harm" approach regarding gender inequalities?</i>	2	18%
A2.c	<i>Is there at least one gender equality objective?</i>	4	36%
A3	Monitoring, evaluation, and reporting		
A3.a	<i>Is there a gender-specific indicator?</i>	4	36%
A3.b	<i>Are indicators/data disaggregated by gender, where applicable?</i>	8	73%
A3.c	<i>Has the project assessed its results toward gender equality, or does it have a plan to do so?</i>	1	9%
	Total minimum requirement score	33	43%

* Based on OECD 2016, p. 10.

B	Gender inclusion criteria	Number of projects with component	Share of projects with component
B1	Planning stage: Gender analysis		
B1.a	<i>Do documents identify opportunities to promote women's leadership?</i>	8	73%

B1.b	<i>Do documents identify opportunities to promote women's participation/leadership in project design, implementation, and evaluation?</i>	3	27%
B1.c	<i>Do documents mention specific inequalities between genders?</i>	4	36%
B1.d	<i>Do documents mention different needs of various genders?</i>	2	18%
B1.e	<i>Do documents indicate or explain potential causes of these inequalities?</i>	2	18%
B1.f	<i>Do documents identify potential unintended negative consequences, including gender-based violence, that could occur as a result of the project/intervention?</i>	2	18%
B1.g	<i>Do documents reference relevant differences in gender roles within the particular context of the project?</i>	3	27%
B1.h	<i>Do documents identify the gender relations, dynamics, and inequalities within political, legal, geographic, economic, or social contexts?</i>	3	27%
B1.i	<i>Do documents identify how other identities (e.g., race, religion, sexual orientation, ability) interact with gender?</i>	4	36%
B1.j	<i>Do documents identify the different challenges across genders in gaining access to services, goods, trainings, etc.?</i>	3	27%
B1.k	<i>Does any planning research/analysis collect relevant, outcome-orientated data disaggregated by gender and age?</i>	1	9%
B2	Project design/implementation: Applying gender analysis to project design		
B2.a	<i>Does the project address challenges and constraints people may face due to gender, including time constraints due to household or unpaid work responsibilities, access to finance, access to education, or other constraints or challenges identified in the gender analysis?</i>	3	27%
B2.b	<i>Do documents discuss how the project will address inequalities between genders?</i>	4	36%
B2.c	<i>Do documents describe how the project will address different needs of various genders?</i>	3	27%
B2.e	<i>Does the project work to address challenges around unintended negative consequences, including gender-based violence, that may occur during implementation?</i>	1	9%
B2.f	<i>Does the project identify and call for staff or partners with experience in gender integration or other gender-relevant technical expertise?</i>	7	64%
B2.g	<i>Do documents describe plans to ensure women are in leadership roles and empowered?</i>	5	45%

B2.h	<i>Do documents discuss how gender roles and power relations will be taken into account in the project design?</i>	1	9%
B2.i	<i>Do documents mention plans to address the interaction of different identities and the needs/gaps of marginalized populations, including sexual and gender minorities?</i>	1	9%
B2.j	<i>Do documents mention the ability for groups—including marginalized populations and women—affected by the project to participate in the planning, design, implementation, and evaluation phases of the project?</i>	5	45%
B2.k	<i>Do documents indicate that project targets/beneficiaries include a proportionally appropriate number of women?</i>	3	27%
B2.l	<i>Where relevant, do documents include non-binary genders (look at more than just men and women)?</i>	0	0%
B3	Monitoring, evaluation, and reporting		
B3.a	<i>Is there mention of plans to be able to monitor for unintended consequences (e.g., gender-based violence)?</i>	1	9%
B3.b	<i>Are there indicators or other reporting mechanisms to note the extent to which relevant gender gaps were closed?</i>	1	9%
B3.c	<i>Was data collected on participation disaggregated by gender?</i>	8	73%
B3.d	<i>Were the viewpoints of women collected during the evaluation of the project?</i>	7	64%
B3.e	<i>Is there any plan to share reporting or evaluation with the communities in question, including women and women's rights organizations?</i>	3	27%
	Total for this section	88	30%
	TOTAL OVER TWO SECTIONS	121	32%

World Bank (WB)

Correct policy marker	Yes	No
Is project marked as gender "Principal"?	n/a	n/a
Is the main objective of the project or program to advance gender equality or women's empowerment (including projects that were mismarked)?	8	2

A	Minimum OECD policy marker requirement (Was this project correctly marked with a gender equality policy marker?)*	Number of projects with component	Share of projects with component
A1	Planning stage: Gender analysis		
A1.a	<i>Is a gender analysis available or is one referenced in any planning documents?</i>	10	100%
A2	Project design/implementation: Applying gender analysis to project design		
A2.a	<i>Do documents discuss how the project will incorporate findings from the gender analysis in the design, or if gender analysis was not referenced in documents, is there reference to how the project will address different needs or inequalities between genders?</i>	10	100%
A2.b	<i>Do documents mention that the intervention will use a "do-no-harm" approach regarding gender inequalities?</i>	3	30%
A2.c	<i>Is there at least one gender equality objective?</i>	8	80%
A3	Monitoring, evaluation, and reporting		
A3.a	<i>Is there a gender-specific indicator?</i>	7	70%
A3.b	<i>Are indicators/data disaggregated by gender, where applicable?</i>	6	60%
A3.c	<i>Has the project assessed its results toward gender equality, or does it have a plan to do so?</i>	5	50%
	Total minimum requirement score	49	70%

* Based on OECD 2016, p. 10.

B	Gender inclusion criteria	Number of projects with component	Share of projects with component
B1	Planning stage: Gender analysis		
B1.a	<i>Do documents identify opportunities to promote women's leadership?</i>	6	60%

B1.b	<i>Do documents identify opportunities to promote women's participation/leadership in project design, implementation, and evaluation?</i>	6	60%
B1.c	<i>Do documents mention specific inequalities between genders?</i>	8	80%
B1.d	<i>Do documents mention different needs of various genders?</i>	6	60%
B1.e	<i>Do documents indicate or explain potential causes of these inequalities?</i>	5	50%
B1.f	<i>Do documents identify potential unintended negative consequences, including gender-based violence, that could occur as a result of the project/intervention?</i>	5	50%
B1.g	<i>Do documents reference relevant differences in gender roles within the particular context of the project?</i>	2	20%
B1.h	<i>Do documents identify the gender relations, dynamics, and inequalities within political, legal, geographic, economic, or social contexts?</i>	4	40%
B1.i	<i>Do documents identify how other identities (e.g., race, religion, sexual orientation, ability) interact with gender?</i>	3	30%
B1.j	<i>Do documents identify the different challenges across genders in gaining access to services, goods, trainings, etc.?</i>	9	90%
B1.k	<i>Does any planning research/analysis collect relevant, outcome-orientated data disaggregated by gender and age?</i>	5	50%
B2	Project design/implementation: Applying gender analysis to project design		
B2.a	<i>Does the project address challenges and constraints people may face due to gender, including time constraints due to household or unpaid work responsibilities, access to finance, access to education, or other constraints or challenges identified in the gender analysis?</i>	10	100%
B2.b	<i>Do documents discuss how the project will address inequalities between genders?</i>	7	70%
B2.c	<i>Do documents describe how the project will address different needs of various genders?</i>	6	60%
B2.e	<i>Does the project work to address challenges around unintended negative consequences, including gender-based violence, that may occur during implementation?</i>	5	50%

B2.f	<i>Does the project identify and call for staff or partners with experience in gender integration or other gender-relevant technical expertise?</i>	6	60%
B2.g	<i>Do documents describe plans to ensure women are in leadership roles and empowered?</i>	2	20%
B2.h	<i>Do documents discuss how gender roles and power relations will be taken into account in the project design?</i>	4	40%
B2.i	<i>Do documents mention plans to address the interaction of different identifies and the needs/gaps of marginalized populations including sexual and gender minorities?</i>	2	20%
B2.j	<i>Do documents mention the ability for groups—including marginalized populations and women—affected by the project to participate in the planning, design, implementation, and evaluation phases of the project?</i>	8	80%
B2.k	<i>Do documents indicate that project targets/beneficiaries include a proportionally appropriate number of women?</i>	7	70%
B2.l	<i>Where relevant, do documents include non-binary genders (look at more than just men and women)?</i>	0	0%
B3	Monitoring, evaluation, and reporting		
B3.a	<i>Is there mention of plans to be able to monitor for unintended consequences (e.g., gender-based violence)?</i>	3	30%
B3.b	<i>Are there indicators or other reporting mechanisms to note the extent to which relevant gender gaps were closed?</i>	4	40%
B3.c	<i>Was data collected on participation disaggregated by gender?</i>	6	60%
B3.d	<i>Were the viewpoints of women collected during the evaluation of the project?</i>	4	40%
B3.e	<i>Is there any plan to share reporting or evaluation with the communities in question, including women and women's rights organizations?</i>	2	20%
	Total for this section	135	50%
	TOTAL OVER TWO SECTIONS	184	54%

Global Affairs Canada (GAC)

Correct policy marker	Yes	No
Is project marked as gender "Principal"?	5	5
Is the main objective of the project or program to advance gender equality or women's empowerment (including projects that were mismarked)?	6	4

A	Minimum OECD policy marker requirement (Was this project correctly marked with a gender equality policy marker?)*	Number of projects with component	Share of projects with component
A1	Planning stage: Gender analysis		
A1.a	<i>Is a gender analysis available or is one referenced in any planning documents?</i>	2	20%
A2	Project design/implementation: Applying gender analysis to project design		
A2.a	<i>Do documents discuss how the project will incorporate findings from the gender analysis in the design, or if gender analysis was not referenced in documents, is there reference to how the project will address different needs or inequalities between genders?</i>	9	90%
A2.b	<i>Do documents mention that the intervention will use a "do-no-harm" approach, regarding gender inequalities?</i>	1	10%
A2.c	<i>Is there at least one gender equality objective?</i>	7	70%
A3	Monitoring, evaluation, and reporting		
A3.a	<i>Is there a gender-specific indicator?</i>	7	70%
A3.b	<i>Are indicators/data disaggregated by gender, where applicable?</i>	1	10%
A3.c	<i>Has the project assessed its results toward gender equality, or does it have a plan to do so?</i>	7	70%
	Total minimum requirement score	34	49%

* Based on OECD 2016, p. 10.

B	Gender inclusion criteria	Number of projects with component	Share of projects with component
B1	Planning stage: Gender analysis		
B1.a	<i>Do documents identify opportunities to promote women's leadership?</i>	2	20%

B1.b	<i>Do documents identify opportunities to promote women's participation/leadership in project design, implementation, and evaluation?</i>	1	10%
B1.c	<i>Do documents mention specific inequalities between genders?</i>	3	30%
B1.d	<i>Do documents mention different needs of various genders?</i>	3	30%
B1.e	<i>Do documents indicate or explain potential causes of these inequalities?</i>	2	20%
B1.f	<i>Do documents identify potential unintended negative consequences, including gender-based violence, that could occur as a result of the project/intervention?</i>	1	10%
B1.g	<i>Do documents reference relevant differences in gender roles within the particular context of the project?</i>	2	20%
B1.h	<i>Do documents identify the gender relations, dynamics, and inequalities within political, legal, geographic, economic, or social contexts?</i>	3	30%
B1.i	<i>Do documents identify how other identities (e.g., race, religion, sexual orientation, ability) interact with gender?</i>	3	30%
B1.j	<i>Do documents identify the different challenges across genders in gaining access to services, goods, trainings, etc.?</i>	2	20%
B1.k	<i>Does any planning research/analysis collect relevant, outcomes-orientated data disaggregated by gender and age?</i>	1	10%
B2	Project design/implementation: Applying gender analysis to project design		
B2.a	<i>Does the project address challenges and constraints people may face due to gender, including time constraints due to household or unpaid work responsibilities, access to finance, access to education, or other constraints or challenges identified in the gender analysis?</i>	7	70%
B2.b	<i>Do documents discuss how the project will address inequalities between genders?</i>	6	60%
B2.c	<i>Do documents describe how the project will address different needs of various genders?</i>	5	50%
B2.e	<i>Does the project work to address challenges around unintended negative consequences, including gender-based violence, that may occur during implementation?</i>	1	10%
B2.f	<i>Does the project identify and call for staff or partners with experience in gender integration or other gender-relevant technical expertise?</i>	4	40%
B2.g	<i>Do documents describe plans to ensure women are in leadership roles and empowered?</i>	1	10%

B2.h	<i>Do documents discuss how gender roles and power relations will be taken into account in the project design?</i>	4	40%
B2.i	<i>Do documents mention plans to address the interaction of different identifies and the needs/gaps of marginalized populations including sexual and gender minorities?</i>	3	30%
B2.j	<i>Do documents mention the ability for groups—including marginalized populations and women—affected by the project to participate in the planning, design, implementation, and evaluation phases of the project?</i>	2	20%
B2.k	<i>Do documents indicate that project targets/beneficiaries include a proportionally appropriate number of women?</i>	2	20%
B2.l	<i>Where relevant, do documents include non-binary genders (look at more than just men and women)?</i>	0	0%
B3	Monitoring, evaluation, and reporting		
B3.a	<i>Is there mention of plans to be able to monitor for unintended consequences (e.g., gender-based violence)?</i>	1	10%
B3.b	<i>Are there indicators or other reporting mechanisms to note the extent to which relevant gender gaps were closed?</i>	7	70%
B3.c	<i>Were data collected on participation disaggregated by gender?</i>	1	10%
B3.d	<i>Were the viewpoints of women collected during the evaluation of the project?</i>	1	10%
B3.e	<i>Is there any plan to share reporting or evaluation with the communities in question, including women and women's rights organizations?</i>	1	10%
	Total for this section	69	26%
	TOTAL OVER TWO SECTIONS	103	30%

European Commission (EC)

Correct policy marker	Yes	No
Is project marked as gender "Principal"?	5	5
Is the main objective of the project or program to advance gender equality or women's empowerment (including projects that were mismarked)	2	8

A	Minimum OECD policy marker requirement (Was this project correctly marked with a gender equality policy marker?)*	Number of projects with component	Share of projects with component
A1	Planning stage: Gender analysis		
A1.a	<i>Is a gender analysis available or is one referenced in any planning documents?</i>	9	90%
A2	Project design/implementation: Applying gender analysis to project design		
A2.a	<i>Do documents discuss how the project will incorporate findings from the gender analysis in the design, or if gender analysis was not referenced in documents, is there reference to how the project will address different needs or inequalities between genders?</i>	9	90%
A2.b	<i>Do documents mention that the intervention will use a "do-no-harm" approach regarding gender inequalities?</i>	0	0%
A2.c	<i>Is there at least one gender equality objective?</i>	5	50%
A3	Monitoring, evaluation, and reporting		
A3.a	<i>Is there a gender-specific indicator?</i>	5	50%
A3.b	<i>Are indicators/data disaggregated by gender, where applicable?</i>	4	40%
A3.c	<i>Has the project assessed its results toward gender equality, or does it have a plan to do so?</i>	6	60%
	Total minimum requirement score	38	54%

* Based on OECD 2016, p. 10.

B	Gender inclusion criteria	Number of projects with component	Share of projects with component
B1	Planning stage: Gender analysis		
B1.a	<i>Do documents identify opportunities to promote women's leadership?</i>	2	20%

B1.b	<i>Do documents identify opportunities to promote women's participation/leadership in project design, implementation, and evaluation?</i>	1	10%
B1.c	<i>Do documents mention specific inequalities between genders?</i>	9	90%
B1.d	<i>Do documents mention different needs of various genders?</i>	1	10%
B1.e	<i>Do documents indicate or explain potential causes of these inequalities?</i>	6	60%
B1.f	<i>Do documents identify potential unintended negative consequences, including gender-based violence, that could occur as a result of the project/intervention?</i>	0	0%
B1.g	<i>Do documents reference relevant differences in gender roles within the particular context of the project?</i>	3	30%
B1.h	<i>Do documents identify the gender relations, dynamics, and inequalities within political, legal, geographic, economic, or social contexts?</i>	5	50%
B1.i	<i>Do documents identify how other identities (e.g., race, religion, sexual orientation, ability) interact with gender?</i>	3	30%
B1.j	<i>Do documents identify the different challenges across genders in gaining access to services, goods, trainings, etc.?</i>	6	60%
B1.k	<i>Does any planning research/analysis collect relevant, outcome-orientated data disaggregated by gender and age?</i>	4	40%
B2	Project design/implementation: Applying gender analysis to project design		
B2.a	<i>Does the project address challenges and constraints people may face due to gender, including time constraints due to household or unpaid work responsibilities, access to finance, access to education, or other constraints or challenges identified in the gender analysis?</i>	7	70%
B2.b	<i>Do documents discuss how the project will address inequalities between genders?</i>	8	80%
B2.c	<i>Do documents describe how the project will address different needs of various genders?</i>	0	0%
B2.e	<i>Does the project work to address challenges around unintended negative consequences, including gender-based violence, that may occur during implementation?</i>	0	0%
B2.f	<i>Does the project identify and call for staff or partners with experience in gender integration or other gender relevant technical expertise?</i>	5	50%

B2.g	<i>Do documents describe plans to ensure women are in leadership roles and empowered?</i>	0	0%
B2.h	<i>Do documents discuss how gender roles and power relations will be taken into account in the project design?</i>	4	40%
B2.i	<i>Do documents mention plans to address the interaction of different identities and the needs/gaps of marginalized populations, including sexual and gender minorities?</i>	3	30%
B2.j	<i>Do documents mention the ability for groups—including marginalized populations and women—affected by the project to participate in the planning, design, implementation, and evaluation phases of the project?</i>	3	30%
B2.k	<i>Do documents indicate that project targets/beneficiaries include a proportionally appropriate number of women?</i>	2	20%
B2.l	<i>Where relevant, do documents include non-binary genders (look at more than just men and women)?</i>	0	0%
B3	Monitoring, evaluation, and reporting		
B3.a	<i>Is there mention of plans to be able to monitor for unintended consequences (e.g., gender-based violence)?</i>	1	10%
B3.b	<i>Are there indicators or other reporting mechanisms to note the extent to which relevant gender gaps were closed?</i>	6	60%
B3.c	<i>Were data collected on participation disaggregated by gender?</i>	4	40%
B3.d	<i>Were the viewpoints of women collected during the evaluation of the project?</i>	2	20%
B3.e	<i>Is there any plan to share reporting or evaluation with the communities in question, including women and women's rights organizations?</i>	0	0%
	Total for this section	85	31%
	TOTAL OVER TWO SECTIONS	123	36%

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adamson, R. 2017. "Vulnerabilities of Women in Extractive Industries." *Antyajaa: Indian Journal of Women and Social Change* 2 (1): 24–31. doi:10.1177/2455632717714134.
- ADB (Asian Development Bank). 2010. *Asian Development Bank's Support to Gender and Development: Phase II: Results from Country Case Studies*. Manila. <https://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/evaluation-document/35407/files/ses-reg-2010-80.pdf>.
- AFD (Agence Française de Développement). 2019. "Gender Equality." <https://www.afd.fr/en/page-thematique-axe/gender-equality>. Accessed July 24, 2019.
- African Union Commission. 2016. *African Gender Scorecard*. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. <http://repository.uneca.org/bitstream/handle/10855/23036/b11560113.pdf?sequence=1>.
- Article 19. 2019. "Tackling Gender Inequality through Access to Information." <https://www.article19.org/resources/tackling-gender-inequality-through-access-to-information/>. Accessed September 12, 2019.
- Bank, T. W. 2015. *World Bank Group Gender Strategy (FY16–23): Gender Equality, Poverty Reduction and Inclusive Growth*. Washington, DC: World Bank. <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/820851467992505410/World-Bank-Group-gender-strategy-FY16-23-gender-equality-poverty-reduction-and-inclusive-growth>.
- Bretton Woods Project. 2019. *The World Bank and Gender Equality: Development Policy Financing*. London. <https://www.brettonwoodsproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/The-World-Bank-and-Gender-Equality-DPF-2.pdf>.
- Brown, D. 2010. "A Mother's Education Has a Huge Effect on a Child's Health." *Washington Post*, September 16. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/09/16/AR2010091606384.html>.
- Byron, G., C. Örnemark, P. Nyamweya, and M. Woldemariam. 2010. *Gender Equality in Swedish Development Cooperation: Final Report*. Stockholm. <https://www.oecd.org/derec/sweden/46143903.pdf>.
- CARE International. 2019. "CARE Gender Marker." <https://insights.careinternational.org.uk/in-practice/care-gender-marker>. Accessed September 9, 2019.
- CIDA (Canadian International Development Agency). 2008. *Evaluation of CIDA's Implementation of Its Policy on Gender Equality*. Ottawa. <https://www.oecd.org/derec/canada/42174775.pdf>.
- Cohen, M. J., and T. Mekuria. 2018. *Tracing Swedish Development Flows: A Study of the Traceability of Swedish Aid to Tanzania*. Bristol, UK: Development Initiatives; Oxford, UK: Oxfam. doi:10.21201/2018.3026.
- d-portal. 2019a. d-portal.org. <http://d-portal.org/ctrack.html#view=search>. Accessed July 30, 2019.
- d-portal. 2019b. d-portal.org. Livelihoods and Food Security Trust Fund for the rural poor and vulnerable in Burma. Accessed March 2019. <http://d-portal.org/>

- portal.org/ctrack.html?search=livelihoods%20and%20food%20security%20trust%20fund&publisher=GB-GOV-1#view=act&aid=GB-1-201239-101.
- d-portal. 2019c. d-portal.org Women's Economic Empowerment Rural Development Project. Accessed April 2019. <http://d-portal.org/ctrack.html?search=Women%27s%20Economic%20Empowerment%20Rural%20Development%20Project&publisher=44000#view=act&aid=44000-P164443>.
- European Commission. 2015a. *Evaluation of EU Support to Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment in Partner Countries: Final Report*. Brussels.
- European Commission. 2015b. *Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment: Transforming the Lives of Girls and Women through EU External Relations 2016–2020*. Joint Staff Working Document. Brussels. https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/gender-equality-and-womens-empowerment-transforming-lives-girls-and-women-through-eu-external_en.
- European Commission. 2018. *EU Gender Action Plan II: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment: Transforming the Lives of Girls and Women through EU External Relations 2016–2020*. Brussels. https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/eu-gender-action-plan-ii-gender-equality-and-womens-empowerment-transforming-lives-girls-and-women-0_en.
- FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations). 2011. *The State of Food and Agriculture 2010–11: Women in Agriculture: Closing the Gender Gap for Development*. Rome. <http://www.fao.org/3/i2050e/i2050e.pdf>.
- Foran, S., A. Swaine, and K. Burns. 2012. "Improving the Effectiveness of Humanitarian Action: Progress in Implementing the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) Gender Marker." *Gender and Development* 20 (2): 233–247. doi:10.1080/13552074.2012.687221.
- French Ministry for Europe and Foreign Affairs. 2018. *France's International Strategy for Gender Equality (2018–2022)*. Paris. <https://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/en/french-foreign-policy/human-rights/women-s-rights/france-s-international-strategy-for-gender-equality-2018-2022/>.
- Government of Canada. 2017. *Canada's Feminist International Assistance Policy*. Ottawa. https://www.international.gc.ca/world-monde/issues_development-enjeux_developpement/priorities-priorites/policy-politique.aspx?lang=eng.
- Government Offices of Sweden. 2018. *Strategy for Sweden's Development Cooperation for Global Gender Equality and Women's and Girls' Rights 2018–2022*. Stockholm. <https://www.government.se/country-and-regional-strategies/2018/11/strategy-for-swedens-development-cooperation-for-global-gender-equality-and-womens-and-girls-rights-2018-2022/>.
- Government Offices of Sweden. 2019. Feminist Foreign Policy. <https://www.government.se/government-policy/feminist-foreign-policy/>. Accessed July 24, 2019.
- Grabowski, A. 2017. *Transparency Is More Than Dollars and Cents: An Examination of Informational Needs for Aid Spending in Sierra Leone and Liberia*. Oxford, UK: Oxfam. doi:10.21201/2017.0377.
- Hafkin, N. J. 2017. "A2I for Gender Equality: How Access to Information Empowers Women and Girls." In *Development and Access to Information 2017*. The Hague, Netherlands: International Federation

- of Library Associations; Seattle: University of Washington, Technology and Social Change Group.
<https://da2i.ifla.org/wp-content/uploads/da2i-2017-chapter5.pdf>.
- Humanitarian Practice Network. 2012. "Sexual Exploitation and Abuse by UN, NGO and INGO Personnel: A Self-Assessment." <https://odihpn.org/magazine/sexual-exploitation-and-abuse-by-un-ngo-and-ingo-personnel-a-self-assessment/>. Accessed August 15, 2019.
- IATI (International Aid Transparency Initiative). 2019. "Members' Assembly." <https://iatistandard.org/en/about/join-iati/members-assembly/>. Accessed July 30, 2019.
- InterAction. 2016. *Agriculture Investment Data Needs: Synthesis Report*. <https://www.interaction.org/document/agriculture-investment-data-needs-%E2%80%93-synthesis-report>. Accessed January 30, 2017.
- Inter-Agency Standing Committee. 2018. *Gender with Age Marker: Improving Humanitarian Effectiveness*. <https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/system/files/iasc-gam-information-sheet.pdf>.
- Le Drian, J.-Y., and M. Schiappa. 2019. "Feminist Foreign Policy." *Libération*, March 8, 2019. <https://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/en/french-foreign-policy/human-rights/events/article/feminist-foreign-policy-op-ed-by-jean-yves-le-drian-and-marlene-schiappa-08-03>.
- Mukhopadhyay, M., G. Steehouwer, and F. Wong. 2006. *Politics of the Possible: Gender Mainstreaming and Organisational Change: Experiences from the Field*. Amsterdam: Royal Tropical Institute (KIT); The Hague, Netherlands: Oxfam Novib. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/237142255_Politics_of_the_possible_gender_mainstreaming_and_organisational_change_experiences_from_the_field.
- OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development). 2016. *Handbook on the OECD-DAC Gender Equality Policy Marker*. Paris. <https://www.oecd.org/dac/gender-development/Handbook-OECD-DAC-Gender-Equality-Policy-Marker.pdf>.
- OECD. 2018. *How Does Aid Support Women's Economic Empowerment?* Paris. <http://www.oecd.org/dac/gender-development/How-Does-Aid-Support-Womens-Economic-Empowerment.pdf>.
- OECD. 2019a. "About the OECD." <https://www.oecd.org/about/>. Accessed August 29, 2019.
- OECD. 2019b. "DAC Gender Equality Policy Marker." <https://www.oecd.org/dac/gender-development/dac-gender-equality-marker.htm>. Accessed July 30, 2019.
- OECD. 2019c. "The Development Assistance Committee's Mandate." <https://www.oecd.org/dac/thedevelopmentassistancecommitteesmandate.htm>. Accessed September 10, 2019.
- OECD. 2019d. *Development Finance for Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment: A Snapshot*. Paris. <http://www.oecd.org/development/gender-development/Dev-finance-for-gender-equality-and-womens-economic-empowerment-2019.pdf>.
- OECD. 2019e. "OECD-Stat." <https://stats.oecd.org/>. Accessed June 21, 2019.

- O'Reilly, M., A. O. Súilleabháin, and T. Paffenholz. 2015. *Reimagining Peacemaking: Women's Roles in Peace Processes*. New York: International Peace Institute. <https://www.ipinst.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/IPI-E-pub-Reimagining-Peacemaking.pdf>.
- Publish What You Find. 2018. "The 2018 Aid Transparency Index." <https://www.publishwhatyoufund.org/the-index/2018/>. Accessed July 31, 2019.
- Reuters. 2017. "Canada G7 Presidency to Focus on Women, Gender Equality – Trudeau." December 14, 2017. <https://af.reuters.com/article/worldNews/idAFKBN1E835Z>.
- Tejada, M., and D. Mortimer. 2018. "End Gender-Based Violence in the World of Work." Power Africa, November 27. <https://medium.com/power-africa/end-gender-based-violence-in-the-world-of-work-e235c78dc8ca>. Accessed April 17, 2019.
- Tiessen, R. 2007. *Everywhere/Nowhere: Gender Mainstreaming in Development Agencies*. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press.
- UK DFID (Department for International Development). 2006. *Evaluation of DFID's Policy and Practice in Support of Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment*. Vol. 3. London.
- UK DFID. 2018. *DFID Strategic Vision for Gender Equality: Her Potential, Our Future*. London. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/dfid-strategic-vision-for-gender-equality-her-potential-our-future>.
- UK Parliament. 2014. International Development (Gender Equality) Act 2014. http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2014/9/pdfs/ukpga_20140009_en.pdf.
- UNDG (United Nations Sustainable Development Group). 2008. *UNCT Performance Indicators for Gender Equality: User's Guide*. New York. <https://undg.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/UNCT-GenderPerformance-Indicators-Users-Guide.pdf>.
- UNDP (United Nations Development Programme). 2015. *Evaluation of UNDP Contribution to Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment*. New York. <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/thematic/gender.shtml>.
- UNICEF. 2011. *Promoting Gender Equality: An Equity-Focused Approach to Programming*. https://www.unicef.org/gender/files/Overarching_Layout_Web.pdf. Accessed September 23, 2019.
- UN Women. 2019a. "What We Do: Facts and Figures: Humanitarian Action." <https://www.unwomen.org/what-we-do/humanitarian-action/facts-and-figures>. Accessed September 9, 2019.
- UN Women. 2019b. "What We Do: Facts and Figures: Peace and Security." <https://www.unwomen.org/en/what-we-do/peace-and-security/facts-and-figures>. Accessed September 9, 2019.
- USAID 2012. USAID Gender Equality and Female Empowerment Policy. https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1865/GenderEqualityPolicy_0.pdf.
- USAID (US Agency for International Development). 2015. *Aid Transparency Country Pilot Assessment*. Washington, DC.

- <https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1870/AidTransparencyCountryPilotAssessment.pdf>.
- USAID. 2016. *The USAID Gender Equality and Female Empowerment Policy: A Report on Implementation: Annexes*. Washington, DC. https://encompassworld.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/FINAL_GEFE_ImplementationReport_ANNEX.pdf.
- USAID. 2016. *The USAID Gender Equality and Female Empowerment Policy: A Report on Implementation*. https://encompassworld.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/Final_GEFE_ImplementationReport.pdf.
- US Congress. 2019. Women's Entrepreneurship and Economic Empowerment Act of 2018. Pub. L. No. 115-428. <https://www.congress.gov/bill/115th-congress/senate-bill/3247/text>.
- US White House. 2019. Women's Global Development and Prosperity Initiative. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wgdp/>. Accessed September 4, 2019.
- Woetzel, J., A. Madgavkar, K. Ellingrud, E. Labaye, S. Devillard, E. Kutcher, J. Manyika, R. Dobbs, and M. Krishnan. 2015. "How Advancing Women's Equality Can Add \$12 Trillion to Global Growth. McKinsey." <https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/employment-and-growth/how-advancing-womens-equality-can-add-12-trillion-to-global-growth>. Accessed August 1, 2019.
- World Bank. 2017. "Child Marriage Will Cost Developing Countries Trillions of Dollars by 2030, Says World Bank/ICRW Report." Press release, June 27. Washington, DC. <https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/press-release/2017/06/26/child-marriage-will-cost-developing-countries-trillions-of-dollars-by-2030-says-world-bankicrw-report>. Accessed September 5, 2019.
- World Bank. 2018. *Women, Business and the Law 2018*. Washington, DC. doi:10.1596/978-1-4648-1252-1.
- World Bank. 2019. "Women's Economic Empowerment Rural Development Project." Accessed April 2019. <https://projects.worldbank.org/en/projects-operations/project-detail/P164443>.
- World Economic Forum. 2018. *The Global Gender Gap Report 2018*. Geneva. <https://www.weforum.org/reports/the-global-gender-gap-report-2018/>.
- Wright, T. 2019. "France Takes Torch Passed by Canada, Will Focus on Gender Equality at G7 Summit." Canadian Press, April 7. <https://www.citynews1130.com/2019/04/07/france-takes-torch-passed-by-canada-will-focus-on-gender-equality-at-g7-summit/>.
- Zuckerman, E., L. Kugli, A. Comeau, E. Guo, and L. Pantoja. 2018. *Gender Scorecard and Analysis of AIB Projects: A Documentary Review*. Washington, DC: Gender Action. http://genderaction.org/docs/Gender_Action_AIB_Scorecard%20Nov%202018c.pdf.

Oxfam Research Reports

Oxfam Research Reports are written to share research results, to contribute to public debate and to invite feedback on development and humanitarian policy and practice. They do not necessarily reflect Oxfam policy positions. The views expressed are those of the author and not necessarily those of Oxfam.

For more information, or to comment on this report, email Aria Grabowski at aria.grabowski@oxfam.org

© Oxfam International February 2020

This publication is copyright but the text may be used free of charge for the purposes of advocacy, campaigning, education, and research, provided that the source is acknowledged in full. The copyright holder requests that all such use be registered with them for impact assessment purposes. For copying in any other circumstances, or for re-use in other publications, or for translation or adaptation, permission must be secured and a fee may be charged. Email policyandpractice@oxfam.org.uk

The information in this publication is correct at the time of going to press.

Published by Oxfam GB for Oxfam International under ISBN 978-1-78748-565-5 in February 2020. DOI: 10.21201/2020.5655

Oxfam GB, Oxfam House, John Smith Drive, Cowley, Oxford, OX4 2JY, UK.

OXFAM

Oxfam is an international confederation of 20 organizations networked together in more than 90 countries, as part of a global movement for change, to build a future free from the injustice of poverty. Please write to any of the agencies for further information, or visit www.oxfam.org

Oxfam America (www.oxfamamerica.org)

Oxfam Australia (www.oxfam.org.au)

Oxfam-in-Belgium (www.oxfamsol.be)

Oxfam Brasil (www.oxfam.org.br)

Oxfam Canada (www.oxfam.ca)

Oxfam France (www.oxfamfrance.org)

Oxfam Germany (www.oxfam.de)

Oxfam GB (www.oxfam.org.uk)

Oxfam Hong Kong (www.oxfam.org.hk)

Oxfam IBIS (Denmark) (www.oxfamibis.dk)

Oxfam India (www.oxfamindia.org)

Oxfam Intermón (Spain) (www.oxfamintermon.org)

Oxfam Ireland (www.oxfamireland.org)

Oxfam Italy (www.oxfamitalia.org)

Oxfam Mexico (www.oxfammexico.org)

Oxfam New Zealand (www.oxfam.org.nz)

Oxfam Novib (Netherlands) (www.oxfamnovib.nl)

Oxfam Québec (www.oxfam.qc.ca)

Oxfam South Africa (www.oxfam.org.za)

KEDV (Turkey) (<https://www.kedv.org.tr/>)

www.oxfam.org

