



Agentur für
Gleichstellung
im ESF

GENDER BUDGETING IN THE GERMAN EUROPEAN SOCIAL FUND – 2011

Berlin, September 2012

Regina Frey
Benno Savioli

CONTENTS

1	Introduction.....	1
1.1	Quantitative analysis.....	2
1.2	Methods of analysis.....	2
	Excursus: Gender budgeting and impact analyses.....	3
1.3	Range of the analysis.....	4
2	Summary of results.....	5
3	Conclusion and trends.....	11
4	Recommendations.....	13
4.1	Gender Equality-oriented governance in the next programme period.....	13
4.2	Recommendations for the monitoring process from 2014 onward.....	15
5	Annex.....	21
5.1	List of analyses.....	21
5.2	Index of tables.....	22

1 INTRODUCTION

The Operational Programme implemented by the German federal government for the ESF in Germany incorporates a Gender Budgeting approach. The definition of Gender Budgeting made in this programme forms the basis for this present report, which the Agency for Gender Equality within the ESF is submitting for a third year. This document is a translation and a summary of the third German report.¹ We briefly describe the approach to Gender Budgeting in the ESF. In case you are already familiar with the 2009 and 2010 reports, we recommend focusing on chapter two: It highlights the main results of our analysis for 2011. In chapter three we draw our main conclusions and pinpoint trends from 2009 to 2011.

This report on the year 2011 continues the analyses that have been performed in 2010 and 2011. It also includes some new areas of emphasis.

The starting point of the analysis is oriented towards the course of action described in the Federal Operational Programme² and towards the target value indicated here:

“Here, the intention is to give women a stake – in an adequate ratio to their proportion in the general population (49.5%) as well as their proportion of the unemployed population (47.9%) in 2006 with a proportion of approx. 50% in the participation-based programme expenditures – that is to say, this target value relates to projects in which participants are counted – and to projects explicitly addressing equal opportunities (Code 69).” (pp. 218f.)

Since the data do not reflect the calendar year – instead, cumulative values were collected at the start of the programme period (2007) – the body of available data has once again increased substantially up to the end of the year 2011: Of the 65 programmes in the ADELE monitoring system, 38 can be viewed as “Gender Budgeting-compatible” and be included in the analysis.

The Gender Budgeting for 2011 encompasses the bulk of the ESF-OP volume (78.1 percent).³ The remainder of this sum total (and/or the respective projects and programmes) can be covered by “qualitative Gender Budgeting”; meanwhile, an initial report has submitted.⁴ This initial report presents an approach that categorises programmes according to their potential impacts in the gender equality context; five programmes that do not indicate or record any participations shall be initially analysed in this report, as examples.

¹ This is how the ESF Directive suggests a continuous consideration of equal opportunity: *“The member countries ensure that the operational programmes contain a description of how equal opportunity for women and men – plus the equivalent opportunities in the course of the development, implementation, support and evaluation of the operational programmes are aided.”* (Regulation No. 1081/2006 issued by the European Parliament and the Council, dated 5 July 2006, on the European Social Fund and for the revocation of the Regulation (EC) No. 1784/1999, Art. 6).

² Operational Programme implemented by the German Federal Government for the European Social Funds programme period 2007-2013: http://www.esf.de/portal/generator/1406/property=data/op_bund.pdf, last updated: 24.09.2012.

³ all projects with participations and expenditures, plus all Code 69 projects with and without participations

⁴ See Agency for Gender Equality within the ESF (2012): Gender Budgeting im ESF – Qualitative Analyse: http://www.esf-gleichstellung.de/fileadmin/data/Downloads/Aktuelles/qual_gb_2011_agentur-gleichstellung-esf.pdf, last updated: 24.09.2012.

1.1 QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS

The analysis was performed based on the annual-report data for 2011, generated from the monitoring database “ADELE”, whereby the *actual*/inclusion of participations was defined as a “participation correlate”.

1.2 METHODS OF ANALYSIS

There are different method-based variants of quantitative Gender Budgeting, which differ in their degree of precision in data collection. Due to the given technical prerequisites, a simple variant was chosen: The participation-based expenditure is determined based on the simple calculated average rate per participation (and/or per-capita) in a project. Only new entrants were counted in the process of determining the number of participations in projects; participants who cancelled or stopped after successfully achieving the project objective could not be considered at this point; an analysis that encompasses different durations of participation is likewise not possible with the current configuration of participant data collection in ADELE.

The proportionate expenditure of funds by gender in a project is thereby identical with the distribution of participants by gender. This fact, however, evens out actual per-capita differences, and consequently only reflects to a certain degree the real extent of distribution, since the expenditures per participant can fluctuate even within an individual project. This means that in a series of programmes – for instance, the entrepreneurial coaching programmes – a maximum subsidy is defined which is not fully utilised in every grant case. If (on the project level) the trend would be reflected that is indicated on the level of the entire programme (on average, men are subsidised in higher-cost programmes), then this would have a negative impact on the target value. The verification of this hypothesis, however, would require the collection of the participants' subsidy rates within the projects in programmes with a possibly different subsidy total per participation. By contrast, in those programmes which specify fixed regular rates, such fluctuations cannot exist, and a precise analysis of participation is automatically in place.⁵

⁵ Even greater precision could only be achieved by determining real durations of participation (dates of joining and leaving), plus – as an extension of this analysis – through the gender-specific documentation of individual, case-based grants and services, at least for each individual project.

Excursus: Gender budgeting and impact analyses

As a strategy, Gender Budgeting is frequently linked to the issue of the impacts of policies of gender equality. In this context, the European Commission – in its “Roadmap for Equality of women and men 2006-2010” – already referred to “[...] *the support of the assessment of gender-specific impacts and Gender Budgeting*” as one of its central activities. This would also include “[...] *reinforcing the comprehension of the gender perspective in the impact assessment of the measures and legal regulations implemented by the Community and examining options for the development of Gender Budgeting on the EU level, primarily in structural funding – within the possibilities available to the joint administration.*” (p. 26)⁶

The oft-cited current definition of Gender Budgeting as set forth by the European Commission also makes clear that Gender Budgeting means more than simply the collection of data on funding distribution among women and men: “*Gender budgeting is an application of gender mainstreaming in the budgetary process. It means a gender-based assessment of budgets, incorporating a gender perspective at all levels of the budgetary process and restructuring revenues and expenditures in order to promote gender equality.*”⁷

The aim of Gender Budgeting is defined here as “*equal opportunity for women and men*” – the collection of data about funding distribution is one means to this end. Yet this statement also indicates that the achievement of the material target of a minimum percentage indicated in the Operational Programme (OP) – 50 percent of ESF funds for women – is initially a target focused exclusively on the ESF. Whether this target mark can also enable the achievement of the equal opportunity-oriented objectives indicated in the OP (such as e. g. the “*involvement of women in gainful employment as a whole – in the capacity as a salaried employee and/or as a self-employed entrepreneur – and in opportunities for professional advancement, plus the filling of executive positions by women and women's participation in future-oriented and potentially lucrative training programmes and courses of study, along with the respective professional positioning*” (OP, p. 217)⁸, remains as yet unclear. That is to say that the “Gender Budgeting” approach as defined in the OP and as implemented here is limited in regard to what it can signify about the programme's impact in terms of gender equality policies. Initially, a mere “Output”, – that is, how many participations with how much funding distributed among women and men, respectively – has been recorded here. The procedure used up to this point, however, does not enable us to make any statement about “Results” or “Impacts”. For instance, if it is the aim of the ESF to promote “employment which ensures one's livelihood”⁹ – especially for women – then the information submitted here on involvement in ESF subsidies is insufficient. After all, it is theoretically also possible to subsidise women by using large amounts of money in ways that do not serve the aims of gender equality – for instance, with measures that ultimately lead to atypical or precarious employment. The analysis of funding distribution by sex, therefore, should also take a qualitative review of the funding into account.

⁶ European Commission (2006): A Roadmap for equality between women and men 2006-2010. (COM/2006/0092 final). Luxemburg. <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52006DC0092:EN:NOT>, last updated: 24.09.2012.

⁷ European Commission / Advisory Committee on Equal Opportunities for Women and Men (2003): Opinion on Gender Budgeting. Brüssel, S. 2. http://www.lex.unict.it/eurolabor/documentazione/altridoc/po/opinion_may03.pdf, last updated: 24.09.2012.

⁸ Operational Programme implemented by the German Federal Government in the programme period 2007-2013. http://www.esf.de/portal/generator/1406/property=data/op_bund.pdf, last updated: 24.09.2012.

⁹ For a definition of “employment which ensures one's livelihood” see: Pimminger, Irene / Agency for Gender Equality within the ESF (2012): Existenzsichernde Beschäftigung von Frauen und Männern. http://www.esf-gleichstellung.de/fileadmin/data/Downloads/Aktuelles/expertise_existenzsichernde_beschaeftigung.pdf, last updated: 24.09.2012.

1.3 RANGE OF THE ANALYSIS

Only when a project records participants who have joined – along with respective expenditures – can funds be calculated per participation (also according to gender).¹⁰ Of the 65 programmes that have been included in the ADELE database up to the year 2011, 38 of these (approx. 58 per cent of the programmes) include “Gender Budgeting”-compatible projects.

The total number of “Gender Budgeting”-compatible projects amounts to 14,057 – with a total expenditure volume of more than 1,818,629,093 Euro. In the context of these projects, a total of 1,354,483 participants receive (or have received) grants.

In addition, projects are included that explicitly addressing gender equality (that is declared as Code 69 projects)¹¹, yet do not indicate any participations. This case applies to 451 projects (in 12 programmes), with a total expenditure volume of 89,086,932 Euro. The inclusion of these projects adheres to the specifications outlined in the OP – according to which the reference parameter for the 50-percent target in quantitative Gender Budgeting consists of the funds for the following types of projects:

1. participation-based projects, as well as
2. non-participation-based projects explicitly addressing gender equality (see quote above).

The analysis up to the year 2011 covers the following:

Table 1: Comparison of coverage, 2008 to 2011

	2008	2009	2010	2011
Data quantity	50 MB	260 MB	498 MB	842 MB
Number of programmes analysed (with projects including participations and expenditures)	9	28	32	38
Included participants	18,827	398,873	834,931	1,354,483
Collected expenditure volume (participation-based projects)	85,697,150 €	428,505,717 €	1,121,133,523 €	1,818,629,093 €

Source: ADELE – Monitoring Database. Reporting date = annual report for the funding year 2009-2011, own calculations.

(The Technical Aid funds were not included in the analysis.)

¹⁰ However, there are also projects with participations without expenditures and projects with expenditures without participations. The latter will only then be considered for quantitative Gender Budgeting when they are subsidised via Code 69 (that is to say, are explicitly addressing gender equality).

¹¹ According to the implementation regulation, the “priority issue” of planned projects with Code 69 is the implementation of “[m]easures to improve women’s access to employment, to increase women’s long-term involvement in gainful employment and improve their professional advancement, to discontinue gender-specific segregation on the labour market – and measures to improve the balance between working life and private life, e.g. simplifying access to child care and to other care measures for dependents” (European Commission, 2006, p. 52, http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docoffic/official/regulation/pdf/2007/fsfc/ce_1828%282006%29_de.pdf, last updated: 24.09.2012).

2 SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Up to the year 2011 (key date: annual report), the value approximated the target described in the Operational Programme on the federal level – that is, giving women a stake of approximately 50 percent in the participation-based programme expenditures; however, this target was not actually achieved.

Including the projects explicitly addressing gender equality without participations, the value at the end of the year amounts to

46.4 percent.

- a) All planned projects with expenditures and participations, plus
- b) the projects explicitly addressing gender equality without participations
(two-thirds are calculated as having been awarded to women).

The total expenditures for all participation-based measures with expenditures amount to 1,818,629,093 Euro – of which 825,231,070 Euro (45.4 percent) are allocated to women. The expenditures for projects explicitly addressing gender equality without participations amount to 89,086,932 Euro.

At the same time, the expenditures for the projects explicitly addressing gender equality without participations (89,086,932 Euro) will be added to the previously-calculated expenditures for women (and men) on a proportional basis, and then divided by the relevant reference value. Depending on the mode of calculation, the results are as follows:

Table 2: Variations in the calculation of expenditures allocated to women and their shares in the Operational Programme

Variations of award distribution	Volume, women	Volume, men	Proportion of women
1) 100 percent for women	914,318,001 €	993,398,023 €	47.9 %
2) Two thirds for women	884,622,358 €	1,023,093,667 €	46.4 %
3) 50 percent for women	869,774,536 €	1,037,941,489 €	45.6 %

Source: ADELE – Monitoring Database. Reporting date: Annual report for the funding year 2011.

Regardless of the variation selected, the following applies: Even when the projects explicitly addressing gender equality are allocated 100 percent to women, a gap remains despite an increase towards the “50 percent” target. When Variation 2 is the basis for analysis, the result for 2011 remains 3.6 percentage points (in 2010, this value amounted to 4.7 percentage points) below the 50 percent defined in the OP.

The volume of all projects explicitly addressing gender equality (with and without participants) amounts to 156,540,473 Euro. That amount represents a proportion of the total volume of OP expenditures – (all projects, regardless of participations = 2,444,226,432 Euro) up to the year 2011 – of 6.4 percent.

The following results are presented in a question and answer format in order to make the figures more readable. In the full-length German report, each of the questions outlined here is explained in-depth. All figures refer to the year 2011, in which the monitoring systems of the federal government documented 65 ESF programmes.

Question:

What percentage of the financial volume (expenditures) for the entire programme is included in the Gender Budgeting analysis?

Answer:

Of the 65 programmes that were available in the electronic data-collection system ADELE for the analysis period, 38 can be included in the analysis, since these show – at least for some of their projects – participants as well as expenditures. This amounts to more than half (approx. 58 per cent) of the programmes. In all, 14,057 projects with 1,354,483 participations were included.

The following table gives an overview of the expenditure volumes for the included programmes/projects:

Table 3: Expenditure volume covered by Gender Budgeting (in EUR)

Gender Budgeting-compatible projects	1,818,629,093 €
Projects explicitly addressing gender equality without participations	89,086,932 €
Sum total of included expenditures	1,907,716,025 €
Total expenditure volume, OP-ESF (all projects with expenditures)	2,444,226,432 €
Share of the included volume in the total volume, in %	78.1 %

Source: ADELE – Monitoring Database. Reporting date: Annual report for the funding year 2011.

Question:

Projects explicitly addressing gender equality comprise what proportion of total expenditures?

Answer:

The proportion of the total expenditures spent on projects explicitly addressing gender equality (Code 69) increased in comparison to the most recent analysis by more than one percentage point, amounting to 6.4 percent (in 2010, this value amounted to 5.2 percent).

Table 4: Proportion of expenditures for Code 69-based planned projects in the total programme volume

Projects explicitly addressing gender equality (with or without participations), in €	156,540,473 €
Total volume, OP-ESF (all projects with expenditures), in €	2,444,226,432 €
Proportion of projects explicitly addressing gender equality in the total programme volume, in %	6.4 %

Source: ADELE – Monitoring Database. Reporting date: Annual report for the funding year 2011.

Question:

The Operational Programme states the following objective: With regard to planned projects that are explicitly addressing gender equality, yet do not indicate any participations, the proportion of funds devoted to women for participation-based expenditures should reach at least 50 percent. Was this target achieved by the year 2011?

Answer:

The target value has still not (yet) been achieved. When the participation-based expenditures

are reviewed along with expenditures for explicitly addressing gender equality that do not indicate any participations, the following observations can be made:

Up to the end of the year 2011, **46.4 percent of the funds were allocated to women** or to projects explicitly addressing gender equality. This value was calculated based on the expenditures for all planned projects with participations (see next question), plus the projects explicitly addressing gender equality without participations. In the calculation, funding for the latter projects was divided into two thirds for women and one third for men, since it cannot realistically be assumed that these planned projects will solely benefit women.

Question:

What percentage of the funds allocated *to those projects with recorded participants* were allocated to men, and what percentage to women (up to and including 2011)?

Answer:

Here, a trend towards the specified target (50 percent) can be detected: 2.8 percentage points more participation-based funds benefited women.

Table 5: Proportions of participations and expenditures for men and women

	Men			Women		
	to 2009	to 2010	to 2011	to 2009	to 2010	to 2011
Participations (number of new members), in %	59.4 %	54.9 %	51.5 %	40.6 %	45.1 %	48.5 %
Expenditures , in %	60.3 %	57.4 %	54.6 %	39.7 %	42.6 %	45.4 %

Source: ADELE – Monitoring Database. Reporting date: Annual report for the funding year 2009-2011.

Question:

What percentage of those funds from the ESF that were allocated to participants benefited men (up to the year 2011), and what percentage benefited women – when one exempts the projects addressing gender equality which are *participation-based*?

Answer:

Table 6: Expenditures distribution with and without participation-based projects addressing gender equality (in each case, w/o QualiKug)

Proportions of Expenditures, in percent	Men			Women		
	to 2009	to 2010	to 2011	to 2009	to 2010	to 2011
with participation-based Code 69 projects	60.3 %	57.4 %	54.6 %	39.7 %	42.6 %	45.4 %
without participation-based Code 69 projects	56.4 %	55.1 %	53.8 %	43.6 %	44.9 %	46.2 %

Source: ADELE – Monitoring Database. Reporting date: Annual report for the funding year 2009-2011.

The distribution of funds can change in favour of women when the (participation-based) Code 69 projects are exempted, since some of these projects are measures in which only low per-capita rates are distributed.

Question:

What percentage of the expenditures from the OP (allocated to participants) benefited men up to the year 2011, and what percentage benefited women – not including the projects explicitly addressing gender equality which are *non-participation-based*?

Answer:

Up to the year 2011, 45.4 percent of the participation-based expenditures went to women. When all projects addressing gender equality (Code 69) – including the non-participation-based projects – are included in the analysis, this value improves by 2.5 percentage points (to 47.9 percent).

Question:

What percentage of the ESF funds allocated to participants benefited men up to the year 2011, and what percentage benefited women – when the programme “Qualification Courses for Recipients of Government-Funded Short-Time Work Programmes” (QualiKug) is not included in the analysis?

(Note: The programme has a 14.4 percent proportion of female participants, at an expenditure volume which exceeds 131,881,989 Euro. This amounts to 7.3 percent of the Gender Budgeting-relevant expenditures – or just less than 5.4 percent of the total expenditures for all ESF-subsidised programmes.)

Answer:

The target of 50 percent (as indicated in the OP) will be undershot by 2.2 percentage points without the QualiKug programme.

Table 7: Participations and expenditures w/o the QualiKug Programme in the years 2009, 2010 and 2011

	2009		2010		2011	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Participations (in %) without QualiKug	49.6 %	50.4 %	48.2 %	51.8 %	46.6 %	53.4 %
Expenditures (in %) without QualiKug	55.7 %	44.3 %	54.1 %	45.9 %	52.2 %	47.8 %

Source: ADELE – Monitoring Database. Reporting date: Annual report for the funding year 2009-2011.

Question:

Are there gender-based differences in the per-capita costs for participants?

Answer:

On the one hand, on the basis of the available information, an answer to this question cannot be formulated with respect to an individually subsidised person, but rather with respect to projects. These projects, also projects belonging to the same programme, sometimes document different average per-capita expenditures. Thus the greater the number of men and/or women in a rather – in this regard – ‘high-cost’ or ‘low-cost’ project, the greater the corresponding differences in the gender-based per-capita expenditures.

However, taking this imprecision into account, the following can in fact be determined: For women – across all programmes – the expenditures are 6.4 percent lower than the per-capita average. In comparison to the total average, the expenditures for men are 6.1 percent higher. For the most recent reporting period, these values still amounted to 2 percent below the average for women and/or 1.4 percent above the average for men: this means that within the year 2011, the gap in the per-capita expenditures has widened.

This divide widens even further when the analysis is performed without the programme with the largest participation numbers (QualiKug). The elimination of QualiKug, with its combination of an 85.6 percent male participation rate and high expenditure volume, influences the average per-capita values: Without the QualiKug programme, women (on average) received 10.5 percent less funding than the per-capita average, while men received 12.0 percent more. The apparently paradoxical effect that men (in terms of per-capita expenditures) have a better outlook without the expensive and male-dominated programme QualiKug than when it is in place, is ultimately attributable to the fact that QualiKug is a large-scale programme, yet the per-capita expenditures are, on the whole, below average (774 Euro) – and nearly identical for men and women.

In terms of per-capita expenditures, projects explicitly addressing gender equality have a certain impact: Without these projects, the gap in the per-capita costs would close, since women received (on average) 1.6 percent less funding than the total average value, while men received 1.3 percentage points more. This apparently paradoxical impact is attributable to the (on average) low utilisation of funds in the projects explicitly addressing gender equality.

Question:

Is there a correlation between the budgetary volume of programmes and the allocation of funds to men and women?

Answer:

For the current reporting period as well, one can determine the following: The largest proportion of the grant volume will be provided for programmes in which neither women nor men are financially under- or over-represented (41-60 percent of the expenditures for women/men). For programmes with a high proportion of expenditures for women (starting at 60 percent), comparatively less grant funding was approved. The 11 programmes with a proportion of women less than 40 percent demonstrated (in 2011) once again a comparatively high volume. However, one can observe that this gap has closed by more than 10 percentage points in comparison with the previous year.

Table 8: Overview: Distribution according to programme (component) groups

Expenditure group	Total expenditures	percent	Programmes	percent
Group 1: 40 % – 60 %	1,138,409,850 €	62.6 %	14	36.8 %
Group 2: Men > 60 %	434,082,735 €	23.9 %	11	28.9 %
Group 3: Women > 60 %	246,136,507 €	13.5 %	13	34.2 %
of these, Code 69	65,305,367 €	3.6 %	7	18.4 %
Total	1,818,629,093 €	100.0 %	38	100.0 %

Source: ADELE – Monitoring Database. Reporting date: Annual report for the funding year 2011.

Question:

Are there gender-based differences with regard to participation in projects with minor funding? (“Bagatellförderung”?)

Answer:

Significantly more than one third (38.6 percent) of all Gender Budgeting-relevant participations are in projects with minor funding. The proportion (participations) of women in these projects with minor funding comprises significantly more than half – namely 57.1 percent. In the context of these minor subsidies, the expenditure share for men does not exceed 60 percent in any of the eight programmes. The Code 69 projects without participations (in total, 451) are – by a near majority (430) – projects with minor funding.

Question:

Is there a discernible trend in the data from the three most recent analyses?

Answer:

The proportion of women in the total participations increased (since the first analysis in 2009) by 7.9 percentage points; the share of expenditures increased by 5.7 percentage points.

3 CONCLUSION AND TRENDS

While the assignation of funds during the past three years (2009-2011) has indeed approached the target defined in the ESF-OP on the federal level of a 50-percent designation of funds (for participation-based expenditures as well as for “Code 69” expenditures without participations) on behalf of women, this target was still not achieved as of the programme year 2011. If two-thirds of the funds for the projects explicitly addressing gender equality (Code 69) without participations are calculated as having been spent on women, this results in a value of 46.4 percent of the total funds that can be considered to have been spent on behalf of women. When “QualiKug”, one of the most significant programmes in budgetary terms and also the programme with the highest participation numbers – with a proportion of women participants amounting to merely 14.4 percent – is eliminated from the calculation, the share of funds increases to 47.8 percent.

When solely participation-based measures – including participation-based projects explicitly addressing gender equality – are considered, the proportion of expenditures for women amounts to 45.4 percent of the funds. If all of the projects explicitly addressing gender equality were grouped together, this would result in a value of 47.9 percent.

Statements regarding per-capita gender-based expenditures can only be made to a limited extent, since a precise project-based analysis would be feasible, but not an analysis per individual participant.

Up to this point, due to technical constraints within the monitoring system, different per-capita expenditures within a project could not be taken into account. Therefore, gender-based differences within a programme indicate that there are different numbers of women or men involved in projects with various respective overall budgets. In this context, the following findings are indicated: Across all programmes, women were allocated 6.4 percent fewer expenditures in comparison to the per-capita total value. Men, in comparison to the overall average, were allocated 6.1 percent more than the per-capita total value. Expressed in different terms, the per-capita expenditures allocated to women amounted to 88.2 percent of the total expenditures for men. This gap has increased significantly in comparison to the most recent analysis.

Altogether, on the OP level, significantly greater expenditures are allotted for male-dominated programmes: In the 11 programmes with a disproportionate share of expenditures allocated to men (more than 60 percent), a significantly higher amount of funding is allotted (23.9 percent) than is the case in the 13 programmes with a disproportionate share of expenditures – more than 60 percent – allocated to women (13.5 percent). However, this gap has closed in comparison to the most recent analysis.

The largest proportion of the grant volume, 62.6 percent, is provided for programmes in which women and men are neither over- nor under-represented (41-60 percent women and men). Programmes with a high proportion of women (starting at 60 percent) had significantly less grant funding available, while in the group of programmes with a proportion of women less than 40 percent and less than 20 percent, significantly higher volumes can be found. Significantly, more than one third of all participations (38.6 percent) are cases of minor funding. Within this group, the disproportionately high percentage of women (57.1 percent) is striking.

The following table 9 summarises the major changes in comparison to the previous year's analysis:

Table 9: Major changes in the analysis for 2011 against 2009 and 2010

Central Gender Budgeting-Parameters	2009	2010	<i>Change</i>	2011	<i>Change</i>
Proportion of women in the total number of participations	40.6 %	44.4 %	<i>+3.8</i>	48.5 %	<i>+4.1</i>
Proportion of expenditures for women (total)	41.4 %	43.7 %	<i>+2.3</i>	46.4 %	<i>+2.7</i>
<i>Proportion of expenditures (projects with participations) allocated to women</i>	39.7 %	42.6 %	<i>+2.9</i>	45.4 %	<i>+2.8</i>
<i>Compensation using Code 69 without participations (calculated as 2/3)</i>	+1.7 %	+1.1 %	<i>-0.6</i>	1.0 %	<i>-0.1</i>
Proportion of "Code 69" in the total volume	6.2 %	5.2 %	<i>-1</i>	6.4 %	<i>+1.2</i>
Per-capita costs, women, as a proportional ratio to the participation average	-2.0 %	-4.0 %	<i>-2</i>	-6.4 %	<i>-2.4</i>
Per-capita costs (women) divided by per-capita costs (men)	96.6 %	93.0 %	<i>-3.6</i>	88.2 %	<i>-4.8</i>

Source: ADELE – Monitoring Database. Reporting date: Annual report for the funding year 2011.

It becomes clear, therefore, that the current total value (46.4 percent) is approaching the OP target of 50 percent of distributed funds allocated to women, and the proportion of measures explicitly addressing gender equality (6.4 percent) increased once again in comparison to the previous year. The projects explicitly addressing gender equality (Code 69 measures) do not compensate for the fact that in a number of programmes, men are implicitly subsidised (although this subsidisation is not acknowledged as such). This means that on the one hand, both the participation rates and the proportion of expenditures spent on women in these initiatives are on the increase. On the other hand, women remain proportionally underrepresented in measures with high per-capita expenditures; in this regard, one can observe an increase in the level of inequality.

4 RECOMMENDATIONS

In the reports on the programme years 2009 and 2010, the Agency for Gender Equality within the ESF had already made recommendations with regard to the monitorings and to an gender equality-oriented management of the Operational Programme. These recommendations are differentiated according to the following topic areas: a) individual programmes and b) monitoring, plus c) management of the programme as a whole. These recommendations remain valid and are incorporated to some extent here.¹² However, the capacity to influence ongoing programmes during the current programme period is very limited, since significant measures have already been taken to shape programme content.

The following recommendations by the Agency for Gender Equality within the ESF are therefore primarily relevant for the planning of the new programme period as of 2014. In this context, it is initially assumed that gender equality will continue to be a significant issue within the ESF, and that Gender Budgeting will also be continued in the next programme period.

4.1 GENDER EQUALITY-ORIENTED GOVERNANCE IN THE NEXT PROGRAMME PERIOD

The target value of an equal distribution of funds between women and men (and/or a distribution of at least 50 percent of the ESF funds to women) represents in the context of gender equity an ESF-specific, formal target for gender equality measures, and therefore represents an important step towards developing a funding policy oriented toward gender equity. However, this target, while necessary, can be viewed as an insufficient with regard to the labour-market-oriented policies and gender-equality objectives set forth by the ESF. As indicated in the excursus on the effects of gender equality, there is more at stake than an “equal share” in budgetary allocations for women and men: This is about achieving content-based gender-equality objectives – as explicitly stated by the EU¹³ – considering the starting points of women and men on the labour market (with all of their attendant variables).

Therefore, for the next programme period, it would be useful to orient the Gender Budgeting more closely toward the information gleaned from the socio-economic analysis. Objectives such as employment sufficient to maintain one's livelihood and equally high involvement in the labour market for women and men¹⁴ can hardly be achieved solely through equal involvement in

¹² See Gender Budgeting Report on the programme year 2010: http://www.esf-gleichstellung.de/fileadmin/data/Downloads/Aktuelles/gb-report-2010_agency_gender_equality_esf.pdf, last updated: 24.09.2012, S. 13f.

¹³ See e. g. “Strategy for equality between women and men 2010-2015”, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2010:0491:FIN:EN:PDF>, last updated: 24.09.2012. For more information on the EU's gender-equality objectives, see e. g. also the summarised targets in “the gender-equality-policy reference framework of the ESF” http://www.esf-gleichstellung.de/fileadmin/data/Downloads/GM_Einstieg/gleichstellungspolitischer-bezugsrahmen.pdf, last updated: 24.09.2012.

¹⁴ The strategy “Europe 2020” designates (defined as the target for Germany) an employment ratio of 77 percent – here, no gender-based differentiation is made (although the discrepancy between the employment ratio of men and women remains), http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/targets_de.pdf, last updated: 24.09.2012.

programmes and/or by way of the distribution of funds, considering the starting points of women and men on the labour market as a whole.

The management of gender-equality-policy-related impacts via Gender Budgeting should therefore include the following measures:

1. Differentiated Gender Budgeting with adjusted target values:

As described in the excursus (see Chapter 1.2), Gender Budgeting does not necessarily indicate that funds are distributed in a schematically equal manner to women and men. On the level of individual programmes as well as in the federal-level OP, it would be practical to designate target values that are derived on a technical basis. In this context, for the cumulative target on the total-OP level, a value exceeding a 50 percent share of the funds for women is indeed conceivable, since there is a clearer need for action due to women's starting point on the labour market.¹⁵ This aspect will be reflected in the individual topic areas and focal points of the ESF to a different extent, and therefore also requires differentiated target values. At the same time, this means that in certain individual programmes, there can indeed be higher grant shares for men, if this is compatible with the funding objective (and/or with the target groups) on the content level.

2. A dual approach for Gender Budgeting is also recommended: The compensatory impact of the Code 69-based planned projects (oriented towards gender equality) is currently rather slight. Therefore, on the one hand, a minimum volume for projects explicitly addressing gender equality should be defined. That is, the programme portfolio for the future ESF-OP should include a pre-defined budget share for those programmes that explicitly address gender equality. For instance, one could strive to commit at least 10 percent of OP funds to this goal.

At the same time, the overall programme portfolio should be selected so that the percentages of allocated funding for women and men can be effectively managed. In this context, there will still be grant areas that address male-dominated sectors. One should ensure, however, that a one-sided orientation is avoided from the beginning.

3. A clearer connection to Gender Mainstreaming – on the OP level as well as on the individual-programme level:

If Gender Budgeting is considered an approach to Gender Mainstreaming on the budget-process level, then Gender Budgeting can highlight an actual state of affairs that comprises the basis for a logical (also content-related) target derivation in the context of a management cycle.

In those programmes in which a de facto subsidy of men occurs (or an unintentional subsidy of women), and this cannot be explained via explicit gender-equality objectives (e. g. Code 69 measures addressing the decrease in gender-stereotypical behaviour with regard to choosing a career or re-entry to the workplace), this under-representation in the distribution of funds should be explained in the future. This reasoning should be based on the specialised objective of the funding and on the verifiable data confirming the gender distribution in the area of intervention. For instance, the EXIST programmes analysed here (grant programmes aimed to promote self-employment in the academic sector) indicate a clear over-

¹⁵ See e. g. Deutscher Bundestag, 17. Wahlperiode (2011): Erster Gleichstellungsbericht. Neue Wege – Gleiche Chancen. Gleichstellung von Frauen und Männern im Lebensverlauf. Drucksache 17/6240. <http://www.bmfsfj.de/BMFSFJ/Service/Publikationen/publikationen.did=174358.html>, last updated: 24.09.2012, along with Klammer, Ute / Motz, Markus (Hg) (2012): Neue Wege – Gleiche Chancen. Expertisen zum Ersten Gleichstellungsbericht der Bundesregierung. Wiesbaden.

representation of men; in the case of the EXIST Research Transfer programme, the proportion of women involved amounts to zero percent. Precisely because the area of intervention covered by these programmes tends to address scientific-technical disciplines, the question arises as to the extent to which these programmes effectively serve in their area of intervention the goals outlined in the ESF Directive for improving gender equality.

That is to say, Gender Budgeting would have to be more clearly embedded into an overall strategy for managing gender-equality objectives. Here, the programming of the new programme period offers a series of opportunities that should be interlocked – when possible from the very beginning – with the planning of the new federal programme.

4.2 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE MONITORING PROCESS FROM 2014 ONWARD

Due to a degree of imprecision in the previous analyses (as indicated above) resulting from the technical limitations of the monitoring system, the Agency for Gender Equality within the ESF maintains that a more precise depiction of the real involvement of women and men is necessary. This is relevant to the following points:

- a) The additional inclusion of those measures that up to this point were considered non-participation-based: In the context of qualitative Gender Budgeting, the research showed that even in programmes which currently do not feed any participation data into the monitoring system, the respective individual-related data are indeed collected and analysed. Once imported into the respective database, these data could be incorporated into the analyses without undue effort.
- b) The continued maintenance of the collection of data regarding participation discontinuance, along with the qualified statement of the grounds for discontinuance (for instance, a regular exit, or premature discontinuation on positive, negative or neutral grounds).
- c) Highly selective collection of expense data:
In programmes without uniform per-capita flat rates, the actual per-capita expenditures may differ, e. g. when merely the upper limits of subsidies per person are defined, yet these can be clearly undershot on a regular basis. If the difference in the utilisation of such limits indicates a – currently non-recordable – gender-based bias or bias due to other features, than such bias automatically leads to an unrecognisable distortion in the reflection of 'reality' under the conditions imposed by the current process. This also applies when projects develop a more complex internal structure with different offerings/modules for male or female participants and the actual use/availment of these options (along with the associated expenditures) produces gender distortions.
- d) Increase in the acquisition of information in cases of projects with minor funding: In the current report, no analyses according to age groups or level of education were presented, since in this context there is only limited predictive power. This is primarily attributable to the high proportion of projects with minor funding for which limited information requirements have been imposed. Above all, however, it is in the projects with minor funding themselves that a definite distortion with regard to gender can be observed. Therefore, with regard to the new programme period, a possible consideration could be how to determine the criteria for minor subsidies more precisely, and how the associated loss of information can be practical-

ly held in check and/or partially compensated. Even though cut-off values for projects with minor funding are practical for limiting the administrative and documentation expenditures for those involved, a proportion of projects with minor funding that amounts to one third of all participations (in combination with a clear gender effect) leads in our view to an incomplete overall picture of the grant itself – not only- from the perspective of gender differentiation.

In our view, these steps enhance not the complexity of the monitoring, but rather its 'efficacy', in that use of the available information would be optimised.

Table 10: Projects with expenditures and participants (measures addressing gender equality are marked in yellow)

No.	Programme (partially abbreviated)	Code	Number of projects	Number of part.	Women part.	Men part.	Percentage of women/ part.	Overall expenditure	Expenditure women	Expenditure men	Percentage women/ expenditures
1	EXIST-Forschungstransfer	68	2	7	0	7	0.0 %	66,071 €	0 €	66,071 €	0.0 %
2	EXIST-Gründerstipendium	68	578	1,301	193	1,108	14.8 %	38,921,080 €	6,173,671 €	32,747,409 €	15.9 %
3	EXIST-Gründungskultur	68	1	4,755	1,571	3,184	33.0 %	1,040,360 €	343,725 €	696,636 €	33.0 %
4	Gründercoaching bei Gründungen aus Arbeitslosigkeit	68	242	35,295	14,754	20,541	41.8 %	293,555,977 €	122,600,580 €	170,955,397 €	41.8 %
5	Gründercoaching in Deutschland	68	224	15,971	5,616	10,355	35.2 %	80,297,281 €	28,084,185 €	52,213,096 €	35.0 %
6	Informations- und Schulungsveranstaltung	68	12	125,275	52,774	72,501	42.1 %	26,309,645 €	10,990,157 €	15,319,488 €	41.8 %
7	Programm „rückenwind“: Personalentwicklung in der Sozialwirtschaft	62	78	9,251	6,833	2,418	73.9 %	17,906,931 €	13,071,124 €	4,835,806 €	73.0 %
8	Programm „weiter bilden“: Förderung der beruflichen Weiterbildung von Beschäftigten	62	46	7,080	2,573	4,507	36.3 %	5,446,821 €	2,078,220 €	3,368,601 €	38.2 %
9	Qualifizierungsangebote für Bezieher von Kurzarbeitergeld (QualiKug)	64	179	170,313	24,467	145,846	14.4 %	131,881,989 €	18,901,191 €	112,980,798 €	14.3 %
10	Qualifizierungsangebote für Bezieher von Transferkurzarbeitergeld (QualiKug Transfer)	64	164	28,692	8,730	19,962	30.4 %	84,404,100 €	24,669,404 €	59,734,696 €	29.2 %
11	Akademikerprogramm (AKP)	73	2	205	119	86	58.0 %	1,468,015 €	870,107 €	597,908 €	59.3 %
12	Bildungsprämie	73	20	39,117	28,921	10,196	73.9 %	26,757,827 €	19,866,199 €	6,891,628 €	74.2 %

No.	Programme (partially abbreviated)	Code	Number of projects	Number of part.	Women part.	Men part.	Percentage of women/ part.	Overall expenditure	Expenditure women	Expenditure men	Percentage women/ expenditures
13	Neue Medien in der beruflichen Bildung	72	3	14,403	14,086	317	97.8 %	6,339,935 €	6,193,234 €	146,700 €	97.7 %
14	Aktionsprogramm Kindertagespflege	69	59	787	758	29	96.3 %	578,416 €	556,357 €	22,059 €	96.2 %
15	Aktionsprogramm Mehrgenerationenhäuser	69	197	142,414	89,458	52,956	62.8 %	16,600,848 €	10,498,554 €	6,102,294 €	63.2 %
16	Bundesinitiative zur Gleichstellung von Frauen in der Wirtschaft	69	38	3,402	2,681	721	78.8 %	5,360,511 €	4,476,864 €	883,647 €	83.5 %
17	Bundesprogramm Kommunal-Kombi	71	7,882	16,722	8,477	8,245	50.7 %	427,784,441 €	219,019,062 €	208,765,379 €	51.2 %
18	ESF-Bundesprogramm zur arbeitsmarktlichen Unterstützung für Bleibeberechtigte und Flüchtlinge mit Zugang zum Arbeitsmarkt	70	68	24,029	10,132	13,897	42.2 %	39,111,042 €	16,352,118 €	22,758,924 €	41.8 %
19	Freiwilligendienste machen kompetent	71	12	413	253	160	61.3 %	2,568,364 €	1,473,012 €	1,095,352 €	57.4 %
20	Jugend Stärken: Aktiv in der Region	71	30	2,447	1,062	1,385	43.4 %	2,840,081 €	1,186,975 €	1,653,106 €	41.8 %
21	Kompetenzagenturen	71	613	101,252	48,453	52,799	47.9 %	103,448,350 €	48,698,303 €	54,750,047 €	47.1 %
22	Kompetenzagenturen – 2. Förderphase	71	178	10,997	5,011	5,986	45.6 %	5,754,583 €	2,542,734 €	3,211,849 €	44.2 %
23	Mehr Männer in Kitas	69	16	74,969	47,483	27,486	63.3 %	2,148,174 €	1,250,766 €	897,408 €	58.2 %
24	Modellprogramm Perspektive Wiedereinstieg	69	23	6,793	6,793	0	100.0 %	11,834,983 €	11,834,983 €	0 €	100.0 %
25	Pluspunkt Erfahrung: Ein Gewinn für alle	71	7	1,839	1,627	212	88.5 %	321,087 €	271,616 €	49,471 €	84.6 %

No.	Programme (partially abbreviated)	Code	Number of projects	Number of part.	Women part.	Men part.	Percentage of women/ part.	Overall expenditure	Expenditure women	Expenditure men	Percentage women/ expenditures
26	Schulverweigerung – Die 2. Chance	71	526	24,794	9,467	15,327	38.2 %	81,704,652 €	31,291,632 €	50,413,020 €	38.3 %
27	Schulverweigerung – Die 2. Chance – 2. Förderphase	71	176	4,011	1,567	2,444	39.1 %	5,710,995 €	2,242,699 €	3,468,296 €	39.3 %
28	Soziale Stadt – Bildung, Wirtschaft, Arbeit im Quartier (BIWAQ)	71	133	31,260	15,899	15,361	50.9 %	51,509,744 €	23,631,792 €	27,877,953 €	45.9 %
29	STÄRKEN vor Ort (ehem. LOS)	71	752	215,588	126,274	89,314	58.6 %	31,430,011 €	19,045,196 €	12,384,814 €	60.6 %
30	Stärkung der berufsbezogenen Sprachkompetenz für Personen mit Migrationshintergrund	70	1,295	36,027	21,821	14,206	60.6 %	97,391,065 €	58,556,734 €	38,834,331 €	60.1 %
31	Unternehmen Familie – Innovationen durch familienunterstützende Dienstleistungen	69	4	140	134	6	95.7 %	565,186 €	518,793 €	46,392 €	91.8 %
32	XENOS – Integration und Vielfalt	71	256	115,231	54,497	60,734	47.3 %	121,649,123 €	59,299,041 €	62,350,082 €	48.7 %
33	XENOS-Sonderprogramm – Ausstieg zum Einstieg	71	16	1,702	785	917	46.1 %	4,243,453 €	1,275,037 €	2,968,415 €	30.0 %
34	Zukunft sucht Idee: Ideenwettbewerb „Bürgerarbeit“	71	35	85	40	45	47.1 %	365,933 €	143,451 €	222,482 €	39.2 %
35	Zukunft sucht Idee: Ideenwettbewerb „Gute Arbeit für Alleinerziehende“	69	75	16,380	15,850	530	96.8 %	30,365,424 €	29,432,989 €	932,435 €	96.9 %

No.	Programme (partially abbreviated)	Code	Number of projects	Number of part.	Women part.	Men part.	Percentage of women/ part.	Overall expenditure	Expenditure women	Expenditure men	Percentage women/ expenditures
36	Berufsbildung ohne Grenzen: Betriebliche Mobilitätsberatung	73	34	63,569	24,085	39,484	37.9 %	5,637,639 €	2,327,765 €	3,309,874 €	41.3 %
37	IdA – Integration durch Austausch	73	70	7,858	3,570	4,288	45.4 %	54,624,672 €	24,969,777 €	29,654,895 €	45.7 %
38	Praxis – Transnationale Qualifizierungsmaßnahmen mit Praktika in Frankreich zur Förderung der Aufnahme einer Beschäftigung	73	11	109	80	29	73.4 %	684,285 €	493,022 €	191,264 €	72.0 %
	Sum/ mean value		14,057	1,354,483	656,894	697,589	48.5 %	1,818,629,093 €	825,231,070 €	993,398,023 €	45.4 %

Source: ADELE – Monitoring Database. Reporting date: Annual report for the funding year 2011.

5 ANNEX

5.1 LIST OF ANALYSES

NOTE: All analyses in the following list are available in comprehensive form – as well as differentiated according to “projects with minor funding” and “projects with major funding”.

1. Overview ESF-OP: Programmes, projects, Financial Resources, target audience and Participation Registration.
2. Programme-wise comparison of the projects, with participation start dates and data on expenditures (Gender Budgeting-compatible projects) according to the given number of projects, recorded expenditures and start dates of participation for all projects with start dates of participation and all projects with data on expenditures.
3. Various uniformly-structured overviews of the ESF-OP, but in different aggregations according to the OP structure (SP, PA) and the programmes, also grouped in each category by:
 1. projects with expenditures and participations, along with any Priority Code
 2. projects with expenditures, w/o participations but with Code 69,
 3. projects, with expenditures, w/o participations and Code < > 69,
 4. projects without expenditures, with participations and any code.

In each case, depiction of the funds distribution by gender, based on detailed calculations for the respective projects – only projects (and programmes) with specifications on expenditures and start dates of participation – including the Priority Code.

The analyses of (3) in itemised form:

- **Summary according to OP focal points (SP), without differentiation according to the Priority Code.**
 - **Programmes** according to OP focal points, differentiated according to the Priority Code.
 - **Summary** according to OP Priority Axes (PA); that is, focal points by target area, without differentiation according to the Priority Code
 - **Summary** according to OP Priority Axes, differentiated according to the Priority Code.
 - **Programmes** according to OP Priority Axes, differentiated according to the Priority Code.
4. **Programmes** according to gender and age, plus a summary according to OP focal points.
 5. **Programmes** according to gender and level of education, plus a summary according to OP focal points.

5.2 INDEX OF TABLES

Table 1: Comparison of coverage, 2008 to 2011	4
Table 2: Variations in the calculation of expenditures allocated to women and their shares in the Operational Programme.....	5
Table 3: Expenditure volume covered by Gender Budgeting (in EUR)	6
Table 4: Proportion of expenditures for Code 69-based planned projects in the total programme volume	6
Table 5: Proportions of participations and expenditures for men and women	7
Table 6: Expenditures distribution with and without participation-based projects addressing gender equality (in each case, w/o QualiKug)	7
Table 7: Participations and expenditures w/o the QualiKug Programme in the years 2009, 2010 and 2011.....	8
Table 8: Overview: Distribution according to programme (component) groups	9
Table 9: Major changes in the analysis for 2011 against 2009 and 2010	12
Table 10: Projects with expenditures and participants (measures addressing gender equality are marked in yellow).....	17

Imprint

Editor: Agency for Gender Equality within the ESF
Commissioned by the Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs

Authors: Dr. Regina Frey, Benno Savioli
Berlin, September 2012

Agentur für Gleichstellung im ESF
Lohmühlenstraße 65
12435 Berlin
Tel: +49 30 53 338-948
E-Mail: office@esf-gleichstellung.de
www.esf-gleichstellung.de

Please Note: If you wish to quote from this publication, please do so by referring to the editor, the authors, the title and the date of publishing.

© Agentur für Gleichstellung im ESF