



Agentur für
Gleichstellung
im ESF

GENDER BUDGETING IN THE GERMAN EUROPEAN SOCIAL FUND – 2009

Berlin, March 2011

Regina Frey
Benno Savioli

CONTENTS

- 1 Introduction 1
- 2 The Gender Budgeting Approach in the ESF 2
 - 2.1 Methods of analysis 2
 - 2.2 Coverage 3
- 3 Results..... 4
- 4 Conclusion..... 8
- 5 Annex.....10
 - 5.1 List of tables.....10
 - 5.2 Allocation of funding for female and male participants based on the average cost per participant in one project 11

1 INTRODUCTION

The Agency for Gender Equality within the ESF is contracted by the German Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs to support the ESF in its goal of achieving more gender equality. The Agency promotes this aim by offering ongoing support to ministries involved in programming and by supporting the ministries & implementing bodies at monitoring.¹

The Agency's approach focuses on two aspects of ESF implementation: on the Operational Programme, which also encompasses gender budgeting as a means of monitoring gender equality, and on policies outlined in the ESF programmes. Labour market and employment policy serve both as the frame of reference and as the basis for identifying the policy goals of gender equality.

The Agency's Gender Budgeting Team presents an annual report on gender budgeting. The approach is based on the Operational Programme for the ESF on the Federal Level in the current funding period (2007-2013). The OP implements gender budgeting to provide strong support for equal opportunity for women and men:

“The intent is [...] to distribute around 50% of the budgetary funds allocated to participants to women; this target value relates to measures in which participants are counted and to measures specifically addressing equal opportunities for women and men (Code 69).” (OP, p. 218/219)

An initial report was already submitted in 2009; however, since the database was incomplete, the results of the report were not yet resilient. The database for the reporting year 2009 was sufficiently comprehensive, covering 28 of 53 programmes.

This document is a translation and a summary of the German report.² It briefly describes the approach to gender budgeting in the ESF (chapter 1) and highlights the main results of our analysis (chapter 2). In a short conclusion, we focus on remaining challenges and future steps to be taken in the German Federal ESF.

¹ In Germany the 16 Federal States and the Federal Government each run an ESF-programme. This report only refers to the ESF on Federal level.

² The report in German language was published in February 2011 with a length of 34 pages. URL: http://www.esf-gleichstellung.de/fileadmin/data/Downloads/Aktuelles/gender-budgeting-bericht-2009_agentur_gleichstellung_esf.pdf

2 THE GENDER BUDGETING APPROACH IN THE ESF

Gender budgeting as defined by the European Council 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.”
(Council of Europe 2003)

The ESF-OP applied a simplified approach: Only the expenditure side is considered, and only programmes with participants and measures explicitly addressing gender equality (Code 69) are included in the analysis. Additionally, no link to gender equality objectives in programmes exists. The analysis serves as a basis for a stronger focus on gender equality goals.

Three types of programmes were considered in the analysis:

- a) programmes without participants
- b) programmes with participants
- c) programmes explicitly addressing gender equality issues according to the Code 69 out of Codes of Dimension (with or without participants).

The analysis was based on yearly reported data. All participants of the year 2009 were included, encompassing all new participants in 2009 as well as participants carried over from the years before.

2.1 METHODS OF ANALYSIS

In 2009, the Agency for Gender Equality in the ESF wrote a proposal introducing a number of possibilities for the GB analysis. Due to technical restrictions /constraints, we had to choose a simple variant: Because it is not possible to determine the cost per individual participant, the average cost per participant in one project is assessed. This means that a different cost per capita within one project cannot be recorded by the current monitoring system, contributing to certain imprecision in the analysis. Of special concern is that if the average cost of women is below the average cost for men within one project, the results can be biased. The costs per capita in our analysis, therefore, are identical with the average cost per capita. Detectable differences between men and women derive from the fact that there are more and less expensive projects, and de facto differences according to sex³ are levelled out. Because of the fact that some programmes set a maximum budget per person (which is not always fully utilised), the results of this report should be read in light of this possible bias. In our assessment, however, the results are still valuable.

Because only programmes/programme components explicitly addressing individual participants are included in the first step of the analysis, the Agency for Gender Equality in the ESF has also developed an additional approach for assessing gender effects of programmes without participants. These projects account for more than one-fifth of the total federal ESF

³ In this report, we differentiate between the terms “sex”, which refers to (biological) women and men, and “gender”, which is socially constructed.

budget expenditures in 2009. This analysis is currently underway, with results to be presented in 2011.

2.2 COVERAGE

As mentioned above, out of 53 programmes documented in the monitoring system, 28 programmes could be considered for the year 2009. Programmes are only compatible with the quantitative Gender Budgeting approach if they a) monitored and documented individual participants and b) reported expenditures. The number of projects covered in the analysis is 7,432, with a total volume of 428,505,717 Euro. These projects engaged 398,873 individual participants.

In addition to these projects, any projects specifically addressing gender equality (so called Code 69⁴ project) were included – even though they do not address single participants. Thus 257 additional projects with a total volume of EUR 29,061,429 were also taken into account (see definition of GB according to the OP).

Table 1: Coverage of gender budgeting analysis

Volume of projects covered by gender budgeting analysis:	428,505,717 €
Volume of projects explicitly addressing gender equality (Code 69) without participants	29,061,429 €
Sum of Budget covered	457,567,146 €
Overall budget ESF 2009 (all projects with expenditures)	582,541,987 €
Share of budget covered by Gender Budgeting analysis	78.5 %

Source: ADELE – Monitoring Database. Reporting date = annual report for the funding year 2009

⁴ According to Commission Regulation (EC) No 1828/2006 of 8 December 2006, the main topic of Code 69 measures is to “[...] improve access to employment and increase sustainable participation and progress of women in employment to reduce gender-based segregation in the labour market, and to reconcile work and private life, such as facilitating access to childcare and care for dependent persons” (EU KOM 2006, p. 54). URL:

[http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docoffic/official/regulation/pdf/2007/fsfc/ce_1828\(2006\)_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docoffic/official/regulation/pdf/2007/fsfc/ce_1828(2006)_en.pdf).

These measures are called “measures explicitly addressing gender equality” in this report.

3 RESULTS

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 2009, in which the monitoring systems of the federal government documented 53 ESF programmes.

Question:

What share of the overall budget is devoted to projects that explicitly address gender equality?

Answer:

The following table shows the share of projects in the overall budget that explicitly address gender equality. These measures encompass both projects with and without participants.

Table 2: Percentage of budget allocated to measures explicitly addressing gender equality in 2009

Sum of all projects explicitly addressing gender equality (Code 69) with and without individual participants)	36,352,994 €
Overall budget ESF 2009 (all projects with expenditures)	582,541,987 €
Percentage of budget for measures explicitly addressing gender equality	6.2 %

Source: ADELE – Monitoring Database. Reporting date = annual report for the funding year 2009

Question:

In the Operational Programme for the Federal ESF, a target value is being set: At least 50 percent of the budget should be allocated to women or to measures explicitly addressing gender equality. Was this target met by the end of 2009?

Answer:

The target has not (yet) been met: Considering the budget for a) projects addressing participants as well as b) measures explicitly addressing gender equality (without participants), the following assessment can be reached:

Up to the end of 2009, the percentage of funding allocated to women or funds dedicated to gender equality was 41.4 percent. This figure was calculated by analysing a) the budget of all projects with participants (see also the next Q&A) as well as b) the funds for all measures explicitly addressing gender equality. Because it would be not accurate to assign the funds for gender equality measures exclusively to female participants, it was presumed and accordingly calculated that two thirds of these funds were allocated to women and one third to male participants.

Question:

If we consider only the budget that was allocated to individual participants, which percentage was dedicated to women and to men, respectively?

Answer:

In this case, an even smaller proportion of the budget was allocated to women.

Table 3: Gender budget analysis exclusively considering programmes with participants

	Male	Female
Participants	59.4 %	40.6 %
Expenditures	60.3 %	39.7 %

Source: ADELE – Monitoring Database. Reporting date = annual report for the funding year 2009

Please see the annex on pages 11-13 for an overview of all ESF programmes: the table shows the number of projects, number of female and male participants, percentage of women, overall expenditure, expenditure allocated to women/men and percentage of expenditure for women as well as the sums of programmes and mean percentages.

Question:

If the Programme “qualification courses for recipients of government funded short-time work programme “ (QualiKug”) is not considered in the overall analysis, how are ESF funds allocated to women and men, respectively?

Remark: Female participants make up 15.4 of this programme, which has a budget of more than 76 Mio. Euro.

Answer:

The programme “QualiKug” has a considerable impact on the gender budgeting result because of its low female participation and its comparably large budget (see the annex as well for the whole range of analysed programmes).

Table 4: Gender budgeting analysis excluding the programme “QualiKug”

	Male	Female
Participation excluding QualiKug	49.6 %	50.4 %
Allocation of budget excluding QualiKug	55.7 %	44.3 %

Source: ADELE – Monitoring Database. Reporting date = annual report for the funding year 2009

When QualiKug is omitted from the analysis, the allocation of budgetary funds to women falls short of the 50 percent target value set in the OP by 5.7 percentage points.

Question:

Is there a difference in the costs per capita for female and male participants?

Answer:

Due to technical constraints, this information cannot be obtained per capita; however, it is possible to assess the costs per project, because the different projects generate different costs within a programme. When more women or more men participate in a project with either a larger or smaller budget, the greater the difference in costs will be. Taking into account this imprecision, the analysis reveals certain tendencies: Women create two percent fewer costs than the average cost per capita. In contrast, men create 1.4 percent more costs per capita. These figures become even more disparate if the programme “QualiKug” is omitted from the analysis (see above): Because this programme has a large budget and, at the same time, a rate of

participation that is 84.4 percent male, it has a considerable influence on the average costs per capita. When the programme “QualiKug” is excluded, women create 12.3 percent fewer costs than the average cost per capita. In contrast, men create 12.5 percent more costs per capita by this calculation.

In regard to costs per capita, the measures that explicitly address gender equality issues (Code 69) have a marked effect: When these measures are omitted from the analysis, women create 9.4 percent fewer costs than the average cost per capita. Men, in this case, create 8.7 percent more costs per capita. These measures, therefore, do have a real compensatory effect in regard to costs per capita.

Question:

Is there a connection between the budgetary volume of programmes and the allocation of funding to men and women?

Answer:

The biggest percentage of the ESF budget is allocated to programmes in which neither women nor men are substantially under- or overrepresented in terms of finances (41-60 percent of the funding for both men and women, group 1). It is remarkable, however, that the group of programmes with a large allocation of expenditures for female participants (more than 60 percent, group 3) had substantially less total funding at their disposal, whereas the group of programmes that allocated 40 percent or less of their total expenditures to women had a larger overall budget (group 2).

Table 5: Percentage of expenditures for women and men according to groups of programmes and their financial volumes

Group	Number of programmes	Financial Volume	Percentage
Group 1: Expenditures for both women and men between 40 and 60 percent	12	252,022,123 €	58.8 %
Group 2: Percentage of expenditures for men more than 60 percent	8	161,105,660 €	37.6 %
Group 3: Percentage of expenditures for women more than 60 percent	11 (4 thereof under Code 69)	15,377,934 €	3.6 %
Sum	31	428,505,717 €	100 %

Source: ADELE – Monitoring Database. Reporting date = annual report for the funding year 2009

Question:

Is there a connection between female participation and the financial volume of programmes?

Answer:

If the programmes are categorised into five groups according to the number of female participants and if the total budgetary volume of each of these groups is analysed, the picture is as follows:

Table 6: Categorisation of the budget with regard to female participation in programmes

Percentage of female participants	Total budgetary volume of programme	Percentage of overall budget in %
0 – 20 %	80,231,089 €	18.7 %
21 – 40 %	80,874,571 €	18.9 %
41 – 60 %	255,164,906 €	59.5 %
61 – 80 %	7,814,249 €	1.8 %
81 – 100 %	4,420,902 €	1.0 %
Sum	428,505,717 €	100.0 %

Source: ADELE – Monitoring Database. Reporting date = annual report for the funding year 2009

4 CONCLUSION

The target value defined by the Operational Programme was not met by 2009. The final result of 41.4 percent falls short of the target value of at least 50 percent of the relevant budget being allocated to women. This value also includes measures without individual participants that were meant to explicitly address gender equality, as described in the OP. Only two-thirds of the volume of these measures, however, was taken into account, as a 100 percent allocation to women would not be appropriate.

If only projects with participants are taken into account, the share of the budget allocated to women falls to 39.7 percent. If all measures explicitly addressing gender equality are taken into full account, the budget allocated to women rises to 43.6 percent.

If the second largest programme in terms of financial volume (QualiKug) with a very low participation rate for women (15 percent) is not taken into account in the analysis, the budget-share allocated to women rises to 44.3 percent.

This also shows that the compensatory effect of measures explicitly addressing gender equality is limited. The reason for this is a correlation between budgetary volume and sex-composition: the measures with a high percentage of female participants also have the smaller budgets.

All of the results must be weighed in the light of a certain methodical imprecision: Because of technical constraints within the monitoring system, it is not possible to assess costs per individual participant. In the analysis, therefore, the average cost per participant in one project was assessed and then afterwards spread amongst men and women according to their relative number in the respective project. This constraint especially applies to the results of a comparison of expenditures per capita. Based on the average cost per capita within each operation, a value of 2 percent under the average emerged for women – the costs for men were 1.4 percent over the average. These differences derive from the fact that the number of female and male participants varies in projects with larger or smaller budget volumes.

The measures in which male participants consume a larger share of the budget are also granted a larger share of the entire budget of the ESF: The eight measures that allocate a significantly greater percentage of their budgets to male participants consume ten times more funds than the eleven measures that allocate a significantly greater percentage to female participants.

The biggest share of the budget is allocated to measures in which women and men are “equally” represented (from 41 to 60 percent). Measures with a high representation of women (more than 60 percent) had significantly smaller budgets, whereas the measures with female participation rates of less than 40- and 20 percent had significantly higher budgets.

Recommendations

In order to make this analysis more revealing, the technical monitoring must be more effective. One of the steps that should be taken is the creation of a database that allows for a real analysis per capita. This is a requirement for enhancing the validity of the GB analysis, and will contribute to the mainstreaming of gender in the ESF and the achievement of gender equality.

There are five main possibilities for achieving the goal of allocating at least 50 percent of the budget to women:

1. Within the current funding period, there should be very clear requirements with regard to raising the participation rates for women in programmes. This can be achieved by adapting funding criteria and by more explicitly addressing women.
2. New measures explicitly addressing gender equality should be initiated – the present gender equality programmes make up less than 7 percent of the budget.
3. New programmes should be initiated that will reliably attract a large number of female participants – because they address target groups in female-dominated sectors or branches.
4. New priorities should be set for existing programmes. For example, programmes that aim to promote academic start-up businesses could extend their target groups from the natural sciences to the social sciences and arts. Interdisciplinary projects could also be targeted.
5. The budget should be shifted from programmes with a large budget volume as well as a high male participation rates to programmes with a small volume as well as a high female participation rates. Increasing the budget for programmes with a large proportion of projects dedicated to addressing gender equality would also help achieve the GB target value of 50 percent.

These activities do not exclude each other; rather, it is possible to put them into practice simultaneously and thus create useful synergies. Although the initiation of new funding programmes will not be possible in the current funding period, a re-monitoring of existing programmes and a re-shifting of the current programme portfolio will be necessary if the target value set by the Operational Programme is to be achieved.

5 ANNEX

5.1 LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Coverage of gender budgeting analysis 3

Table 2: Percentage of budget allocated to measures explicitly addressing gender equality in 2009..... 4

Table 3: Gender budget analysis exclusively considering programmes with participants..... 5

Table 4: Gender budgeting analysis excluding the programme “QualiKug”..... 5

Table 5: Percentage of expenditures for women and men according to groups of programmes and their financial volumes..... 6

Table 6: Categorisation of the budget with regard to female participation in programmes7

5.2 ALLOCATION OF FUNDING FOR FEMALE AND MALE PARTICIPANTS BASED ON THE AVERAGE COST PER PARTICIPANT IN ONE PROJECT

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	QualiKug Transfer	64	128	11,951	3,893	8,058	32.6 %	32,883,971 €	10,508,847 €	22,375,124 €	32.0 %
2	Gründercoaching bei Gründungen aus Arbeitslosigkeit	68	186	3,255	1,421	1,834	43.7 %	43,959,666 €	19,164,987 €	24,794,679 €	43.6 %
3	EXIST-Gründerstipendium	68	250	548	80	468	14.6 %	12,569,350 €	1,808,867 €	10,760,483 €	14.4 %
4	Gründercoaching in Deutschland	68	185	4,549	1,457	3,092	32.0 %	23,557,308 €	7,510,660 €	16,046,648 €	31.9 %
5	QualiKug	64	179	112,360	17,249	95,111	15.4 %	67,395,321 €	10,477,983 €	56,917,338 €	15.6 %
6	Informations- und Schulungsveranstaltung	68	12	46,115	19,495	26,620	42.3 %	10,748,525 €	4,529,341 €	6,219,184 €	42.1 %
7	rückenwind	62	3	125	80	45	64.0 %	171,893 €	112,555 €	59,339 €	65.5 %
8	Akademikerprogramm (AKP)	73	2	205	119	86	58.1 %	1,468,237 €	870,222 €	598,015 €	59.3 %
9	Bildungsprämie	72	2	1,212	958	254	79.0 %	154,315 €	121,943 €	32,372 €	79.0 %
10	Bildungsprämie	73	1	194	141	53	72.7 %	25,727 €	18,698 €	7,029 €	72.7 %
11	Neue Medien in der beruflichen Bildung	72	2	5,828	5,645	183	96.9 %	1,866,221 €	1,809,468 €	56,753 €	97.0 %
12	Bundesprogramm Kommunal-Kombi	70	2	2	0	2	0.0 %	3,586 €	0 €	3,586 €	0.0 %
13	Bundesprogramm Kommunal-Kombi	71	4,968	10,480	5,305	5,175	50.6 %	117,064,337 €	59,769,834 €	57,294,503 €	51.1 %
14	XENOS – Integration und Vielfalt	66	4	535	322	213	60.2 %	273,555 €	120,651 €	152,904 €	44.1 %
15	XENOS – Integration und Vielfalt	70	22	2,213	1,085	1,128	49.0 %	2,142,872 €	1,139,994 €	1,002,878 €	53.2 %

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
16	XENOS – Integration und Vielfalt	71	152	20,793	9,601	11,192	46.2 %	23,006,364 €	10,968,264 €	12,038,101 €	47.7 %
17	Arbeitsmarktliche Unterstützung für Bleibeberechtigte und Flüchtlinge	70	39	10,586	4,597	5,989	43.4 %	4,120,636 €	1,752,583 €	2,368,053 €	42.5 %
18	Stärkung der berufsbezogenen Sprachkompetenz für Personen mit Migrationshintergrund	70	55	1,015	574	441	56.6 %	1,315,180 €	731,545 €	583,635 €	55.6 %
19	STÄRKEN vor Ort (ehem. LOS)	71	248	61,655	36,135	25,520	58.6 %	5,212,075 €	3,181,462 €	2,030,613 €	61.0 %
20	Kompetenzagenturen	71	388	42,937	18,176	24,761	42.3 %	39,818,351 €	16,881,361 €	22,936,990 €	42.4 %
21	Freiwilligendienste machen kompetent	71	12	328	198	130	60.4 %	1,795,737 €	1,048,857 €	746,880 €	58.4 %
22	Aktionsprogramm Mehrgenerationenhäuser	69	134	40,725	25,428	15,297	62.4 %	4,991,879 €	3,168,934 €	1,822,945 €	63.5 %
23	Soziale Stadt – Bildung, Wirtschaft, Arbeit im Quartier (BIWAQ)	66	1	71	50	21	70.4 %	131,458 €	92,576 €	38,881 €	70.4 %
24	Soziale Stadt – Bildung, Wirtschaft, Arbeit im Quartier (BIWAQ)	71	36	4,032	1,873	2,159	46.5 %	3,257,304 €	1,334,579 €	1,922,725 €	41.0 %
25	XENOS-Sonderprogramm – Ausstieg zum Einstieg	71	5	66	11	55	16.7 %	262,832 €	36,009 €	226,823 €	13.7 %
26	Pluspunkt Erfahrung: Ein Gewinn für alle	71	7	1,003	871	132	86.8 %	200,876 €	162,924 €	37,952 €	81.1 %
27	Modellprogramm Perspektive Wiedereinstieg	69	22	1,228	1,228	0	100.0 %	1,954,034 €	1,954,034 €	0 €	100.0 %
28	Schulverweigerung – Die 2. Chance	71	319	8,558	3,189	5,369	37.3 %	24,278,091 €	9,062,538 €	15,215,553 €	37.3 %

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
29	Unternehmen Familie - Innovationen durch familienunterstützende Dienstleistungen	69	4	107	101	6	94.4 %	338,712 €	315,366 €	23,347 €	93.1 %
30	Zukunft sucht Idee: Ideenwettbewerb „Gute Arbeit für Alleinerziehende“	69	1	98	94	4	95.9 %	6,940 €	6,657 €	283 €	95.9 %
31	Zukunft sucht Idee: Ideenwettbewerb „Gute Arbeit für Alleinerziehende“	71	1	115	111	4	96.5 %	54,119 €	52,236 €	1,882 €	96.5 %
32	IdA – Integration durch Austausch	62	7	233	114	119	48.9 %	522,673 €	277,581 €	245,092 €	53.1 %
33	IdA – Integration durch Austausch	73	37	1,165	510	655	43.8 %	2,495,751 €	1,029,439 €	1,466,312 €	41.3 %
34	Berufsbildung ohne Grenzen: Betriebliche Mobilitätsberatung	62	2	186	82	104	44.1 %	32,937 €	17,492 €	15,445 €	53.1 %
35	Berufsbildung ohne Grenzen: Betriebliche Mobilitätsberatung	73	11	4,354	1,546	2,808	35.5 %	155,201 €	50,658 €	104,543 €	32.6 %
36	Praxis – Transnationale Qualifizierungsmaßnahmen mit Praktika in Frankreich	73	5	46	32	14	69.6 %	269,684 €	186,226 €	83,459 €	69.1 %
	Sum / mean value		7,432	398,873	161,771	237,102	40.6 %	428,505,717 €	170,275,369 €	258,230,348 €	39.7 %

Source: ADELE – Monitoring Database. Reporting date = annual report for the funding year 2009

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, March 2011

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