



Agentur für
Gleichstellung
im ESF

GENDER BUDGETING IN THE GERMAN EUROPEAN SOCIAL FUND – 2010

Berlin, January 2012

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.....11
 - 4.1 Recommendations for programme officers..... 13
 - 4.2 Recommendations for monitoring from 2014 onwards14
 - 4.3 Recommendations for equality oriented monitoring15
- 5 Annex 17
 - 5.1 List of tables..... 17
 - 5.2 Allocation of funding for female and male participants based on the average cost per participant in one project.....18

1 INTRODUCTION

In the following document, the Agency for Gender Equality of the ESF presents a second report on gender budgeting. This report continues and expands upon the already existing report from 2009, which was also published in an abbreviated form in English.¹ The basic analytical structure used in 2009 has been retained but also further developed in the differentiation of small scale intervention (“Bagatellförderung”).² In addition, monitoring data pertaining to the age and educational level of the participants has been included.

This document is a translation and a summary of the second German report.³ In chapter 2, we briefly describe the approach to gender budgeting in the ESF. In case you are already familiar with the 2009 report and the Gender Budgeting approach, we recommend focusing on chapter 3: It highlights the main results of our analysis for 2010 and also compares some of the figures in 2009 to 2010. In a short conclusion (chapter 4), we focus on remaining challenges and future steps to be taken in the German Federal ESF.

Background:

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.⁴

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 Gender Budgeting 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)

¹ URL: http://www.esf-gleichstellung.de/fileadmin/data/Downloads/english_site/gb-report-2009_agency_gender_equality_esf.pdf

² To the category of small scale intervention belong: „All initiatives in the area of systems, which are primarily focused on structural improvements. Other initiatives, when the following criteria are met: Participants/Organisations are involved in individual brief advisory sessions [...] Participants/Organisations are involved in collective informational events [...]“
Source: <http://www.esf.de/portal/generator/1284/foerdergrundsaeetze.html>, Date: 21.10.2011.

³ The report in German language was published in December 2011 with a length of 38 pages. URL: http://www.esf-gleichstellung.de/fileadmin/data/Downloads/Aktuelles/gender-budgeting-bericht-2010_agentur_gleichstellung_esf.pdf

⁴ 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 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 2010 were included, encompassing all new participants in 2010 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 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 costs⁵ 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

⁵ In this report, we differentiate between the terms “sex”, which refers to (biological) women and men, and “gender”, which is socially constructed.

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 budget expenditures in 2010. This analysis is currently underway, with results to be presented in 2012.

2.2 COVERAGE

As mentioned above, out of 62 programmes documented in the monitoring system, 32 Programmes could be considered for the year 2010. 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 11.569, with a total volume of 1,121,133,523 Euro. These projects engaged 834,931 individual participants.

In addition to these projects, any projects specifically addressing gender equality (so called Code 69⁶ project) were included – even though they do not address single participants. Thus 347 additional projects with a total volume of EUR 54,829,574 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:	1,121,133,523 €
Volume of projects explicitly addressing gender equality (Code 69) without participants	54,829,574 €
Sum of Budget covered	1,175,963,097 €
Overall budget ESF 2010 (all projects with expenditures)	1,514,405,258 €
Share of budget covered by Gender Budgeting analysis	77.7%

Source: ADELE – Monitoring Database. Reporting date = annual report for the funding year 2010, own calculations.

⁶ 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 2010, in which the monitoring systems of the federal government documented 62 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 2010

Sum of all projects explicitly addressing gender equality (Code 69) with and without individual participants)	78,841,752 €
Overall budget ESF 2010 (all projects with expenditures)	1,514,405,258 €
Percentage of budget for measures explicitly addressing gender equality	5.2 %

Source: ADELE – Monitoring Database. Reporting date = annual report for the funding year 2010, own calculations.

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 2010?

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 2010, the percentage of funding allocated to women or funds dedicated to gender equality was 43.7 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 2009 and 2010

	Male		Female	
	2009	2010	2009	2010
Participants	59.4 %	54.9 %	40.6 %	45.1 %
Expenditures	60.3 %	57.4 %	39.7 %	42.6 %

Source: ADELE – Monitoring Database. Reporting date = annual report for the funding year 2010, own calculations.

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 14.5 percent of this programme, which has a budget of more than 117 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” 2009 and 2010

	Male		Female	
	2009	2010	2009	2010
Participation excluding QualiKug	49.6 %	48.2 %	50.4 %	51.8 %
Allocation of budget excluding QualiKug	55.7 %	54.1 %	44.3 %	45.9 %

Source: ADELE – Monitoring Database. Reporting date = annual report for the funding year 2010, own calculations.

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 4.1 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 four percent fewer costs than the average cost per capita. In contrast, men create 3.2 percent more costs per capita. For the last reporting period, these values were still at 2 percent below average for women and 1.4 percent above average for men, which mean that in 2010, gaps in per-capita costs increased. 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 85.5 percent male, it has a considerable influence on the average costs per capita. When the programme “QualiKug” is excluded, women create 11.3 percent fewer costs than the average cost per capita. In contrast, men create 12.2 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 7.9 percent fewer costs than the average cost per capita. Men, in this case, create 7.5 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	762,902,499 €	68.0 %
Group 2: Percentage of expenditures for men more than 60 percent	8	303,985,527 €	27.1 %
Group 3: Percentage of expenditures for women more than 60 percent	12 (6 thereof under Code 69)	54,245,497 €	4.8 %
Sum	32	321,121,133,523 €	100 %

Source: ADELE – Monitoring Database. Reporting date = annual report for the funding year 2010, own calculations.

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 %	143,331,170 €	12.8 %
21 – 40 %	163,663,206 €	14.6 %
41 – 60 %	773,576,168 €	69.0 %
61 – 80 %	18,990,607 €	1.7 %
81 – 100 %	21,572,371 €	1.9 %
Sum	1,121,133,523 €	100.0 %

Source: ADELE – Monitoring Database. Reporting date = annual report for the funding year 2010, own calculations.

Question:

Are there differences according to sex with regard to participation in projects with minor funding (compare footnote 2 above)?

Answer:

Yes, a significant difference exists: Although the numbers vary among the topics addressed, well over half – 56.7 percent – of the participants in projects with minor funding were women.

Table 7: Projects and participation according to sex: Projects with minor and major funding

	Number of projects	Number of participants	Men	Women
All	13,852	890,626	54.9 %	45.1%
Projects with major funding	13,075	602,088	60.4 %	39.6 %
Projects with minor funding	777	288,538	43.3 %	56.7%

Source: ADELE – Monitoring Database. Reporting date = annual report for the funding year 2010, own calculations.

This also affects the resource allocation and per-capita costs: Disregarding the projects with minor funding, the proportion of female participants in comparison to the total average sinks to only 39.6 percent, and their corresponding fraction of spending is 42.2 percent. The per-capita costs then add up to 1,946 Euros.

The Code-69 projects without participants are in large part projects with minor funding. From the total of 323 projects funded here, only 24 receive major funding.

Question:

Are there differences according to sex among the different age groups with regard to participation rates and the allocation of resources?

Answer:

In accordance with ESF practice,⁷ three (variously-sized) age groups were defined and monitored:

- young people, defined as 15- to 24-year-old participants,
- older people, defined as 55- to 64-year-old participants,
- and all other ages, whereby it is assumed that in this group the majority of people are between 25 and 54 years old.

Age-related data was not collected from all participants (590,897 from a total of 890,626 recorded participants, or 66.3 percent). In addition to this limitation in the informative value of the data, it should also be taken into account that the age ranges defined under this classification scheme are very unequal and that the groups under examination are correspondingly unequal in size.

⁷ Compare Annex XXIII ESF-VO.

Table 8: Distribution according to sex and age category (all participants for whom sex and age category were recorded)

	Number of participants	Age 15-24 years	Age 55-64 years	Other age category
Total	590,897	161,883	36,878	392,136
Men	60.5 %	55.1 %	67.0 %	62.1 %
Women	39.5 %	44.9 %	33.0 %	37.9 %
Total	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %

Source: ADELE – Monitoring Database. Reporting date = annual report for the funding year 2010, own calculations.

This table shows not only that more men than women are represented in the total average, but also in all analysed age groups. Within the group of men, however-- and in contrast to the tendency among the women-- the older age groups are represented more than average. Among the women, on the other hand, it is the younger women who are represented in greater numbers than the rest.

With regard to the statistics for sex and age, for only 550,199 participants were statistics regarding costs collected; that is, for 61.8 percent of the total number of participants. Of this group, 61.7 percent were men, upon whom 57.9 percent of the funds were spent.

An inspection of the spending structure shows that within the group of 15- to 24-year-olds, women participated more than women of other ages, a fact that is not reflected, however, in the spending data. Young men are underrepresented in terms of participation rates, yet they received a disproportionately large percentage of the funds. Among the 55- to 64-year-olds, women are underrepresented in comparison to women of other age categories, yet they receive a disproportionately large per-capita amount of spending. Men of this age group are correspondingly overrepresented, and the ratio of participants to spending deviates here downwards. Within the other age groups, these deviations are less pronounced.

Question:

Are there differences according to sex with regard to the educational level of the participants (in accordance with ISCED) and also to the allocation of resources?

Answer:

Data concerning educational level in accordance with ISCED was not collected from all participants (see projects with minor funding): From a total of 890,626 recorded participants, data was collected for only 460,604, that is 51.7 percent of the participants analysed in ADELE. Additionally, data concerning costs on a project basis are also available for only 426,648 cases, or 47.9 percent of all participants. The corresponding subset of participants is therefore not congruent with the previous subset analysed according to age category, which is also reflected in the variations with regard to the basic division of participants according to sex. It should also be taken into account that the proportion of participants having “no degree” is astoundingly large. It should be investigated as to whether mistakes in coding took place, and the results presented here should be considered with these reservations in mind.

Table 9: All participants with recorded sex and educational level

	Number of participants	No degree	ISCED 1, ISCED 2	ISCED 3	ISCED 4	ISCED 5, ISCED 6
Total	460,604	42,923	168,402	164,817	14,020	70,442
Men	63.5 %	55.2 %	66.4 %	65.3 %	49.9 %	60.1 %
Women	36.5 %	44.8 %	33.6 %	34.7 %	50.1 %	39.9 %
Total	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %

Source: ADELE – Monitoring Database. Reporting date = annual report for the funding year 2010, own calculations.

Taking into account that the available numbers are limited in their informative value, the following conclusions can be reached: Among men, the low and mid-level degrees are proportionately overrepresented in comparison to the total percentage of men, among the women this is true particularly among the higher (above all ISCED 4) educational levels: In this overall sparsely represented educational group, women account for almost half of all participants. Also in the group of participants without any degree are women overrepresented in comparison to their total percentage.

With regard to the group for whom data concerning educational level as well as project-related spending allocation is available, the following picture emerges: Overall, the underrepresented group of women was allotted a somewhat larger proportion of spending. With regard to the relation of participants and costs, the biggest difference occurs in the large group of ISCED 3. Within this group, 56.3 percent of the funds were distributed among the two-thirds of participants who were male, whereas the one-third of participants who were female received over ten percentage points more funding.

4 CONCLUSION

The target value defined by the Operational Programme was not met by 2010. The final result of 43.7 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 42.6 percent. If all measures explicitly addressing gender equality are taken into full account, the budget allocated to women rises to 44.9 percent.

If the second largest programme in terms of financial volume (QualiKug) with a very low participation rate for women (14.5 percent) is not taken into account in the analysis, the budget-share allocated to women rises to 45.9 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 four percent under the average emerged for women – the costs for men were 3.2 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 five times more funds than the twelve 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.

Barely a third of all participants (32.4 percent) were involved in projects with minor funding. Within this group, the disproportionately high representation of women (56.7 percent) is striking. This also has an influence on the analysis according to age and educational level: Since these features are not recorded for projects with minor funding -- where the percentage of women is particularly high-- an analysis of the social characteristics of ‘age’ and ‘sex’ detects a disproportionately small number of women. Bearing these reservations in mind, the following results are of interest:

Where data for sex and age were collected (66.3 percent of participants), women were even more underrepresented than in the general analyses of sex and participation rates, due to their

dominance in projects with minor funding. Differences within the gender groups are also in evidence here: Among men, young men are particularly underrepresented and men in the 55- to 64-year-old age group are overrepresented, in comparison to the total percentage of men. Among women, young women are overrepresented and the age group of 55- to 64-year-olds is underrepresented.

Where data related to costs is available as well as data on sex and age (61.8 percent of participants), women in the 55- to 64-year-old age group are markedly less present; however, in comparison to the men in this age group, they receive significantly higher per-capita spending.

With regard to educational level, the data survey is even spottier due to the projects with minor funding. Data on the characteristics of 'sex' and 'educational level' were gathered for only 51.7 percent of all participants, and for only 47.9 percent of the participants were data on the characteristics of 'sex,' 'educational level,' and 'spending' available. Keeping these restrictions in mind, the following results are of interest:

Women are generally more weakly represented here as well (see projects with minor funding). Within their gender group, men are overrepresented at the low- and mid-levels of education. Within their group, women are particularly present among those with high levels of education (above all ISCED 4) and among those without any degree.

Where sex and educational level as well as the distribution of spending could be analysed, spending for the women who were funding recipients (just under 35 percent) was more than 6 percentage points higher. In contrast, the men received more than 6 percentage points less spending. Here it should also be remembered that these statements can only encompass the projects with major funding, which affects the results.

Table 10: Important changes in the 2010 analysis in comparison with 2009

Analysis	2009	2010	Change
Percentage of funding allocated to women or to equality-oriented measures (computed to be 2/3)	41.4 %	43.7%	+2.3
Percentage of funding allocated to women (with participants)	39.7 %	42.6 %	+2.9
Compensation code 69 without participants	+1.7 %	+1.1%	-0.6
Percentage of code 69 of the total volume	6.2 %	5.2 %	-1.0
Average per-capita costs (project-focused) for women in comparison to the total average	-2.0 %	-4.0 %	-2.0
Average per-capita costs (project-focused) for men in comparison to the total average	+1.4 %	+3.2 %	+1.8

Source: ADELE – Monitoring Database. Reporting date = annual report for the funding year 2010, own calculations.

While the total funding percentage approached the OP goal of a 50 percent allocation for women, it becomes apparent here that the percentage of equality-oriented programmes declined and the differences in per-capita costs increased. This last point has to do with the QualiKug programme, which plays a significant role here.

Recommendations

In the report for the funding year 2009, the agency had already submitted recommendations with regard to:

- a) controlling and
- b) an equality-oriented regulation of the operational programme.

These will be included here when relevant.

The following recommendations are admittedly addressed to a diverse audience of actors. These include, first of all, those involved in the direction of single programmes (Chapter 4.1), and second of all, those who are responsible for the technical implementation and controlling (Chapter 4.2), as well as those who are involved in the direction of ESF-OP in general and with the preparation of the new funding period from 2014 onward (Chapter 4.3).

4.1 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROGRAMME OFFICERS

With regard to the OP level, the target mark for Gender Budgeting is a 50-percent funding distribution for participation-based and equality-oriented development plans in support of women. This goal cannot be directly and completely transferred onto each single programme. Nevertheless, the results of the existing report show that, given the state of current allocations, this target mark can be reached by the end of the funding period only with concentrated effort. Programmes with a high funding volume and disproportionately low participation of women should be called on in particular to strengthen their activities geared toward equality between men and women (compare especially Chapter 2.3). Even when no fundamentally new change of course, for example in the changing of guidelines, is expected for the rest of the current funding period, programme officers can, for instance, prompt responsible entities to request that agencies make stronger and more specific appeals to or outreach efforts towards the target groups, or that they address the topic of equality between men and women in reports insofar as the guidelines allow. In support of these activities, the Agency for Equality in the ESF prepared guidelines for the programme and project level, which contain incentives for an equality orientation for the entire controlling cycle. The programme evaluation can -- if it is a constant companion to the programme in its work -- provide incentives for a stronger equality orientation.

At the present time, the Agency for Equality in the ESF is preparing a working tool for the formulation of professionally-oriented goals and target values for programmes.

Within limits, other programme-related analyses on the topics of sex- and funding-distribution that go beyond the results examined here can be made available. If programme officers wish for more information, they can refer to the Agency for Equality in the ESF.

4.2 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MONITORING FROM 2014 ONWARDS

Chapter 1.2 highlighted the uncertainties which currently delineate the boundaries of the present analysis: These are in essence determined by the pre-assemblage of sufficient legally required, project-based data on participants within the framework of the funding period 2007-2013. In the view of the Agency for Equality in the ESF, however, it would be advisable in the funding period 2014-2020 to strive for an even more exact mapping of the actual participation of women and men, that is to say, the creation of prerequisites for a precise analysis of participation independent of the legal requirements.

This applies, on the one hand, to the survey of expenses with a focus on participation: In programmes in which no uniform, all-inclusive per person expenditure exists, the per-person expenditures can differ widely -- when, for example, only per-person spending caps are defined but are also regularly exceeded. In the current practice, when these excess expenditures betray an undisclosed gender bias, this automatically leads to an unquantifiable distortion of the real picture. The same is true when projects develop a more complex inner structure that leads to different opportunities/modules being offered to female and male participants, and the actual use/availment of these possibilities (and the linked costs) demonstrates a gender bias.

This pertains as well to a more exact survey of or exchange of actual participation times (time spent in projects) to the central controlling; that is, first and foremost the availability of dates of entry and withdrawal in connection with the individual outcome of the funding (including early dropouts) and in combination with special target group characteristics.

In the light of the present discussion surrounding the conditions and future reporting requirements for the funding period 2014ff, it would seem that such a step toward improved surveying would be advisable. In addition, the data must in any case be compiled in the general system (at least by the project agency) in order to be transferred further -- if only in aggregated form. Thus, in the view of the Agency for Equality in the ESF, it is less a matter of increasing the complexity of monitoring and more a matter of increasing its "grade of efficacy," hence improving the use of the existing information to its full potential.

Both possibilities for improvement named here are to be regarded as independent from each other and would also separately lead to more exact results and alternatives for improved controlling.

The high percentage of projects with minor funding makes the gender budgeting analysis more difficult, in particular for questions that require combining or intersecting multiple characteristics of participants in order to formulate an answer. As only reduced information requirements exist for projects with minor funding and data on important characteristics are thus not gathered, but above all because projects with minor funding display a pronounced gender bias, the scope of such analyses, for example of age and/or educational level in combination with sex, is markedly reduced. In light of the new funding period, therefore, it would be advisable to consider how the criteria for projects with minor funding should be set and how the associated information loss can be limited or partially compensated. The view of the Agency for Equality in the ESF is that, even when it makes sense to define the limits for projects with minor funding in order to keep the administrative and documentation overhead within appropriate limits, a third of all participants involved in projects with minor funding in combination with a marked gender bias, leads to a fragmentary picture of funding, (not only) from a gender perspective.

4.3 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR EQUALITY ORIENTED MONITORING

The ESF-OP as a whole offers a range of controlling alternatives that can be used to close in on the target value of a 50 percent funding distribution for women or equality-oriented initiatives. The last report outlined five alternatives for monitoring for the current funding period. Due to the advanced funding period, these are now only partially realizable. However, it still remains that for programmes currently in progress, the funding administrators or departments can provide more specific directives to those responsible for equality-oriented monitoring and controlling within the programme (see also Chapter 4.1). A good example is the Programme BIWAQ: Here, Gender Budgeting was introduced into the programme during the process of guideline revisions.

The entrepreneurship Programmes “Entrepreneurial Coaching in Germany” (BMWi) and “EXIST Scholarship for Entrepreneurs” still have potential for improvement. Both Programmes have a high funding volume and serve a disproportionately low number of female entrepreneurs.

With a view to the planning of the new funding period, we suggest:

Gender Budgeting has proved itself as an instrument for equality-oriented monitoring and should be retained. Despite all existing limitations, the disparities in funding for women and men could be detected and made transparent, thus indicating how equality-oriented funding allocation should be (re-)directed toward the agreed-upon goal. Drawing upon the insights that Gender Budgeting provided with regard to the current funding period, and that also hold true for the last funding periods (compare Meseke 2004), planning should take three points first and foremost into account:

- a) **Dual approaches to Gender Budgeting:** The compensatory effect of this plan that is geared toward equality and equal opportunity must up until now be described as minimal, and its impact is at this time even diminishing. In order to validate equality as a worthy goal in the ESF, we suggest a double strategy for Gender Budgeting: First, it continues to be useful to set an umbrella target value for all programmes. In terms of its content, this value should be determined by the priorities set in the new funding cycles. Thus, for example, when there is a focus on poverty reduction, it should also be taken into consideration that women are disproportionately affected by poverty in old age. A target value of 50 percent would hardly do justice to this problem. On the other hand, when entrepreneurship is prioritized, a target value of 50 percent would be exaggerated, as the engagement of women and men in entrepreneurship is dissimilar. The target value must therefore be tailored to the direction in which the new ESF is headed and must not necessarily consistently stay at 50 percent. At the same time, however, a minimal volume for equality-oriented initiatives should be set. The results show that, although a total of one-fourth of the programmes have initiatives coded as Code-69 that receive funding, the financial volume is comparatively insignificant. This means that in the programme portfolio of the future ESF-OP, a predetermined percentage of programmes should be selected that explicitly address equality, with regard not only to the number of programmes but also to their financial endowment. Here the goal could be to commit 10 percent of the OP funding. In this way, the total target value for gender budgeting can be reinforced.
- b) **Equality-Oriented Programme Portfolio:** The gender-budgeting analysis clearly showed that when well-funded programmes with a high percentage of men are established, attaining the target value becomes difficult. A balanced mix should be planned from the beginning.

The total portfolio of programmes should be chosen so that it is possible to balance out the numbers. Funding sectors geared toward male-dominated topics will continue to exist. It is necessary counteract the development of a one-sided dominance.

- c) Gender Mainstreaming in programmes: In the planning and implementation of the new ESF-OP, equality questions specific to the funding topic and target group should play a role from the beginning. This is true, for instance, when priorities for the programme content are set, when equality goals in guidelines are being formulated, and when the next steps in the implementation process of individual programmes are being determined (compare Pimminger 2009/2011). Guidance with regard to the EU equality goals can be found in, for example, the “Strategy for the Equality of Women and Men 2010-2015” and the European Pact for the Equality of the Sexes.

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 2010 4

Table 3: Gender budget analysis exclusively considering programmes with participants 2009 and 2010 5

Table 4: Gender budgeting analysis excluding the programme “QualiKug” 2009 and 2010..... 5

Table 5: Percentage of expenditures for women and men according to groups of programmes and their financial volumes7

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

Table 7: Projects and participation according to sex: Projects with minor and major funding 8

Table 8: Distribution according to sex and age category (all participants for whom sex and age category were recorded) 9

Table 9: All participants with recorded sex and educational level.....10

Table 10: Important changes in the 2010 analysis in comparison with 2009 12

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	EXIST-Gründerstipendium	68	399	893	133	760	14.9 %	25,493,131	4,089,399	21,403,733	16.0 %
2	Gründercoaching bei Gründungen aus Arbeitslosigkeit	68	221	15,662	6,620	9,042	42.3 %	215,822,869	91,042,052	124,780,817	42.2 %
3	Gründercoaching in Deutschland	68	210	9,230	3,075	6,155	33.3 %	47,069,431	15,601,130	31,468,301	33.1 %
4	Informations- und Schulungsveranstaltung	68	12	86,593	36,389	50,204	42.0 %	17,660,840	7,367,688	10,293,152	41.7 %
5	Programme "rückenwind": Personalentwicklung in der Sozialwirtschaft	62	40	3,454	2,569	885	74.4 %	5,564,927	4,274,372	1,290,554	76.8 %
6	Programme "weiter bilden": Förderung der beruflichen Weiterbildung von Beschäftigten	62	2	97	25	72	25.8 %	154,462	46,476	107,986	30.1 %
7	Qualifizierungsangebote für Bezieher von Kurzarbeitergeld (QualiKug)	64	179	165,427	23,929	141,498	14.5 %	117,838,039	17,121,752	100,716,287	14.5 %
8	Qualifizierungsangebote für Bezieher von Transferkurzarbeitergeld (QualiKug Transfer)	64	161	25,028	7,876	17,152	31.5 %	68,947,759	20,455,080	48,492,679	29.7 %
9	Akademikerprogramm (AKP)	73	2	205	119	86	58.0 %	1,468,015	870,107	597,908	59.3 %
10	Bildungsprämie	73	3	12,091	8,999	3,092	74.4 %	3,389,501	2,529,529	859,972	74.6 %
11	Neue Medien in der beruflichen Bildung	72	3	7,425	7,221	204	97.3 %	4,464,541	4,334,872	129,669	97.1 %
12	Aktionsprogramm Kindertagespflege	69	5	117	108	9	92.3 %	55,063	51,616	3,447	93.7 %

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	Aktionsprogramm Mehrgenerationenhäuser	69	195	100,188	62,897	37,291	62.8 %	7,225,435	4,584,706	2,640,729	63.5 %
14	Bundesinitiative zur Gleichstellung von Frauen in der Wirtschaft	69	12	394	343	51	87.1 %	585,494	546,723	38,771	93.4 %
15	Bundesprogramm Kommunal-Kombi	71	7,638	15,659	7,913	7,746	50.5 %	298,672,738	153,950,381	144,722,357	51.5 %
16	ESF-Bundesprogramm zur arbeitsmarktlichen Unterstützung für Bleibeberechtigte und Flüchtlinge mit Zugang zum Arbeitsmarkt	70	43	14,949	6,531	8,418	43.7 %	27,843,562	11,926,699	15,916,863	42.8 %
17	Freiwilligendienste machen kompetent	71	12	413	253	160	61.3 %	2,292,223	1,296,196	996,027	56.5 %
18	Innovative Einzelprojekte BMAS Prio. C	70	1	3,846	1,154	2,692	30.0 %	619,237	185,802	433,435	30.0 %
19	Kompetenzagenturen	71	550	76,531	37,110	39,421	48.5 %	58,175,616	27,713,401	30,462,215	47.6 %
20	Modellprogramm Perspektive Wiedereinstieg	69	22	4,029	4,029	0	100.0 %	6,487,063	6,487,063	0	100.0 %
21	Pluspunkt Erfahrung: Ein Gewinn für alle	71	7	1,839	1,627	212	88.5 %	321,087	271,616	49,471	84.6 %
22	Schulverweigerung - Die 2. Chance	71	457	17,843	6,735	11,108	37.7 %	41,646,580	15,584,226	26,062,354	37.4 %
23	Soziale Stadt - Bildung, Wirtschaft, Arbeit im Quartier (BIWAQ)	71	117	19,890	9,739	10,151	49.0 %	26,289,683	11,687,839	14,601,845	44.5 %
24	STÄRKEN vor Ort (ehem. LOS)	71	469	124,835	72,955	51,880	58.4 %	15,974,742	9,602,657	6,372,085	60.1 %
25	Stärkung der berufsbezogenen Sprachkompetenz für Personen mit Migrationshintergrund	70	366	7,958	4,685	3,273	58.9 %	14,661,255	8,540,781	6,120,474	58.3 %

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
26	Unternehmen Familie - Innovationen durch familienunterstützende Dienstleistungen	69	4	140	134	6	95.7%	338,712	316,607	22,106	93.5%
27	XENOS - Integration und Vielfalt	71	247	72,560	34,162	38,398	47.1%	70,922,042	34,650,009	36,272,032	48.9%
28	XENOS-Sonderprogramm - Ausstieg zum Einstieg	71	16	855	337	518	39.4%	2,216,887	674,178	1,542,708	30.4%
29	Zukunft sucht Idee: Ideenwettbewerb "Gute Arbeit für Alleinerziehende"	69	64	8,265	8,017	248	97.0%	9,320,411	9,028,250	292,162	96.9%
30	Berufsbildung ohne Grenzen: Betriebliche Mobilitätsberatung	73	34	33,393	12,658	20,735	37.9%	3,008,850	1,209,479	1,799,371	40.2%
31	IDA - Integration durch Austausch	73	70	5,044	2,217	2,827	44.0%	26,084,807	11,408,217	14,676,590	43.7%
32	Praxis - Transnationale Qualifizierungsmaßnahmen mit Praktika in Frankreich zur Förderung der Aufnahme einer Beschäftigung"	73	8	78	55	23	70.5%	518,522	358,431	160,091	69.1%
	Sum/ mean value		11,569	834,931	370,614	464,317	44.4%	1,121,133,523	477,807,332	643,326,190	42.6%

Source: ADELE – Monitoring Database. Reporting date = annual report for the funding year 2010, own calculations.

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, January 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