

CLASSIFICATION OF OFFICIAL DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE (ODA) PROJECTS ACCORDING TO GENDER-RESPONSIVENESS

Republic Act (RA) 7192 or the Women in Development and Nation-Building Act mandates the National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA) to monitor the amount of official development assistance (ODA) resources allocated for gender-responsive programs and projects. RA 7192 is supportive of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), which was adopted in 1979 by the UN General Assembly and defines the commitment of the states to end discrimination against women in all forms. Likewise, the Philippines is committed to the Millennium Declaration which includes the promotion of gender equality and women empowerment as MDG Goal 3. Gender equality is integral to the achievement of the MDGs.

In keeping with these mandates, NEDA prepares an annual report on the gender-responsiveness of ODA-assisted programs and projects using the Harmonized Gender and Development Guidelines (HGDG) for Project Development, Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation as a tool. For the past four years, NEDA, in coordination with the ODA-GAD Network, has been tracking the level of ODA allotted for women's concerns based on inputs from the donor agencies. This is the second year that gender and development perspective is incorporated in the ODA Portfolio Review, with inputs from implementing agencies using the classification presented in the Harmonized GAD Guidelines. Under these guidelines, projects can be classified as: D or GAD is invisible in the project if score is 0-3.9; C or Project has promising GAD prospects if score is 4 to 7.9; B or Project is gender-sensitive if score is 8 to 14.9; and, A or Project is gender-responsive if score is 15 to 20.

As in the previous year, the implementing agencies (IAs) were requested to provide information on the gender-responsiveness of their projects using templates that are based on the Harmonized GAD Guidelines. They were asked to fill out Table 10 (Classification of ODA Projects by Gender-Responsiveness) using Box 7 (Summary Assessment of Proposed Projects) of the Guidelines as basis. The assessment focuses on completed and ongoing projects in 2009.

Only 15 out of 30 implementing agencies (50%) responded to the request. This is a 6 percent increase from the 2008 reporting (17 out of 39 agencies). These agencies were the following: Department of Education (DepEd), Development Bank of the Philippines (DBP), ARMM Regional Government, Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD), North Luzon Railway Corporation (NLRC), Department of Public Works and Highways (DPWH), Land Bank of the Philippines (LBP), Supreme Court (SC), National Power Corporation (NPC), Department of Agriculture (DA), Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR), Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR), National Irrigation Authority (NIA), Department of Trade and Industry (DTI) and Department of Health.

In consolidating these inputs, all allocations were expressed in US dollars. The average annual exchange rates for 2008 were applied to convert Philippine Pesos, Euros, and Australian dollars into US dollars (1 PhP = US\$ 0.020996; 1 Euro = US\$ 1.393895; 1 Au\$ = US\$ 0.791381).

Table 1. Classification by Gender-Responsiveness (PD)

ITEM	No. of Projects	Amount (in million US\$)	%
Percent of total portfolio budget adjudged to be			
• Gender-responsive	20	997.127	32.02
• Gender-sensitive	15	586.150	18.82
• With promising GAD prospects	13	570.447	18.32
• GAD invisible in the project(s)	14	960.593	30.84
TOTAL	62	3,114.317	100

A total of 67 projects were reported by the implementing agencies, however, five (5) of these projects do not have information on the GAD rating and assessment. Therefore, at the project design stage, the report covers 62 programs/projects with a total ODA allocations amounting to US\$ 3.1 billion. This is only 30 percent of the total 209 projects (106 loans, 103 selected grants), and 29 percent of the total ODA allocations amounting to US\$10.747 billion, reviewed by NEDA in the ODA Portfolio Review. However, the figures presented show an improvement from last year's reporting. It is noted that only 40 projects were assessed in 2008, covering only about US\$ 2.7 billion ODA allocations.

Based on the submission of the 15 implementing agencies (Table 1), about 51 percent of their ODA portfolio reported support projects that were designed to be gender responsive/sensitive. Meanwhile, about 18 percent went to projects with promising GAD prospects. However, 31 percent of these ODA-funded projects were 'GAD invisible', or with no gender issues or concerns identified in the project design.

Table 2 generally shows that the agriculture, agrarian reform and natural resources sector had the most number of projects reported (24 out of 62 projects) at about 39 percent. It also had the largest ODA allocation, which amounted to about US\$1.5 billion (50%). This is followed by the infrastructure development sector, which had around 16 percent share in the total ODA allocation, with 10 projects out of 62 (16%).

Table 2. Classification of Projects, by GAD category *

(Amounts are in million US dollars)

Development Sector	Gender Responsive	Gender Sensitive	With Promising GAD Prospects	GAD Invisible	Total
1. Agriculture, Agrarian Reform and Natural Resources	\$730.113 (46.5) (10 projects)	\$93.823 (6.0) (4 projects)	\$211.688 (13.5) (4 projects)	\$534.443 (34.0) (6 projects)	\$1,570.067 (100) (24 projects)
2. Governance and Institutional Development	9.671 (2.8) (3 projects)	24.4 (7.1) (1 project)	--	308.168 (90.0) (3 projects)	342.239 (100) (7 projects)
3. Infrastructure Development	--	96.769 (20.0) (1 project)	269.056 (55.7) (5 projects)	117.282 (24.3) (4 projects)	483.107 (100) (10 projects)
4. Social Reform and Development	195.873 (42.8) (6 projects)	262.098 (57.2) (7 projects)	--	--	457.971 (100) (13 projects)

Development Sector	Gender Responsive	Gender Sensitive	With Promising GAD Prospects	GAD Invisible	Total
5. Industry and Services	--	9.06 (19.8) (1 project)	35.911 (78.6) (3 projects)	0.70 (1.5) (1 project)	45.671 (100) (5 projects)
6. Integrated Sector (multi-sectoral)	61.470 (28.6) (1 project)	100 (46.5) (1 project)	53.792 (25.0) (1 project)	--	215.262 (100.0) (3 projects)
Total	\$997.127 (32.1) (20 projects)	\$586.150 (11.2) (15 projects)	\$570.446 (29.6) (13 projects)	\$960.593 (27.1) (14 projects)	\$3,114.317 (100) (62 projects)

* The italicized entries in the parentheses refer to the percentage of allocation for each sector by GAD category to the total ODA for the sector.

In terms of classification by gender-responsiveness, of the projects subjected to gender assessment, the agriculture, agrarian reform and natural resources sector was the most gender-responsive sector as it comprised 47 percent of the total reported ODA allocation going to gender-responsive projects. On the other hand, the social reform and development sector was the most gender-sensitive, with 57 percent of the total reported ODA allocation going to gender-sensitive projects. In contrast, the industry and services sector had the most ODA allocation going to projects with promising GAD prospects, at 79 percent. Lastly, the governance and institutional development sector had the most projects that were classified as GAD-invisible, at 90 percent.

Table 3. Classification by Gender-Responsiveness (PIMME)

ITEM	No. of Projects	Amount (in million US\$)	%
Percent of total portfolio budget adjudged to be			
• Gender-responsive	18	829.350	26.33
• Gender-sensitive	21	1,254.156	39.81
• With promising GAD prospects	8	750.442	23.82
• GAD invisible in the project(s)	7	316.091	10.03
TOTAL	55	3,150.039	100

At the project implementation, management, monitoring and evaluation (PIMME) stage, or simply, implementation, a total of 55 projects were assessed by the implementing agencies. The decrease in the number of projects reported is due to lack of rating at the implementation stage. Table 3 shows that about 61 percent of their ODA portfolio reported support projects that were gender responsive/sensitive at implementation. Meanwhile, about 24 percent went to projects with promising GAD prospects, and 10 percent of these ODA-funded projects were 'GAD invisible', or with no gender issues or concerns identified in the project design.

Table 4. Classification of Projects, by GAD category **(Amounts are in million US dollars)*

Development Sector	Gender Responsive	Gender Sensitive	With Promising GAD Prospects	GAD Invisible	Total
1. Agriculture, Agrarian Reform and Natural Resources	\$567.215 (37.1) (9 projects)	\$730.927 (47.8) (12 projects)	\$8.377 (0.5) (1 project)	\$223.817 (14.6) (2 projects)	\$1,530.336 (100) (24 projects)
2. Governance and Institutional Development	4.792 (15.6) (2 projects)	24.4 (79.3) (1 project)	--	1.574 (5.1) (1 project)	30.766 (100) (4 projects)
3. Infrastructure Development	--	132.781 (15.2) (2 project)	650.415 (74.5) (3 projects)	90.00 (10.3) (3 projects)	873.196 (100) (8 projects)
4. Social Reform and Development	195.873 (42.8) (6 projects)	256.988 (56.1) (4 projects)	5.048 (1.1) (2 projects)	--	457.909 (100) (12 projects)
5. Industry and Services	--	9.06 (21.3) (1 project)	32.810 (77.1) (1 project)	0.70 (1.6) (1 project)	42.57 (100) (3 projects)
6. Integrated Sector (multi-sectoral)	61.470 (28.6) (1 project)	100.00 (46.5) (1 project)	53.792 (25.0) (1 project)	--	215.262 (100.0) (3 projects)
Total	\$829.350 (26.3) (18 projects)	\$1,254.156 (39.8) (21 projects)	\$750.442 (23.8) (8 projects)	\$316.091 (10.0) (7 projects)	\$3,150.039 (100) (54 projects)

* The italicized entries in the parentheses refer to the percentage of allocation for each sector by GAD category to the total ODA for the sector.

On the other hand, Table 4 generally shows that the agriculture, agrarian reform and natural resources sector had the most number of projects reported (24 out of 54 projects) at about 44 percent. It also had the largest ODA allocation, which amounted to about US\$1.5 billion (49%). This is followed by the infrastructure development sector, which had around 28 percent share in the total ODA allocation, with 8 projects out of 54 (15%).

Looking closely at the figures, it is observed that there was a sudden increase of projects classified as gender sensitive, from project entry to implementation stages. These projects are mostly under the agriculture, agrarian reform and natural resources sector, which increased from 4 projects at design stage to 12 projects at implementation. Most of these projects are those implemented by the NIA and DPWH, where rating at implementation stage improved.

In the agriculture, agrarian reform and natural resources sector, gender-responsive/sensitive projects in this sector addressed, among others, issues on women's access and control over resources/services which reinforces barriers to participation and decision making capacities of men and women, women's involvement in farming activities and their lack of livelihood opportunities in the rural areas, access to credit facilities, and access to public services such as health and education. Women had reduced burden in fetching water which resulted in their having more time for productive/economic activities, studying, attendance to training activities, and recreation.

In the governance and institutional development sector, gender-responsive/sensitive projects in this sector addressed, among others, the participation of both men and women in project implementation in their localities, issues on women's access to judicial services, access of resources, and access to information/ knowledge.

In the social reform and development sector, gender issues identified by the projects include limited gender training/orientation of project staffs, lack of gender indicators in the project logical framework that resulted to non-inclusion of gender data in the reports, This was addressed through the inclusion of capability building programs such as gender-sensitivity training and enhancement of project monitoring tools in order to generate gender-related data. Another issue identified is the need for protection policies and observance of non-discriminatory practices for persons with HIV/AIDS, which the project addressed by incorporating policies for the protection of women and children with HIV/AIDS. Another issue identified is on reproductive health/safe motherhood, complementary feeding and breastfeeding promotion initiatives that often neglect men during community-based health education and promotion activities. This was addressed through social marketing and health education and promotion interventions that have considered men as target clientele.

Lastly, most of the infrastructure development and governance/institutional projects had designs that were classified as GAD invisible. Based on the agencies' submission, gender analysis has not been a component in some programs/projects, and gender issues/concerns were not identified and incorporated into project preparation and implementation. Objectives/goals were expressed in general terms. In some projects, especially in the hiring and training of staffs, agencies often cite as a reason the indifferences or non-bias personnel qualifications hiring, as well as competence-based qualifications in attendance to training.

In terms of the agencies' assessment on the gender-responsiveness of their projects, it is noteworthy to mention the improvement in the compliance of implementing agencies in providing their inputs. Likewise, the improvement in the quality of assessment, particularly in identifying gender issues of their respective projects shows that there were staffs who were aware and can identify GAD. However, there were still a few submissions that showed inconsistencies in classifying projects, as projects with "no gender issues identified" were still classified as gender-responsive/sensitive. This was the same observation in the 2008 reporting. The same was observed in projects adjudged as GAD invisible, where agencies view gender as "not applicable". An identified reason for such inconsistencies in the interpretation, rating and analysis of projects is the evaluating staffs' different levels of skills and understanding on gender and development as well as on the use of the Harmonized GAD Guidelines. Given the results of this monitoring activity, agencies are still faced with the challenge to enhance the gender awareness and sensitivity, as well as the skills of the project staffs and implementing agencies on gender analysis in order to effectively accomplish the GAD forms, particularly Table 10.