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Introduction

The aim of this paper is to examine how women have been included in the Lomé Convention and the consequences for the success of development projects and for the sustainability of development in general. I will analyse whether women specifically have been targeted (women in development - WID) or whether the different roles and needs of women and men stemming from their different position in society, in the economy and in the household have been incorporated into policy and implementation (gender and development - GAD) (Moser 1993: 15; Østergaard 1992a: 6).

Before we examine the EU's approach to women/gender and development, we need first to identify the principal approaches which have been used by various aid organisations to incorporate women into development. The four main approaches are the welfare approach, the equity approach, the anti-poverty approach; and the efficiency approach. The welfare approach focused on women "in their gendered roles as wives and mothers" and was "primarily concerned with their family's welfare" (Moser 1993: 59). The equity approach purported that women suffered not because of their subordination to men, but because of poverty in itself (Moser 1993: 66). Here the aim should therefore be to increase women's income through better access to productive resources (Cleves Mosse 1993: 156; Moser 1993: 66) "the emphasis thus shifts from reducing inequality between men and women, to reducing income inequality" (Moser 1993: 67). The focus on the poorest sections of society continued through the anti-poverty approach, which aimed to meet 'basic' and social needs. Women's productive and family welfare roles were targeted (Moser 1993: 67; Cleves Mosse 1993: 156). The efficiency approach also focuses on women's productive role, and aims to increase women's economic participation (Moser 1993: 56-57).
For the EU in particular "the approach to women in development in the Convention has developed from ignorance on the subject (Lomé II) to an approach that mostly emphasised women's importance in the sociocultural dimension (Lomé III). The approach in Lomé IV underlines women's important contribution to economic development and the necessity therefore that they actively participate in development programmes" (CEC 1990a: 23).

We see that the current EU's approach is predominantly the equity approach, to improve productivity and women's income earning potential. "The equity aspect must remain central when the long-term objective is to support a sustainable development in which social, cultural and economic progress are interlinked" (CEC 1990a: 2; Lomé IV, article 153 (a)). Yet, as Moser highlights (Moser 1993: 63) this approach focuses on the market economy: "priority should be given to improving women's productivity and income earning potential and to allowing women more choice in their own lives" (CEC 1990a: 1).

The concentration on increasing income "will enable women not only to improve their own living standards but to contribute more to economic performance, poverty reduction, and family welfare. It will also help to slow population growth, and improve the use of land, forest, and water resources" (CEC 1990a: 1). Several observations can be made from this statement. Firstly, the welfare approach is also followed - highlighting the woman's role in family welfare and population growth. Secondly, the efficiency approach is suggested by the reliance on women's labour to improve the environment. This also implies recognition of the role women undertake in the community. Therefore, we have a positive element of the EU policy in that by incorporating several elements of WID, all women's roles are to some extent recognised "those donor agencies that have sought to fashion a coherent policy approach and have met with the greatest success have chosen various elements of the five policy models and then allowed their overall approach to develop pragmatically over time in response to perceived needs and changing perceptions" (Andersen 1992: 175).

However, the importance and overlap of these multiple roles is not recognised. The roles which women fulfil are important in the already significant contribution these make to production in the economy. They are important in the amount of constraint they impose on women through the hours of input into production and non-production activities, paid and non-paid activities. These obligations are increasing with current policies and this impact and limit on participation should be explicitly recognised. Without such recognition, it will be assumed that women can 'contribute more'.

Similar constraints act to limit the income-generating policies which the EU assumes will assist women. The distribution of income at a household level is not equal, but distributed according to gender and therefore increased resources may "not necessarily be transformed into greater power and control over budgetary allocations" (Young 1992: 153). Similarly, in certain cases where women's income increased through the focus of aid on their activities, men 'commandeered' such activities (Brydon and Chant 1989: 112). The EU's policy, through its concentration on the equity approach, ignores barriers to the effectiveness of its implementation.

It can be seen, therefore, that two considerations must be made explicit in policy.
1. The complexity of women's roles: women have an increasing burden, as each of their three roles has expanded; therefore, their time constraints and the overlap between these roles must be recognised. Moreover, the overlap between their roles in the informal and formal sectors must be made explicit.

2. Gendered distribution of income: resources are used for different needs by different recipients and not necessarily pooled for the general benefit of household members.

(see Moser 1993: 15).

Chapter one examines whether these considerations can be identified in EU policy.

CHAPTER ONE: EU DEVELOPMENT POLICY

1. Policy considerations

1.1. Complexity of roles

In the introduction we saw that the EU's policy seemed to recognise women's multiple roles. However, further examination illustrates that the policy does not adequately reflect gender roles and needs.

In the work programme for the Lomé Convention it is acknowledged that "women already contribute far more to the economy than is usually recognised" and that "their productivity and earning capability are especially constrained by gender-related difficulties that limit their access to information, resources, and markets" (1990a: 2). These propositions would appear to recognise the problems women face in relation to economic activity. However, the proposed solution points to a different analysis.

Three measures are proposed: the introduction of top-down legislation to improve productivity and opportunities; investment in agricultural extension, credit and technology; expansion of education, nutrition, family planning services and other basic healthcare (CEC 1990a: 2, 4). These would suggest that the "gender-related difficulties" are temporary, and can be overcome by measures to improve human resources "investments in women as part of the human capital have a high pay-off" (CEC 1991a: 17 and see CEC 1991b, article 150; article 229 (o)). This relates to the argument that women are in an inferior position because of their different education levels compared to men (Dex 1985: 121-124). What effect would this approach have in addressing gender difficulties?

Implicit assumptions about women's economic role will reduce the effectiveness of the first two measures. These assumptions relate to the male breadwinner model in the identification of the main producer and of the household head. An evaluation of EU policy (CEC 1990b) identified a distinct male bias in projects (Male bias of development policies is identified by several writers, but most notably Elson 1995; Moser 1993: 71; Senapaty 1994); "the agricultural extension services are traditionally
used to dealing with men, and discontinue their visits if the male head of the household is away" (CEC 1990b: 13). Treatment of female-household heads (FHH) in guidelines issued since this evaluation point to the maintenance of this bias and thereby the male breadwinner assumption - where a male household head is defined as the norm. The glossary of basic concepts (CEC 1993a: 103-105) defines FHH as "households in which adult males are present (due to divorce, separation, migration, non-marriage, widowhood). Households in which men, although present, do not contribute to the household income (due to illness, alcoholism, drug addiction, etc.)." (CEC 1993a: 103, emphasis added). Women's economic contribution to the household received similar treatment in the guidelines of 1991. Here FHH are highlighted, not for associated gender-related difficulties, but to stress the need to target these households in the fight against poverty "The FHHs are disproportionately represented among the very poor, the lack of resources being the very reason for the departure of men. Data on the prevalence of FHHs are required if our operation is to reach the poor" (CEC 1991a: 70). Yet, female headed households are an increasing phenomenon in Sub-Saharan Africa (Whitehead and Bloom 1992: 51). They should not be regarded as an exception and gender-related needs should be targeted. By reducing gender issues to market imperfections, rather than recognising these as a deeper structural characteristic of the economy, the effectiveness of these two measures is reduced.

The final measure seems to concentrate on improving women's productivity through increasing their skill and health levels. Yet, this ignores women's immobility owing to the constraints of their multiple roles and in particular their reproductive role "education cannot address issues of child care and domestic work" (Benería and Sen 1988: 371). This suggestion also fails to recognise the unemployment rate for those with high levels of education in LDCs (Benería and Sen 1988: 371). Therefore, although the EU incorporates several WID approaches, we can see that the goal of equity continues to be emphasised. This is supported by evidence from the evaluation that "the roles and needs of women and the constraints on their participation were not taken into account" (CEC 1990b: 17).

1.1.2 Women's role as principal producer

With reference to the Lomé Convention (CEC 1991b) we can see that although it is proposed that "women already contribute far more to the economy than is usually recognised" (1990a: 2), the key role of women in food security is not acknowledged. This is all the more surprising since food security figures in a separate section with agricultural co-operation and rural development. This highlights two characteristics of this section of the Lomé Convention. One, when women are referred to, it is mainly regarding measures related to equity. For example, "the active participation of the rural population, both men and women ... and integrating producers, men and women, more effectively into national and international economic activity" (article 42.) Two, that where equity measures are not concerned, neither is gender. In other words, women are ignored in general articles on improving production. The main concern is to guarantee women benefits from the development process, not to acknowledge their contribution to development (Article 13) (CEC 1990b: 111). This concern is echoed in further references in the Convention to women which reinforces the traditional view of women as passive recipients of development (Articles 143, 144, 155). Yet, despite the emphasis on women receiving benefits, the continuation of assumptions
means that "project interventions have increased the income of the male farmers considerably...No real changes in responsibility for family subsistence have occurred. Women's own income has not increased" (CEC 1990b: 15).

The barriers to gender equity are thus ignored, the objective is emphasised whilst the process by which gender inequality has occurred is not mentioned. This is evident in the proposal to integrate women into the national economy. Firstly, the significance of their current role is not acknowledged. Article 159 (o) of the Lomé IV Convention suggests "expanding their economic and social roles" whilst their roles as community managers are not specifically mentioned in the sections where their roles are relevant, for example conservation of natural resources. This is all the more evident since a protocol was added on the sustainable management of forest resources when the Convention was revised in November 1995, which does not make any mention of women (CEC 1996). Secondly, the constraints on their productive role - an increase in their other roles through gender blind policies and a reduction in access to factors of production - are also ignored.

If we turn now to look at general measures to improve production, we see that although women are significant in agricultural production, they are not explicitly recognised as such. This omission is the more evident since they are mentioned as producers in other articles. Two effects result from this: one, this may lead readers to conclude that unless specific mention is made of women, agricultural producers are men (Dex 1985: 47-48; Pahl 1988a). Two, if attention is focused on the measures to improve productivity in agriculture, the gendered division of labour and distribution of resources will be ignored. If we take a specific example, we can examine how a gender differentiated impact may result from a gender blind measure. In article 44, it is suggested that cultivation techniques be modernised and better use made of factors of production. However, gendered production and ownership patterns are at work in both measures. Since the male also owns the productive resources (for example, plough, hoe (Haugeraud 1984: 192)) and pays for productive resources (Saito 1994: 19), then any change in cultivation technique will invariably be decided upon by the male. However, the woman actively participates in production (Benería and Sen 1988: 357; Moser 1993: 33; Hyma and Nyamwange 1993: 39), and therefore she will be the one who bears the burden of implementing the change. Similarly, making better use of factors of production implies improving allocative efficiency - i.e. using factors of production in their most productive use and this in turn assumes a mobile distribution of factors. However, the woman, responsible largely for food production for the family, does not have equal access to factors of production and cannot necessarily determine use of the factor which is usually controlled by the male (Saito 1994: 19). Therefore, factors of production, as well as labour cannot be easily reallocated. In addition, incentives to reallocate factors of production may not lead to increased family production, but to increased factors of production concentrated on agricultural production for the paid sector (Pahl 1988b: 351). This would reduce factors available for food production, including labour, and thereby decrease food security. This negative impact is evident in the Machakos Integrated Development Programme which aimed to increase agricultural production in Kenya (CEC 1990b: 33). For example, a plan to increase production was formulated which required "an extra labour input of some 50 and 85 man-days per year. The models assume that the extra labour will come from the household's own resources. In the project area, where labour migration is high and casual labour is either not available or too expensive, this
means that the extra labour input must be provided by women" (CEC 1990b: 34). Yet, the possibility of a reallocation of labour may be limited since women's productive role is already significant, through their other roles, and/or if they were the producers in this sector.

Despite the crucial role of gender differentiation in agricultural production, this factor is not made explicit in the Convention. This is not simply because the Convention is in vague terms. If we look at the Title on the environment, we see that specific action can be agreed. Articles 35 and Article 37 (Title I, part 2) both suggest measures which would be equally viable for gender - impact and viability assessment of a project, as well as a trans-sectoral approach to take into account the indirect consequences. The latter approach would be particularly enlightening of the link between sectors of the economy where there is a gendered division of labour; for example, labour availability in the cash crop sector and the effect of this for the subsistence sector. This would contribute to the recognition of the overlap of women's production roles and to viable plans to increase production: "the bypassing of women cannot but hamper the effectiveness of the project, not only because of the growing inequality between men and women, but also because of the inefficient use of women's important contribution to agricultural production and productivity to family subsistence" (CEC 1990b: 16).

1.2 Recent measures

Guidelines introduced since the Convention and since the initial work programme must be analysed in order to examine whether any changes have occurred.

The guidelines, aimed at helping general policy makers to incorporate gender, were issued in 1991 (CEC 1991a) in response to the questions raised as to effectiveness of development policy in the evaluation of projects (CEC 1990b). These guidelines were updated in 1993 (CEC 1993a). Both are separate from the main project assessments; this would indicate that gender is to some degree marginalised. This indication tends to be confirmed by further considerations. Firstly, although article 287 of Lomé IV stipulates that gender is one element to be taken into account in project/programme appraisal (CEC 1991a: 39), projects which make no reference to gender can still be accepted; "it is theoretically possible for a project to be rejected on grounds of gender-blindness... But it hasn't happened yet" (Macdonald 1995: 18). Secondly, the Commission does not yet seem to have information available on the percentage of projects to which these guidelines are applicable (CEC 1995a: 50-51), nor plans to prepare for an evaluation: "an evaluation will not be useful until projects identified and designed under these procedures have acquired some degree of implementation on the ground, and this will take at least three years from the identification stage" (CEC 1995a: 51). The lack of evaluation from the Commission will mean the adoption of new guidelines will depend more on pressure from other sources, for example, the European Parliament or certain member states (see chapter two). Moreover, key documents reviewing EU's development policy namely the Mid-Term Review (MTR) of Lomé IV, revision of the Lomé Convention (CEC 1996), the financial review (CEC 1995b) review of EU-ACP co-operation (CEC 1994a), the work programme of the Commission (CEC 1995c), presented opportunities to promote the implementation of projects from a gender perspective. However, reference to gender in all documents is either limited (review of co-operation),
unchanged (revised Lomé Convention) or non-existent (MTR, work programme, financial review). "The MTR debate, both at the governmental level in both the EU and the ACP...is almost entirely ungendered. In the Joint Assembly Working Party on the MTR, gender 'almost came up', in the context of 'incentive envelopes'..., but was then dropped and apparently sank without trace" (Macdonald 1995: 34). The review of EU-ACP co-operation refers to the integration of women under management constraints, arguing that this measure slows down the implementation of aid (CEC 1994a: 32). The only other reference to women is related to health and the spread of AIDS (CEC 1994a: 14). In addition, the trend of 70% of National Indicative Programmes which did not contain any reference to gender will take some time to reverse (CEC 1991a: 27). This puts the guidelines into context, and in particular reduces the relevance of measures introduced in 1993 such as the checklist for gender sensitivity (1993a: 92-93) and the Gender/WID impact assessment form (1993a: 97-99).

An examination of the guidelines indicates that the complexity of women's roles and the gender division of labour and of control of resources is not adequately incorporated. The guidelines do appear to heed the queries raised by the evaluation, but by concentrating on equity issues, the gender gap will tend to widen.

"It must be realised, however, that mentioning women in formats and manuals is no guarantee for their integration in projects. Neither are standard checklists the solution, as every situation is different and the checklists are only useful if used flexibly by people who are familiar with the subject. The training of WID staff and the consultation of the WID Desk or the involvement of external WID experts in the different phases of the project cycle are more important measures to accomplish the implementation of the WID policy" (CEC 1990b: 116).

The WID Desk and WID strategy will be examined in the next chapter in order to evaluate these elements of WID policy - training and involvement of WID experts. The focus will be to try to establish possible impediments to the expansion of these elements. Attention will also be paid to identifying the entry points for influencing development policy and WID policy in particular. The focus will be on the member states who have been key actors in shaping general development policy.

**CHAPTER TWO. EUROPEAN DEVELOPMENT POLICY: INFLUENCES AND ASSESSMENT**

This chapter sets out to examine reasons why gender blindness continues. Are there specific obstacles which would prevent the incorporation of gender into development policy (technical problems) or is there a lack of political will which serves to marginalise gender issues (Evans 1992) (Moser 1993: 114)?

In order to look at possible constraints on incorporating gender we need to look at inputs into policy making, examining first where and how policy is made. I will not analyse the ACP countries' policies since the bargaining power and influence of ACP states is currently low (Grilli 1993: 37). In addition, the WID consultant tends to be provided by the EU (CEC 1991a: 28). Therefore, although provisions are laid out for joint appraisal of projects to incorporate gender (CEC 1991a: 27), I would argue that
the Commission is more responsible for a lack of integration. Since the Commission is the principal source of legislation (CEC 1990c), the first section will therefore look specifically at the incorporation thus far of gender in development in this organisation, by outlining budget details, the role of departments in the organisation and the implementation of policy. This will serve to locate the position of departments dealing with gender issues within the organisation and to highlight the obstacles to the incorporation of gender. The European Parliament's influence through the positive pressure they exert to introduce gender into development will also be discussed.

Member states' development policies will be examined in the second section in order to establish what policies are likely to form the basis of consensus. Certain countries have traditionally exercised more influence in development policy at a European level, and particular attention will therefore be paid to their policy. Those countries for whom gender is a significant element of their national development policy would be expected to contribute to the gendering of EU development policy, and their potential influence will therefore need to be surveyed.

2.1 The Commission

The Lomé Convention is in the remit of DGVIII (Macdonald 1995: 8). In this directorate responsibility for incorporation of women in development lies with the Women in Development (WID) desk (in DGVIII/A) (Macdonald 1995: 9). Its location in the policy division would seemingly assist in gendering development policy. However, "the policy unit has no direct role in implementing co-operation" (Macdonald 1995: 9). The role of the unit is to advise and discuss (Macdonald 1995: 9; CEC 1993b: 2).

However, if we compare the WID desk in DGVIII with that of DGI, we see that the location of the WID desk does impact on the integration of gender into policy. The WID desk in DGI reports directly to the Director General (Macdonald 1995: 15). This facilitates input into decision-making, for example "compulsory gender training was established simply by a letter from the Director-General" (Macdonald 1995: 15). The lack of incorporation of women in Lomé IV could therefore stem from the placement of the WID desk of DGVIII, since this would reduce its influence at policy level. However, the combined strategy of the two desks should offset this to a large extent.

Further comparisons with other organisations' attempts to integrate gender are also useful in evaluating the EU's progress. Efforts to introduce gender into aid organisations, were particularly widespread during the UN Decade of Women 1975-85 (Moser 1993: 111). This corresponds to the introduction of the EU's desk in DGVIII in 1982 (CEC 1994b), but points to a somewhat belated introduction of the second in DGI in 1990 (Macdonald 1995: 14). However, this latter delay may be related more to policy on the geographical area than to the importance of gender issues (DGI deals with Asia, Latin America countries (Macdonald 1995: 11; ODA 1992: 5). The method of integrating gender differed between organisations; for example Oxfam had a specific department, whilst Christian Aid followed a 'mainstreaming' approach (Moser 1993: 115-118). It has been suggested that the method employed depends on organisational structure (Moser 1993: 115-6; Anderson and Chen 1988 in Moser 1993: 116). If the organisation is relatively large, with field offices, and/or a tradition of conflict politics, a separate unit to integrate gender tends
to be established. By contrast, a mainstreaming approach will tend to be employed by relatively smaller organisations accustomed to consensus decision-making. The EU then does not appear to be significantly different in this respect to other organisations. Another reason for the EU establishing a separate desk within the Commission, which poses a problem for mainstreamed organisations, is the need for identifiable personnel to report to international monitoring bodies, such as the OECD's DAC (CEC 1994b; Moser 1993: 117-118).

Alternatively, this could imply that gender is seen as a marginal issue and is not considered sufficiently important to mainstream. We need to look at further details of the integration of women to enable us to judge the commitment to WID/GAD - in particular, staff numbers, budget, the existence of project guidelines and training, and work programme.

Firstly, the separate budget line for WID/GAD, which was introduced principally at the instigation of the European Parliament, would support the view that a separate desk would be a result of marginalisation (Macdonald 1995). Further evidence stems from the size of the budget, 2 million ECU (Macdonald 1995) compared to the total budget of Lomé of 12000 million ECU (CEC 1990d: 1). This indicates the principal role of the European Parliament (EP) in exerting the pressure to gender policy. However, this role is limited by the EP's limited power as an institution and time constraints which prevent a consistent approach to promote gender (Macdonald 1995: 25).

Moser (1993) argues that staff size is perhaps more indicative of the importance assigned to gender issues since budgets can vary according to whether the agency implements policy (Moser 1993: 125). In 1990, the average number of OECD WID Units with full-time employees was 2.4 (excluding the US) (Moser 1993: 126) which is described as "universally pathetic" (Moser 1993: 125). In the Commission, staff numbers are inferior to even this low level, each desk has one full-time staff member to implement all measures (Macdonald 1995: 10, 14). Evidently, consultants can be employed for various aspects (Macdonald 1995), but this would lead to lack of internal coherence.

The work programme outlines the implementation and aims of the policy. This will help to identify the scope for the units to promote gender. As we have seen (chapter one) project guidelines and training influence the effectiveness of policy. The existence of these elements would indicate that there is implementation of policy and not simply rhetoric and that an attempt has been made to enable staff to incorporate gender (Moser 1993: 122-3). However, the methodology used by the Commission may hamper these efforts (see appendix A). Their 'rational comprehensive' planning methodology has been criticised (Moser 1993: 85) for its lack of relevance to the structure of the country at which the project is aimed. "The separation of the context of planning from the context in which it is located results in the separation of facts from values" (Moser 1993: 86). Adding gender into such a framework poses two problems. One problem is "the assumption that gender is simply another neutral component (Moser 1993: 86). The second problem is that "the planning methodology and the institutional arrangements they utilise may be inappropriate for incorporating gender" (Moser 1993: 86) since entry points are limited (Macdonald 1993: 105). It would appear that the planning methodology used acts as an important technical constraint
on the adequate incorporation of gender. However, additional measures to overcome
this technical issue can be effective (Moser 1993: 171). This would imply that there is
another explanation for an inadequate incorporation of gender. This view is supported
by an examination of other aspects of policy implementation.

The role of the WID units is "to ensure the full integration of women, both as agents
and beneficiaries, into the mainstream of development actions throughout all phases
of programme preparation, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation" (CEC
1993b: 1). This is translated into practice through "an overall strategy ... to increase
the capability of development staff within the EC to deal with WID issues in their
daily work" (CEC 1993b: 1). This strategy consists of sensitising staff through
training, technical support to delegations, country studies and publications (CEC
1993b; Macdonald 1995: 10). However, certain reservations must be made in order to
illustrate the potential of these measures. Firstly, training was instigated in 1992, and
involves the use of a manual on integrating women into development (CEC 1991a) as
a basis for case-studies (CEC 1993b). However, the effectiveness of this training is
doubtful, since the duration is severely limited (one day of gender training for DGI
staff (Macdonald 1995: 50)). This will have implications for project implementation
since "it is felt that ... written instructions should be complemented with regular staff-
training sessions, because without adequate knowledge of WID, country and sector
guidelines cannot be applied correctly" (CEC 1990a: 6). More training would also
have a positive impact since staff would gain a better understanding as to why gender
should be an integral part of development policy.

Secondly, technical assistance to delegates can be considered. This consists of a WID
consultant screening EDF projects and providing advice on how to improve the
countries are covered. This is usually at the request of those drafting the National
Indicative Programme, in the case where staff or financial constraints prevent gender
being incorporated by themselves, finance is available for the employ of a short-term
WID consultant (CEC 1991a: 28). However, the significance of technical assistance
may be undermined since gender integration does not appear to be a necessary
criterion for finance (Macdonald 1995: 18 and see chapter one). The country studies
would seem to be a positive measure in promoting recognition of women's roles, since
they contain information on socio-cultural and economic roles of women in ACP
countries (CEC 1993b: 4). Yet, only 11 studies had been produced by 1993, and
further studies depended on finance (CEC 1993b: 4). Similar trends are evident in
measures to publicise policy (Macdonald 1995: 10) and in evaluations of policy; the
latter would indicate that there is a commitment to make the incorporation of gender
effective. However, evaluations are not common; one was produced in 1990 (CEC
1990b), the next is planned before the end of this century (CEC 1995a).

One factor which appears to underlie the reservations regarding the activities of the
WID desk is that all activities have been constrained; training is limited, coverage of
countries for technical assistance and profiles is not complete, the number of regular
publications has fallen. Finance could be one limitation; the other is staffing levels.
The limits to finance and staff would imply lack of political will, and this will be
examined in the section on member states.

2.2 Member states' policies
In examining the influence of member states' policies we need to try to establish various categories. The first category consists of those countries who have a strong national development policy, either by way of a high contribution as a percentage of GDP or by way of the monetary value of their contribution owing to a high level of GDP. The second is those whose support for European level aid is significant; indicated either by tradition and/or by high contributions to EU level aid. Finally, we need to examine those countries for whom gender is a priority issue.

2.2.1. High contribution to aid

Figure 2.1 shows the percentage of GNP that countries contribute to aid (both bilateral and multilateral contributions). The countries are ranked by their contributions in 1993-1994. Two trends can be observed. Firstly, Denmark, Sweden, the Netherlands and France contribute a higher proportion than the average to aid (0.45 for member state countries in 1994, 0.47 for all countries). Secondly, for member countries there is a trend towards convergence of contributions to aid as a proportion of GNP. The contributions of Portugal, Spain and Ireland have increased since membership. 1. Luxembourg and Italy's contribution have also increased since 1973, yet since they were two of the original six signatories of the Treaty of Rome, there would appear to be another explanation for this increase; for example, the formalisation of the European Political Cooperation structure (EPC) and the subsequent need for Luxembourg to participate in this process (Lorenz 1983: 159).

However, owing to the size of the countries' GNPs, only France and the Netherlands among this first group of countries also figure among those countries who make a significant contribution to total aid (figure 2.2). This figure also shows how other countries (United Kingdom, Germany and Italy), through the relative size of their GNPs, could influence EU development policy. This trend is translated into contributions to EU aid (table 2.1). The level of contributions are reflected in the
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weighted votes of each representative on the EDF committee. The qualified majority of 133 evidently requires the support of two of Germany, France, or the United Kingdom. Hewitt and Stevens (1981: 44) argue that support for aid at an EU level can also be ascertained by looking at the proportion of contracts gained according to the member state. The United Kingdom, Germany and Spain, receive a smaller proportion of contracts compared to their proportion of aid to the EDF. A "plausible case has been made that the UK's low share of contracts derives from a low degree of interest among contractors who have been too preoccupied with rich pickings in the Middle East and elsewhere" (Hewitt and Stevens 1981: 44). A similar explanation may underlie Germany's reduction in contracts gained, since companies' attention may have shifted focus to the restructuring being undertaken in the former Eastern Germany.

Table 2.1 Member states (ranked by percentage share of EU aid)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Aid as % of all EU aid (EDF VII)</th>
<th>Weighted votes on the EDF committee</th>
<th>Contracts gained (as proportion of all contracts won by member states)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>25.96</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>24.37</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>26.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>16.37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>12.96</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Danish 2.07 5 2.18
Portugal 0.88 3 3.2
Ireland 0.35 2 0.9
Luxembourg 0.19 1 0.69

1. The EDF committee acts by a qualified majority of 133 votes, expressing a vote in favour by at least 6 member states.


Therefore, of those who have a strong national policy in terms of GNP to aid (Denmark, Sweden, Netherlands and France) and in terms of contribution to total aid (France, Germany, United Kingdom, Italy, Netherlands and Spain), and also contribute significant levels to EU aid (Germany, France, United Kingdom, Italy, Spain and the Netherlands), only the Netherlands and France figure in all three categories. Germany, the United Kingdom and Italy may also be expected to be influential in EU policy by way of their high relative levels of GNP and/or their votes on the EDF committee. The absence of these three countries in the first category (GNP to aid) could signify that aid is not a political priority, or is examined in absolute rather than percentage terms. The absence of Germany and the UK in the number of contracts could also signify different regional priorities to those of the EU (see table 2.2). The foreign policy of these main actors will be discussed below in order to evaluate the influence of countries in EU development policy.

2.2.2. Development policies of key actors

The EU’s development policy has been largely French influenced. Firstly, it began with a French initiative to associate its colonial territories and départements with the EC (Grilli 1993: 2; Harrop 1992: 242; Hewitt 1981: 23). This was accepted by opposing member states, Germany and the Netherlands, in the context of European integration rather than specific support (Grilli 1993: 8). In addition, Dutch and German aid programmes post-war were relatively small "and their importance in shaping overall trends within the Community was quite limited" (Grilli 1993: 60; de Schoutheete 1986: 170). When their contributions did increase "solidarity with other EC partners contributed to making the allocations of their bilateral aid more in tune with those of the rest of the Community" (Grilli 1993: 60). Secondly, French influence continued, through the dominance of French nationals as commissioners in the Commission until 1985 (Grilli 1993: 87, n; Hewitt and Stevens 1981: 33).

Thus, the Netherlands did not appear to hold great sway at an EU policy level, but along with Danish influence later increased its leverage to a certain extent (Grilli 1993: 68). Portugal and Ireland who had relatively small aid programmes before membership appear to have followed the line of other EU member states (see table 2.2). Grilli (1993: 68) argues that this influence is evident in the move of most countries’ aid programmes to support Africa as a priority. The priority of Africa, would also indicate that the influence of DGI was inferior to that of DGVIII.

*Table 2.2 Africa as a priority ranked by figures for 1993-94.*
### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>87.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>37.7 *</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>36.1 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>30.1 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>19.5 *</td>
<td>13.6 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>22.5 *</td>
<td>12.0 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEC</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Africa not a priority
E 1988-94 57.2%, 60.4% to Latin America
UK 1983-84 40.4% to South/Central Asia
I 1993-94, 38% to Middle East, North Africa and Southern Europe
D 1993-94, 31.1% to Middle East, North Africa and Southern Europe
A 1983-94, 63.3%, 45.7%, 63.3% to Middle East, North Africa and Southern Europe

This would impact on WID since DGI's WID desk is better situated to influence the policy of its Directorate, than is DGVIII's (see section 2.1).

#### 2.2.3. Development policies of key actors at European level

This would support the view that France is significant in shaping development policy along with support from Italy (Mishalan et al. 1981: 72). However, the United Kingdom and Germany appear to have different priorities and this has to some extent impacted on their contribution to policy-making. Their influence may however heighten with the current focus on efficiency and effectiveness "We need to identify where we can work together more closely to increase the effectiveness of our programmes" (ODA 1992: 4). Similar concern has been expressed in Germany (OECD 1995a: 35); and Denmark and Finland regarding the implementation of aid (Svendsenik 1983: 183-186; Harsted and Sifverbez 1995: 2). Yet in Denmark the debate is whether to shift aid resources away from EU level policy to a more efficient use. For example, some Danish aid priorities were better met in other donor organisations. However, since contributions are on an incomes-tested basis (OECD 1995a), Denmark may be expected to concentrate its efforts on improving the effectiveness of EU aid.

#### 2.3. Gender and development policies.
We saw specified in the section above those countries who either had a strong development policy or who - by way of their GNP- had a high relative contribution to EU aid. Which of these countries also had incorporated gender into this policy (see table 2.3)?

**Table 2.3 WID policies of member states (ranked by staff numbers)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Policy guidelines</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Project Guidelines</th>
<th>Plan of Action</th>
<th>Steering committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DK 5+</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y all and national progs.</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK 4</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1986 ('78/82)</td>
<td>Y all</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 2+</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1987 ('85)</td>
<td>Y comprehensive</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 1</td>
<td>1988 ('85)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y gender impact obligatory</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 1.5</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRL 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 0.5</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>in preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Budget $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NL Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Mainstream</td>
<td>Special prog.s and technical</td>
<td>28% / 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Special Unit</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Y</td>
<td>30% of all ODA staff</td>
<td>Mainstream</td>
<td>Economic and Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I in preparation</td>
<td>1990 ('87)</td>
<td></td>
<td>DG for development cooperation</td>
<td>24 b lire (1991-93)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Women, family, youth issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Special Unit</td>
<td>Sectoral and thematic studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRL N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mainstream</td>
<td>Social development</td>
<td>Audit and Evaluation Unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F N</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1983)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Y</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Commission for Equality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women's</td>
<td>Ministry of</td>
<td>1 m (S)7.6 m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The same criteria of judgement will be used as for the EU's WID policy; budget, staff, project implementation and, in addition, introduction of project guidelines. Further considerations of the commitment of member states are evident in comparison with those outlined above for the Commission.

Firstly, the budget is important since "within organisations different parts compete for budget allocations. Consequently, the size of the budget has come to exemplify the organisations' perception of the importance of the work of the WID Unit" (Moser 1993: 124).

Secondly, the date of introduction of policy guidelines, paralleling the establishment of one of the WID desks in the Commission (see above), is significant since it would indicate whether the policy was proactive or reactive to UN conference declarations and how quick reactions were. The introduction of most policy guidelines after or shortly preceding the end of the UN decade for women would appear not to be coincidental.

Three countries meet more of these criteria than others: the Netherlands, Denmark and the United Kingdom. Specific elements of their policies should be examined in order to highlight their commitment. For all these countries women in development is one of four priority areas. 2. All three countries identify gender as a cross-cutting issue (OECD 1994b: 19; OECD 1995b: 17; OECD 1994c: 38). Both the Netherlands and Denmark support a participatory approach. The Netherlands finances a local WID fund ($4 million in 1993) to enable embassies to finance small-scale WID activities without referring to the national ministry (OECD 1994b: 29). A case-study of the Danish programme identified "a grass-roots, participatory approach, [with] long-term commitment, and shared donor-recipient responsibility for input and management" (OECD 1995b: 75). This approach aims "to take account of the needs of women [farmers]" (OECD 1995b: 44).

However, evaluations of the programmes for the UK and Denmark would suggest that incorporation of WID across sectors is incomplete. The UK does not appear to have successfully translated their policies into practical project assistance "in a recent survey one third of projects which mentioned women were found to have a potentially negative impact on women" (NAWO 1993: 9). It is argued that this stems from the lack of a gender analysis in large-scale infrastructure projects (NAWO 1993: 9). A similar result was found in Denmark where "the intentions and ideas of the plan of action have not yet penetrated into the project planning and administration procedures in the agriculture and health sectors" (Ministry of Foreign Affairs 1994: 75). One positive element of the Danish approach was "the practice of including socio-economists [which] ... has proved useful in connection with considerations of gender issues" (Ministry of Foreign Affairs 1994: 75).

2.4 Implications for gendering EU development policy
The first section identified that the underlying constraint to gendering development policy was political. This is confirmed in the second section on member states' policies. Of those states who have strong aid programmes at both a national and EU level - France, Italy, Belgium and Germany - none have significant gender policies. Germany and the United Kingdom, who have potential influence, do not appear to exercise that leverage as often (Cooper 1995). Those countries represented in the roles as development commissioners in the EU do not have an established gender policy (Spain and Portugal). Owing to the size of their aid programmes, Ireland, Luxembourg and Greece would not be expected to influence policy either. Those countries who do have a strong gender policy, the Netherlands, and Denmark would therefore find it difficult to gender European level policy. However, as attention is focused on the efficiency and effectiveness of EU aid, opportunity may arise for coalition pressure; for example, with the UK or Germany. Denmark's input thus far is positive. They have provided technical assistance and training for EU staff and projects (Danida 1993: 20). They have also "actively promoted women and women's issues in the Council of Development Ministers and at expert meetings organised by the Commission" (Danida 1993: 20). The aim is "to make gender a central analytical concept in EU's development activities and to apply a WID perspective to the overall development policies of the Community" (Danida 1993: 20).

Another influence on gendering policy is the recent emphasis on co-ordination supported by certain member states in the name of efficiency, and also by the Commission (CEC 1995e). However, the member states who have a strong emphasis on gender and efficiency may not be those who are influential in shaping development policy. It is to be hoped that there will be a levelling-up of gender policies by way of closer co-operation. The recent UN conference is likely to be a positive influence in this area (UN 1995; ODA 1995).

CONCLUSIONS

The European Union, by the assumptions they employ as to the working of the economy in less developed countries, ignores persistent obstacles to growth in these countries, in particular with regard to the distribution of benefits or costs and to the mobility of factors of production. Yet, the sexual division of labour, gendered income distribution and access to resources work to constrain one group of the population and the distribution of benefits to them.

The first of these constraints is rendered less visible by way of assumptions as to women's role and by policy focus on the paid economy. The male breadwinner model promotes the idea of women as dependent on male contributions to household income. Women's production work is also less visible than that of men's since it is women who are principally responsible for subsistence agriculture. This sector does not tend to be a target of development aid, and when it is, the male breadwinner model works to target males even if their participation in subsistence agriculture is minimal. Where women's work is visible - in the paid economy - it is not evident that their receipt of benefits and of productive resources is not commensurate with their contribution to production. The constraints on women's contribution from the obligations of the informal sector and from their other roles in the community and production are not made explicit, and their workload is increased. Therefore, the distribution of income to those who contribute to income is severely limited by the
invisibility of this contribution through assumptions employed. Yet, "women are so important to African agriculture that initiatives to raise the sector's productivity cannot afford to ignore them" (Saito 1994: vii). The neglect of women has a two-fold effect on production. Firstly, incentives to increase production may not be as effective. Secondly, production in the subsistence sector is adversely effected. "Despite large injections of funds into rural development projects, nothing had really changed in terms of nutritional balance or food security. Yields stagnated and even regressed" (CEC 1990e: 9).

However, incorporation of gender into the project cycle of the EU has thus far been inadequate. Two technical constraints were identified - the location of the WID desk and the methodology used. Both constraints can be overcome but whether they will be depends on whether erroneous assumptions about women's role and about the functioning of the economy are discarded.

"the problem with the array of guidelines, checklists and methodological tools that have been formulated has less to do with their technical qualities and shortcomings than with the conceptual frameworks, and paradigms, within which they are situated and by which they are constrained" (Antrobus 1989: 5, quoted in Moser 1993: 155).

Further characteristics of the EU's WID policy also point to another reason for their limited progress: the lack of staff and finance imply that the reason for lack of integration lies more with political priorities. This is supported by a review of member states policies, in particular those who are influential in shaping development policy; this suggests that in general gender is not a priority issue. The co-ordination of member states policies will hopefully lead to a levelling-up of WID policy, for example a mainstream approach which would promote a cross-sectoral analysis and thereby make more explicit the complexity of women's roles.
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