



Kosovo Women's Network

Serving, Protecting and Promoting the Rights of Women and Girls

POLICY BRIEF

HOW WELL HAS THE EU IMPLEMENTED THE GENDER ACTION PLAN II IN WESTERN BALKANS PROGRAMMING?

An analysis of Instrument for Pre-Accession II programming in 2014-2019 based on EU Gender Action Plan II indicators

By Sara Nicole Baxley, Nicole Farnsworth, and Valmira Rashiti for the Kosovo Women's Network¹

INTRODUCTION

Gender equality is a fundamental value of the European Union (EU).² The EU has committed to furthering gender equality through its Gender Action Plan II ([GAP II](#)).³ As a Staff Working Document, GAP II was not legally binding. Meanwhile, the Common Implementing Regulation for financing external action⁴ was largely gender blind, having few concrete requirements for gender analysis and mainstreaming in EU programming. Therefore, amid preparations for GAP III and new regulations for EU external financing, such as the Instrument for Pre-Accession (IPA) III and the Neighbourhood, Development and International Cooperation Instrument, this brief sought to assess the extent to which GAP II has contributed to mainstreaming gender in EU programming in the Western Balkans (WB) under IPA II. Conducted in May 2020, this analysis by the Kosovo Women's Network (KWN) involved a review of all 240 IPA II Action Documents (ADs) available [online](#) to assess the extent to which they had implemented GAP II in programme design, based on GAP II indicators. This brief's sections are organised by GAP II indicators. Conclusions in reference to each indicator are boldfaced.

FINDINGS

Use Gender Analysis to Inform All Actions

According to GAP II, all ADs should contain gender analysis.⁵ The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) also requires gender analysis for assigning the correct gender

¹ The research and writing of this brief was financed by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) and the Kvinna till Kvinna Foundation.

² Article 1 of the Treaty of Lisbon, Amending the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty Establishing the European Community, 2007; and Article 8 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.

³ "Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment: Transforming the Lives of Girls and Women through EU External Relations 2016-2020".

⁴ No. 236/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council "laying down common rules and procedures for the implementation of the Union's instruments for financing external action", 2014.

⁵ Activity 4.1. "Inform all actions, whatever aid modalities (e.g. budget support), with strong and rigorous gender analysis that is reflected in the final programme implementation". Here, by gender analysis, the authors refer to the inclusion of gender analysis in the document itself and/or mention of any gender analysis conducted. It was beyond the scope of this research to verify whether in fact a separate gender analysis had been conducted for each sector.

marker. A shortcoming of the European Commission’s annual GAP II reporting process has been that it has not required reporting on all actions, but only on actions already contributing to gender equality. This has led to inaccurate information regarding the extent to which the EU has used gender analysis to “inform all actions”. KWN’s analysis found that **only 6% of IPA II ADs included sufficient gender analysis**.⁶ An additional 23% contained some, albeit weak, gender analysis.⁷ By country, more ADs in Kosovo (44%) included at least some gender analysis, followed by Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) (33%), Albania (32%), North Macedonia (NM) (16%), Serbia (15%), and Montenegro (11%) (see Table 1). Only in Albania and Kosovo could some improvements be observed over time since GAP II’s adoption in 2015. **These findings suggest that the EU’s commitment to ensuring that gender analysis informs programming has not been institutionalised in the WB, but rather ad hoc.**

Table 1. Percentage of IPA II ADs Containing Sufficient (“S”) or Partial (“P”) Gender Analysis, by Country																
Year	Albania N=25		BiH N=46		Kosovo N=55		Montenegro N=27		NM N=19		Serbia N=41		Cross-border N=27		Total N=240	
	S	P	S	P	S	P	S	P	S	P	S	P	S	P	S	P
2014	0	20	8	15	6	22	6	0	0	17	0	43	0	40	4	20
2015	20	20	0	33	0	43	25	0	0	0	0	14	0	38	5	25
2016	0	25	11	33	17	50	0	0	33	0	10	0	0	0	10	20
2017	0	50	17	17	0	45	0	25	25	0	0	0	0	0	6	24
2018	0	40	17	17	0	56	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	43	5	29
2019 ⁸	-	-	-	-	0	50	-	-	-	-	20	0	0	0	11	22
Total	4	28	11	22	4	40	7	4	11	5	5	10	0	37	6	23

Very few ADs had interventions that responded to inequalities identified in gender analyses. Only 12% of all IPA II interventions partially (8%) or fully (3%) responded to gender analysis findings.⁹ Of the ADs that contained any gender analysis, 41% addressed gender inequalities identified in the gender analysis within the action (29% with partial and 12% with strong gender analyses).

Ensure Consultations Inform Programme Design

GAP II foresees that the EU will consult with National Gender Equality Mechanisms (NGEMs) and civil society, particularly women’s rights civil society organisations (WCSOs) in designing programmes.¹⁰ Such information may not be explicitly stated in ADs, and indeed ADs contained little evidence that NGEMs and WCSOs were involved in designing IPA II programmes. **Roughly 5% of all IPA II ADs contained any evidence of consultations with WCSOs and NGEMs to inform AD design.**¹¹ The EU Office in Kosovo seems to have held slightly more consultations with WCSOs and NGEMs than

⁶ KWN defined “sufficient” (S) gender analysis to include: describing the current situation in the sector from a gender perspective, including sex-disaggregated data, identifying notable gender inequalities in the sector, stating the relevant legal framework pertaining to gender equality in that sector, identifying key challenges to furthering gender equality, and noting relevant stakeholders. When insufficient gender analysis exists, the AD should identify the need for such data and plan for its collection in the inception phase, if not earlier. All percentages are rounded to facilitate reading.

⁷ KWN defined “partial” (P) gender analysis to involve ADs containing a general statement acknowledging or implying gender inequalities, but no relevant sex-disaggregated data or description of gender inequalities. Actions that mentioned gender inequalities only in the cross-cutting section, but did not gender mainstream the document were considered to have “partial”. This could be described as “ticking the box” without incorporating sufficient analysis for addressing gender inequalities in the programme design.

⁸ Not all countries published ADs online for 2019. As such, “-” indicates that there were no ADs published for that country, in that year.

⁹ The slight difference here and in other sections of this brief is due to rounding numbers to whole numbers.

¹⁰ Indicator 4.3.1.

¹¹ Strong evidence exists in 2.1% of ADs that the EU consulted WCSOs and in 0.4% that the EU consulted NGEMs. KWN defined strong evidence as an explicit reference to inclusion of NGEMs and/or WCSOs in planning stages in the gender analysis, as recipients of funding, and/or citation of data from either NGEMs and/or WCSOs. Partial evidence exists that the EU consulted WCSOs in 2.9% of interventions and NGEMs in 2.1%.

EU delegations in other countries. No evidence exists in ADs of the EU in North Macedonia consulting these entities.

Use of the OECD Gender Marker, Objectives, Results, Corresponding Indicators, and Activities

GAP II ambitiously aims for 85% of all EU programmes to have an OECD Gender Marker (GM) 1 or 2 by 2020.¹² Notably, in order to assign an accurate GM, the OECD requires that gender analyses be conducted. As this information was not publicly accessible or always included in the ADs, this analysis assumed (albeit potentially incorrectly) that the EU’s marking was based on appropriate analysis. Notably, according to the OECD, for a GM0, gender analysis still must be conducted to determine that the action will not contribute to gender equality. For assigning a GM1, at least one significant objective with a corresponding indicator must contribute to gender equality. For a GM2 ranking, the overall objective must contribute to gender equality and have a corresponding indicator.

About the OECD Gender Marker

The OECD Gender Marker is a tool for evaluating the extent to which programmes and projects target gender equality. The marker uses a three-point scale to assess whether projects target gender equality as a primary objective (2), secondary objective (1), or not at all (0). Gender analysis is required to mark actions appropriately.

KWN has identified several challenges with using the Gender Marker. First, users seem to lack knowledge in how to use it and thus mismatch projects, contributing to inaccurate data. Second, the OECD marker only recognises objectives; it does not consider outputs or activities that contribute to gender equality, which perhaps could reflect better the EU’s attention to gender in more programmes.

The EU assigned gender markers for publicly available IPA ADs starting from 2016.¹³ Albania, Montenegro, and North Macedonia had the best track record in ensuring that all ADs received a gender marking. Albania had more GM0 ADs (53%) than did the other countries. Based on the EU’s gender marking, only North Macedonia consistently increased the percentage of actions with GM1 or GM2 over time. North Macedonia (90%) had the highest percentage of country actions with a GM1 or GM2, followed by Montenegro (83%) and BiH (59%). Overall, **53%** of EU ADs had a GM1 or GM2 from 2016 to 2019.

Year	Albania (n=15)	BiH (n=27)	Kosovo (n=30)	Montenegro (n=6)	NM (n=10)	Serbia (n=27)	% of All Country ADs ¹⁴ (n=115)
2016	25%	56%	50%	100%	67%	30%	45%
2017	100%	83%	36%	75%	100%	0%	55%
2018	60%	50%	67%	-	100%	83%	66%
2019	-	-	0%	-	-	60%	33%
Total	47%	59%	43%	83%	90%	41%	53%

For assigning the appropriate gender marker, the OECD also requires that relevant, gender sensitive indicators accompany each objective. Of all IPA II programmes with an overall objective towards gender equality (strong or implied), only 10% had a corresponding gender sensitive indicator. Meanwhile, 30% of all IPA II programmes with specific objectives towards gender equality had

¹² Indicator 5.1.4. For information regarding OECD requirements related to the GM, see their [website](#). The box draws from research by Farnsworth et al. for KWN, *Where’s the Money for Women’s Rights? Funding Trends in the Western Balkans*, Pristina: The Kvinna till Kvinna Foundation, 2020.

¹³ Notably, each AD is divided into several contracts, which should each receive a gender marker; examining these was beyond the scope of this analysis. For a complete table regarding gender markers, please see Annex 1.

¹⁴ None of the cross-border collaboration (CBC) programmes are included in Table 2, except in the “All ADs” column, given that none of the CBC ADs had any gender marking.

corresponding gender sensitive indicators.¹⁵ Overall, 22% of activities demonstrate some gender sensitivity.¹⁶ Of all IPA II results (outputs) relating to gender equality, 54% of ADs had corresponding gender sensitive indicators. According to the OECD, without an indicator to measure achievement of the objective, EU officials did not mark accurately several actions as GM1 or GM2.

GAP II also calls for sex disaggregation of all relevant indicators,¹⁷ that is, indicators referring to people. **ADs should have included 464 sex-disaggregated indicators though only 27% of these actually involved requirements to provide sex-disaggregated data.**

Of all IPA II programmes, the EU assigned 25% a GM1, though KWN’s analysis suggests that only 3% actually should have received a GM1 marking, based on the OECD’s criteria. The EU assigned 1% of ADs a GM2: one in Kosovo and two in BiH. However, based on KWN’s assessment using the OECD criteria, only one AD in BiH (0.4%) met the OECD criteria: “EU Gender Equality Facility”. This review suggests that EU staff have not applied correctly the OECD criteria for correctly assigning the gender marker: gender analysis, objectives contributing to gender equality, and accompanying indicators.¹⁸ KWN’s remarking of ADs suggests that **only 4% of all IPA II ADs had a GM1 or GM2, and the EU remains far from achieving the ambitious GAP II target that 85% of all ADs will have a GM1 or GM2 by 2020** (Table 3).

Table 3. Percentage of ADs with GM1 or GM2, Based on KWN’s Re-marking According to OECD Criteria							
	Albania N=25	BiH N=46	Kosovo N=55	Montenegro N=27	NM N=19	Serbia N=41	All IPA II programmes N=240
2014	0%	0%	6%	6%	0%	0%	3%
2015	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2016	0%	0%	17%	0%	0%	10%	5%
2017	50%	17%	0%	0%	25%	0%	9%
2018	0%	8%	11%	-	0%	0%	5%
2019	-	-	0%	-	-	0%	0%
Total	4%	4%	5%	4%	5%	2%	4%

Among the countries, Serbia (14) and Kosovo (13) have more actions that have been marked accurately as GM1 or GM2. Kosovo ADs also have multiple, specific references to GAP II objectives and indicators, including how individual actions will contribute to the implementation of GAP II. Two Serbian ADs mention GAP II, but do not reference any GAP II objectives. Only one AD in Albania mentions GAP II: the “Consolidation of the Justice System in Albania -EURALIUS V” AD.¹⁹

Generally, KWN’s analysis of the cross-cutting issues section of ADs, which relates to gender mainstreaming, suggests that this section seems to have been completed as an afterthought or a “box-ticking” exercise. This section frequently states the same issues and text verbatim. In some ADs it seemed as if the cross-cutting section had been copied and pasted, rather than written based on the actual situation related to the given AD or any gender analysis.

Increase Funding for Gender Equality

In total, according to ADs, the EU committed €2,855,971,213 for the WB through IPA II since 2014. Funding decreased between 2015 and 2016, but increased thereafter, except in 2019 (see Table 4). With current EU systems it is difficult to assess the precise amount of funding allocated for gender equality. Historically, some funders have used the OECD Gender Marker as a proxy in calculating such funding.²⁰ According to the EU’s marking, only 0.08% of all IPA funding was allocated solely for

¹⁵ Some ADs had indicators, but not objectives that referred to furthering gender equality.

¹⁶ Gender sensitivity includes any reference to gender equality, general or specific.

¹⁷ Indicator 5.1.

¹⁸ As evaluated by the authors.

¹⁹ It refers to GAP II indicator 4.4.1.

²⁰ This is used by the OECD.

furthering gender equality, while according to KWN’s analysis, only 0.02%. Table 4 shows funding allocated for both GM1 and GM2 IPA II actions, according to the EU’s marking of actions, as well as the research team’s corrected marking of actions. While it can be assumed that all funding (100%) from actions with a GM2 will contribute to gender equality, usually only a percentage of GM1 actions is used for furthering gender equality. Thus, the table likely includes more resources than the EU actually allocated for gender equality. Considering this, based on the EU’s gender marking, an estimated 37% of all funding involved some contribution towards gender equality (GM1). However, KWN’s corrected marking suggests that less than 3% of funding focused on furthering gender equality.

Year	% of Overall Funding by Year	Overall Amount of Funding	EU-assessed % of Funding for GM1 & 2 ADs	Amount of funding for GM1 & 2 ADs according to EU	KWN Corrected % of Funding for GM 1 & 2 ADs	KWN Corrected Amount of Funding for GM1 & 2 ADs
2014	18%	504,744,549	-	-	1%	4,328,000
2015	18%	509,052,951	-	-	0%	0
2016	15%	420,234,980	56%	235,557,765	9%	35,800,000
2017	16%	445,293,175	43%	189,916,564	9%	41,400,000
2018	22%	621,532,099	66%	409,022,810	1%	6,662,800
2019 ²¹	12%	355,113,459	62%	221,173,897	0%	0
Total		2,855,971,213	37%	1,055,671,066	3%	88,190,800

Among sectors, Education, Employment, and Social Policies (2% of all IPA II funds), Democracy and Governance (0.7%), and Rule of Law and Fundamental Rights (0.1%) had the highest percentage of funding towards furthering gender equality.²² By country, Serbia allocated the most funding overall, followed by North Macedonia, Kosovo, and Albania (Table 5).²³ All countries except Montenegro seem to have allocated more funding to gender equality since 2015, but this was not done annually.

	Albania	BiH	Kosovo	Montenegro	NM	Serbia	% of IPA II Funds
% of funding	3.3%	0.7%	3.7%	1.4%	11.6%	2.4%	3.1%
Amount (million Euros)	14.6	2.2	17.1	1.7	25.2	27.4	88.1

GAP II called for increased funding towards gender equality over time.²⁴ GAP II objective 3 foresees “sufficient resources allocated by EU institutions and Member States to deliver on EU gender policy commitments”, and the indicator foresees a “change (increase or decrease) in dedicated funding to improving results for girls and women”.²⁵ Based on KWN’s marking of ADs, funding towards gender equality seems to have increased in 2016 and 2017, following the adoption of GAP II. However, funding for gender equality decreased in 2018 and 2019. Therefore, **GAP II commitments to increasing funding for gender equality seem only partially met, rather than systematically ensured.**

Resources Set Aside for NGEMs, WCSOs, and Civil Society

GAP II calls for programmes to engage and support NGEMs.²⁶ Of all IPA II ADs, **only 10% planned to engage NGEMs in implementing actions, and, at most, 2% may have planned to support**

²¹ For 2019, ADs were only available online for two WB countries: Serbia and Kosovo.

²² Also based on the research team’s re-assignment of accurate gender markers.

²³ Annex 1 contains amounts by country and year.

²⁴ “The Council stresses the need for increased funding within the existing envelopes to ensure the effective implementation of the actions identified in the GAP” ([GAP II \(2016-2020\) Council Conclusions](#)).

²⁵ Notably, that the indicator allows for a “decrease” means that it is poorly aligned with the objective, which foresees “sufficient” resources.

²⁶ Indicators 6.3.1. and 6.3.2.

NGEMs in furthering their capacities.²⁷ In addition to the aforementioned GAP II indicator relating to resourcing for women and girls,²⁸ GAP II, Objective 18 also foresees EU support for women human rights defenders.²⁹ However, only 5% of all ADs clearly foresaw support for civil society and less than 0.1% of all IPA II funding was specifically designated for CSOs. **Only 6% of ADs clearly set aside resources for WCSOs**, but no amount is specified. Based on ADs alone, no accurate assessment of resources allocated for NGEMs, WCSOs, or civil society could be determined.

United Nations Sustainable Development Goals

The EU has sought to align GAP II indicators with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).³⁰ Even so, **fewer than 2% of ADs specifically mention any SDG, while 13% reference SDGs only generally**. This could mean missed opportunities for coordination in realizing gender equality objectives.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations for the EU are derived from the findings, towards informing the planning of IPA III and GAP III.

- Further enhance EU and beneficiary governments' human capacities for gender analysis, gender mainstreaming IPA programming, and making it more gender responsive and transformative.
- Ensure gender analysis is mandatory for all programming, as required by the OECD to identify gender markers accurately; ensure gender analysis is incorporated in the situation analysis and informs activities, results, and objectives, where relevant, towards furthering gender equality.
- Improve engagement of WCSOs and NGEMs in programme design, as required by GAP II, which can contribute to more gender responsive and transformative programmes.
- Further train all EU task managers on the appropriate assignment of gender markers in accordance with OECD criteria; establish checklists and put in place quality assurance review towards ensuring accurate gender marking of all programmes.
- If, following gender analysis, it is determined that gender equality is not targeted by a given action, when assigning a GMO, ensure a justification is provided.
- Include engagement of and support for NGEMs, WCSOs, and CSOs more in IPA actions.
- If relevant, gender-specific information is needed to inform an action, but not available, ensure funding and time are allocated for gender analysis to be conducted during the action's inception phase, towards informing the action.
- Install quality assurance to ensure that all indicators, baselines, and targets that should be disaggregated by sex are indeed disaggregated.
- Ensure information mentioned in the cross-cutting section on gender is integrated into the action design and intervention logic, towards ensuring its implementation.
- For objectives and results to contribute to furthering gender equality, ensure they have corresponding and relevant indicators to measure progress, as per OECD requirements.
- Establish a gender assessment "checklist" as a guideline in programming for ensuring that all GAP II and OECD criteria are fulfilled; consider including it as an annex for beneficiaries to complete, as per best practices used by EU member state Austria.

²⁷ Most of these five ADs referred to the need to support NGEMs in the cross-cutting issues section. Only one mentioned support to NGEMs in activities or intervention logics.

²⁸ Indicator 3.1.1.

²⁹ Indicator 18.1.

³⁰ Indicator 5.1.3. "Status of SWD indicators as compared to the SDGs"; and [GAP II Council Conclusions](#).

ANNEX 1. ADDITIONAL DATA

Year	Albania				BiH				Kosovo				Montenegro				NM				Serbia				All ADs				
	-	0	1	2	-	0	1	2	-	0	1	2	-	0	1	2	-	0	1	2	-	0	1	2	-	0	1	2	
2016	N	0	6	2	0	0	4	5	0	0	3	2	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	2	0	1	6	3	0	1	20	16	1
	%	0	75	25	0	0	44	56	0	0	50	33	17	0	0	100	0	0	33	67	0	10	60	30	0	3	52	42	3
2017	N	0	0	2	0	0	1	4	1	1	6	4	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	4	0	0	6	0	0	1	14	17	1
	%	0	0	100	0	0	17	67	17	9	55	36	0	0	25	75	0	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	3	42	52	3
2018	N	0	2	3	0	1	5	5	1	3	0	6	0	-	-	-	-	0	0	3	0	0	1	5	0	4	8	22	1
	%	0	40	60	0	8	42	42	8	3	0	67	0	-	-	-	-	0	0	100	0	0	17	83	0	11	22	63	3
2019	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	3	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	0	3	0	3	3	3	0
	%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25	75	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40	0	60	0	33	33	33	0
Total	N	0	8	7	0	1	10	14	2	5	12	12	1	0	1	5	0	0	1	9	0	3	13	11	0	9	45	58	3
	%	0	53	47	0	4	37	52	7	17	40	40	3	0	17	83	0	0	10	90	0	11	48	41	0	8	39	50	3

Year	Albania	BiH	Kosovo	Montenegro	NM	Serbia	Total
2014	0	0	2,600,000	1,728,000	0	0	4,328,000
2015	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2016	0	0	8,400,000	0	0	27,400,000	35,800,000
2017	14,600,000	1,650,000	0	0	25,150,000	0	41,400,000
2018	0	550,000	6,112,800	-	0	0	6,662,800
2019	-	-	0	-	-	0	0
Total	14,600,000	2,200,000	17,112,800	1,728,000	25,150,000	27,400,000	88,190,800

³¹ This is based on marking by the EU. The symbol “-” indicates that there were no ADs published for that country in that year.

ANNEX 2. METHODOLOGICAL NOTES

About the Sample

The sample included 213 country ADs for 2014-2019 and 27 CBC programmes for 2014-2018.³² Compared to CBC programmes, ADs have more descriptive intervention logics and indicators; planned activities; and identify more entities responsible for implementation. CBC documents have more general objectives and potential sectors for action proposals. Kosovo and Serbia are the only two countries with ADs for all years (2014-2019). ADs for 2014-2018 are available for Albania, BiH, and North Macedonia; and ADs for 2014-2017 for Montenegro.

Indicators Examined

This analysis examined implementation of the following GAP II indicators on each AD:³³

- 4.3.1: Inclusion of gender analysis³⁴ in the situation analysis
- 4.1.1: Degree to which the gender analysis findings informed the intervention design³⁵
- 4.3.1: Any evidence of consultations with NGEMs and WCSOs³⁶
- 5.3.1 and 5.3.2: The extent to which the overall objectives, significant objectives, results, their corresponding indicators, and/or activities in the intervention logic sought to contribute to gender equality³⁷
- 5.1.3: Any references to the UN SDGs related to gender equality³⁸
- 6.3.1 and 6.3.2: Commitment to engage NGEMs in implementation³⁹
- 3.1.1: Resources set aside for gender equality, WCSOs, and CSOs, respectively, including any specified amount⁴⁰
- 5.1: Number of indicators that should be disaggregated by sex and those that are⁴¹
- 5.1.4: The percentage of EU programmes with a GM1 or GM2, including also the accuracy of the GM provided, based on the OECD criteria and guidance; and assessing the actual GM ranking, based on information provided in the document
- 5.3.1: Whether any explanation or justification was provided for GM0 actions⁴²
- 18.1: N# of women Human Rights Defenders who have received EU Support⁴³

Limitations and Delimitations

Notably, as ADs tend to be further divided into specific contracts, the possibility exists that contracts implemented GAP II even if ADs did not mention gender equality. However, examining all contracts was beyond the scope of this particular analysis. The funding mentioned here refers to allocations and not actual expenditures.

³² All ADs were accessed through the EC [website](#).

³³ The indicators are in [GAP II Council Conclusions](#).

³⁴ Objective 4. "Robust gender evidence used to inform all EU external spending, programming and policy making".

³⁵ 4.1.1. "N# of thematic, bilateral and regional programmes per year using gender analysis to inform design".

³⁶ 4.3.1. "% of programmes using findings of consultations with National Gender Equality Mechanisms, CSOs, women's organisations, to inform action design".

³⁷ 5.3.1. "N# of justifications for OECD Marker G0 scores"; and 5.3.2. "% of new programmes that score G1 or G2".

³⁸ 5.1.3. "Status of SWD indicators as compared to the SDGs".

³⁹ 6.3.1. "N# of programmes for NGEM supported by EU"; 6.3.2. "N# of sector programmes working with the NGEM".

⁴⁰ 3.1.1. "Change (increase or decrease) in dedicated funding to improving results for girls and women".

⁴¹ 5.1.1. "Status of results monitoring on gender sensitive indicators".

⁴² 5.3.1. "N# of justifications for OECD Marker G0 scores". Notably, this information was unavailable within the publicly provided ADs and therefore was not examined herein.

⁴³ 18.1.