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This report sought to provide an assessment of the South African government’s Gender Responsive Budgeting Framework (GRBF), formally named the Gender Responsive Planning, Budgeting, Monitoring, Evaluation and Auditing Framework (GRPBMEAF). The framework was formally adopted by the National Cabinet on 27 March 2019. This was a response to longstanding public demands for the greater prioritisation of gender policy issues when allocating resources in the South African national budget.

As part of the Commission for Gender Equality’s (CGE) constitutional and legislative mandate to hold government accountable for programmes aimed at promoting gender equality and transformation, this work was aimed at assessing the extent to which this framework has been embraced, prioritised, planned for and implemented by various government departments. As this report will show, the GRBF is a new initiative by government, intended to formally introduce the concept of gender responsiveness in budgeting processes across government. The report identifies some of the challenges faced by the Department of Women, Youth and People with Disabilities (DWYPD) in its attempts to ensure that the framework is embraced and implemented by all national government departments.

The CGE is grateful for the cooperation and assistance, including information and documents, received from the various government departments and officials interviewed for this assessment. Such information played an important role in our attempts to gain greater insights and understanding into the continued challenges faced in the process of introducing gender responsive budgeting as a routine planning tool in South Africa.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The Commission for Gender Equality (CGE) is among several independent Chapter 9 institutions established in terms of Section 181 of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, is geared towards supporting democracy in the country. Furthermore, as part of its mandate expressed in Section 187 of the Constitution, the CGE is required to promote respect for, and protection, development and attainment of, gender equality in South Africa. The Constitution specifically gives the CGE powers to “monitor, investigate, research, educate, lobby, advise and report on issues concerning gender equality”. This mandate is elaborated on further through the Commission for Gender Equality Act.¹

A key aspect of this mandate is to monitor and evaluate the implementation of domestic policy and legislative frameworks, alongside the country’s compliance with international regulatory frameworks, to promote gender equality. Under Section 11 (i) and (h) of CGE Act, the CGE is required to monitor and evaluate South Africa’s compliance with regional and international treaties which promote gender equality in the private and public sectors.

This research report is the first of its kind by the CGE, providing an initial assessment of the readiness/preparedness of national government departments for the implementation of the Gender Responsive Budgeting Framework (GRBF) for the financial year 2020/2021. The subject of the research study falls within the mandate of CGE and is of critical importance for promoting democracy in South Africa. The CGE undertook this study to contribute to the knowledge on issues relating to gender budgeting and women’s empowerment.

One of the important issues the world continues to grapple with is gender equality, and related gender economic empowerment. Various countries have undertaken different initiatives to try and achieve gender parity and empower both women and girls in their respective countries. One such initiative is Gender Responsive Budgeting (GRB), which has become a key initiative adopted by various countries in seeking to address challenges around gender equality and gender economic empowerment. GRB can be defined as “diverse initiatives or efforts that are aimed at making government’s planning, budgeting and auditing contribute [towards] gender equality”.² GRB ultimately explores the differential impact of policies and budgets on women and men, as well as on other facets of social discrimination.³

Beyond GRB being a key initiative that has been implemented by various countries, the United Nations (UN) 17 Sustainable Development goals (SDGs) which were adopted in 2015 also refer to GRB, which is meant to achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls, and includes key provisions such as:

• Undertake reforms to give women equal rights to economic resources, as well as access to ownership and control over land and other forms of property, financial services, inheritance and natural resources, in accordance with national laws.

• Adopt and strengthen sound policies and enforceable legislation for the promotion of gender equality and the empowerment of all women and girls at all levels.⁴

These provisions speak directly to GRB, and therefore strengthen the argument of why GRB is a key initiative that must be implemented globally. In support of GRB, various guidelines have been developed by the UN.

¹ Act 39 of 1996.
³ Ibid.
and organisations such as Oxfam, which help guide countries with regard to the procedures and systems required to be in place in order to implement GRB successfully.

According to the Department of Women, Youth and Persons with Disabilities (DWYPD), South Africa is at the forefront globally on creating and implementing GRB initiatives, and provided support to several African countries in developing their GRB systems. Despite South Africa playing a leading role on the African continent with regard to GRB initiatives, it faced its own unique challenges in the implementation of GRB. The most significant challenge was that it became apparent the implementation of GRB was less effective in the absence of gender responsive planning, as well as the monitoring, evaluation and auditing components of the overall evidence-based policy cycle and the results-based performance management cycle.

This resulted in the drafting of the Gender Responsive Planning, Budgeting, Monitoring, Evaluation and Auditing Framework (GRPBMEAF) by the DWYPD in 2018, which aimed to ensure a more sustainable, comprehensive and multi-sectoral approach to gender mainstreaming within the country’s planning, monitoring and evaluation, and public financing systems. The GRPBMEAF is therefore meant to close the gap between plans and budgets with an overall approach of mainstreaming gender through the planning, budgeting, monitoring, evaluation and auditing cycle.

This project report is structured into six sections:

• The first section deals with the objectives, research approach and method, and the constraints/limitations of the study. It includes a statement of ethical commitment and a brief background;
• The second section outlines some of the background and literature on GRB, legislation and policy on GRB and the rationale for GRB in South Africa;
• The third section outlines the findings of the research study. This includes outlining some of the various initiatives by key or lead departments in the implementation of GRB in South Africa. This includes the DWYPD; initiatives by the Department of Planning Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME); initiatives by the National Treasury and the High-Level -Steering Committee (HLSC);
• The fourth section is a discussion and analysis of key emerging issues from the study’s findings in relation to GRBF implementation in South Africa.
• The fifth section examines at the research conclusions; and,
• The sixth section provides recommendations.

1.1. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The main aim of this research study was to assess the readiness/preparedness of national government departments in the implementation of the GRBF for the financial year 2020/2021. The objectives of the study included:

- Assessing the measures or systems put in place by national government departments in preparation for the implementation of the GRBF;

---

2 Ibid.
3 Ibid.
• Assessing what resources were required, both financial and human, to implement the GRBF;
• Assessing levels of awareness of the GRBF tool by the various national government departments; and,
• Assessing experiences and challenges faced by the national departments in implementing the GRBF.

1.2. RESEARCH APPROACH AND METHODS

The study employed a qualitative research approach. The rationale for using this approach to the study was to canvass the views of specific individuals who had the expert knowledge regarding this subject area. Furthermore, the qualitative research approach allowed the research team to collect and analyse multiple data sources such as interviews, observations, documents and audio-visual information, rather than relying on a single source. Qualitative research approaches allow for deeper understanding through further probing of available content.⁹

The research team chose three national government departments as case studies for the research report, namely DWYPD, DPME and National Treasury. The motivation for selecting these three departments was due to the team’s early assessment of various documents, policies and other secondary sources, which established that these three were the leading departments with regard to the implementation of the GRBF. Qualitative research was conducted through the research team developing an interview guide containing a series of questions explaining addressing the aims and objectives of the study. The research team then conducted semi-structured interviews with officials from the three key departments who have significant roles in implementing the GRBF. These interviews included open-ended questions drawing on some of the experiences and challenges faced by officials in their preparedness to implementation of the GRBF.

The qualitative research approach also involved:

• Analysing data collected through secondary sources in the form of published and unpublished documents either made available to the research team, or sourced independently through the internet; and,
• Document review of various media and other platforms including concept notes, Annual Performance Planning (APP) documents, budget speeches etc.

In the initial stages of the study, the research team planned to conduct a document review of all 45 National Department APPs and Strategic Plans (SP) for the financial year 2020/2021. They sought to review whether their APPs or SPs included any elements or references related to gender responsive budgeting. It was found that most national departments did not factor gender responsive budgeting measures or gender issues into their APPs and SPs. These findings are contained in Annexure 1 of this report. The qualitative research approach and the tools used by the research team allowed them to gather rich data from the participants, and enabled the participants to answer questions thoroughly.¹⁰

1.3. CONSTRAINTS/LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This assessment is the first that the CGE has undertaken with regard to the implementation of the GRBF. Consequently, it entailed a great deal of learning and study, not only of the complexities of the gender responsive budgeting sector and the challenges facing it, but also the complexities around the implementation of the GRBF in South Africa.

¹⁰ Ibid.
This research study was carried out in less than a year, and therefore does not in any way constitute a full-scale and comprehensive inquiry into, and a full understanding of, the challenges of implementing the GRBF. This research report is an initial fact gathering exercise which will continue to develop and grow as the GRBF is implemented fully over the coming years.

In addition, the research team wishes to acknowledge a number of constraints faced during the study. These have limited the team’s ability to broaden their understanding of certain issues related to gender responsive budgeting and the implementation of the GRBF. Primary among the constraints/limits of the research study are the following:

- Constraints in the level of cooperation by some officials from the departments selected for this assessment. The level of cooperation and assistance was characterised mainly by long delays in responding to communication by the research team to arrange interviews, or in providing relevant documentation which would assist the study.

- There were also constraints related to getting information from the selected departments and officials. The research team’s impression was that there was either limited access to, or a lack of official information on, reports, activities or processes of the implementation of the GRBF by the three selected national departments. This could be based on two reasons: one is that the selected departments did not have the relevant information, since the implementation of the GRBF is a new process in South Africa; or it could have been a reluctance on the part of the officials to assist the research team.

- Due to the Covid-19 pandemic in South Africa and the national lockdown, the researchers were limited to conducting interviews online through various channels like Zoom, Skype, and Microsoft Teams. No face-to-face interviews were conducted for the study, and so one could not physically assess respondents when answering questions, which is quite a useful tool in qualitative research.

1.4. STATEMENT OF ETHICAL COMMITMENT

The CGE abides by accepted ethical standard of research and has adopted and subscribes to the Human Sciences Research Council’s (HSRC) Research Code of Ethics. Central to this code of ethics are key principles to which the CGE subscribes:

- Respect and protection;
- Transparency;
- Scientific and academic professionalism; and,
- Accountability.

The code of ethics entails various key principles as indicated above, but also includes commitment to other standards that CGE researchers should abide by in undertaking research work involving people, communities, and other social entities with rights. The Human Sciences Research Council’s Code of Research Ethics provides guidance primarily with aspects of the research that involve interaction with selected individuals, households, communities, etc. Through this code, CGE researchers are required and expected to comply with universally accepted professional standards of research and to ensure that they consider and respect the rights and concerns of those involved and potentially impacted by the activities related to the study. In particular, the CGE Research Department respects (and abides by) the following rights of informants:

---

• Informed consent

Before commencement of the interviews and focus groups, participants were informed about the study, its goals and objectives, and a letter with the above information was provided to them. Participants were also afforded the opportunity to ask questions or seek clarification on any aspect of the study that may have been unclear.

• Voluntary Participation

None of the participants were coerced to participate in the study or promised any incentives for doing so. Cooperation was always sought and obtained.

• Confidentiality and anonymity

Participants were informed that the study would be developed into a research report, and that their names would not be mentioned in any documentation or presentations regarding the research.

• Beneficence

The right of participants to be free from harm, uneasiness and mistreatment was respected. Failure to do so would run the risk of being unethical.

Having outlined above the objectives and key methodological aspects of the study, the next section of the report explores the notion of gender responsive budgeting, and key international experiences and examples.
2. UNDERSTANDING GENDER RESPONSIVE BUDGETING

2.1. CONSTRAINTS/LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

In 1996, member of Parliament Pregs Govender made this statement, “If you want to see which way a country is headed, look at the country’s budget and how it allocates resources to women and children.” Govender underlined the importance of the distribution of resources to some of the most marginalised people in the country. Budgeting is one of the means used to assist with the eradication of gender inequality. Various countries have embarked on a quest to achieve gender equality and have used the national budgeting system to this end. The national budget can be an important tool for the allocation of national resources in a way that seeks to address all forms of socio-political injustice and inequality. South Africa’s efforts in this regard are signalled by the adoption of the Gender Responsive Budgeting Framework (GRBF), as will be discussed in this report.

2.2. INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENCES AND CHALLENGES

In 2016, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development released a report covering one of the countries at the forefront of undertaking action regarding gender responsive budgeting plans, Australia. As far back as 1984, the Australian Women’s Budget Initiative was established, becoming a trailblazer for gendered resource allocation at a national level. This government-led initiative operated until 1996, ending due to economic restrictions at the time. The initiative was deemed a success during the time due to its ability to increase expenditure towards the needs of women, and allocated resources in light of these facts. The Australian Women’s Budget Initiative focused greatly on national expenditure patterns, targeting women and girls in communities, the civil service, as well as general non-gender targeted expenditure. The success of the Australian case also lies in the fact that gender issues became important beyond the national budget and fast tracked the process of gender mainstreaming.

India also has a long history of gender responsive budgeting, particularly at state level. Through persistent civil society engagements, gender responsive budgeting plans became a national conversation. It was the plight of poor women, men and children that prompted civil society organisations and non-profit organisations to measure the success of the budget plan of the government. The focus on the intersection of gender, class and caste allows for a deeper and broader engagement which meets the needs of the poor and most vulnerable. It is important to note that gender responsive budgeting, as is the case with India, underlines that gender is a key indicator for the distribution of resources and alleviates bias in other different spheres of need. In other words, gender denotes an important aspect of identity that shapes the need for relevant and equitable resource allocation.

Despite this, other aspects of identity come into consideration based on the specific geo-political location where this will be implemented. In India’s case, the caste system remains a key informant of needs and resources that assist in this regard. Similarly, civil society organisation Associacão Cultural de Mulheres Negras in Brazil is mindful of this too. An organisation made up of poor black women in Brazil found that the healthcare facilities where they were located were in a poor condition, and consequently continued to fail them.

---

12 Govender, P. “Foreword”. In Budlender, D. The Women’s Budget. (IDASA, Cape Town. 1996).
14 Ibid.
17 Ibid.
18 Santos, S. B. D., “Brazilian black women’s NGOs and their struggles in the area of sexual and reproductive health: experiences” (2008).
This organisation noted that better facilities were too costly, thus discriminating against them particularly because of the racialised nature of the services that were provided.  

To establish this scientifically, these women living in impoverished areas conducted surveys as part of their research endeavours which formed an important impetus to support their quest for specific budgetary allocations for their needs in the late 1990s.

Through the leadership of the United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM) later United Nations Women, gender responsive budgeting became part of the international mandate and led to the assistance of marginalised women in particular. The coalition of local and international organisations for furthering gender equality cannot be understated. Similarly, the collaboration at state level remains important in assisting with achieving long-term gender related goals. This can be highlighted through the India-Brazil-South Africa Women’s Forum resolution that was signed in New Delhi in 2013, to, amongst others, “promote gender responsive budgeting and equitable development.”

**2.3. REGIONAL EXPERIENCES AND CHALLENGES**

Many African countries lack the necessary resources to prioritise critical social policy challenges in their budgets, including vital gender transformation programmes. Many countries on the continent are low- to middle-income countries. Nonetheless, many of them have made political commitments towards gender equality, whereby gender responsive budgeting serves as one of the many means. In Uganda, as early as the 1990s, gender responsive budgeting formed part of the national agenda through non-governmental organisations. A low-income agricultural economy, Uganda has become a leading country on the continent regarding gender responsive budgeting. Through collaborations with the UN, there have been various local level budget initiatives that have transformed the lives of women and children through resource allocation.

Rwanda has made significant strides in terms of gender equality initiatives despite it being one of the low-income, predominantly agricultural, developing countries on the continent. As far back as 2002, through the Ministry of Gender and Family Promotion and the Ministry of Finance, the country insisted on the importance of appropriate and just resource allocation towards addressing the plight of women and children. One of the ways in which this was done was that, between 2008-2010, the Finance Ministry, alongside UNIFEM, avoided the use of consultants across departments; instead, they were assisted through building local support and skills. Rwanda took time to conceptualise, implement and monitor the GRBF initiatives through the gender monitoring office alongside the UN through gender-oriented performance indicators.

A study by OXFAM America assessed the implementation of gender responsive budgeting and its potential benefits for small-scale farmers in Ghana. The study found that while the government had made some progress with regard to gender responsive budgeting, there was still a long way to go in terms of consistent and effective application and implementation.

---

19 Ibid.
20 Ibid.
25 Ibid.
Some countries have not been as forthcoming, or as successful, in their endeavours. For example, Nigeria continues to struggle with gender responsive budgeting as the use of programmes that are not gender responsive remains a challenge. The systemic lack of will continues to stifle efforts to improve the gendered resource allocation process. Other factors, such as culture, continue to hinder the development of gender centred approaches to resource allocation. As Emmanuel Botlhale notes, the baTswana chiefs in Botswana are considered a threat to gender equality and could become gatekeepers of resources.

The technical capacity of some countries such as Benin also challenges the plight of gendering resource allocation. As of 2013, Benin received technical support from the German Technical Cooperation Agency, as well as the United Nations Development Program. The inability and sometimes reluctance of countries to capacitate themselves in the long term continues to be a challenge.

Nonetheless, the Southern African Development Community (SADC) developed a Protocol on Gender and Development. Article 15 of the Protocol highlights that SADC members states that are party to the protocol “shall ensure gender sensitive and responsive budgeting at the micro and macro levels, including tracking, monitoring and evaluation”. The African Union Strategy for Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment asserts that to assist in the challenging implementation of the GRBF, countries should “build institutional capacity and strengthen compliance with Member States, Regional Economic Community’s, institutions and organs of the AU and civil society, and integrate gender into strategic partnership platforms”.

This is welcomed, and many African countries aspire to implement the gender responsive budgeting legislation, frameworks and guidelines. However, for many, implementation remains to be seen. The challenges include unsustainable efforts by government to implement, not institutionalising processes through legislation, and reluctance to comply by finance ministries. Moreover, where the GRBF has been unsuccessful, poor goal setting, poor monitoring and evaluation systems, and under-resourcing are key features of failure.

2.4. SOUTH AFRICA’S EXPERIENCES AND CHALLENGES

In 1995, the South African Women’s Budget Initiative (SAWBI) (modelled on the Australian Women’s Budget Initiative), started working on plans aimed towards gendering budgets as part of the work to orientate the post-apartheid resource allocation. The coalition of parliamentarians and various civil society organisations was supported by the Parliamentary Joint Standing Committee on Finance, the Institute for Democracy in South Africa, and the Community Agency for Social Enquiry. SAWBI launched the first women’s budget in March 1996, which was centred around national and provincial budgets in the country. This was groundbreaking work, despite only operating for five years.

The aim of the initiative was to insert gendered references into published governmental budgets. The “gendered text” was located in various parts of public documents, as opposed to a separate document altogether, seemingly as part of mainstreaming. The use of this “gendered text” is important in that it allowed for gender to become a key aspect that needs to be considered within the main budget, rather than be side-lined or relegated to secondary aspects of governmental policy, and budgets in particular.
The initiative eventually collapsed following the end of the Commonwealth project, which lasted for two years ending in 1999.

South Africa has remained committed to furthering gender equality through aligning with organisations that promote gendered budgeting, such as the UN, AU, the International Labour Organisation, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, SADC, amongst others. The International Monetary Fund has underlined that South Africa has indeed shown commitment and effort in relation to gender sensitive budgeting, with short strides in fiscal policy and administration.36

The Department of Trade and Industry, for example, was one of the first departments to highlight that it had not provided adequate resources to small-, micro- and medium-sized businesses owned by women, and focused on increasing expenditure to address this. Nevertheless, a study by the CGE found that despite this, gender responsive budgeting (through women economic empowerment programs) did not always achieve impact with the intended beneficiaries.

Even so, South Africa – through the DWYPD – has persisted and developed the Gender Responsive Budgeting Framework (GRBF). The framework was approved by Cabinet on 27 March 2019, and the department published the GRBF in December of that year. In this regard, theoretical and legal strides have been made that should be applauded. Moreover, the guidelines of the framework were finalised in February 2020. With that, the implementation of the framework through the guidelines should be underway. However, several delays (for various reasons which will be outlined in this report) have occurred.

There are various lessons to be learned from previous experiences, including ensuring there is full buy-in from political and administrative leadership, and that relevant stakeholders are afforded enough resources so as to embed and institutionalise the importance of the framework. Also required is a strong legal backing of the integration of GRBF initiatives across all spheres of government. As such, projected timelines that would require departments to implement the framework will come under scrutiny.

2.5. FRAMEWORKS ON GENDER RESPONSIVE BUDGETING

2.5.1. INTERNATIONAL FRAMEWORKS

South Africa has committed itself to several international legislative conventions, protocols and treaties that are in favour of gender equality and of ensuring the equitable involvement of women across industries. This includes the United Nation’s Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), which was signed in January 1993 and ratified by South Africa on 15 December 1995.37 CEDAW advocates for a number of issues around women’s inclusion into the political, economic, health and educational spheres, among others, through the advancement of legislation, resources and other available mechanisms through its general recommendations.38

The Beijing Declaration and its Platform for Action,39 adopted at the 4th World Conference on Women in September 1995, advocates directly for gender responsive budgeting through actionable political commitment to empower women.40

---

34 Ibid.
36 Ibid.
In September 2002, South Africa adopted the United Nations Millennium Declaration, which committed SA to eight Millennium Development Goals. Goal 3 (Promote gender equality and empower women) gives special attention to gender equality. South Africa also adopted the renewed UN Sustainable Development Goals in 2015 (the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development),41 with particular focus on Goal 5 (i.e. To Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls”).42

The 2015 Addis Ababa Action Agenda, hosted under the International Conference on Financing for Development, is a financing framework aimed at achieving the post-2015 development agenda.43 Part of its key initiatives was the mainstreaming of women’s empowerment into financing for development.

2.5.2. REGIONAL FRAMEWORKS

The optional Protocol to the African Charter on Human and People’s Rights on the Rights of Women in Africa44 re-emphasises previous articles, such as those advocated for by CEDAW, as well as approaches underpinning the Beijing Platform for Action, in as far as the requirements for adequate measures to finance women’s empowerment and gender equality initiatives by AU member states are concerned.45

The Solemn Declaration on Gender Equality in Africa was adopted by the AU Assembly in 2004. Its plea to member states centred on ensuring gender equality, as well as reinforcing state involvement in women’s rights instruments across the globe.46

African Union Agenda 2063, founded in 2013, envisages that goals and developments should be achieved in the next 50 years, and includes aspirations for, among others, women to reach improved levels of equality and empowerment in all available spheres.47 The Amended SADC Protocol on Gender and Development48 caters towards varying areas of empowerment for women, such as equality in relation to the role of women in the economy through equitable resources, and access to and control of ownership.

The African Union Strategy for Gender Equality & Women’s Empowerment 2018-2028 sets forth a plan to realise Aspiration 6 of the African Union’s Agenda 2063: “An Africa where development is people driven, relying upon the potential offered by people, especially its women and youth and caring for children,” and the principles enshrined in Article 4 (I) of the AU’s Constitutive Act - ‘the promotion of gender equality as well as other key continental and global commitments.49

2.5.3. SOUTH AFRICAN FRAMEWORKS

The 1954 Women’s Charter adopted by the Federation of South African Women is one of the earliest proponents of gender equality and non-racialism, calling out the discrimination and marginalisation experienced by women across the country at the time.50 Developed by the Women’s National Coalition during South Africa’s democratic transition, the Women’s Charter for Effective Equality is a reconfigured version of the 1954 Women’s Charter, which demanded the equality51 of women within a democratic South Africa. This is done by articulating the position of women at the time, together with the struggles they
experienced and ways to rectify these through recognition and the fair and equal treatment of the roles they occupied in society.

The South African Constitution allows for several rights that discourage against discrimination as a result race, gender, sex, pregnancy, marital status, ethnic or social origin, colour, sexual orientation, age, disability, religion, conscience, belief, culture, language and birth.52

Moreover, the Promotion of Equality and Prevention of Unfair Discrimination Act,53 outlines the prohibition of unfair discrimination on the grounds of gender. This legal framework forms part of the ways in which South Africa is legally obliged to ensure that gender does not disadvantage any individual in the country. In 2005, the Gender Directorate within the Department of Justice and Constitutional Development introduced the Gender Mainstreaming and Gender Responsive Budgeting package that contained the Gender Responsive Budgeting Guidelines.54

The National Development Plan (NDP) 2030 is closely aligned to the UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The NDP prioritises the elimination of poverty, reduction of inequality reinforced by race, class and gender, and growing an inclusive economy by 2030.55 NDP goals are aligned to UN SDGs and to the AU’s Agenda 2063, and are integrated into government planning systems and processes across all levels.56

The Public Sector 8-Principle Plan for Heads of Department on Women’s Empowerment and Gender Equality57 is an initiative by the Department of Public Service and Administration, and has been accepted as part of the Key Performance Indicators of accounting officers in national and provincial departments. This measure is an initiative geared towards the representation of women at the upper echelons of leadership in government. Targets were set at 30% representation of women in senior management service positions, in line with the then SADC target of 30% women in political and decision-making positions.58

The South African National Policy Framework for Women’s Empowerment and Gender Equality59 outlined South Africa’s vision in relation to gender equality and how this would be accomplished. The 2013 Women’s Empowerment and Gender Equality Bill60 (WEGE) adopted by the National Assembly in 2014 sets out ambitious targets for women in society. WEGE places gender equality and transformation at the epicentre of transformation. It advocates for a paradigm shift in terms of resource allocation and the treatment of people, especially women. This is a diversion from the business-as-usual principle.

The GRPBMEAF61 2018, adopted by Cabinet in March 2019 is the most audacious yet. It outlines a number of targets, work plans and timelines for implementing gender responsive budgeting, monitoring, evaluation and auditing. Among other key developments, it is geared towards the equality of women through inclusion and involvement in the government’s budget and planning processes. Having outlined above some of the background and the basis for gender responsive budgeting internationally, the report turns to the South African context.
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57 Department of Public Service and Administration. The Head of Department’s 8-Principle Action Plan for Promoting Women’s Empowerment and Gender Equality within the Public Service Workplace. (4 October 2007).
58 Ibid.
2.6. THE RATIONALE FOR GENDER RESPONSIVE BUDGETING IN SOUTH AFRICA

South Africa has a long and painful history of black people and people of colour being deprived of freedom, peace and equality. This stems from years of colonialism, later succeeded by apartheid. Although the remnants of the subjugation of African men remain vivid in the present day, African women experience it at the intersection of race and gender. Even during the hardships of colonialism and apartheid, women, and African women in particular, did not enjoy equal rights in relation to their male counterparts.

The ownership of property, availability of jobs, education, career choices, and economic empowerment opportunities were not equally accessible to women, and although the advent of democracy brought a great deal of change, the reverberations of the past continue to be felt. In its commitment to achieving gender equality and the empowerment of women, the government of South Africa has adopted a number of measures that include anti-discrimination legislation, international treaty obligations and affirmative action policies.62

Although much progress has occurred in terms of affording opportunities to women in varying disciplines, there are still disparities that exist.

This is because plans or strategies are often narrow in their outlook, assuming equality of circumstances between men and women in terms of resource allocation needs. As a measure to turn gender equality commitments into reality, many countries including South Africa are increasingly turning to gender responsive budgeting (GRB).63 The consensus is that key groups are left out or inadequately considered when spending takes place through the national budget. GRB recognises that traditional budgeting systems are actively patriarchal and fail to see the contribution of women, who are the primary (and predominantly unpaid) bearers of the burdens home caregiving.64

GRB is not a budget specifically catered to women, it’s much broader. This is made clear by Oxfam International, which states that GRB programmes are not budgets for women, although they do examine spending on services geared towards women to understand whether their needs are met.

Thus, GRB does not entail government splitting expenditure 50/50 between men and women, it does however encompass looking at the budget through a gendered lens to strategically analyse how it will cater and respond to the varying needs of different groups that include women and men, girls and boys, and can further involve assessment of the intersection of the above-mentioned groups within dimensions such as age, class or religion.66 Of ultimate significance is the ability to ensure that equality occurs between groups with far more reach, especially to groups that are ordinarily neglected by the system. As stated by Oxfam International, “The rationale for GRB initiatives is that they help bridge persistent inequalities between women and men and facilitate development by integrating gender issues into macroeconomic policy and budgets”.67

South Africa is one of the most affected countries in terms of economic inequality between citizens. This follows similar trends found in sub-Saharan Africa, insofar as below par living standards dominated by high levels of poverty and inequality are concerned. High levels of poverty have been extant in sub-Saharan Africa since the 1990s, with progress towards alleviating it occurring far slower than in other regions; only in
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the 2000s was there a sustained period of economic growth, as well as robust action to reduce poverty. Despite this the region continues to exhibit a large number of households headed by women that tend to be poorer. The picture in South Africa is not any different, and serves to confirm the reality that women are disadvantaged in the country. Confirmed by Statistics South Africa adult females experienced higher levels of poverty when compared to their male counterparts, regardless of the measurement used.

The poverty gap (the distance away from the poverty line) was larger for female-headed households compared to households headed by males. The stark truth is that the situation in the country is far from ideal. Should it’s resolution be left to chance without adequate intervention, the situation of women will worsen. Differences between women and men, as well as between boy and girl children, mean that more complex and nuanced policy interventions are necessary to address these varying needs over time, depending on other variables such as financial and human resource capacity. Those in positions of power to make policy decisions regarding the setting of priorities and allocation of resources have to face the challenge of ensuring that such decisions avoid unintended and inequitable outcomes, including gender inequality.

Considerations need to go beyond the generally accepted population groups that contribute to the fiscus through the paying of taxes. For example, entitlements to state benefits and pensions are often tied to fulltime paid employment over a lifetime, meaning that women who work in the informal sector, or those without fulltime employment for most or all of their lives, may not qualify for these benefits. This is the reason why gender responsive budgeting is seen as a solution, in order to cater for and meet the needs of those who are overlooked when policies are developed.

Shortly after South Africa’s democratic transition, the country showed great enthusiasm for gender responsive budgeting. Gender responsive budgeting a means of promoting gender equality was popularised in 1995 under the Beijing Platform for Action, when the UN made a plea to governments to assess how public expenditures benefitted women, and to further adjust budgets in order to realise gender equality. The enthusiasm for GRB displayed by South Africa was short-lived. Acknowledging this, the Financial and Fiscal Commission commended the early gains of the mid 1990s, as GRB was implemented at national level, but the process has gradually lost momentum since. This was regained in the 2000s with a number of different strategies geared towards GRB that were discussed in section 2.1 of this report. However, it appears that the changes of administration often mean that instead of the continuation of previous strategies, new priorities ultimately displace them, leading to the failure to realise the goal of GRB.

Having discussed the background with regard GRB internationally and in the South African context, the next section of this report examines the findings of the study, focusing on the initiatives by DWYPD, DPME, the National Treasury and the High-Level Steering Committee (HLSC) in the implementation of the Gender Responsive Budgeting Framework in South Africa.
3. FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

3.1. INITIATIVES BY THE DWYPD

The Department of Women, Youth and People with Disabilities (DWYPD) as the lead department responsible for the implementation of the Gender Responsive Budgeting Framework (GRBF) in South Africa, has implemented several initiatives over the years and intends to continue in the future. The initiatives which the DWYPD has implemented broadly centre on the following key themes:

- Policy development, including legislation;
- Education, raising awareness and advocacy; and,
- Capacity building and training.

3.1.1. POLICY DEVELOPMENT, INCLUDING LEGISLATION

Initially, efforts towards policy development and legislation for Gender Responsive Budgeting (GRB) in South Africa begun with the development of the GRBF. According to the DWYPD, “the development process included close collaboration with key government partners, including the Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME) and National Treasury”. Below is a fairly long list of activities that the DWYPD provided to researchers to illustrate its efforts in preparing stakeholders for the GRB initiative:

- Presentations on gender responsive planning and budgeting with a wide range of civil society stakeholders in May 2018;
- Engagements with National Treasury, the DPME, and other government departments including Statistics SA, the Department of International Relations and Cooperation, the Department of Public Service and Administration (DPSA) and the Department of Higher Education and Training, as well as the Commission on Gender Equality (CGE), as part of the High-Level Steering Committee on Gender Responsive Policy, Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (HLSC) from June 2018 to November 2018;
- Deliberations on the GRBF took place during a Women’s Dialogue with a range of stakeholders that included researchers, public intellectuals, academics, young women in tertiary institutions and others, in August 2018;
- A presentation was made and detailed deliberations took place at the DPME National Planning Monitoring and Evaluation Forum in October 2018, attended by delegates from national, provincial and local government and non-state sector representatives; and,
- A proposed GRBF was presented, initially titled the Gender Responsive Planning, Budgeting, Monitoring, Evaluation and Auditing Framework (GRPBMEAF). It was discussed at one of the commissions of the Presidential Summit on Gender-Based Violence and Femicide from 1 to 2 November 2018, according to DWYPD.

The extent to which some of the activities listed above is relevant for the task of preparing government departments for GRB is questionable. The DWYPD also indicates that it convened a summit on the GRBF between 29 and 30 November 2018, where a declaration was adopted.76 The declaration outlined a raft of commitments with regard to the GRBF, which include a number of key commitments:

- Ensure the development and implementation of a Gender Responsive Planning, Budgeting, Monitoring, Evaluation and Auditing Framework (GRPBMEAF) in South Africa; and,

76 See attached details under Annexure 2 in this document.
• Urge all government departments and public entities at national, provincial and local level to:
  a) Institutionalise gender responsive planning and budgeting systems, including within the Mandate Paper, Medium Term Strategic Plan, Strategic Plans, Annual Performance Plans and Budgets; and,
  b) Develop and implement gender responsive monitoring, reporting and evaluation systems, including regular performance and expenditure reviews on gender equality and women’s empowerment.

Following the declaration in 2018, the DWYPD developed a draft GRPBMEAF, or Gender Responsive Budgeting Framework (GRBF), in 2018. This served as a guiding theoretical framework document which would be used in South Africa to initiate GRB in state departments and related entities. According to the DWYPD, “the GRPBMEAF aims to ensure a more sustainable, comprehensive and multi-sectoral approach to gender mainstreaming within the country’s planning, monitoring and evaluation, as well as its public financing systems”.

The GRBF aims to be the medium through which the gap can be closed between plans and budgets through an overall approach of mainstreaming gender. The GRBF document also contains an implementation plan with key phases and interventions. The GRBF was formally approved by Cabinet on 27 March 2019 as policy for implementation by the sixth administration, headed by President Cyril Ramaphosa.

The DWYPD then developed guidelines to support the GRBF, and these were released in February 2020. According to the DWYPD, the guidelines “aim to provide a framework to assist in the implementation of the GRBF”. Specific objectives of the guidelines include the following:

• To develop a common understanding of gender responsive planning, budgeting, monitoring, evaluation and auditing among stakeholders;
• To guide the development and implementation of initiatives and interventions that promote gender equality and women’s empowerment in order to achieve the country’s constitutional vision of a non-sexist society, and to ensure better outcomes for women and girls and gender impacts for the country;
• To outline key steps and procedures that can be undertaken to institutionalise gender responsive planning, budgeting, monitoring, evaluation, and auditing;
• To provide guidelines on how to assess government and non-government development interventions’ plans and budgets for their impact on the different categories of men and women, boys and girls;
• To measure the progress made in translating policy commitments on gender equality into concrete actions for the benefit of men and women, boys and girls, and persons with disabilities; and,
• To reduce interventions identified as gender negative or gender blind.

Again, some of the activities listed above, particularly under bullet points two and four, seem extraneous and therefore not completely necessary and relevant for the purpose of preparing government departments and related entities for the task of adopting and eventually implementing the GRBF. Towards the end of 2020, the DPME, after consultations with the DWYPD, released a new Medium Term Strategic Framework (MTSF) and Revised Framework on Strategic Plans and Annual Performance Plans (APP), and other related instruments and guidelines which were more gender responsive. The National Treasury, also around August 2020, released the Medium-Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) Technical Guidelines, which provide public institutions with guidance on how to prepare their medium-term budget estimates for the 2021 National Budget. These technical guidelines released by National Treasury contained key elements of the GRBF which national departments must incorporate in their budgets for 2021.

77 See additional information contained in a table summarising the implementation plan by DWYPD for the GRPBMEAF framework as attached under Annexure 3 below.
An assessment of the above initiatives appears to show that the DWYPD has made considerable efforts in attempting to ensure that the GRBF is accepted and embraced by other departments and state entities in South Africa. Nonetheless, progress has been very limited in this regard. For instance, some of the key state departments, particularly the National Treasury and the DPME, were considered not fully engaged in the process of institutionalising the framework across government in line with the efforts of the DWYPD.

Here, lessons from other countries who have successfully implemented GRB become useful for South Africa to draw from. For example, one crucial step Rwanda made in its gender responsive budgeting efforts was to draw on the model of Austria, which enacted in 2012/2013 an organic budget law, which formally incorporated gender budgeting into budget laws and made gender budget statements mandatory. Furthermore, “the gender budgeting framework in Rwanda importantly assigns the lead role to the Ministry of Finance in collaboration with the Ministry of Gender and Family Promotion and spending ministries”. In South Africa’s case, this would mean a strong collaboration between DWYPD and the National Treasury, with the Minister of Finance taking a leading role in terms of the implementation of the GRBF.

3.1.2. EDUCATION, RAISING AWARENESS AND ADVOCACY.

With regard to education, raising awareness and advocacy initiatives by the DWYPD in relation to the implementation of the GRBF, the department claims to have carried out several efforts in this regard, as indicated below:

- In 2019/2020, various initiatives, including presentations, were undertaken towards the development of improved capabilities. These have directly reached over 900 officials at national and provincial level, and many more indirectly;
- Presentation to the Forum of South African Directors-General Management Committee on the GRBF following its adoption in Cabinet, with pledges by Directors-General to drive the implementation of the Framework;
- Correspondence to Directors-General, Ministers and Premiers regarding the Framework and its implementation;
- Establishment of an inter-departmental High-Level Steering Committee on Framework to enhance consultation, coordination and implementation of the GRBF;
- Presentations at a variety of national and provincial forums, including the Gender Advisory Committee (April 2019), the Gauteng Gender Conference (June 2019) (provincial and local government), the Interim Steering Committee on Gender-Based Violence and Femicide (July 2019);
- Proposals on making the National Evaluation System more gender responsive were submitted at a National Evaluation Workshop attended by national and provincial government evaluation officials on 21 and 22 September 2019;
- Gauteng Budget Lekgotla attended by the Premier and Members of the Executive Council (October 2019);
- City of Ekurhuleni inter-departmental workshop (November 2019);
• Mpumalanga Provincial Government – Provincial Gender Machinery\textsuperscript{82} (November 2019);
• National Technical Planning Forum, including departmental strategic planning heads and officials (December 2019);
• National Community of Practice Forum, including public entities (December 2019);
• KwaZulu-Natal Legislature Multi-Party Women’s Caucus (February 2020);

A provincial workshop was held in February 2020 to assist Offices of Premiers to drive the implementation of the GRBF at a provincial level. The workshop was attended by representatives of eight of the nine provincial governments (excepting North West Province). The workshop also provided guidance on the roles of key stakeholders at a provincial level, including the Offices of the Premier, provincial treasuries and provincial departments. Guidance was provided on the completion of the GRBF;

• With regard to the GRBF, copies were widely distributed, and the document was placed on the DWYPD and DPME websites; and,
• DWYPD presented the GRBF to a forum of government communicators.\textsuperscript{83}

There have been more recent engagements related to the implementation of the GRBF, as explained by a DWYPD official in a written response to further questions from the CGE. It was pointed out that recent engagements included the following:\textsuperscript{84}

• GRBF presentation to the Parliamentary Multi-Party Women’s Caucus on 22 May 2020;
• GRBF presentation to the Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs (COGTA) Colloquium on 30 July 2020;
• DG to DG meetings with various departments, including on issues of GRBF (DPME, Stats SA, DALRRD, COGTA).
• Presentation to the North West Senior Managers during the Public Service Management Week on 28 August 2020;
• GRBF lecture on 3 September 2020, as part of the National School of Government gender course;
• Meeting with the Office of the Pension Fund Adjudicator on the inclusion of women, youth and persons with disabilities in their Strategic Plans and Annual Performance Plans, on 10 September 2020;
• Workshop with KwaZulu-Natal Provincial Government planning officials on 18 September 2020;
• GRBF lecture to the CGE Learning Hub with provincial CGE officials on 22 September 2020;
• Meeting between the DWYPD and the DPME Evaluation, Evidence and Knowledge Systems Branch, to discuss collaboration concerning a number of matters of mutual interest, including evaluations and the gender knowledge repository, on 23 September 2020;
• Meeting between the DWYPD and the DPME Public Sector Monitoring Branch on 23 September 2020, where the GRBF and guidelines were discussed. There were deliberations on areas of collaboration, including the assessment of the gender responsiveness of performance agreements and the gender responsiveness of on-site service delivery monitoring;
• The HLSC meeting on 2 October 2020;
• Workshop with Provincial Government Representatives on 8 October 2020;
• Presentation including GRBF to the North West Education Department Senior Managers on 8 October 2020;
• Meeting with DPME planning officials to discuss preparations and guidelines on the first draft and Annual Performance Plans, on 12 October 2020.

\textsuperscript{82} Provincial Gender Machineries are formal policy advisory deliberation forums involving gender activists and gender related organisations from government and the civil society sector established to deliberate and advise government on issues of gender equality and transformation at provincial level. A similar structure exists at national level, serving the same purpose.

\textsuperscript{83} Details of the date of this event were not provided.

\textsuperscript{84} DWYPD official, Microsoft Teams Interview, 30 October 2020.
Given that the Gender Responsive Budgeting Framework is intended to be institutionalised and implemented by national departments at this stage, it is not clear what the relevance of many of the activities listed above would be. Many of the activities include meetings, workshops and engagements with entities that have no role to play in the process of implementing the Framework at this stage. This raises questions as to the effectiveness of the process of educating, advocacy and raising awareness, particularly with those departments and public sector officials that have a direct role to play in the process of implementing the GRBF in the short to medium term.

3.1.3. CAPACITY BUILDING & TRAINING

The process of institutionalising the GRBF across government was also intended to include capacity building and training, presumably for those state officials with direct responsibility for carrying out the tasks and responsibilities related to its implementation. In this regard, the DWYPD to have carried out the activities listed below. This information is contained in the “Rapid Evaluation of the Early Implementation of the GRPBMEAF report 2020”, compiled by the DWYPD:

- The DWYPD, in collaboration with the National School of Government and the DPSA, developed a training module on gender responsive planning and budgeting in line with the GRBF. A session to train the trainers has been held and the course is to be piloted in 2020/2021;
- A number of departments have included gender mainstreaming in their induction programmes, and some encourage senior managers to attend gender-related training. However, this remains voluntary; and,
- The Department of Transport has gender mainstreaming campaigns and training for employees, while the Department of Social Development (DSD) has a Biannual National Gender Forum with national and provincial DSD.

Once again, the activities listed above bear no direct relevance to the need for capacity building among those public entities and state officials who will be directly involved in the implementation of the GRBF in the current financial year. An analysis of these efforts with regard to capacity building and training for the GRBF implementation shows that very little has been done. Even according to the DWYPD Rapid Early Evaluation Report on the implementation of the GRBF, the department scores itself a lowly 2 on its own 5-Point rating scale in terms of capacity building and training initiatives (on the scale, a score of 5 represents excellent progress, while a score of 1 represents no/limited progress).

3.2. INITIATIVES BY THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING, MONITORING AND EVALUATION

The DPME is a ministry housed under the Presidency, alongside the DWYPD. Its vision is to “coordinate government planning, monitoring and evaluation to address poverty, unemployment and inequality.” Moreover, its mission is “to mobilise stakeholders and harness resources towards the implementation of the National Development Plan (NDP) as a guide for the country’s developmental trajectory.” As such, the scope of its work ranges from planning to evaluating processes of government departments in accordance with the broader NDP envisioned for completion in 2030.

Currently, the Medium-Term Strategic Framework (2019-2024) is an important aspect of implementing the NDP. Some of the core and supporting initiatives by the DPME include the following: The National
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Evaluation System; the Citizen's-Based Monitoring System; Frontline Service Delivery Monitoring; Capacity Development Coordination; and the Management Performance Assessment Tools.

The GRBF locates the DPME as a key department in the achievement of the objectives regarding gendering resource allocation at a national level. According to the Framework, the DPME is to “facilitate gender responsiveness of planning, monitoring and evaluating systems together with the Department of Women (now the DWYPD)”. This statement articulates that the DPME should be involved in at least three aspects of the implementation of this Framework.

Furthermore, the GRBF further locates responsibility of the DPME in the short-term and medium to long term strategies. For the short term (2018/2019), the GRBF outlines relatively simple changes that will bring systemwide changes and big impacts. In this regard, the DPME is to improve the gender responsiveness of several policies, processes and programmes that it is responsible for, including the MTSF, the Mandate Paper and National Evaluation System, amongst others. Part of this involves the planning, assessing and evaluation of the gender responsiveness of such processes and policies, which would augment the work done by the DWYPD and lay an important foundation for the implementation of the GRBF. Nevertheless, such responsibility has not translated into material gains for the GRBF process altogether.

In an interview conducted with the DPME for this report, one official pointed out that the DPME works to ensure that all departments should have gender as a key aspect of their planning, and by extension their budgeting – all departments should include gender issues. A rapid evaluation by the DWYPD to evaluate the early implementation of the Framework found that the SPs and draft APPs for 2020/2021 of the majority of the departments were predominantly gender-blind. Presumably, this means that departments were failing to identify and prioritise gender issues in their SPs and APPs. The evaluation underlines the poor uptake of gender issues on key aspects relating to women, including health, education, labour and employment.

The DPME has issued the Revised Framework for Strategic and Annual Performance Plans, which still places responsibility solely on the DWYPD for ensuring that gender is key to their policy, process and programmatic efforts, rather than a systemwide responsibility. The role of the DPME as per the GRBF through the Mandate Paper and MTSF (including the DPME’s Revised Framework), for example, is to ensure that this is engaged at a planning level, yet this has not translated in institutional guiding documents and plans to provide material changes for those concerned.

In the medium to long term (2019-2024 & 2019-2030), the Framework outlines the following:

- A comprehensive, evidence-based diagnostic and gender audit of the government. This should include a more thorough investigation of the extent to which key government entities are indeed gender responsive, as well as the key enablers and obstacles to implementation;
- Comprehensive, country-wide programme theory of development and design;
- A more detailed exploration of implementation models and systems, with recommendations on the most appropriate model for South Africa;
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• Further development of a plan for the institutionalisation of the model, including the appropriate mechanisms and resources, and the identification of the appropriate incentives and disincentives to engender behavioural change;
• Legislative review to amend existing legislation or legislative proposals, or introduce new legislation;
• Clear assignment of roles and responsibilities, including the Department of Women (now DWYPD), DPME, Parliament, the CGE, etc;
• Development of a detailed implementation plan, including change management and capacity development; and,
• Development of a monitoring and evaluation plan.

Each of these medium to long term strategic points involve the input of the DPME in one way or another, particularly in reference to the time periods, as these align both with the MTSF and the NDP more broadly. In March 2018, Twende Mbele published a report entitled Diagnostic Study on the Gender-responsiveness of the South African National Evaluation System,93 which had various findings with regard to the DPME’s systems and policies. These findings include that the Government-Wide Monitoring and Evaluation System does not mention gender in any meaningful way; on the DPME’s Guidelines on the Functioning of M&E units, gender is not mentioned; gender is addressed in a number of ways throughout the NDP; and while there are gender indicators in certain outcomes, gender has not been found to be comprehensively included in the MTSF.

These are damning findings create a grim picture of the broader inclusion of gender in the fabric of the DPME’s work. For the GRBF, this is of particular concern as the medium to long term goals involve the “fundamental re-conceptualisation, redesign and implementation and institutionalisation” of core building blocks of the work of the DPME. In other words, the DPME itself has been shown to be gender-blind in their own processes, which are of vital importance to the success of the DWYPD’s GRBF.

According to the guidelines for the GRBF, the DWYPD has undertaken a process alongside the DPME to amend the National Evaluation Policy94 to ensure that this core policy is gender responsive, as opposed to its current gender-blind state. The DWYPD has adapted the DPME’s evidence-based policy management cycle for the GRBF, which begins to impel the DPME to do more for gender in its work. Nevertheless, an interview with a DPME official highlighted that the role of the DPME was an oversight role, and that it is primarily the role of the DWYPD to ensure that this Framework is distributed and implemented while their responsibility is to oversee this process.

The GRBF further places responsibility on various departments with regard to a sub-programme that involves leading the development of the Country Gender Indicator. These include the CGE, Statistics SA and the DPME, amongst others that are not named. This Country Gender Indicator (CGI) has since been established according to the final guidelines of the Framework.

The CGE has not been part of this process, as per the Framework outline. Nevertheless, the DPME appears throughout the GRBF as a lead department, yet an interview with a DPME official indicated that their role is simply an oversight role. Overall, the DPME carries an immense responsibility throughout the GRBF plans for implementation across all state organs and spheres, and their involvement has already been seen through some policy amendments. However, the level of initiatives required in the allocated timeframe does not indicate the DPME’s enthusiastic participation in the implementation of the Framework.

### 3.3. INITIATIVES BY THE NATIONAL TREASURY

Treasury has specific roles and responsibilities which it needs to meet as a leading national governing entity; these are listed below.

**Table 1. Roles and responsibilities for reporting: National Treasury**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Custodian of the financial performance reporting system</td>
<td>Establish systems for monitoring implementation of government budget allocations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance on annual reporting</td>
<td>Issue guidelines on preparing Annual Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversight of reported Information</td>
<td>Analyse government expenditure reports and provide feedback; and, Participate in structures to provide oversight of government performance information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for the utilisation of monitoring findings</td>
<td>Support government institutions to use monitoring findings during the budget process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** DPME, Revised Framework for Strategic Plans and Annual Performance Plans
These are among the basic and standard duties expected of the National Treasury, which is also expected to have a greater role in the GRBF. Past experiences from prior GRB initiatives indicate how the involvement of the Minister of Finance and National Treasury to drive the GRB-specific components, including the provision of guidelines and instructions to integrate gender into budgets, and monitoring line function ministries budget compliance with the guidelines, was key for success.96

As indicated in the table, Treasury is already engaged with the establishment of systems for the monitoring and implementation of government budget allocations; key for GRB would the incorporation of gender within the allocations of budgets, as recommended by the Framework. Given the role occupied by Treasury, and the public purse it handles, GRB would not get off the ground without the requisite support. Unlike before in its APPs, “National Treasury has introduced a programme to mainstream gender matters in the finance department. The special committee is tasked to coordinate organisational self-reflection, to review values, norms, policies, practices and support services to ensure that they are free from discrimination, and responsive to the specific needs of women employees, and where gaps are identified, propose concrete steps for organisational change and transformation”.97 This was a potentially important step given the general perception in the DWYPD that Treasury frameworks tend to sideline gender issues. For example, the Treasury’s Framework for Managing Programme Performance Information (FMPI) had no explicit mention of gender, which would have allowed greater depth with regard to its initial purpose.98

National Treasury is responsible for performance management as one of the three key pillars of Government-Wide Monitoring & Evaluation (GWM&E) policy through the FMPI, as a recommendation by Twende Mbele, which found that “eventually, gender responsive budgeting and planning support the project cycle, and are central to encouraging gender responsiveness, provided the expectations are reasonable, affordable and achievable. Mainstreaming of gender into each step in the planning and budget approval cycle, with policy for gender accountability integrated into budget approval, would provide the necessary mechanism to support consistent and habitual gender responsiveness”.99

As earlier highlighted, GRB needs the full participation and commitment from the National Treasury in order to improve its chances for success. This is a prerequisite stated in the GRBF document, particularly at the level of the Executive, where the support of other ministries and the approval of the President and Cabinet are critical. The support of the Minister of Finance and the National Treasury are critical.100 Further requirements stated in the Framework document include the following:

- Overall fiscal framework to incorporate Women’s Empowerment and Gender Equality Bill (WEGE) considerations;
- Gender responsiveness to be addressed across the budget cycle and MTEF processes;
- Budget Guidelines to include requirement/incentives on gender responsive allocations and programme bids;
- Each vote to include gender indicators per programme (mainstreamed & targeted);
- Allocations to key WEGE interventions to be included in MTBPS and the National Budget Speech;

99 Ibid at pp 9.
• Gender to be included in the National Treasury database; and,
• Treasury regulations on gender to be issued.\textsuperscript{101}

The GRBF appeared to have realised the potential inherent in gender responsive budgeting as an instrument for change. However, challenges continue to confound the process, particularly the lack of political will and buy-in, as well as limited commitment among many state entities to embrace the Framework. Previous failures of GRB initiatives were as a result of the absence of directives by Cabinet, National Treasury, the Presidency and Parliament, which were seen as fatal gaps contributing to the lack of sustainability, among others.\textsuperscript{102}

During the financial year 2020, only two departments embraced the GRBF, namely the DWYPD and the DPME.\textsuperscript{103} Uptake has been limited from other national departments, including key ministries such as the National Treasury, the DPSA and COGTA.\textsuperscript{104} However, according to the DWYPD, the National Treasury has made some progress on the gender responsiveness of institutional plans, with its Instruction No. 5 of 2019/2020 giving legal effect to the DPME’s Revised Framework for Strategic Plans and Annual Performance Plans.\textsuperscript{105}

In as far as the role of the National Treasury in the GRBF is concerned, it would appear that they were leaving the DWYPD to take the lead, while offering limited support in the process.\textsuperscript{106} The limited role and involvement of the National Treasury appears to have raised concerns within Parliament’s Multi-Party Women’s Caucus. For instance, at a Parliamentary briefing session held on 28 May 2020, a member of the Caucus appeared to express deep concern with the limited involvement of the Treasury in the process of institutionalising gender responsiveness in financial matters of state entities.\textsuperscript{107}

Based on interviews with Treasury officials, it would appear that the GRBF was not an important priority matter.\textsuperscript{108} Although the DWYPD has set timelines in its previous and current MTEF targets on GRB, the same is not the case for the Treasury, which has set no clear implementation plans in this regard. Due to lack of enforcement, many entities in government did not prioritise GRB. However, during interviews for this report, some respondents from the DPME and the DWYPD were not in favour of enforcement, preferring voluntary and proactive willingness by state entities to embrace the GRBF. This is probably one of the key factors accounting for the limited progress currently experienced in the level of participation in the process by many government departments.

\section*{3.4. Initiatives by the High-Level Steering Committee (HLSC)}

The HLSC is a structure that was formed by the DWYPD to assist in efforts and coordination across various departments, to implement the GRBF. According to the DWYPD, the HLSC was formed to fulfil the mandate to lead and coordinate efforts to advance women’s empowerment and gender equality.\textsuperscript{109} Furthermore, recognising that all government entities have a responsibility to advance women’s empowerment and gender equality, the DWYPD initiated the establishment of the HLSC for the GRBF, comprising senior officials from across national departments and institutions, including the CGE.\textsuperscript{110}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{101} Ibid at pp. 91.
\item \textsuperscript{102} Ibid at pp. 21.
\item \textsuperscript{104} Ibid at pp. 4.
\item \textsuperscript{105} Ibid at pp. 21.
\item \textsuperscript{106} National Treasury, Microsoft Teams Interview, 18 September 2020.
\item \textsuperscript{107} Multi-Party Women’s Caucus, Framework for gender responsive planning, budgeting, evaluation and auditing: Department briefing with Minister and Deputy Minister, 28 May 2020.
\item \textsuperscript{108} National Treasury, Microsoft Teams Interview, 18 September 2020.
\item \textsuperscript{109} Department of Women, Youth and Persons with Disabilities (DWYPD). “HIGH-LEVEL STEERING COMMITTEE ON GENDER RESPONSIVE POLICY, PLANNING, BUDGETING, RESEARCH, MONITORING AND EVALUATION AND GENDER AUDITING (HLSC) TERMS OF REFERENCE”. (July 2018).
\item \textsuperscript{110} Ibid.
\end{itemize}
According to the DWYPD, the HLSC terms of reference (ToRs) are guided by some key objectives which included the following:

i. To develop a collective understanding of and guide the development and implementation of a Gender Responsive Policy, Planning, Research, Budgeting, Gender Auditing, Monitoring and Evaluation Framework and System in South Africa;

ii. To share best practice and relevant knowledge regarding policies, programmes and institutional mechanisms which have successfully advanced women’s empowerment and gender equality;

iii. To consider relevant national policies, legislation and frameworks which have a direct bearing on the mandate of the HLSC;

iv. To contribute towards gender mainstreaming within government’s planning, policy development, budgeting and programming systems;

v. To strengthen gender responsive evidence, including through contributing to the development of a gender responsive research agenda and gender responsive evaluations;

vi. To share knowledge, information and research and contribute to the development of a knowledge repository on women’s empowerment and gender equality;

vii. To strengthen monitoring, reporting and reviews of government-wide performance on women’s empowerment and gender equality and to make recommendations for continuous improvement and policy and programming interventions;

viii. To contribute to the development of a common Country Gender Indicator Framework and the enhancement of gender data and statistics, including those relating to the SDGs as well as continental, regional and national instruments;

ix. To support the development of women’s empowerment and gender equality policy priorities for integration within government-wide planning and budgeting systems on an annual basis;

x. To contribute towards improving the gender responsiveness of sectoral policies and plans;

xi. To deliberate on relevant international relations matters relating to gender equality and women’s empowerment, including reporting on international obligations as well as the relevant policies, strategies and engagements at multi-lateral and bilateral level;

xii. To establish and strengthen partnerships towards the achievement of the objectives of the HLSC; and,

xiii. To contribute to capacity building and awareness raising on GRB in partnership with relevant state organs.

It is not clear how effective the HLSC has been in terms of coordinating work around ensuring that government departments embraced the GRBF. Although officials insisted that the structure has been effective, evidence of this is very limited considering the limited uptake of the Framework across government.

The next section below looks at and discusses some of the key emerging issues from the assessment exercise.
4. DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF KEY EMERGING ISSUES

As can be seen from the discussions above, there are several emerging issues which bear on the implementation of the Gender Responsive Budgeting Framework (GRBF). One key issue and challenge is that the implementation of the GRBF, which has been outlined in various planning and policy documents of the Department of Women, Youth and People with Disabilities (DWYPD) – like the GRBF and in their 2019/2020 strategic planning document – should have been undertaken by all national departments as of the financial year 2020/2021. However, what is clear is that this did not happen. The DWYPD is still in the initial stages of raising awareness around the GRBF.

DWYPD officials interviewed also pointed out that the Strategic Plans (SP) and Annual Performance Plans (APP) for almost all national departments for the 2020/2021 financial year were still gender-blind.\textsuperscript{112} For instance, one official from the DWYPD argued that:

“It’s a bit discouraging. We had hoped for better outcomes given that the guidelines for the SPs and APPs have included a component of asking departments to be a bit more gender responsive in their plans… [DWPD] anticipated that in the current financial year, the APPS and SPs of the national departments would have included gender responsiveness, that it would have started to filter through.”\textsuperscript{113}

Furthermore, the DWYPD’s Early Rapid Evaluation Report of the GRBF points out that the majority of the first draft SPs and APPs of national departments which were assessed are largely gender-blind, and the lack of gender responsiveness of SPs and APPs points to a lack of alignment with the MTSF.\textsuperscript{114}

It is clear that the implementation of GRBF is already facing an uphill battle in terms of the buy-in of national government departments. In order to resolve these challenges, it will require much more concerted efforts to assist the DWYPD in its efforts to implement the GRBF, and political will to push through some of the reforms required through either the DWYPD, National Treasury or even at the level of the Presidency.

The second important issue and challenge is that greater cooperation is required between the key national departments which are leading the implementation of GRBF in South Africa (i.e. DWYPD, the National Treasury and the Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME) in this case). From the interviews conducted with various officials working at the DWYPD, the DPME and the National Treasury, it is clear that the Framework was the responsibility of the DWYPD, and that the other departments did not have much of a role to play. If the GRBF is to be implemented successfully, it will require all the departments to buy in to the process and be willing to share the responsibilities of its implementation. The fact that the HLSC – where most of the departments are represented – was not making any real inroads into the implementation of the Framework remains a serious cause for concern.

Thirdly, the National Treasury is clearly a key national ministry for playing a significant and forceful role in realising GRB. Given its key importance as the department responsible for the allocation of national resources, the Treasury is perceived to have played a less than central role insofar as current attempts to institutionalise the GRBF. In other countries where the rollout of GRB has been successful, the Ministries of Finance have played a significant role in pushing through either policy, measures or systems to support the implementation of gender responsive budgeting in these countries.

\textsuperscript{112} DWYPD official, Zoom interview, 28 July 2020.
\textsuperscript{113} Ibid.
Fourthly, the process of realising the GRBF needs greater political will. As indicated above, the DWYPD is accountable for the process because it is the department responsible for gender equality issues and women’s affairs. However, it needs support from the National Treasury and the Department of Finance, and even the Presidency, given the importance of the GRBF for gender equality and transformation in the country. South Africa could emulate the model followed by Rwanda, where responsibility for GRB resides with the Ministry of Finance in collaboration with the Ministry of Gender and Family Promotion.115

Fifthly, regarding the DPME, the GRBF places a great deal of responsibility on the department in terms of its mandate. Its participation is vital with regard to its power in influencing the ways in which government departments plan, strategise, implement, and assess their work. The departments’ activities are guided by the NDP and MTSF. While the DPME has worked closely with the DWYPD compared to other ministries in the process of preparing to implement the framework and guidelines, there has not been a strong buy-in by the DPME. While the GRBF document extensively outlines the role of the DPME, in practice it would appear that its level of involvement has been less than what would have been expected, based on interviews with DWYPD officials.

The DPME is adamant though that it has worked closely with the DWYPD throughout the process, particularly on specific matters such as amending the National Evaluation Policy Framework. Yet the DPME points out that the overhauling and uprooting of gender-blindness in government planning, budgeting, monitoring, evaluation and auditing is proving to be painstakingly slow. In some instances, DPME officials said this bordered on reluctance on the part of some government departments. A number of factors appear to account for the slow progress and lack of buy-in, including lack of human and financial resources in the DWYPD, which constrains its capacity to carry out its government-wide mandate in relation to gender planning, budgeting, monitoring and evaluation.116 With one of the smallest budgets across government, the DWYPD’s ability to institutionalise GRB in the country seems severely constrained at the moment.

Sixthly, another key emerging issue and challenge is that outside the work of the DWYPD, the GRBF does not seem to be a key priority for many of the other government departments. During interviews conducted for this study, a number of issues were raised in this regard. For instance,117 the DWYPD often experiences difficulties in securing the support, commitment, and involvement of other departments in terms of embracing the GRBF. Also, its limited budgetary allocation is usually attributed to its perceived lack of political clout within government, thus limiting the level of its influence in critical national priorities. There was a strong perception among officials interviewed for this study that the DWYPD is a minor department that does not carry the necessary political weight necessary for an entity located within the Presidency.

116 Ibid.
5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the presentation, discussion and analysis of the findings in this report, the CGE has drawn several conclusions, listed in this section. It is clear from the research study that a number of challenges face the implementation of the Gender Responsive Budgeting Framework (GRBF) and gender responsive budgeting generally in South Africa.

One of the challenges observed is that although the DWYPD is the lead department in the implementation of the GRBF, it lacks the resources – both financial and human – and political clout hinder its ability to implement Gender Responsive Budgeting (GRB) in South Africa. GRB should already have been implemented by all national departments as of 2020, however this is not the case, and already implementation is lagging behind based on the timelines and projections of the DWYPD. This is a cause for concern and needs urgent intervention to address the issue, and ensure the projected timelines of the implementation of the GRBF are observed, or are as close as possible to initial projections.

Secondly, the DWYPD is quite a small department, and so is its share of the budget allocation in comparison to other departments budgets like education and health. The DWYPD needs to be assisted urgently by the National Treasury and other key government departments like the DPME, the DPSA and the Presidency in the implementation of GRB in South Africa. Also, more financial resources must be provided by national government to implement gender responsive budgeting.

Thirdly, we conclude that there is a lack of clear and effective communication channels regarding the specific roles and responsibilities of the various key departments in terms of the GRBF, particularly among the core departments (i.e. DWYPD, DPME and National Treasury).

5.2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- The CGE recommends that the GRBF is legislated into law, as in other countries like Rwanda, to assist in the effective institutionalisation and implementation of GRB in South Africa. This will ensure that the adoption and implementation of the Framework is not a voluntary act but an act of compliance with legislation;
- The CGE recommends that, as a matter of urgency, the DWYPD should put in place effective mechanisms for oversight and enforcement of implementation of the Framework, with clearly defined consequences for lack of compliance;
- We recommend that the roles and responsibilities of key ministries, particularly the National Treasury and the DPME, be clearly defined and enforced through clear practice guidelines to be drafted by the DWYPD;
- We recommend that the HLSC be restructured and provided with the necessary administrative capacity and financial resources to ensure that it serves as an effective structure for the institutionalisation, coordination of implementation of the GRBF by all national departments;
- It is recommended that GRB be made a requirement for all government department annual planning and budgeting processes, with regular reviews and scrutiny by Parliamentary Portfolio Committees to ensure compliance and accountability in this regard;
- It is recommended that the DWYPD develop a clear, focused and targeted awareness raising, education and training programme with clear timelines, to be followed by engaging with national departments and senior officials directly responsible for the implementation of the GRBF; and,
- The CGE should engage the DWYPD and the National Treasury on best practices to institutionalise and implement GRB across government in South Africa.
ANNEXURE 1

The table below shows the state of progress for all 45 national government departments in terms of adopting and implementing the Gender Responsive Budgeting Framework. This is based on a review and examination of Annual Performance Plans and Strategic Plans of these departments for the financial year 2020/2021, including analysis of budget speeches delivered by the Ministers of all these departments for the same financial year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>National Departments</th>
<th>GRBF reflected in both APPs, SPs or Budget Speech.</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries [Department of]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No mention either in APP/budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Sports, Arts and Culture [Department of]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No mention either in APP/budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Basic Education [Department of]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No mention either in APP/budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Civilian Secretariat for Police Service</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No mention either in APP/budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Communications and Digital Technologies [Department of]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No mention either in APP/budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Cooperative Governance [Department of]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Contained in the APP for 2020/2021, under District development model. Ensuring inclusive and gender mainstreamed budgets based on the needs and aspirations of our people and communities at a local level (pp. 17 &amp; 19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Correctional Services [Department of]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No mention either in APP/budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Defence [Department of]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No mention either in APP/budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Economic Development [Department of]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No mention either in APP/budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Environment, Forestry and Fisheries [Department of]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No mention either in APP/budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Government Communication and Information System</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No mention either in APP/budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>National Departments</td>
<td>GRBF reflected in both APPs, SPs or Budget Speech.</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Government Pensions Administration Agency (GPAA)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Health [ Department of ]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Higher Education and Training [ Department of ]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Home Affairs [ Department of ]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Human Settlements [ Department of ]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Independent Police Investigative Directorate (IPID)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>International Relations and Cooperation [ Department of ]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Military Veterans [ Department of ]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Mineral Resources and Energy [ Department of ]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>National School of Government</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>National Treasury</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation [ Department of ]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>National Departments</td>
<td>GRBF reflected in both APPs, SPs or Budget Speech.</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Public Enterprises Department of ]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No APP online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Public Service and Administration [ Department of ]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>APP mentions the policy framework, pp. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Public Works and Infrastructure [ Department of ]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No mention either in APP/budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development [ Department of ]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No mention either in APP/budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Science and Technology [ Department of ]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No mention either in APP/budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Small Business Development [ Department of ]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Mentioned GRPBME as guiding APP, but not mentioned in the budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Social Development [ Department of ]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No mention either in APP/budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>South African Police Service (SAPS)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No mention either in APP/budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>South African Revenue Service (SARS)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No mention either in APP/budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Sports, Arts, Culture and Recreation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No mention either in APP/budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>State Security [ Department of ]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No mention either in APP/budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Statistics South Africa [ Stats SA ]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No mention either in APP/budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Telecommunications and Postal Services [ Department of ]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No mention either in APP/budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Tourism [ Department of ]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No mention either in APP/budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Trade, Industry and Competition (the dtic) [ Department of ]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No mention either in APP/budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs [ Department of ]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No mention either in APP/budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Transport [ Department of ]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No mention either in APP/budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Water and Sanitation [ Department of ]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No mention either in APP/budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Women, Youth and Persons with Disabilities [ Department of ]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Mentioned in the latest budget and previous APPs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Declaration of the Gender Responsive Planning and Budgeting Summit held on 29 and 30 November 2018 at the Birchwood Hotel, Gauteng.

PREAMBLE

We, the delegates gathered at this Gender Responsive Planning and Budgeting Summit from 29-30 November 2018 held at the Birchwood Hotel and Conference Centre, Boksburg, Gauteng, comprising representatives from various government departments, provinces and public sector entities; the Commission for Gender Equality, NGOs and civil society in South Africa, both women and men, young and old, from urban, rural areas; from Ethiopia, Kenya, Mozambique, Rwanda and Uganda; as well as International Development Partners, especially UN Women.

NOTING THAT:

1. The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa guarantees the full and equal enjoyment of all rights and freedoms by people of all genders and the realisation of a non-sexist society.

2. Despite the notable strides made in women’s empowerment and gender equality in the country since the advent of democracy in 1994, the majority of women and girls still suffer from multi-dimensional poverty, inequality and discrimination on the basis of sex and gender; multiple social problems such as gender-based violence and violence against women and girls, the high unemployment rate of women, especially young women, and the increasing feminisation of poverty;

3. While women’s representation and participation in political, decision-making and leadership levels has demonstrably increased across the different sectors of the social fabric of South African life, it has not fundamentally resulted in transformation for women and girls in the country, and they continue to face political, social and economic exclusion.
GRBF IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINES AND INDICATORS

The GRPBMEA documents projected key implementation phases from 2017-2021 by the DWYPD. Phase 1: 2017 / 2018 covered the initial consultation processes with key government stakeholders; Phases 2 – 4 are outlined in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial consultation processes with key government stakeholders</td>
<td>• Decision to broaden focus to Gender Responsive Planning &amp; entire public policy cycle.</td>
<td>• For implementing the reforms developed and adopted in 2018/2019, as well as undertaking a more in-depth review and design process to finalise</td>
<td>• Government-wide rollout of GRBF at a national level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• GRBF finalised, approved and announced by President</td>
<td>• Plans for the rollout of GRBF are announced by the sixth administration in 2019.</td>
<td>• Further development and implementation of institutionalisation mechanisms, systems development, capacity building and training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Existing government wide Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation policies, systems and procedures as well as public finance, budgeting and expenditure review systems engendered.</td>
<td>• Gender indicators are mainstreamed within all key government planning instruments, including the NDP Five-Year Implementation Plan, MTSF, Strategic Plans and Annual Performance Plans.</td>
<td>• An evaluation of the implementation and early outcomes of GRBF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Country Gender Indicator Framework developed.</td>
<td>• The Mandate Paper includes gender priorities.</td>
<td>• Further refinement of the Quarterly Gender Performance Reviews and corrective interventions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 25-year review on the status of women completed.</td>
<td>• Quarterly Gender Performance Reviews are undertaken and tabled in Cabinet system for consideration and corrective interventions.</td>
<td>• Gender policy reviews across different government sectors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Women’s Dialogues undertaken to ensure women’s voices are heard, and that they are used to inform gender policy priorities.</td>
<td>• An in-depth analysis of key government plans and policies is undertaken using the Gender Results Effectiveness Scale (GRES).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Gender policy priorities for 2020/2021 and 2019-2024 are identified and form part of a government Mandate Paper to inform budget prioritisation</td>
<td>• Country GEWE Policy Priorities and Programme of Action for the period 2019-2024 are developed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• NSG capacity building on GRPB implemented</td>
<td>• The GRBF model is finalised and implemented with piloting in selected national departments, provinces and metros. This includes institutional mechanisms as well as change management, further systems development, guidelines, capacity building and training.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Free State GRB pilot completed</td>
<td>• A formative evaluation for the GRBF system.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Initiation of a legislative review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Table adapted from Department of Women, Youth and Persons with Disabilities (DWYPD). 2018. Framework on Gender Responsive Planning, Budgeting, Monitoring, Evaluation and Auditing (GRPBMEA).
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