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“…..attempts to deliver on gender equality in terms of actual policy shifts will not be sustainable in the longer term if equal attention is not paid to the way in which things are done. That is, the policy process itself is key in developing an understanding of the nature of gender inequalities and thus should remain a central focus in any attempt at promoting GB”

“Embarking upon a gender budget initiative then, initially involves developing an understanding of the relationship between policy and the actual allocation of public monies and to locate the budget within the policy process as opposed to viewing the two as distinct.”

Ailsa McKay (2004:2)
Gender Responsive Budgeting in Turkey 2006+

Action/reality: significant awareness BUT no applied case

one- or two-day training sessions
- Central Government, Local Government, CSO
- International experts
- Project commitment: (inter)national CSO or UNDP, UNFPA
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BROAD QUESTION:
“what difference do WFCP cities make for gender well-being?”

implications for GRB

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS: WFCP and non-WFCP Cities – municipality level

CHANNELS OF ANALYSIS:
policy making, policy implementation, resource allocation

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE:
well-being (capabilities) (Nussbaum, Robeyns, Sen)
well-being gender budgets (Addabbo, Picchio et al. 2008+)
TASKS: gender auditing of:

• policy documents (strategic plans, performance programs, LEAPS for WFCP cities)

• budgets:
  De-construction (de-composition) of municipality budgets on the basis of capabilities and functionings

• local policy implementation: interviews public service providers & women beneficiaries
  (service production vs service outreach)
  (wrt capabilities)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coverage:</th>
<th>WFCP</th>
<th>non-WFCP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kars</td>
<td></td>
<td>Erzurum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Şanlıurfa</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diyarbakır</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevşehir</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kayseri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İzmir</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samsun</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ordu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Decomposition of municipality budgets:

three mapping stages:

1. capabilities with municipality functions
2. capabilities with responsible units
3. responsible units with municipality functions

Money allocations

Proportional (%) distribution structures
List of Capabilities

1. Access to Adequate and Secure Living Spaces
2. Access to Adequate Mobility and Environmental Planning
3. Access to Leisure Time and Sports Activities
4. Access to Adequate Care Services
5. Social and Political Participation
6. Access to Paid Employment and Decent Working Conditions
7. Access to Cash and in-kind Income
8. Access to Health (mainly Central Govt. responsibility)
9. Access to Education and Training
10. Ability to Lead a Life Without Violence
## Expenditures - Capabilities vs Municipality Functions
in 1000 Turkish Liras

### Ordu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions</th>
<th>Zoning and Town Planning</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Fire and Disaster Management</th>
<th>Culture and Tourism</th>
<th>Social Services</th>
<th>Labour and Employment</th>
<th>Democracy and Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Adequate and Secure Living Spaces</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Adequate Mobility and Environmental Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Leasure Time and Sports Activities</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Adequate Care Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Political Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Paid Employment and Decent Working Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Monetary Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Education and Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to Lead a Life Without Violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An Example forCapabilities Expenditures vs Organizational Structure of Municipality: İzmir (2013), %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>Zoning and Town Planning</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Fire and Disaster Management</th>
<th>Culture and Tourism</th>
<th>Social Services</th>
<th>Labour and Employment</th>
<th>Democracy and Participation</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Adequate and Secure Living Spaces</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Adequate Mobility and Environmental Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Leisure Time and Sports Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Adequate Care Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Political Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Paid Employment and Decent Working Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Monetary Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Education and Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to Lead a Life Without Violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FINDINGS:

no significant difference in favour of WFCP cities

1. gender auditing of policy documents
   - women’s empowerment: social risk aversion (women’s poverty)
   - emphasis on women’s traditional roles in the society and family
   - pro-women ≡ pro-family

2. gender auditing of the budgets
   - See 1. above…
   - Resource allocation for women: social transfers, budget items of: public relations, culture works and publications depts.
   - finance department: no active role in initiating gender budgeting
   - Infrastructure (road, sewage, water supply) expenditures dominate.
3. **gender auditing of local policy implementation**

**municipality staff**

- weak governance - strong bureaucracy

- high degree of centralization and hierarchy: low local autonomy

- gender awareness (rhetoric) of policy makers (mostly men) significantly much higher in WFCP cities.

- Perception: activities for women only,

- (mis) Perception: gender budgeting is “expenditures for women” rather than “expenditures on eliminating gender imbalances”.

- Missing link: the role of men in improving women’s capabilities (e.g. violence, education and employment opportunities)
3. gender auditing of local policy implementation

Women beneficiaries

Both WFCP and non-WFCP cities:

capability priorities of the beneficiaries of municipality services differ:
Factors: socio-economic status and location

Women are not homogenous:
High and middle income + center
demand services and spending on mobility and recreation,
Low income + periphery
demand services and spending on security and basic needs
• WFCP cities are not homogenous:
  A non-WFCP city could be more gender sensitive than a WFCP city.

  – multiplicity of issues (e.g. administrative, economic, cultural, political)

  – societal cum political atmosphere is the determining factor (encouraging or discouraging women’s empowerment)

  – the effectiveness of policy transfer i.e. projects like UNJP-WFCP are subject to these constraints.
APPENDIX
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT: State Planning Organisation

• road map and vision for macroeconomic and social policies.

The 9th Development Plan (2007-2013):
• no mention with regard to gender mainstreaming (no GB)
• women counted among groups “exposed to the risk of poverty and social exclusion”.

• Empowerment of women (esp. poor and immigrants to the cities) linked with women’s employability.

• Emphasis on:
  vocational training for women,
  education opportunities for girls,
  protection from domestic violence.
The Finance Minister:  (Budget presentation, Oct. 2011)

“WE ARE GENDER SENSITIZING OUR BUDGET FOR 2012”

No budget allocation stated, targets:
- positive discrimination for girls’ education in poor families, (conditional cash transfer)
- women’s employability (insurance premium support to employers)
- protection of women from domestic violence (women’s shelters)
- NOT GB? Payment for caregivers in poor families
The 10th Development Plan (2014-2018):
Empowerment and social inclusion of women culturally, socially and economically, while preserving family integrity (work-life balance, flexible work, parental leave, discourage divorce & abortion)

🌟 «AWARENESS RAISING FOR GB WILL BE PROMOTED AND CASE EXAMPLES WILL BE DEVELOPED»

Annual Plan for 2014: NO mentioning of GB (2014+?)