Indicator 5.c.1

Indicator Name, Target and Goal

**Indicator 5.c.1:** Percentage of countries with systems to track and make public allocations for gender equality and women's empowerment

**Target 5.c:** 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

**Goal 5:** Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls

Definition and Rationale
Definition:
This indicator is defined as percentage of countries that track budget allocations for gender equality and women’s empowerment (GEWE) throughout the public finance management cycle and make these allocations publicly available.

The indicator measures three criteria. The first focuses on the intent of a government to address GEWE by identifying if it has programs/policies on GEWE and corresponding resource allocations to support implementation. The second criterion assesses if a government has mechanisms throughout the public financial management cycle to track resource allocations towards these policy goals. The third focuses on transparency of data by assessing existence of provisions to make information about allocations for GEWE publicly available.

While this indicator is monitored at the global level, a country can assess its own status according to the international criteria. It can also track its progress over time and compare its system to those of other countries.

Concepts:
An assessment of a country’s status in tracking and making public the budgetary allocations for gender equality and women’s empowerment is based on the following questionnaire.

Criterion 1. Which of the following aspects of public expenditure are reflected in your government programs and its resource allocations? (In the last completed fiscal year)

Question 1.1. Are there policies and/or programs of the government designed to address well-identified gender equality goals, including those where gender equality is not the primary objective (such as public services, social protection and infrastructure) but incorporate action to close gender gaps? (Yes=1/No=0)

Question 1.2. Do these policies and/or programs have adequate resources allocated within the budget, sufficient to meet both their general objectives and their gender equality goals? (Yes=1/No=0)

Question 1.3. Are there procedures in place to ensure that these resources are executed according to the budget? (Yes=1/No=0)

Criterion 2. To what extent does your Public Financial Management system promote gender-related or gender-responsive goals? (In the last completed fiscal year)

Question 2.1. Does the Ministry of Finance/budget office issue call circulars, or other such directives, that provide specific guidance on gender-responsive budget allocations? (Yes=1/No=0)

Question 2.2. Are key policies and programs, proposed for inclusion in the budget, subject to an ex ante gender impact assessment? (Yes=1/No=0)

Question 2.3. Are sex-disaggregated statistics and data used across key policies and programs in a way which can inform budget-related policy decisions? (Yes=1/No=0)

Question 2.4. Does the government provide, in the context of the budget, a clear statement of gender-related objectives (i.e. gender budget statement or gender responsive budget legislation)? (Yes=1/No=0)

Question 2.5. Are budgetary allocations subject to “tagging” including by functional classifiers, to identify their linkage to gender-equality objectives? (Yes=1/No=0)

Question 2.6. Are key policies and programs subject to ex post gender impact assessment? (Yes=1/No=0)

Question 2.7. Is the budget as a whole subject to independent audit to assess the extent to which it promotes gender-responsive policies? (Yes=1/No=0)

Criterion 3. Are allocations for gender equality and women’s empowerment made public? (In the last completed fiscal year)

Question 3.1. Is the data on gender equality allocations published? (Yes=1/No=0)

Question 3.2. If published, has this data been published in an accessible manner on the Ministry of Finance (or office responsible for budget) website and/or related official bulletins or public notices? (Yes=1/No=0)

Question 3.3. If so, has the data on gender equality allocations been published in a timely manner? (Yes=1/No=0)

Rationale and Interpretation:
Adequate and effective financing is essential to achieve SDG 5 and the gender related targets across the SDG framework. By tracking resource allocations, governments introduce deliberate measures into the planning and budgeting cycle to meet their gender policy objectives. By making these allocations public, governments commit to higher levels of transparency and accountability in budget decision making.

This is an indicator about the characteristics of the fiscal system, and not about the quantity or quality of financial resources allocated for gender equality and women’s empowerment. It can incentivize governments to put in place a system to track and make public resource allocations which can then inform policy review, better policy formulation and more effective public financial management. The system should be led by the Ministry of Finance in collaboration with the sectoral ministries and National Women’s Machineries and overseen by an appropriate body such as Parliament or Public Auditors.

Data Sources and Collection Method
Method of Computation and Other Methodological Considerations

Computation Method:

Method of computation for global aggregation of the indicator 5.c.1 is defined as follows:

\[
\text{Indicator 5.c.1} = \left( \frac{\text{Number of countries that fully meet requirements}}{\text{Total number of countries}} \right) \times 100
\]

The indicator includes a scoring system structured as a ‘scale’ measure by classifying countries, based on their responses, into one of three categories: ‘fully meets requirements’, ‘approaches requirements’, and ‘does not meet requirements.’ The use of a scaled scoring can incentivize countries to improve tracking systems and to show progress over time.

A country’s status for this indicator is calculated based on the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements per criterion</th>
<th>Criterion 1</th>
<th>Criterion 2</th>
<th>Criterion 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A country will satisfy</td>
<td>if it answers “Yes” to 2 out of 3 questions in Criterion 1</td>
<td>if it answers “Yes” to 4 out of 7 questions in Criterion 2</td>
<td>if it answers “Yes” to 2 out of 3 questions in Criterion 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each question within each criterion has the same weight. A country would need to satisfy the threshold of “yes” responses per criterion to satisfy each criterion. Countries are then classified as: ‘fully meets requirements’ if all Criteria are satisfied; ‘approaches requirements’ if one or two of Criteria are satisfied; and ‘does not meet requirements’ if no Criteria is satisfied.

Comments and limitations:

The indicator does not measure allocation of resources but the existence of mechanisms to track resource allocations and that make that information available publicly. However, there is an optional question in the questionnaire (not scored) that requests countries to report the percentage of the government budget allocated for gender equality programs. Another limitation is that the indicator, which is process oriented, does not provide data on the adequacy or quality of resource allocations.

Sub-indicator, alternative and additional indicators: N/A

Data Disaggregation

a) The following two country classification global proportions will also be reported:

i. \[
\left( \frac{\text{Number of countries that do not meet requirements}}{\text{Total number of countries}} \right) \times 100
\]

ii. \[
\left( \frac{\text{Number of countries that approach requirements}}{\text{Total number of countries}} \right) \times 100
\]

a) Additional disaggregation by region as follows:

\[
\left( \frac{\text{Number of countries in region } x \text{ with country classification } y}{\text{Total number of countries in region } x} \right) \times 100
\]

Where \( x \) refers to the region of analysis and \( y \) refers to the country classification based on the questionnaire.
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