Tackling the inadequate use of resources by municipalities and building a rights-based approach to service delivery
ABOUT THE ABS PROJECT

To improve accountability and to ensure that communities’ democratic rights go beyond a simple vote towards active political participation and engagement, efforts need to be made to capacitate and enable citizens to do so. In 2016-2018, Afesis-Corplan, the Built Environment Support Group (BESG), the Heinrich Böll Foundation (HBF) Southern Africa Office, Isandla Institute and PlanAct have jointly implemented a project entitled “Accounting for basic services: Tackling the inadequate use of resources by municipalities and building a rights-based approach to service delivery” – referred to as the ABS Project. The ABS Project contributes to these efforts by assisting in improving the understanding of the complex framework that finances local government in the country. The project has been supported by the EU Delegation to South Africa.

The ABS Project aims to strengthen community engagement with local government to ensure equitable, just and effective use of municipal funds. While doing so, it hopes to expand the use of budget analysis and social accountability tools as key approaches to engaging communities, fostering responsive governance and strengthening accountability.

By engaging in their local municipal affairs, communities and their organisations can develop an understanding of where and on what money is being spent, and to evaluate if government’s priorities adequately address their needs. By doing so communities are better able to voice their concerns and needs, in order to keep government accountable.

Planned outcomes of the project include: the support of 6 rural and urban communities in strengthening political voice; holding their municipalities to account for effective and equitable spending of their finances; and, crystallising lessons for policy and practice. The communities are: KwaZenzele (Lesedi LM), Masakhane (Emalahleni LM), Chris Hani (Buffalo City Metropolitan Municipality), Glenmore (Ngqushwa LM), Mpolweni (Umngungudlovu District Municipality) and Kwa-Nxamalala (Msunduzi LM).

The capacity building of ABS project partners was an integral part of the project. In March 2018, the ABS Project partners engaged in a Gender-Responsive Budgeting workshop. The workshop was facilitated by Debbie Budlender, who also wrote this manual.
TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Background</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This manual</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section A: Gender concepts</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 1: Understanding gender jargon</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex and gender</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender division of labour</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaid care work</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender equality</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender equity</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminism</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender mainstreaming</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex-disaggregated data</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender-sensitive data</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Session 2: What is Gender-responsive Budgeting?</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 3: GRB activities</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section B: Municipal services and gender</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 4: Municipal functions and gender</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 5: Services and gender</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section C: Households and gender</strong></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 6: Household headship</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 7: Alternative classifications</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section D: Planning municipal GRB work</strong></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 8: Planning the way forward</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section E: Copies of the slides</strong></td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BACKGROUND
The Accounting for Basis Services project’s primary objective was to strengthen community engagement with local government to ensure equitable, just and effective use of municipal funds. Amongst others, this implied providing budget analysis and capacity building support to six communities (KwaZenzele, Lesedi LM; Masakhane, Emalahleni LM; Chris Hani, Buffalo City Metropolitan Municipality; Glenmore, Ngqushwa LM; Mpolweni, Umgungudlovu District Municipality; and, Kwa-Nxamalola, Msunduzi LM).

For ABS project partners, learning about the theory and practice of budget analysis and advocacy has been an integral element of the project. The purpose of this was two-fold: to enhance the knowledge and capacity of ABS project partners, and to transfer the knowledge and skills to community partners. ABS project partners were exposed to a number of capacity building events and to ongoing budget work support. In March 2018, the ABS Project partners engaged in a Gender-Responsive Budgeting workshop. This manual is the result of that workshop.

THIS MANUAL
This manual supplements an earlier manual, A Guide to Local Government Budget Advocacy, developed by the Cape Town office of the International Budget Partnership (IBP). Like this manual, the IBP manual accompanied capacity building provided to the ABS partners. The IBP manual is South Africa-specific and draws on the ABS project as well as other local government budget work that IBP has supported in South Africa in recent years. The IBP Guide can be accessed at: https://bit.ly/2FXYxV5

This manual does not repeat the basics covered in the IBP manual, but should instead be used alongside it.

The IBP manual should be consulted not only for an understanding of local government budgets and processes, but also for the suggestions on how information and analysis can be used in budget and policy advocacy. This manual should also be read alongside the ABS factsheet on the Local Government Planning and Budget Process.

What this manual adds to the two prior earlier publications is an understanding of how municipal issues – and thus budgets – are gendered, and what this might mean if one wants to ensure that analysis and advocacy are gender-responsive.

The structure of this manual is based on the programme of the March 2018 workshop held for ABS partners. This approach has been adopted to illustrate how a workshop should, as far as possible, be tailored to the particular participants and context in which it is held. The approach also allows for concrete examples to be given. The same approach was used for the IBP manual, which repeatedly uses documents and examples from municipalities in which the ABS project was active. In this manual, the blue boxes and some of the graphics illustrate what happened during the workshop with ABS partners.

However, it is unlikely that the programme used for the March 2018 workshop will be appropriate for other situations without any adaptations. For a workshop to be useful and the learnings used, it must relate as closely as possible to what workshop participants already know, the activities that they have done, and the activities that they plan to engage in.

A workshop must also be shaped by the knowledge and experience of the facilitator/s if they are to facilitate in a meaningful way.

A further word of caution is that such a workshop would be very difficult to facilitate effectively for someone who does not have...
practical experience of doing gender-responsive budgeting (GRB) analysis and advocacy.

A belief in the need for effective learning to be based on practice is also what informs the use of practical exercises throughout the workshop, with the exercises in this case strongly linked to the work that the partners were doing as part of the ABS project.

Table 1 shows the two municipalities which were the focus of the work of each of the three ground-level implementing partners. The table includes the specific focus areas chosen for each municipality. These focus areas were chosen through engagement with local communities in which they identified their priorities. The workshop worked through the budget issues identified through the lens of GRB analysis and advocacy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>MUNICIPALITY</th>
<th>TYPOLOGY</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>MUNICIPAL BUDGET ISSUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masakhane</td>
<td>Emalheni LM (MP)</td>
<td>Urban Informal</td>
<td>Households:3500 Population: 16000</td>
<td>Lack of basic services (water &amp; sanitation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KwaZenzele</td>
<td>Lesedi LM (Gauteng)</td>
<td>Rural Informal</td>
<td>Households: 415 Population: 2200</td>
<td>Housing Shortage, Lack of basic services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpolweni</td>
<td>Umngungudlovu DM Umshwati LM (KZN)</td>
<td>Rural Settlement</td>
<td>Households: 1367</td>
<td>Housing Shortage, Lack of basic services (water &amp; sanitation) - Focus on implementation of the Free Basic Service Indigent Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwa-Nxamalala</td>
<td>Msunduzi LM (EC)</td>
<td>Rural Settlement</td>
<td>Households: 2036 Population: 10016</td>
<td>Youth Employment opportunities in a R39.5m road construction project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Hani</td>
<td>Buffalo City (EC)</td>
<td>Urban Informal</td>
<td>Households: 304 Housing Units.</td>
<td>Housing Shortage, poor construction of existing houses. Focus on reticulation budget.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The manual also assumes that the facilitator has experience in workshop facilitation. It therefore does not include any guidance in respect of standard items such as the introductory and closing sessions, reaching agreement on workshop “rules”, methods of dividing participants into groups, and use of ice-breakers.

The March 2018 workshop programme is shown in Table 2. The presentations are available for use in future workshops, whether with or without adaptations.

This manual is one of many that purports to explain and “teach” GRB. GRB is a term that spans a large number of diverse activities.

The manual covers only a small portion of the field. The manual does not attempt to replicate others or to cover all the many things covered by the other manuals. Instead, its purpose is modest and focused – to facilitate first attempts at GRB by civil society organisations (CSOs) in the specific context of local government in South Africa.

It is only if and when the manual is used for on-the-ground work that we can claim it is useful.

So – over to you as a potential user!
### TABLE 2: GRB WORKSHOP PROGRAMME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY 1</th>
<th>START</th>
<th>END</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introductions</td>
<td>09h00</td>
<td>09h15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender concepts</td>
<td>09h15</td>
<td>09h45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is GRB? Brainstorm</td>
<td>09h45</td>
<td>10h00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is GRB? Presentation &amp; discussion</td>
<td>10h00</td>
<td>10h45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEA</td>
<td>10h45</td>
<td>11h15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRB activities: Presentation &amp; discussion</td>
<td>11h15</td>
<td>12h00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal functions &amp; gender: Group work</td>
<td>12h00</td>
<td>12h40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal functions &amp; gender: Report back</td>
<td>12h40</td>
<td>13h00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUNCH</td>
<td>13h00</td>
<td>14h00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services &amp; gender: Presentation &amp; discussion</td>
<td>14h00</td>
<td>15h00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEA</td>
<td>15h00</td>
<td>15h15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What about our municipalities? Group work</td>
<td>15h15</td>
<td>16h00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What about our municipalities? Report back</td>
<td>16h00</td>
<td>16h30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY 2</th>
<th>START</th>
<th>END</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal workers: Reading</td>
<td>09h00</td>
<td>09h30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recap/reflection on previous day</td>
<td>09h30</td>
<td>10h00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household heads: Presentation &amp; discussion</td>
<td>10h00</td>
<td>11h00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEA</td>
<td>11h00</td>
<td>11h30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative categories: Group work</td>
<td>11h30</td>
<td>12h10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative categories: Report back</td>
<td>12h10</td>
<td>12h30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUNCH</td>
<td>12h30</td>
<td>13h00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going forward: Individually and/or together</td>
<td>13h00</td>
<td>14h00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning future work: Group work</td>
<td>14h00</td>
<td>15h00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning future work: Report back</td>
<td>15h00</td>
<td>15h30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>15h30</td>
<td>15h45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEA</td>
<td>15h45</td>
<td>16h00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION A: GENDER CONCEPTS
The first exercise in the workshop aims both to start the process of demystification of “gender” and related concepts, and to ensure that all participants had more or less the same understanding when different terms and concept were used during the workshop. At the outset of the exercise, the facilitator should emphasise that there is ongoing debate about many of the terms, and therefore not necessarily only one “correct” definition.

Hand out the A4 pages so that every second person has at least one page.

Ask participants to work with the person sitting next to them to come up with their understanding or definition of what the terms that they have been allocated meant. Give them about ten minutes to have this discussion.

Then ask each pair to present the outcome of their discussion. When they have done so, the facilitator and other participants can add or amend the definition and provide examples that illustrate the concepts. Move on to the next term when there is sufficient agreement in the group as to the meaning of the term being discussed.

After all terms have been discussed, hand out the suggested definitions. If you use different terms and concepts in the exercise, try to use the same approach of including a simple practical example after each one.
HANDOUT 1: GENDER TERMS AND CONCEPTS

SEX AND GENDER

- Sex refers to the biological differences between male and female people. Sex is fixed and does not change over time, across countries, and across cultures.
- Gender refers to the social differences between men and women, girls and boys. It is what society tells different men and women, girls and boys from different social groups about how their roles and responsibilities.

Example: The fact that it is only female people who can be pregnant and bear children relates to sex. The fact that it is women who do the bulk of child care relates to gender. The former cannot change. The latter can.

GENDER DIVISION OF LABOUR

The gender division of labour refers to who (women or men, young or old) does what in terms of different types of work such as productive work in factories, offices and on the land, reproductive work cooking, cleaning and caring for family members, and community activities such as attending meetings. There is a gender division of labour in terms of both paid and unpaid work.

Example: Within their homes, women tend to do the bulk of cooking, cleaning and caring jobs that constitute reproductive work. Beyond the home, paid jobs such as manager (where the "important" decisions are made) and engineer (where the work is with "things") are more likely to be done by men, while women are more likely to do jobs such teaching and nursing (where the work is with "people, and where there is limited autonomy.

With community work, men are more likely to attend and preside at meetings, while women are more likely to work as volunteers or followers. There is no physical (sex) reason for these different roles.

These roles are stereotypes, and there are exceptions. This proves rather than disproves the statement that gender roles are societally determined and can change.

UNPAID CARE WORK
The unpaid work done, mainly by women, in the home and community, including housework and caring for family and community members.

Example: The work in the home for which women bear the main responsibility, and which involves production of services, is unpaid. It is also not counted when calculating gross domestic product (GDP). In contrast, work involving production of goods for use in or by the home, such as subsistence production, is counted when calculating GDP even though it is unpaid.

MARRIAGE IS BAD FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH!
When a man marries his former housekeeper, she continues to do the same work as she did previously, but is now unpaid. As a result, GDP falls by the amount of her salary. Yet there is no change in the amount of production and benefit in the society.

GENDER EQUALITY
Gender equality is often understood as equality of opportunity. This means that women and men, girls and boys, are not discriminated against in access to opportunities. This understanding is equivalent to formal equality.

Example: Women and men have the same rights to attend early evening meetings of the organisation.

GENDER EQUITY
Gender equity is about equality of outcome or result. This is a stronger concept than equality of opportunity. It means that women and men, girls and boys, have an equal chance of reaching the finishing line rather than only an equal chance at the starting line. Gender equity is about fairness. It takes account of the different situation of women and men, girls and boys. This understanding is equivalent to substantive equality.

Example: Meetings are not held in the early evening so that women will not be prevented from attending because of having to feed, bathe and put their children to bed, and will also not be prevented from fear of walking alone in the dark.

FEMINISM
Feminism is a social movement that questions gender inequalities and tries to change them. Feminism is not about focusing only on women.

Example: Feminism is similar to black consciousness in recognising oppression and affirming that it is only when oppressed people mobilise and take action against their oppression that there can be real change. As the extract from writing by Zimbabwean feminist Everjoice 2009 suggests, waiting for men to end gender inequality is like waiting for the bosses to bring exploitation of workers to an end.
“We must involve the bosses. We can not move without them. The bosses are our partners. Many of them are just victims of the system too. Most of the employers mean well. All we need to do is raise their awareness and they will be ok. We did a workshop with some of the most senior bosses last year, just one workshop. And I remember two of them standing up and saying, ‘This workshop has been a real eye opener to the suffering endured by the workers. We did not know that running sweatshops, under paying workers, and sexual harassment of female workers is wrong. We really did not know. We will change from this minute on. You can count on us.’ Since that discussion, we now have so many employers on our shop floor committees. One is even the chairperson of my equal wages sub-committee. Another provides counseling to women who are sexually harassed.”

Can you imagine this testimony coming from the head of any trade union movement? Anywhere in the world? Substitute workers and trade unions for landless people’s associations, or the Dalit movement, or an anti-racism movement: can you imagine them saying this? Why not? ...

Sound unlikely? Why not? We have done it in the women’s movement. ... in this world, labels and naming matter. Inclusion of men and boys equals a good thing done by gender activists; protecting women’s spaces and talking about power equals bad thing done by those awful feminists! Who isn’t afraid of being seen as a bad, strident woman?

My safe space called the women’s movement is going, or even gone. It’s been taken over by men. And I am scared and angry. To paraphrase them racists, let me say it one more time – I love men. Some of the best people I’ve had sex with are men. So there. I believe progressive, non-patriarchal, non-sexist men have a positive role to play in the struggle for women’s human rights. There are a few of them out there. But they are not yet in a majority, and a few good men do not a system make. Patriarchy in all its forms is still alive and doing quite well by my last diagnosis. The majority of men and boys continue to have access to all kinds of power, resources, and privileges, which they don’t hesitate to use to exert their control over women’s and girls’ lives and bodies...

Over the last few years, I keep wanting to sing my own version of Jacob Zuma’s dreadful song, “mshini wam’, mshini wam’, awu’leth’ u’mshini wam’! (My machine gun, my machine gun; give me my machine gun.) My song would go: Movement yam’, movement yam’,’ awu leth’ i – movement yam’! (My movement, my movement; give me (back) my movement.) Where has the notion of safe spaces for women gone? What has happened to the politics that should be the foundation of our movements? ... When did we become this depoliticized?...

It is time to reclaim women’s spaces and re-politicize our movements with feminist politics. We can only do this if we put back onto the table, the fact that this is about POWER. Repeat after me....Gender is about men and women, and the UNEQUAL power relations between them. It’s back to feminism 001. Sadly.
GENDER MAINSTREAMING
Gender mainstreaming is about considering gender in all policies, planning, budgets and monitoring instead of addressing gender as a separate issue through separate programmes.

Example: Sports facilities cater for sporting codes favoured by girls and women as well as those favoured by boys and men.

SEX-DISAGGREGATED DATA
Sex-disaggregated data are data that show the differences between the situation of women and men, girls and boys. Sex-disaggregated data are necessary for good gender analysis.

Example: Recording and reporting the number of girls and boys who utilise the municipal sports facilities.

GENDER-SENSITIVE DATA
Gender-sensitive data includes both sex-disaggregated data that record measurements for male and female, and gender-relevant data that record measurements on issues such as violence against women and maternal mortality where measurements for one sex may not make sense but the data reflect a gender issue.

Example: Data related to municipal support for early childhood development (ECD) centres is gender-relevant because about 80% of children in South Africa live with their mothers while less than 40% live with their fathers.

DISCRIMINATION
Discrimination means treating people with different characteristics (such as male and female people) differently. Discrimination can be unfair, but is sometimes appropriate and fair, because sometimes when the situation of different groups is different, they need different treatment to achieve equal outcomes. Discrimination is sometimes explicit. At other times it is implicit because it does not, for example, say male and female will be treated differently, but instead uses characteristics that are more common for male or female to discriminate. Both implicit and explicit discrimination can be unfair.

Example: Inadequate sanitation facilities are discriminatory because, both biologically and socially, women need sanitation facilities more than men. For example, biologically women need to urinate more than men, and also need proper facilities, including a means of disposal, when menstruating.

At the end of the March 2018 workshop, when participants were reflecting on the two days, one participant commented that she had previously been anxious about doing work on gender as she had perceived it as requiring advanced theoretical understanding if one was to do it “correctly”. She said that the workshop had helped her see that this was untrue, and that gender work could (and should) be done by anyone given the tools to see everyday realities in a new way.
Before making the presentation, allow for a 15-minute brainstorm in which you invite participants to offer their understanding of what GRB is. Then start the presentation. Encourage participants to interrupt you if they have questions or comments. There is also a break in the middle of the presentation for group discussion. After you have finished presenting, allow time for further questions and discussion.

The first slides provide a basic definition as to what GRB is and is not. Important elements include:

- That the focus is on government budgets, because this is public money.

- That, in using the terms, “women” and “men”, we must remember that this is shorthand and not forget the girls and boys, who are at the stage in their life when many of the gendered patterns shaping society are established.

- That, especially in South Africa, gender analysis needs to be combined with other possible axes of disadvantage – in particular, race, class and location. Stated crudely, budgets are about prioritisation because there is never enough money to do everything that is wanted. In South Africa, the needs of black men should usually be prioritised above the needs of white women.

- The budget is a policy that becomes a law when voted by the legislature. So budget analysis is policy-legal analysis.

- GRB does not advocate for separate budgets for women and girls. The needs of women and girls must be prioritised within the main budget.

A corollary of the last point is that it is difficult – and not useful – to try to calculate the amount of rands that are allocated or spent on GRB. It is difficult or impossible to do this because some of the money for “general” programmes will benefit women and girls but we can’t separate out how much, for example, of money spent on electricity is for women and how much for men.

The difficulty is greater at the municipal level than for some provincial services. For example, one can count the number of girls and boys attending school but cannot sex-disaggregate provision of water, electricity and refuse collection.

The next slides present different conceptual approaches to analysing budgets from a gender perspective. The three categories of GRB analysis were developed by Australian Rhonda Sharp for South Australia’s inside-government women’s budget initiative in the mid-1980s. Australia was the first country to do GRB (with South Africa and Philippines, the next countries to have GRB initiatives, doing so only about a decade later).
SECTION A

The three categories approach highlights the danger of restricting analysis to category 1 (expenditures targeted explicitly at women or gender equality) or category 2 (expenditures for gender equality among government officials – or, in the case of local government - councillors). Both of these categories can be important, but will never account for more than a tiny portion of the government budget. Focusing on them is like focusing on the crumbs while someone else eats the cake.

GRB work in other countries has also come up with misleading results in respect of category 1 because of focusing on expenditures for women without considering matching expenditures for men. In both the following examples this happened despite the exercise being named as gender budget rather than women’s budget work. In Pakistan, government-based analysis of the education budget classified a relatively substantial proportion of the budget as category 1 because it represented the allocation for girls’ schools. The amount could be identified because there is very little co-educational education in Pakistan. What the analysis overlooked was that an ever larger proportion of the budget was allocated for boys’ schools.

In the Philippines, there was a different twist on category expenditures. In that country there was a law – often ignored – that every unit of government at every level must allocate 5% of their budget for gender. When a CSO doing local-level budget work in Philippines asked officials in one of the local government units1 (LGUs) which allocations represented their gender budget allocation, the officials provided a list which included an allocation for Girl Guides alongside an allocation twice as large for the Boy Scouts. The LGU was counting both of these expenditures as part of their 5%.

In respect of category 2, there is a danger in focusing all attention on government employees. In general government employees tend to be better-off than the general population. We therefore want to ensure that women, black people and people with disabilities get a fair share of the jobs. Category 2 is also important because expenditures on salaries usually account for a large proportion of government budgets. However, if we place most of our attention on category 2, our focus is missing a larger number of people who are more disadvantaged than the government employees. The primary purpose of government budgets should be to deliver goods and services to the general population.

---

1 LGUs are equivalent to municipalities

WOMEN OR GENDER

The Australian GRB work of the 1980s used the term “women” rather than “gender”. When the first GRB initiative started in 1995, as a collaboration led by two CSOs and a portfolio committee of the national parliament, it was similarly name the “Women’s Budget Initiative”. About a year after the initiative started, there were suggestions that the name should be changed to Gender Budget Initiative. After discussion by those involved, there was strong agreement that the name should not be changed. The main motivation for not changing was the desire to make the work accessible and clear to as many people (in particular, women) as possible rather than academically or theoretically correct. The word “women” was seen as making it clear that while gender relations involved men and women (and boys and girls), in that relationship it was almost always the women and girls who were disadvantaged. In addition, while South Africa has eleven languages, but only one of these – English – had a term for “gender”. The disadvantage of retaining the name was that some people thought the call was for a separate budget for women. That understanding can, however, also happen when the term “gender” is used.
The most important category is category 3 – all the rest of the budget, which is for general programmes and activities. With this category, the task is to understand whether and how the programmes and activities meets women’s and men’s needs and addresses inequitably gender patterns.

The five steps approach recognises that budgeting is not a separate exercise from planning, policy-making, and implementation. The approach has strong alignment to the understanding of budgets underlying performance budgeting – an approach that governments have tried to implement over recent decades in place of the traditional budgeting approach which was more of a book-keeping or accountancy exercise. The first slide on the five steps includes the performance budgeting terms that correspond with each of the steps.

The five steps approach and performance budgeting saying that policy must drive budgets rather than vice versa.

GRB adds that the policy must be gender-responsive, with policy defined broadly to include explicit policy and the policy that is implicit in government programmes, activities and inaction. The five steps approach is also more explicit than most performance budgeting that the first step must be to understand the situation on the ground, because it is only then that you can check whether the policy will address the inequalities and other challenges in the situation.

Figure 1 illustrates how the three Es – economy, efficiency, and effectiveness – that are meant to inform effective performance budgeting relate to the different stages of the budgeting process. Economy is about converting the budget allocation into inputs, efficiency is about converting the inputs into outputs or deliverables, and effectiveness if about converting outputs into outcomes, i.e. changes in the situation.

Figure 1 does not include the fourth E, i.e. equity. While each of the other Es is relevant for only one stage of the process, equity is relevant at all stages.

The box illustrates this in terms of both race and gender equity in South Africa.

---

EQUITY ADDING THE FOURTH E

An example from education illustrates how the fourth E of equity applies at all the different stages of the budgeting process where each of the other three Es are considered. The example also illustrates how the three standard Es often compete against each other – if you do well on one E, it is often difficult to do well on one of the other Es.

The first E, economy, relates to obtaining input as cheaply as possible. In education, it includes “buying” teachers. In the 1950s, the apartheid government introduced a policy whereby only women would be employed to teach in African schools. This was “economic” because at that stage women teachers were paid less than men teachers.

The second E, efficiency, relates to how many outputs one can produce with each input. Two of the ways in which this was achieved in the Bantu Education system of the apartheid years were by having large numbers of children in a single class, and by not providing schools for black pupils with facilities such as laboratories, libraries and sports grounds. This was “efficient” because more children could be “educated” by fewer teachers and using only the most basic infrastructure and equipment.

The third E, effectiveness, relates to how well the outputs perform. In this example, effectiveness is weakened because of the efficiency measures that allowed only a poor quality of education. As a result, young people came out of school without the education and skills that they needed in the economy and in their lives more generally, and without having reached their potential.

The five steps approach does not mean that a CSO engaging in GRB must start with the first step and move chronologically through the steps. The approach is instead intended to assist in identifying the different steps so as to understand better where the challenges are occurring and focus advocacy on that point.

The example in the box illustrates how the youth wing of a religious mass movement in Indonesia shifted from step to step in their successful advocacy for health services in their district, Pakalongan. Can you see the shifts between the different steps in the story?
When LABDA examined the budget, it found that the allocation was well below the World Health Organization standard for a subsidy. They also found data showing that only 70% of the poor were covered. They therefore advocated that local governments allocate additional funding.

An additional allocation was duly made, but they then found that only Rp 50 million of the total allocation of Rp 500 million was claimed by the poor because people were not aware of the benefits and the government had made no effort to inform them. LABDA then used its own networks, such as prayer groups, to spread the message. This resulted in the number of users tripling within the space of a year.

Meanwhile, a political lobby emerged within the local legislature which argued that the allocation should be cut because of under-spending. LABDA therefore engaged in this forum. This resulted in an increased allocation of Rp 1.3 billion rather than the cut proposed by the local legislators.

The next problem to emerge was that some poor people were unable to use the available benefits because there was no government-owned general hospital in their district, despite a regulation stating that there should be at least one in each district. Instead of advocating for what would have been a very large allocation needed for such a hospital, LABDA suggested that the local government enter into an agreement with private hospitals in the area so that poor people covered by insurance could receive services from them. This was done, and the poor now have access to three private hospitals in their area.

The presentation includes a few slides related to rights, and how GRB can be used as a tool to promote and defend rights (if you are government), or to monitor whether budgets are promoting and defending rights and undertake advocacy when this is not happening.

When you come to the slide about “vulnerable women”, divide participants into groups and ask them to discuss whether classifying women as a vulnerable group is appropriate and useful. Ask them to give reasons for their answer. Allow 10-15 minutes for discussion, and then facilitate a plenary sharing of their responses.
The group-based discussion in the March 2018 workshop came to the conclusion that it is neither useful nor appropriate to classify women as a “vulnerable group”. Reasons include:

- The term presents women as objects who must be protected and saved, rather than as actors in their own rights.
- The term presents women as weak and incapable.
- The term implies that women are naturally vulnerable, rather than asking what factors and forces might make them vulnerable.
- The categorisation generally groups women together with other categories such as children and people with disabilities. This is not helpful as these groups are very different, face different challenges, and require different policy and actions to address the challenges.

After the break, the presentation continues with slides highlighting different aspects of the experience of researching and producing the Fourth Women’s Budget in South Africa, which included a study of five municipalities. The research was done in 1999, and the presentation highlights some of the changes that have happened that might make GRB at local level easier in 2018, as well as the challenges that remain the same as before. The changes and consistencies covered include political, contextual and conceptual ones.

In respect of gender explicitly, the presentation makes the following points:

- Municipal services are directed at households rather than at individuals, as is the case for education and health, for examples. Individuals have gender; households do not.
- Female-headed household concept is not the solution. This was explored further in a later session of the workshops.
- Community is not the same as black people is not the same as black women although we often think, talk, write and discuss policy as if they are.
- Women is not the same as poor people (although women in South Africa are more likely than men to live in poor households).
- Municipal services have strong gender implications. These are based on current gender roles, but cannot be ignored on the basis that they perpetuate these roles. We need to address current challenges created by problematic gender patterns at the same time as we fight to change problematic gender patterns.
- (Poor) women are not a single homogeneous category. A single policy or type of expenditure will not address the needs of all poor women.
This provided for additional food supplements for children under five and payments for the mainly woman volunteers.

**WOMEN ARE NOT A SINGLE HOMOGENEOUS CATEGORY**

In Solo, Indonesia, a CSO’s budget advocacy assisted in getting an allocation intended for a privileged group of women being reprioritised towards an expenditure that would benefit poor women.

The Solo municipality planned to allocate fund for a “field visit” by the wives of local government officials to Bali. The CSO’s advocacy resulted in the funds being reallocated for *Posyandu*. *Posyandu* are local community-based primary health centres that provide mother and child health services such as immunisation and prenatal care. They are the most grassroots level of the health system in Indonesia. The services are provided by local (women) community members who act as volunteers. In some cases, but not all, the volunteers receive a small stipend for their work.

The support provided by the CSO to the *Posyandus*’ advocacy efforts resulted in an increase in the annual allocation from Rp³ 500,000 to Rp 1,200,000 over a period of three years. This provided for additional food supplements for children under five and payments for the mainly woman volunteers. The CSO also advocated to change the basis of allocation from a flat rate per *Posyandu* to one based on the number of children needing services in the area served by a particular *Posyandu*.

In Yogyakarta municipality, CSO advocacy resulted in the provision of health insurance for the volunteer *Posyandu* coordinator at the village level, whereas previously the only “appreciation” given for the village’s efforts in sustaining the *Posyandu* service had gone to the village chief.

³ Rupiah

- It is not only rural people who can be poor but rural people (and those in urban informal settlements) are more likely to be poor than those in formal urban areas. Similarly, the municipalities that serve rural people are likely to have fewer resources than those that serve rural people. In the 1999 research, in Cape Town Councillors could argue about whether grants in aid should go to Rape Crisis rather than to a rugby club. In Lebowakgomo there were no grants in aid at all.
This presentation highlights the diversity that can be found across GRB initiatives in terms of lead actors, at least four different aspects of focus, level (sphere) of government, and timing (whether the analysis is done as part of budget formulation or as analysis after the budget has been drawn up. Some of these characteristics are dependent on each other. For example, a GRB initiative based in government is more able to have the GRB work done when the budget is being formulated. That said, if the budget process allows for meaningful participation by civil society and local communities, then these actors could also have influence during budget formulation. Unfortunately, even where there is provision for participation, government officials may not take the inputs seriously enough for them to have real influence. The chance of influencing the budget is strongest if the input comes earlier in the process.

The presentation also categorises activities into five broad categories – research, advocacy, monitoring, training, and policy analysis and design. Often initiatives will include more than one of these categories and the work in one category strengthens the work in another category. For example, advocacy is not very useful if it is not based on evidence coming from research or monitoring. And training is not useful if it is not linked to what the trainees are doing or plan to do. That said, given the broad scope of GRB, when starting work it is best to avoid over-ambition, to plan a confined set of activities, and experiment and do those well before adding other aspects.

Advocacy is not very useful if it is not based on evidence coming from research or monitoring.
The tools are by no means the only ways that GRB analysis can be done. The presentation includes slides on each of the tools developed by Diane Elson after the Commonwealth Secretariat, which supported the early work in GRB, commissioned her – as a well-known feminist economist – to come up with possible approaches to GRB analysis.

The tools are by no means the only ways that GRB analysis can be done. As the presentation suggests, the tools are also not appropriate for all contexts or actors. They are included in the presentation because they are referred to quite often in the literature. So this is for information purposes, and to stimulate ideas, rather than a suggestion that all these tools should be used by a CSO doing GRB work at local level in South Africa.

The presentation includes an example of a gender budget statement produced by the Western Cape Department of Community Safety in one of the four years in which each department in that province was required – under the leadership of the Premier’s Office – to produce a gender budget statement. Gauteng’s Premier’s Office also developed a gender budget statement format that was included in departmental votes in the annual Estimates of Provincial Revenue and Expenditure that is tabled by the MEC of finance each year. Both provinces had a format that reflected the five steps of GRB and, because the provinces were using performance budgeting, used budget terms that matched terms used in the budget vote.

Figure 2 gives an example of the boxes that National Treasury included in its annual Budget Review for two years in a period before government used performance budgeting. The example is appropriate for this manual insofar it focuses on water and sanitation, although from the perspective of national government.

The “box” approach seemed appropriate at that time because National Treasury also used boxes for other purposes. The approach thus followed the basic rule of designing the format for gender budget statement in line with the format, terms and style used for “mainstream” budgeting.
FIGURE 2 GRB IN NATIONAL TREASURY'S BUDGET REVIEW, 1998

The 1998 Budget Review

Basic Water Supply

In late 1995 only a third of African households and less than three-quarters of coloured households had running tap water inside their dwellings, compared to 97 per cent of Indian and white households. Outside urban areas only 12 per cent of African households had an inside tap and 21 per cent had a tap on the site, while 28 per cent were collecting water from a river, stream, dam or well and 16 per cent from a borehole. One in six African households who had to fetch water were forced to travel at least a kilometre to do so. In 1993 the average time spent on the task by members of rural African households forced to collect water was 1 hour and 40 minutes. The average time spent by individual women who collected water was over an hour, at 74 minutes. Just under half of rural African women over the age of 18 were spending part of their time collecting water.

A programme to supply water is one of the Presidential Lead Projects of the Reconstruction and Development Programme. One thousand days after the 1994 elections more than a million people had benefited from the ready availability of fresh, safe water for the first time in their lives. By the end of October 1997 the programme had provided basic water supply and sanitation to approximately 1.2 million people and spent approximately R800 million on the more than 1,000 projects initiated since 1994. Of the 195,878 jobs created by the twelve Presidential Lead Projects initiated in 1994/5, 25,750 (13 per cent) were reported to have been taken up by women and 12,516 (6 per cent) by youths.

In late 1997, on the basis of available information, the estimated involvement of women in various roles was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>per cent women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employees on schemes</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainees on schemes</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractors</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering committee</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Department has initiated the Working for Water Programme as part of its national water conservation campaign. The programme provides for the employment of local people in the clearing of invasive alien plants. By doing so it both enhances the available water supply and provides much-needed employment. In May 1997, 7,400 previously unemployed people, of whom more than half were women, were working on the Working for Water Programme. Meanwhile the Forestry division of the Department has encouraged the planting of trees in community woodlots. Many of these are managed by local women’s groups.

---

7 Calculations by Ingrid Westard
8 Personal communication, Hugh Sussens
9 Department of Water Affairs and Forestry, 1997. The Magic of Delivery: Water to 1 million persons, and 3.4 million trees planted in 1,000 days. Pretoria, and other information provided by Departmental staff.
SECTION B: MUNICIPAL SERVICES AND GENDER
This session involves group work. Divide participants into three groups. In all groups, the discussion should focus on (a) identifying the main functions assigned to local government in South Africa and (b) exploring what gender issues are related to those functions. Once a group has some agreement, they must make a drawing of one of the functions showing the gender aspect. They must not include any writing on the drawing. Reassure participants that this is not a test of drawing!

After about 40 minutes, ask the groups to come together in plenary. Each group should then show their drawing to plenary, without saying anything. Participants from other groups must suggest what functions and gender issues the drawing is showing. Members of the group whose drawing it is can indicate when their suggestions are correct or incorrect. If participants do not fully identify what the drawing means, the group whose drawing it is should explain.

In the March 2018 workshop, none of the groups followed the instructions completely! One of the groups decided to write up their conclusions.

The remaining two groups drew all the main functions rather than only one. Figure 3 and Figure 4 are the drawings made by the two groups.
FIGURE 3 MUNICIPAL FUNCTIONS: GROUP 1

1. [Icon 1]
2. [Icon 2]
3. [Icon 3]
4. [Icon 4]
5. [Icon 5]
6. [Icon 6]
7. [Icon 7]
8. [Icon 8]
9. [Icon 9]

FIGURE 4 MUNICIPAL FUNCTIONS: GROUP 2

1. [Icon 1]
2. [Icon 2]
3. [Icon 3]
4. [Icon 4]
5. [Icon 5]
6. [Icon 6]
7. [Icon 7]
8. [Icon 8]
9. [Icon 9]
This session consists of three parts – a presentation, a group discussion, and reading.

This presentation highlights gender issues in relation to functions. It introduces a particular focus on water and sanitation which is carried through as an example into the activities that follow. If a different focus is chosen, the activities should – if possible – be changed accordingly so that the logic and learnings can be carried through.

The presentation is likely to reinforce many of the issues raised in the preceding group discussions, and also elaborate on some of them.

The first slides of the presentation examine the different ways in which poor black women are likely to be disadvantaged in two roles – as users and as paid or unpaid deliverers of services. For each aspect it draws on evidence from various sources to illustrate why and how women in particular are affected. Much of the evidence is quantitative. This is deliberate because people who work on budgets may place more weight on information that includes numbers.

Further, the type of sanitation provided by the municipality is in part determined by the type of water supply provided.

Water and sanitation was also a “hot” topic at the time of the workshop because Cape Town was in the middle of an extremely severe drought that had made everyone – rich and poor – aware that these services should not be taken for granted.

This does not, however, mean that you cannot and should not use qualitative information. A combination of qualitative and quantitative is generally stronger and is “heard” by a greater number of people than either of the two alone.

Most of the quantitative evidence comes from Statistics South Africa, the government statistical agency. Again, this is deliberate because Statistics South Africa’s numbers are likely to be regarded as more authoritative.

This does not mean that you cannot and should not use data from other sources.

---

**SESSION 5: SERVICES AND GENDER**

**ESTIMATED TIME: 120 MINUTES**

**PREPARATION:**

- There is a presentation for this session.
- You will also need copies of Handout 2 if you want to give participants this as reading. As before, you can also make handouts of some of the figures and boxes below.
- You will also need flipchart paper and markers for group work.

Water was chosen for the March 2018 workshop because it was the issue chosen most often by the ABS implementing partners in their work in the six municipalities.

Sanitation was included because the two functions are generally dealt with by the same section of the municipality.
In some cases Statistics South Africa will not have information to illustrate the points you want to make. In other cases information from other sources may be more compelling.

The extract in Figure 2 above refers to the Working for Water programme and highlights its multiple gender aspects. Similar points are repeated in the presentation. However, nearly 20 years later there are also queries. Firstly, the Department of Public Works has reduced the women quota. Secondly, the programme has not been rolled out to the extent that it should have been given its benefits. Indeed, the failure to roll it out more energetically can be seen as one of the contributory factors to Cape Town’s drought situation.

The slides on sanitation firstly highlight several different reasons why this might be more important for women and girls than for men and boys. The slides then draw on research done with financial support from the Heinrich Böll Foundation. The particular piece drawn on is a case study of the Expanded Public Works Programme (EPWP) in the City of Cape Town, but looks beyond the EPWP to examine how this way of organising delivery of sanitation and cleansing differs from other ways in terms of the gender impact. The cleansing aspect is of interest both because there is some prior research on it, and because the work is so similar to the housework that women generally do unpaid in the home.

The box below illustrates that the problems are ongoing at the time of writing this manual by profiling a woman who has a cleansing job through a sub-contracted company that pays much less than the City would pay and who has lived for a decade without sanitation, with very inadequate water and with electricity purchased from a neighbour.

---

**TRAPPED IN BHOLOBHOLO WITHOUT A TOILET FOR 10 YEARS**

In Bholobholo informal settlement, Mfuleni, 16 families live without toilets. They share one water tap with local braai meat vendors. There used to be three taps, but two are damaged. They draw electricity from nearby houses.

One of the residents is Zingiswa Tshwela. She sweeps the streets and cleans the informal settlement for R2,400 a month. She is employed by Macho Group, a company contracted by the City of Cape Town.

She lives in a shack with her jobless husband, his three brothers, and her two-year-old son.

“I was having difficulty paying rent, so I made a decision to buy the shack [in 2009] from a shack dweller who was leaving for the Eastern Cape,” says Tshwela.

A neighbour charges her R500 a month for electricity to cook, play her TV and light up her shack. “Most of the time we don’t use the fridge because it eats up electricity,” she says.

As there is no toilet, she uses an open field, a 20-minute walk away. Tshwela says there are toilets nearer, but the owners no longer allow them to be used. “They are tired of us,” she says.

"Imagine walking for 20 minutes to the field while you have a runny tummy,” she says. “You squat and nervously look around while you relieve yourself in case a thug emerges from nowhere to harm or rob you.”

---

Her husband accompanies her if she needs to go at night.

Luthando Tyhalibongo, media manager at the City of Cape Town, said, “The City is currently busy with designs for the installation of toilets and water taps … Toilets are expected to be supplied at the end of May 2018, if all goes according to plan.”

“It should be noted that the community refused other typologies of toilets and said that they would rather wait for full-flush toilets,” said Tyhalibongo.

Tshwela said residents had rejected chemical toilets “because they smell”.

We want flush ones,” says Tshwela. She said residents were also afraid if they accepted other toilets the City would never install flush toilets.

Meanwhile, Xoliswa Bhukaza puts a nappie on her two-year-old son before he goes to bed at night. During the day he uses a bucket.

“We want to leave Bholobholo and stay in a place where there are toilets, but we have no money to rent or buy a house. It is not nice to stay here,” she says.


The presentation examines the situation in Cape Town in respect of sanitation and cleansing using the following framing questions:

1. Who receives services – and what is the quality of services received?
2. Who pays for services – through paid work, unpaid work, rates, special rating area private provision?
3. Who is paid for the delivery of the services, what type of work is involved?
4. What is the nature of the payment and conditions of EPWP, municipal, externalised, and unpaid work?
5. Who determines how services are delivered and the related payments?

After completing the presentation, divide participants into groups, each of which should focus on a specific municipality. Ideally this should be a municipality with which they are familiar and that they are already working on or plan to work on. Each group is tasked with answering the following questions, drawing on the framework suggested in the presentation:

- How is the situation in your municipality the same?
- How is the situation in your municipality different?
- What do you know already?
- What do you still want to know?

They should document their responses on pieces of flipchart paper, but with each group using a maximum of two pieces of paper.

After about 40 minutes, ask participants to reconvene in plenary. Each group must then present their findings. After all groups have presented, open the floor for any general points that participants might want to make on the exercise.

To round off this topic, give workshop participants a handout with the information in the box below. As explained in respect of the 3-category framework above, an exclusive focus on government employees runs the danger of ignoring the generally more disadvantaged people who should be receiving services.
For this reason, the workshop and manual focus mainly on those who receive, or should receive, services.

In the case of municipal budgets, the question of who delivers the services is important both because reaching the many people who do not have services will require more workers, and because municipalities have found so many different ways in which workers are employed with pay and conditions that are much less favourable than the pay and conditions negotiated by trade unions and the South African Local Government Association in the South African Local Government Bargaining Council.

Ask participants to read through the handout, either overnight (if this is near the end of the day) or in a short session. Allow time for a short discussion on whether the handout was useful, and whether they know what the situation is in their own municipalities in terms of what type/s of workers deliver services.

A National Treasury publication of several years ago noted that the six metros, including the City of Cape Town, accounted for more than half of all municipal employees, and for 1% of total national employment. It noted further that over the period 2006-09 many municipalities outsourced various activities, including refuse removal in particular. Once outsourced, these workers are not counted as part of municipal employment, but instead listed under “contracted services” or “other expenditure” in the municipal budgets. Tshwane decreased its workforce by 4,601 jobs between 2007 and 2008. Cape Town was the only metro to expand its workforce over the period – from 23,420 in 2006 to 26,196 in 2009, although with a temporary decrease in 2007. For all metros combined, personnel expenditure dropped from 40% of total operating expenditure in 2006/07 to 35% in 2010/11-2012/13 (National Treasury, 2011: 118).

The South African Municipal Workers Union (SAMWU) has taken up the issue of loss of municipal jobs and their replacement with inferior jobs in Cape Town and elsewhere.

Even before the first national democratic election in South Africa, a major SAMWU strike in 1990 included demands for an end to casualisation and the filling of all vacant positions. In 1990/01 many African workers employed by municipalities had their jobs graded for the first time with the addition of about five extra levels for “unskilled” workers to the job evaluation scheme.

The job grading went together with a conversion of the status of these workers from temporary to permanent and SAMWU’s joining of the old Industrial Council that preceded the current Local Government Bargaining Council.

**HANDOUT 2:**

**WHO ARE THE WORKERS WHO DELIVER SERVICES?**

A National Treasury publication of several years ago noted that the six metros, including the City of Cape Town, accounted for more than half of all municipal employees, and for 1% of total national employment. It noted further that over the period 2006-09 many municipalities outsourced various activities, including refuse removal in particular. Once outsourced, these workers are not counted as part of municipal employment, but instead listed under “contracted services” or “other expenditure” in the municipal budgets. Tshwane decreased its workforce by 4,601 jobs between 2007 and 2008. Cape Town was the only metro to expand its workforce over the period – from 23,420 in 2006 to 26,196 in 2009, although with a temporary decrease in 2007. For all metros combined, personnel expenditure dropped from 40% of total operating expenditure in 2006/07 to 35% in 2010/11-2012/13 (National Treasury, 2011: 118).
Over the period 1997 to 2009 the minimum wage increased by 335% in nominal terms, while inflation increased by only 80%. Increases for lower-paid workers tended to be higher than for better-paid workers.

The background to the 2009 strike in Cape Town was a “restructuring” exercise which saw the number of municipal employees fall from 32,000 serving a population of approximately 1.5 million people to 20,000 serving a population of approximately 2.8 million people (Jacobs, personal communication). SAMWU contended, however, that this restructuring brought about virtually no reduction in the number of municipal staff serving wealthier areas, while the limited services available in poorer areas were provided by “cheaper” workers.

SAMWU’s campaign and the 2009 strike focused, in particular, on labour brokering 5, although the union has also at times challenged the City of Cape Town on its use of EPWP workers (Theron & Perez, 2012). In 2009 labour broker workers were paid an hourly rate of R11.98 per general worker, yielding a monthly wage of R2,075. At that time the national minimum wage for municipal workers doing exactly the same work and working under the same supervisors was R3,850 per month. Labour broker workers were initially used within the cleansing department for refuse collection and street cleaning, but the practice was later extended to other departments and also to higher levels of staff.

A SAMWU press statement at the time of the 2009 strike commented on the relative invisibility of municipal work, and in particular cleansing work.

The press statement went on to highlight the large gap between payments for these workers and those for municipal managers and other high-level workers:

Many of our members are invisible to the public. They clean the streets at night, and gather in the trash that the public expects to be taken away, and often at great human cost. Our members do the work that many of the commentators would never dream of doing. Maybe the commentators and others should spend just one shift with the City night cleaners and open their eyes to the appalling conditions they have to endure. We collect dead animals and worse on the roadside, we unblock sewers, we fix water pipes in the freezing cold, respond to emergencies and much more besides….

The strike and litigation resulted in a settlement agreement that saw a large portion of the labour broker workforce converted into direct employment in Cape Town. Cape Town was not the only metro affected. The eThekwini Municipality, for example, converted approximately 1,300 temporary positions into permanent ones in mid-2010.

The rate of pay for the Cape Town ex-labour broker workers increased from R2,075 to R4,800 per month plus benefits. The agreement stated that the City could use labour broker workers only under exceptional circumstances and for no longer than six months. The terms of the agreement are still in place today.

Nevertheless, there are still many workers providing basic municipal services in Cape Town who are not direct employees of the municipality.

---

5 Labour brokering is a system in which workers are procured from another company remains the legal employer of the workers while they are working for the client company (or municipality, in this case).
SECTION C: HOUSEHOLDS AND GENDER
The first presentation of the workshop highlights that one of the difficulties in undertaking gender analysis of local government functions and budgets is that most of the local government services target households rather than individuals, and households do not “have” gender in the same way as individuals do.

In GRB and elsewhere the concept of female-headed households is often used as a proxy for women. Following on from this, female-headed households are regarded as a “vulnerable” category. However, the concept may well result in misguided policy development and implementation. The workshop therefore included a presentation that explored the problems with the concept.

Before starting the presentation, ask workshop participants to discuss with the person sitting next to them the composition and relationships in the household in which they live, and who could be seen as the household head.

Although the number of participants in the March 2018 workshop was small, there was a lot of diversity in their households. Two people lived on their own – apart from pets. Some of the others named themselves as household heads. Some reported that a woman headed the household, while others reported a male head. Several talked about how headship changed when their living arrangements changed. The reasons given for naming the person as head also varied across participants.
Then ask the pairs to report back in plenary, and to explain why they have named that particular person as the head. This exercise provides a good lead-in to the presentation.

The presentation is based on a South African critique of the concept of household headship published more than a decade ago.\(^6\)

The presentation kicks off with quotes from a variety of authoritative sources which highlight the problems associated with the concept. In particular, the quotes highlight that there are several different definitions, but the definition is rarely clarified. The failure to clarify the definition often happens even when the data are collected. The result is that those who analyse and use the data may interpret it in a way that is inaccurate. They will think they have a measure of oranges, but some of the oranges might well be giraffes!

Nevertheless, authorities which have published the critiques often continue to publish analysis that uses the concept of household headship.

Unlike many other countries, in South Africa surveys find that female-headed households definitely tend to be poorer than male-headed households. However, they surveys also show substantial differences in the situation of female-headed households:

- headed by women whose partner is also in household;
- where the partner is absent;
- where the woman head not married (the largest group, accounting for about half of all female-headed households);
- where the woman head is absent.

In addition, there are almost as many women and girls living in male-headed households as live in female-headed households.

The presentation refers to another categorisation which, although it may not be helpful in all situations for which household headship has been used, seems more meaningful. The categorisation was developed by the Minnesota-based IPUMS, which collates and makes available official government data such as census data from a large number of countries. The categorisation is derived from the composition of the household and the main relationships between the members. It focuses, in particular, on identifying parent-child and partner relationships.

The standard IPUMS categorisation focuses only on the relationship when identifying parents and children i.e. people over 18 years of age are considered children if they live with their parents. For our purposes we consider only those under 18 years of age as children as an adult child is likely to generate different gender roles.

Figure 5 shows that the most common type of family is an extended one. These families contain only members who are related, but include some members who are not related to the nucleus of the family as a partner or child.

Lone-parent households are the most likely to be recorded as headed by a woman. However, the assumption that female-headed households can be equated with lone-parent households is clearly false. The female-headed lone-parent households account for only 10% of all the female-headed households. A policy that attempts to reach these households through targeting female-headed households will therefore benefit nine incorrect households for every correct household reached.

---

Figure 5: South African Households by Type and Headship, 2016

Session 7: Alternative Classifications

Estimated Time: 45 Minutes

Preparation:

- Flipchart paper and markers will be needed.

After completing the presentation, divide participants into groups. Ask participants to discuss possible alternatives to the concept of household head. Allow about 30 minutes for this discussion. Then, in plenary, pool the views from all the groups.

In the March 2018 workshop, the alternative which won the most support – especially in the local government context – was the “householder”, i.e. the person who owns, rents or has built the dwelling. But this also has its problems. For example, a single householder may not be identifiable because several people contribute to paying the rent.

Further, even with this alternative, one cannot assume that the characteristics of the householder are representative of the characteristics of other household members. For example, an older head may have very little education and not be employed, while the household may contain other members who have completed Grade 12 or higher and who are earning well.
SECTION D: PLANNING MUNICIPAL GRB WORK
In this final session of the workshop you will ask participants to discuss, in their organisational groups, what ideas the workshop had given them for how they can incorporate gender in their project work.

Groups should have sufficient time – a minimum of an hour – to discuss and plan how they will use what they have learnt in the workshop and how they will incorporate this into their work.

You should provide some guidance and/or structure for these discussions. You could, for example, ask each group to draw up a table of planned activities indicating for each activity who will be responsible, the timeline, the output, any resources needed, and what challenges they foresee.
In the March 2018 workshop, in plenary discussion after organisation-based discussions as to how they could use what they had learnt in their work, there was general agreement that by choosing to focus on water, the organisations already had a gender-responsive topic. What was learnt in the workshop would therefore not require a change in focus, but instead provided new understanding and new arguments in support of the focus.

One of the most important points is to emphasise that their plans should be feasible. It is better to plan and execute a smaller task effectively, that you can build further on afterwards, than to plan and fail on an over-ambitious task and end up discouraged about the potential of GRB. In the plenary feedback, participants should (constructively) critique each other’s plans.

The plenary discussion should help highlight issues that the organisation might not have thought about. The plenary discussion can, in particular, offer ideas as to how the organisation might address the challenges that they have identified.

However, the nature of the guidance and structure you offer will depend on what work participants have done previously or are previously doing, their relationship with other actors in the municipalities in which they work, and a host of other factors.

Given that the main demand is for larger allocations for water services, and that the main counter-argument of the municipalities is financial constraints (that they simply do not have additional funds available), the group then agreed that it would be useful to identify existing allocations that seemed questionable. The organisations could then advocate for those funds to be re-allocated (“reprioritised”) to water.

Participants then again sat in their organisational groups. The task this time was to examine the budget documents for the municipalities in which they worked and identify questionable allocations.

Each of the groups had no difficulty in identifying a number of questionable allocations. Figure 6, Figure 7 and Figure 8 document the items they found as reported back in the plenary.
EMALAHLENI LOCAL MUNICIPALITY

IDP

- LED SUMMITS AND CONFERENCES
- COMMUNICATION STRATEGY BETWEEN MUNICIPALITY, MINING, HOUSES AND OTHERS (LED)
- EMALAHLENI DEVELOPMENT COMMISSIONERATE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AGENCY ESTABLISH
- 1 COMMUNITY OUTREACH IMBIZO (R850 000)
- ANTI RAPE + ASSAULT + VICTIM EMPOWERMENT CENTERS - NO BUDGET

CAPITAL BUDGET 2018 /2019

- ALL DIRECTORATES + IT DEPARTMENT ALLOCATED
- R1.4MILLION FOR COMPUTERS. NEED TO INVESTIGATE STATE OF CURRENT PCS TO JUSTIFY EXPENDITURE. 2017 / 2018 SAME EXPENDITURE ALLOCATED
- STAFF CLOCKING SYSTEM – R1.2 MILLION
BUFFALO CITY METROPOLITAN MUNICIPALITY

1. R50K GRAPHIC DESIGNER
2. R2M BOARDWALK (ONLY BURGLAR GUARDS AT JAN SMUTS STADIUM – NO WORKING TOILETS)
3. R1.5M OFFICE FURNITURE (MM OFFICE)
4. NOMPUMELELO PARK R3M?
5. NOMPUMELELO HALL R20M?
6. FENCING COMMUNITY PARK NOMPUMELELO – R300K
7. FENCE GERMAN SETTLER MONUMENT R650K
FIGURE 8 QUESTIONABLE ALLOCATIONS: UMGUNGUNDLOVU

UMGUNGUNDLOVU

WASTEFUL EXPENDITURE

- IDP PACK PRODUCTION R190 000 (R140 000 FOR PRINTING)
- WSA – R4.4M. PUBLIC AWARENESS CAMPAIGN. WATER WEEK R 399 900. SANITATION WEEK. R799 900
- WATER CONSUMER EDUCATION (DROUGHT AWARENESS) R2 244 000
- PUBLICITY (CORPORATE GIFTS) R1 000 000
- YOUTH DEVELOPMENT: R4.1M (R500 000 FOR YOUTH CAMP)
- TOURISM – R5M (R3M FOR MANDELA MARATHON)
SECTION E: SLIDES
SESSION 2: WHAT IS GENDER RESPONSIVE BUDGETING?

What is Gender Responsive Budgeting?

What is GRB?
- GRB analyses the government budget for impact on women & men, girls & boys
- Ideally, GRB goes beyond simple male-female to look at location, age, race & class (rich/poor), etc

What is GRB? (continued)
- GRB = policy analysis
  - that goes beyond words on paper
  - checks money is allocated to implement the words
  - checks whether the money is spent as allocated
  - checks who the money reaches
  - checks whether the money changes ‘bad’ gender patterns in society
- GRB says
  - Budget = most important policy of government because without money no policy will work

What GRB is not
- NOT about separate budgets for women, men, girls or boys
- NOT (for us) about setting aside X% for gender/women
- NOT about money for women councillors to control
- NOT about 50% male:50% female for every expenditure
- NOT (only) about ‘women’s needs’

3 categories of GRB analysis
- 1: Targeted gender-based expenditures
  - Women’s health programmes
  - Special education initiatives for girls
- 2: Equal employment expenditure on government employees
  - Training for clerical officers or women managers
  - Provision of child care facilities
- 3: General budget expenditure judged for impact on male and female
  - Who needs adult education & how much spent on it?
  - Who are users of contraceptive services?
Challenges of 3 category approach

- Should it be ‘women’ or ‘gender’?
- Tendency to focus on first category because easiest:
  - 1st category is important as affirmative action/positive discrimination BUT
  - Danger of focusing on crumbs
  - Can give misleading picture e.g. Pakistan expenditure on girls’ schools
- Some interpret 2nd category as % of salaries & allowances going to women:
  - Important question because large % of budgets is salaries
  - Can be important in countries with strict gender roles (e.g. lady doctors & teachers)
  - Danger of focusing on relatively privileged government officials instead of poor people in communities

5 steps of GRB

- Describe situation of women & men, girls & boys (and different sub-groups) in the sector
- Check whether policy is gender-sensitive i.e. whether addresses situation described (Budget speak: ‘Activities’)
- Check that adequate budget is allocated to implement gender-sensitive policy (Budget speak: ‘Inputs’)
- Check whether expenditure is spent as planned (Budget speak: ‘Outputs’)
- Examine impact of policy & expenditure i.e. whether it has promoted gender equity as intended (Budget speak: ‘Outcomes’ or ‘Impact’)

This is very similar to the performance budgeting framework used by government

Performance budgeting & the three Es

A rights-based approach

Assess State commitments to women’s rights (international human rights standards, domestic laws, etc.)

Identify existing gaps obstructing attainment of women’s rights and necessary interventions

Distinguish between budget policies that treat women as autonomous citizens and those that treat them as “vulnerable groups”, “reproduction tools”, “development instruments”

Ensure meaningful participation of all groups involved in budget policy making

Are women a “vulnerable group”?

**Why? Why not?**

The Fourth Women’s Budget
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Difficulties encountered in 1999 study
- The large number of municipalities [Some decrease in number since 1999 but still many]
- The diversity of municipalities, including types [Some improvement]
- The lack of uniform formats [Some improvement]
- The complexity of the accounts – more like business than government
- The diverse forms of revenue
- The lack of information and knowledge, even of government officials.
- Reluctance to share information
- Conflicting information
- The state of flux: Not a bit problem now
- Concurrency of functions (even in metros with water crisis?)

And then there are the gender challenges
- Conceptual: Municipal services directed at household rather than individual. Individuals have gender, households do not.
- Female-headed household concept is not the solution.
- Community <> black people <> black women (and spokespersons are often men)
- Women <> poor people (although women more likely to be poor)
- Municipal services have strong gender implications. These are based on current gender roles but cannot be ignored on the basis that they perpetuate these roles
- (Poor) women are not a single homogeneous category.
- It is not only rural people who can be poor but in Cape Town councillors can argue whether grants in aid should go to Rape Crisis rather than to a rugby club. In Lebowakgomo there were no grants in aid at all.

Approach
- Five diverse municipalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Cape Town</th>
<th>Port Elizabeth</th>
<th>Middelburg</th>
<th>Lebowakgomo</th>
<th>Lusikisiki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>TMC</td>
<td>TLC</td>
<td>TLC</td>
<td>TLC with R293</td>
<td>TrepC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>946 902</td>
<td>749 922</td>
<td>85 884</td>
<td>102 141</td>
<td>344 656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillors</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>23 (32%)</td>
<td>12 (22%)</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
<td>12 (55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>12 000</td>
<td>5 841</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equitable share (000)</td>
<td>1 013 079</td>
<td>11 608</td>
<td>2 103</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 894</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What worked
- knowing officials and councillors
- using one’s network of contacts
- going to the top people first for clearance
- background reading
- (structured) questionnaires faxed before the interview
- talking about ‘impact on women and men’ rather than ‘women’s budget’
- getting things in writing

- checking information received against more than one source
- patience and perseverance
- communicating with other researchers
- choosing areas on which to focus
- Familiarity with budgetary terms, words, and concepts used
- using wide range of documentary sources
SESSION 3: WHAT ARE TYPICAL GRB ACTIVITIES?

GRB initiatives are very diverse

- **Actors**: Government-led vs civil society-led vs parliament-led
- **Focus**: Full budget vs selected sector.
- **Focus**: Sector (e.g. health) vs problem (e.g. gender-based violence)
- **Focus**: Expenditure vs revenue
- **Focus**: Recurrent vs development
- **Level**: National vs province vs district
- **Timing**: Post-budget analysis vs in-process budget formulation

GRB activities are very diverse

- **Research**: Usually outside government as basis for advocacy, Government may do to inform policies & budgets
- **Advocacy**: Usually outside government, but CAN be inside government & legislature
- **Monitoring**: Key role of legislature, legislature monitors as part of management function, civil society can monitor budget implementation
- **Training**: For whom? By whom? To do & know what?
- **Awareness-raising**: For whom? By whom? To achieve what?
- **Policy analysis & design**: Government role but can involve others

History of six/seven Elson tools

- Diane Elson was commissioned by Commonwealth Secretariat to develop tools
- This was done in the very early days of GRB
- The tools were developed on the basis of existing approaches, adapted for GRB
- Focus on analysis rather than development of budget
- You do not need to do all these tools for every GRB!
- These are not the only available tools

Here we look at:
- characteristics, strengths, weaknesses, likely actors

Gender-aware policy appraisal

- Probably the most commonly used tool
- Good to do early in GRB initiative:
  - Learn how budgets work
  - Provides material for training & awareness raising
- Includes qualitative and quantitative analysis
- Often used by civil society groups
- Can be used by government, e.g. for CEDAW or by Morocco & France for gender budget statement or by Pakistan PRS Monitoring or South Africa in 1997
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Gender-aware policy appraisal (2)
- Analysis often uses 5-step approach:
  - Situation analysis of sector
  - Policy/programme analysis within sector
  - Analysis of budget allocations
  - Analysis of service delivery
  - Analysis of outcomes/impact/change in situation
- Other tools don’t cover all the stages

Gender-aware policy appraisal (3)
- Challenges
  - Access to data
    - This can become the basis of further advocacy
    - Alliances with government improve access
  - Too few people with budget & sectoral & gender expertise
- Critiques
  - 5-step approach excludes some important issues
    - Institutional issues e.g. budget process, how & by whom budgets formulated, flexibility in decision-making (especially local govt)
    - Role of formal rules vs informal networks in decision-making

Beneficiary assessment
- Asks users/beneficiaries of services about their experience:
  - Can be used by government or civil society
  - Can be done on varying scale e.g.
    - Particular health clinic vs
    - Particular service vs
    - Sector-wide vs
    - Locality-wide across services
- Can use different methods:
  - Opinion polls vs attitude surveys vs group discussion vs interviews
- Gender-aware beneficiary assessment:
  - Ask both male and female beneficiaries
  - Ask about gender-related issues

Beneficiary assessment (2)
- Challenges:
  - Capturing views of less powerful
  - Literacy problems
  - Problems of fear of retribution
  - Trade-offs between quality vs quantity
  - Closed-ended short questionnaire too many
  - Difficult to cover more than one service at a time
- Critiques:
  - You will miss half the picture if you only listen to beneficiaries & ignore non-users
  - But how can we reach non-beneficiaries?

Sex-disaggregated public expenditure incidence analysis
- Estimates distribution of budget between male & female by:
  - Measuring unit costs of providing a service
  - Multiplying unit cost by number of units delivered to male/female
- For example, how much education expenditure:
  - Reaches male/female learners at different levels of education
  - Reaches male/female learners from different income groups
- Can be used to estimate gender impact of proposed budget cuts
- Usually done by non-government actors
Sex-disaggregated public expenditure incidence analysis (2)

- **Challenges:**
  - Difficult/impossible if service not delivered to individuals as cannot sex-disaggregate
  - Depends on data availability e.g., household surveys with correct questions & unit costs
  - Requires ability to analyse large data-sets

- **Critique:**
  - Assumes that unit cost of delivery does not change e.g., urban vs rural
  - Assumes that quality of service is similar across groups
  - Unless add income or other dimension, does not tell more than simple sex-disaggregation of beneficiaries

---

**Analysis of impact of the budget on time use**

- Shows link between budget allocations and how male & female household members spend their time
  - e.g., electricity & fuel collection
  - e.g., household water supply & water collection
  - e.g., childcare services & staying at home to care for kids & not earning income
  - e.g., public transport & time spent travelling

- Can compare imputed value of unpaid care work with budget amounts:
  - e.g., value of caring work in household vs personnel cost of hospitals & creches

- Could be done by government or civil society
- South Africa has time use survey data

---

**From Stats SA’s 2010 Time Use Survey**

*Figure 4.12: Water collectors in the household by sex of respondent*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Less than 100m</th>
<th>100m to less than 200m</th>
<th>200m to less than 400m</th>
<th>400m to less than 600m</th>
<th>600m to less than 800m</th>
<th>800m or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Analysis of impact of budget on time use (2)**

- **Challenges:**
  - Accurate & reliable analysis requires time use survey (which South Africa has!)
  - Large time use survey is resource-intensive
  - NGO can usually not do large time use survey itself, but may be possible in small area
  - Analysis of time use data requires special skills

- **Critique**
  - From feminists: Time use survey tells us nothing we don’t know already
  - From anti-feminists: Gender roles are as they should be

---

**Gender-aware medium-term economic policy framework**

- **Two interpretations:**
  - Framework
  - Model

- **Framework = multi-year:**
  - Can use same tools as for single-year budget
  - Provides indication of overall trends planned over next few years e.g., growth/stagnation of social sector

- **Model = “adding gender”**
  - Disaggregating existing variables e.g., labour supply
  - Adding variables e.g., unpaid care work sector

- To have impact, this must ideally be done by government
- To be most useful, must include previous year data

---

**Gender-aware medium-term economic policy framework (2)**

- **Challenges:**
  - Disaggregating labour supply is fairly simple; adding unpaid care work is more complicated
  - Adding unpaid care work requires time use data (which South Africa has)
  - Engendering model is only first step:
    - Need subsequent analysis
    - Need advocacy on implications for policy
  - Very little experience internationally in doing this
SECTION E

SESSION 3: WHAT ARE TYPICAL GRB ACTIVITIES?

Gender-responsive budget statement

- Government tool of accountability
- Should be done on regular basis e.g. annually
- Done by government, but to be used by parliament & civil society
- Can be narrative or table or indicator format
- Easiest if programme/performance budgeting format
- Can use some of the other tools
- Done previously in Gauteng and Western Cape but not now

Western Cape Community Safety continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Project in 2010/11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female victim hospital care accessibility</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children in non-violent families</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children born to single mothers</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Challenges encountered:
- No dedicated victim empowerment co-ordinator at district level to implement the sub-programme
- The shortage and high caseloads of social workers cause tempo implementation of the programme
- The USAID initiative for the 2010 World Cup requires costs time and resources

Gender-responsive budget statement (2)

- Challenges:
  - Need strong instructing agency to ensure all agencies do it
  - Officials may lack gender analysis skills
  - Statement can become advertisement – telling only the “good news”
  - Parliament & civil society need to read & comment or officials lose interest
  - Trade-off between including in standard documents (hidden away) vs separate documents (ignored by mainstream budget readers)
GENDER-RESPONSIVE BUDGETING IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT BUDGET ADVOCACY

SESSION 5: SERVICES AND GENDER

Gender issues in municipal services

- Poor black women disadvantaged both as users and deliverers of services.
- Population distribution:
  - Census 2011: Women = 50% of adults in urban but 56% in ex-homeland.
  - GHS 2013: 51% female in urban formal areas vs 48% in informal.
- Public-private divide: Home is domain most affected by municipal services.
- TUS 2010: Women average 81% of their time in homes vs 70% for men.
- Differences in need for services: (a) unequal shares of unpaid care work, (b) biology affecting physical need for services & facilities, (c) assigned roles affecting need for services and specific characteristic of services.
- Paid work: LM01S 2010: 70% non-domestic cleaners are female.
- Ability to pay: QLFS 2012: Median monthly wage R3,500 vs R2,600 female.

Water and gender

- In rural areas women more likely than men to collect water — especially when distances are long.
- Water “on tap” saves this time and benefits women’s health and physical well-being and gives them increased time for productive, reproductive and leisure activities.
- Easily available safe water makes cooking, washing and clearing easier.
- It also increases the productivity and profitability of income-earning activities such as food selling and hair dressing.
- And it improves the health of women and the families they care for.
- Water projects can provide temporary employment for women — in construction and also on projects like Working for Water.

Working for Water (WfW)

- WfW is a water conservation-cum-public works programme which employs local people to eradicate alien vegetation.
- It provides jobs — and early on introduced a quota of 60% women.
- It also introduced most of the gender-friendly aspects of the EPWP.
- (Public Works later unilaterally dropped the quota to 40% for EPWP.)
- By removing alien vegetation, WfW increases the water supply.
- And the vegetation that is removed can be used for many different purposes — coffins, school desks, affordable housing....
- Why do we hear so little about it?
Sanitation and gender

- Biological differences mean that:
- Women tend to urinate more often than men
- Women cannot easily manage without a toilet; men can
- Women’s menstruation increases the need for a toilet
- Other factors include:
  - Women are more at risk of violence when using shared toilet
  - Women are the main caregivers – so are more affected by child-related need for toilets
- Other???

Sanitation, cleansing & gender
A case study of Cape Town

Guiding Questions

Human Rights Commission report

- DPME 2011: R44.75 billion needed nationally to provide basic services to unserved (R13.5 billion) and to upgrade existing infrastructure (R31.25 billion). This excludes funding for bulk infrastructure for both new services and upgrading.
- Municipal Infrastructure Grant (MIG) allocations for sanitation only R3.2 billion per year. Many municipalities use funds for maintenance rather than backlogs.
- Poor sanitation services violate a range of human rights and disproportionately affects particular groups – in particular women.
- Government’s approach favours economic growth over needs of poor households.
- Free Basic Services policy of 2001: Ability to pay should not affect access:
  - National indigent policy required at least VIP or septic tank toilet for all households.
  - Households cannot benefit from free basic services unless the infrastructure exists to deliver services to their homes and communities.
  - Wealthier ones should cross-subsidise poorer ones.

Underlying questions

1. Who receives services – and the quality of services received;
2. Who pays for services – through paid work, unpaid work, rates, special rating area private provision?
3. Who is paid for the delivery of the services, what type of work is involved?
4. What is the nature of the payment and conditions of EPWP, municipal, externalised, and unpaid work?
5. Who determines how services are delivered and the related payments?
Who receives services – and what is the quality?

- Most households in Cape Town have access to flush toilets.
- However, 10% of households are in informal settlements, and most of these households do not have access to flush toilets.
- Most residents of informal settlements are black, the majority African.
- Households in informal settlements that have access to flush toilets share the toilet with other households.
- Many of the shared toilets are broken and dirty.
- Non-flush toilets need municipal services in addition to hardware.
- Household-based toilets are more likely than shared to have washing facilities, toilet paper, sanitary bins and other “quality” elements.

And for cleansing...

- People in formal settlements usually have weekly collection of refuse.
- The City usually also usually provides some street cleaning services.
- People living in informal settlements do not have household-based refuse collection, or City-provided street-sweeping and litter-cleaning.
- In 2014, 88% of households in formal urban areas had their refuse collected by the municipality but only 54% of households in informal urban areas.

Who pays for services?

- Municipal-type services can be paid for through paid work, unpaid work, rates, special rating area (SRA), or private provision.
- National policy provides for free sanitation for the indigent and a tariff structure that gives a small amount of sanitation at no cost. This policy benefits only those with individual flush toilets.
- People who use communal toilets do not usually pay a direct fee. However, sometimes they are expected to clean and monitor the toilets on an unpaid basis. When this happens, it is usually women who do this work.
- Households in formal areas provide for themselves privately when building, buying or renovating a dwelling when they decide how many toilets and bidets they want.

Free services benefits City as well as poor

- Already in 1998, the Dept of Finance realised that the time and energy spent chasing after small amounts owed by poor households was not cost-effective. It wrote:
  - Should it be possible to subsidise most or all of the cost of basic services to poor households, it might be possible to free these households from the burden of paying for them, and local authorities from the administrative costs of having to collect large numbers of very small payments. The problem of non-payment would then be confined to a subset of households consuming higher levels of service. The case for requiring payment would then be clearer and more defensible, and sanctions easier to apply against defaulters.
- Are there free services for the poor in YOUR municipality?

Cleansing

- Property owners are charged a flat fee for refuse collection.
- There is no specific payment for general cleansing services such as street sweeping and litter collection.
- SRAs [see next slide] commonly provide extra services in respect of cleansing.
- People living in wealthier areas also often pay a domestic worker to do their personal cleaning.
- In informal settlements people – and particularly women – do their own household cleaning.

Special rating areas (SRAs)

- Property owners in Cape Town’s 31 SRAs pay higher rates. The City collects the money but property owners decide how the extra money is spent. Tenants and homeless people have no decision-making power.
- SA’s Constitution states that municipalities must deliver basic services in an equitable manner. The Municipal Property Rates Act states that an SRA “will not be used to reinforce existing inequities in the development of the City’s area of jurisdiction”
- SRAs provide better public services based on the ability of property owners to pay additional levies. This is likely to increase inequality.
- SRAs in Cape Town usually focus on 4 “pillars”: security (“crime”), cleaning (“grime”), environment, and social responsibility.
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Who is paid for delivery?

- In Cape Town municipal services are provided by:
- EPWP workers: Janitors provide sanitation services in informal settlements. More women than men. R1,592 for 22-day month. No benefits except UIF. Six-month contracts.
- Workers employed by sub-contractors: Sannicare workers provide services in informal settlements. Similar daily rate to EPWP workers, but fewer days a week so earn less. Fixed-term contracts.
- Casual workers employed daily by SRAs: Wage usually lower than for EPWP. No benefits. Mainly men (off the street)
- Unpaid work: Done by (mainly female) residents.

Who determines how services are delivered?

- In theory, elected councillors determine how services are delivered.
- In practice, municipal officials and consultants probably have more influence.
- Pay for municipal employees is determined through collective bargaining in the SA Local Government Bargaining Council.
- The minimum pay rate for EPWP workers is determined by Minister of Labour, on advice of the ECC. Municipal officials can decide to pay more than the minimum.
- Pay for outsourced workers, labour broker workers and SRA workers is partly determined by the contractors and NPOs that supply or employ the workers. The municipality and SRAs can influence the pay rates by insisting on cost-cutting or on decent wages.

For discussion

- How is the situation in your municipality the same?
- How is the situation in your municipality different?
- What do you know already?
- What do you still want to know?
SESSION 6: HOUSEHOLDSHIP AND GENDER

1. Discuss with the person sitting next to you

- Why did you name this particular person as the household head?

2. What does YOUR household look like?

- Who is the household head in your household?

3. The Debate on Household Headship

4. 1973 UN review of national population censuses

- “...essentially three different types of headship definition:
  - Self-definition, that is classifying as the head of the household the person who nominates himself or herself as the head, or who is designated by other household members;
  - Identification of the person in authority, that is, the person who controls the maintenance of the household and exercises the authority to run the households;
  - Identification of the economic supporter of the household, that is, the chief earner or the main supporter of the household’s economy”.

- “...more countries reported data on household heads than provided definitions of the head of the household”
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World Bank publication

- “The most serious problem with the use of the concept of householdship... has to do with the assumptions it carries. The term assumes that a hierarchical relationship exists between household members and that the head is the most important member; that the head is a regular presence in the home; has overriding authority in important household decision matters; and, provides a consistent and central economic support... The common practice among survey researchers and analysts is to impute the characteristics of the head to the household only serves to aggravate the problem. In doing this, researchers tacitly assume that the head’s information is the most important...” (Rosenhouse, 1989:4).
- Researchers also assume that the head’s characteristics can “represent” those of other household members.

In addition to the conceptual problems....

- The previous slides focus on conceptual aspects – on what one is trying to measure.
- In practice, there is often also a difference between what one tries to measure and how the definition is operationalised.
- Further confusion arises when analysts assume that a certain thing is being measured but...
- It is interpreted in a different way by respondents, interviewers, other analysts, readers of the analysis, and policy makers who use it to make decisions.

Further evidence....

- In South Africa, FHH are definitely poorer than MHH.
- But there is a big difference between:
  (a) FHH headed by women whose partner also in household;
  (b) FHH where partner was absent;
  (c) FHH where woman not married (largest group, at 54%);
  (d) FHH where woman head was absent.
- Lockwood & Baden: The type of FHH that is vulnerable differs across countries and/or regions. In Latin America, FHH with dependent children are the most vulnerable.

Why do we need the concept of household head?

- Globally FHH are seen as a category which is “vulnerable”.
- The focus on FHH in analysis responds to a desire to do gender-disaggregated analysis of households.
- However:
  - Gender is a characteristic of individuals
  - Households usually consist of more than one individual. And there is often more than one gender in a single household
  - Empirically, there is evidence that FHH are not always vulnerable.
- Buvinic & Gupta, 1997? Review of 61 studies on poverty status of FHH. In 38 of these studies the FHH were poorer than MHH. However, only certain types of FHH were over-represented among the poor.
- Quisumbing, Haifdad & Pena, 2001: Analysed data from 10 developing countries. FHH more likely to be poor than MHH in only 2 countries.

- Statistics uses the concept for two reasons:
  - Household head as household classifier: To classify households by personal characteristics (e.g. age, educational status, sex/gender)
  - Relationships, family and household form: To distinguish different family relationships and family forms by asking about every other member’s relationship to the head or reference person.
- There are problems with both these reasons.
- Do we need the concept outside of statistics?
- If YES, why?
Alternative approaches for HH reference person

- **Householder**: Person in whose name the dwelling is rented or owned
- **Economic definitions**: Several options:
  - property ownership (similar to the ‘householder’);
  - primary income provider;
  - control or decision-making on income and resources
    - person working most hours for pay
- **Presence of adult men**: Does not need additional questions
- **Primary decision-maker**: Rarely used
- **Would any of these be useful for South Africa?**

---

What do Caribbean data tell us?

- Rogers 1995: Comparison in Dominican Republic of FHH defined by:
  - (a) the household’s own self-definition;
  - (b) absence of adult males;
  - (c) women as major earner (earning over 50% of wage income)
  - (d) major income contributor (earning over 50% of total income).
- Conclusion: The “overlap among definitions is very imperfect”
- Households defined as woman-headed under the four definitions shared some characteristics, but differed on others.
- Characteristics that differ might be important ones for policy purposes.
- In St Vincent & Grenadines share of FHH differs by household type

---

In conclusion

- The motivation for abolishing the concept of ‘household head’ is not to get away from a situation where the majority of heads are men. It is:
  - to avoid fuzzy thinking, ambiguity and the resultant miscommunication and misunderstanding
  - to get a better measure of what a society looks like.
- The measure may tell us that the society is patriarchal. But we need to know in what way that male power and control plays out.

- The Nairobi Forward-looking Strategies for the Advancement of Women advocated the elimination of the term ‘head of household’.
- This strategy came out of the 1985 Women’s Conference.
- Nevertheless, in the 2010 census round 80 of the 121 countries that collected information on relationship to a reference person still used the term “head of household”.
SESSION 6: HOUSEHOLDSHIP AND GENDER

Female-headed households

- This concept is inadequate. Firstly, the definition of head of household is usually ill-defined both in the surveys which generate the data and in the analysis (see discussion at www.statssa.gov.za). This muddies the meaning and the analysis. It makes it virtually impossible to propose meaningful policy. Secondly, while the statistics usually suggest that female-headed households are, on aggregate, poorer than male-headed, there are usually fewer female-headed households overall. In absolute terms, there are usually more poor women living in male-headed households than in female-headed ones. Thirdly, household analysis does not take account of intra-household resources, power relations and other flows and dynamics.

Ideas for better categories

- What categorisations would be more useful for thinking about households in your municipality?

- How does the need for services differ across the categories?

- How does gender interact with these categories?
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