

Abstract

A Analysis and Evaluation of Local Government Gender Budgeting and Settlement System(V) – Performance and Future Tasks

Soo Bum Park
Young-Sook Kim
Youn Sun Chang
Byeongkwon Kim

Since the new administration came into office in 2017, interest in gender mainstreaming policy has begun to grow. As the new administration's national agenda includes strengthening performance management of gender budgeting, there are growing concerns about the definition of performance in this context and how to improve it. The purpose of this study is to identify the results of the implementation of gender budgeting at the local government level and to propose future operational plans.

In order to understand the performance of gender budgeting, it is necessary to clarify what “performance” means. In this study,

performance is broadly classified into two categories: quantitative and qualitative. Quantitative performance refers to results that can be identified by quantitative figures, such as changes in the number of target programs and size of budget as well as changes in budget allocation within a target program. On the other hand, qualitative performance is defined as public officials' perception of gender budgeting; in this study, an actual survey of public officials was conducted to identify changes in their perception.

The indicators most representative of a quantitative expansion of gender budgeting are the number of programs for which a gender budget statement was prepared and the size of the budget. Since 2013, when the gender budget statement was first published, the number of programs for which gender budget statements are produced and their budgets have increased. The gender budget for local governments amounted to KRW 12.59 trillion for 11,803 programs in 2013, but in 2018, it significantly increased to KRW 20.547 trillion for 17,010 programs. In other words, the number of programs that are analyzed through a gender lens has steadily increased every year, which means that the application of a gender perspective on local financial systems has continued to expand.

In the past, target programs for gender budgeting at local government levels were mostly found in the social welfare sector. In 2013, 46.1% in terms of number of programs and 79% in terms of budget were accounted for by social welfare programs, but in 2018, these figures decreased to 37% and 71.3% respectively. The reason for this decline is target programs are now found in a wide variety of fields, including public administration, culture and tourism. However, it remains necessary to actively identify target programs in traditionally male-dominated fields such as

environmental protection, industry and SMEs, national land and regional development.

In terms of target programs, gender impact assessment programs account for the largest proportion, which has increased each year. This has largely been brought about by the Gender Impact Analysis and Assessment Act and the joint evaluation of local governments. However, as the weight of gender impact assessment programs as a factor in the joint evaluation of local governments decreases, it is necessary to closely monitor whether the proportion of gender impact assessment programs will continue to increase.

Changes in the gender benefit effect were analyzed by program, using gender budget statements made available on the financial management information system for local governments, e-hojo. The results are summarized as follows. The rate of women who benefit from these programs is increasing every year, and there was a statistically significant increase in this rate from 2014 to 2016. In addition, by examining the distribution of the percentage of women who benefit by program, we can see that when the area where this rate is very low or high decreases, there is a tendency to converge to the median value of 50%. The sectors with a high proportion of female beneficiaries are education, culture & tourism, and social welfare; the sectors with a low share of female beneficiaries are public order & safety, environmental protection, agriculture, forestry & fisheries, industry & SMEs, transportation, national land and regional development.

Based on the results above, the outcome of gender budgeting can be stated as follows. Since the implementation of gender budgeting, not only have the number of programs and size of the budget steadily increased, but benefits received by gender in

individual programs have also changed. While the increase in the number of gender budget programs and size of budget is considered to be quantitative expansion, the change in benefit by gender can be viewed as a shift in allocation within the budget. In other words, through the implementation of gender budgeting, the scope of programs covered by gender-sensitive analysis has increased every year, and as a result, benefit by gender in these programs has also consistently changed to achieve balance. In particular, these changes were greater in areas where women are relatively more active, such as education, culture & tourism, and social welfare, and lesser in traditionally male-dominated industries such as agriculture, forestry and fisheries, industry and SMEs, transportation, national land and regional development. Therefore, it is important to identify programs for gender budgeting in male-dominated fields in the future.

A survey of public officials inquiring their perception of gender budgeting shows that this perception hardly improved since 2014. The problems revealed through the survey can be summarized into three categories. First is the issue of selecting target programs. Officials pointed out the ambiguity in the selection criteria. This problem seems to arise from the fact that as programs chosen for gender budget statements are excluded from the target program list every two to three years, programs that are inconsistent with previous ones are selected as new target programs. The second issue concerns education and consulting. Public officials received less education and consulting compared to 2014; as gender budgeting has been in operation for a longer time, public officials are more likely to reference preexisting material when preparing gender budget statements. In particular, only 37-38% of basic local governments received consulting because education and consulting

are mostly offered to larger regional local governments. The third issue is the utilization and accountability of gender budget statements. Gender budget statements are not being used for the purpose of increasing the budget; it is only being utilized when preparing gender budget settlement reports. Officials responded that in order to invigorate gender budgeting, the budget of target programs for gender budget statements should be increased (budget department officials) and that incentives should be provided to officials who prepare gender budget statements (program department officials).

Therefore, we would like to propose the following policy directions for the operation of gender budgeting at the local government level. First, target programs for gender budget statements should be found in various fields. This would indicate that the gender lens is being applied across all government programs in Korea. In order to select target programs in various fields, it is necessary to first establish regional gender equality goals and then intensively identify programs that will help meet those goals. In addition to setting gender equality goals, we can consider selecting target programs using a checklist. A checklist can provide clear criteria for selection and help identify target programs in various fields.

Second, the effectiveness of gender budgeting should be improved by managing the performance of target programs. These programs are subject to performance management needed to reduce the gender benefit gap and gender inequalities. Therefore, in order to achieve these goals through performance management, gender budget statements should continue to be produced over a long period of time. If gender budget statements are produced for only two or three years, there will be no incentive to manage the

performance of the target programs. Furthermore, there is the issue of unsuitable programs being included as target programs for gender budgeting to maintain the number of these programs.

Third, it is necessary to expand education and consulting to improve public officials' perception. Training on gender budgeting must be provided to both public officials and local council members. Training for public officials should be made mandatory for public officials in charge of the actual programs, rather than those in charge of the budget or women's policy. As demand for consulting continues to decrease, a new direction must be taken. In particular, demand for consulting services on the preparation of gender budget statements is declining in regional local governments, requiring a shift to consulting on selecting target programs and establishing gender equality goals. Moreover, as basic local governments did not have adequate access to consulting for the preparation of gender budget statements, there must be a continued effort to provide these services.

Fourth, in order to reinforce performance management of gender budgeting in the long run and to ensure that the gender perspective is reflected in all budgets of local governments, we can give consideration to integrating the gender budget statement into the performance plan. Local government performance plans set performance indicators for policy programs to manage performance. If the gender budget statement is included in the performance plan, performance targets and indicators are determined by policy program, which means performance management via outcome indicators becomes feasible because of the larger budget. Furthermore, gender equality issues and related budget compilation directions can be included if a 'gender equality-oriented compilation direction' is included in the

direction of local government fiscal management, so that gender analysis can be applied to all budgets of the local government. However, this plan is difficult in the short term because it requires a major change in the overall framework, including the revision of the law, and requires in-depth discussions with participants of the system.