



SUMMARIES

papers TAKING STOCK

Seminar
On track with gender
May 29th
ISS, The Hague



website: www.ontrackwithgender.nl | email: info@ontrackwithgender.nl

Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action through a gender lens: an international perspective and the case of the Dutch Development Cooperation

Nathalie Holvoet and Liesbeth Inberg

SUMMARY

With the aim to increase aid effectiveness and promote development changes in aid policies and instruments have been propagated over the last decade. The Paris Declaration (PD) and Accra Agenda for Action (AAA) set out a reform agenda of ownership, harmonisation, alignment, results-orientation and mutual accountability. This article studies the ongoing processes through a gender lens and focuses more specifically on **the following research questions**: what is the underlying rationale for a gender-sensitive Paris Declaration (PD), Accra agenda for Action (AAA) and ongoing review processes? What are the opportunities and challenges/risks of the different PD/AAA principles for gender equality and empowerment? To what extent are gender concerns effectively taken into account in the PD/AAA? How does Dutch Development Cooperation deal with gender concerns in the context of the ongoing changes in aid policies and instruments.

Methodology

The study is based upon secondary data and primary data collection. Secondary data consists of academic as well as 'grey' literature related to the PD, its review processes and the broader aid effectiveness agenda. In order to get more insight into underlying processes secondary data is complemented with semi-structured face-to-face and telephone interviews with key stakeholders engaged in PD/AAA-related processes. In the sample of interviewees, we have deliberately included actors who have a specific 'gender' mandate and others who have not. One of the limitations of the Dutch case study is its focus on actual experiences and insights registered at headquarters which does not necessarily capture adequately practices, challenges and insights at the level of embassies.

Findings

The rationale for a gender-sensitive reform agenda is clear-cut. First, gender equality and women's empowerment are among the objectives that most partner and donor governments have endorsed. It is thus straightforward to scrutinize changes in aid modalities on their value added towards policies and results in the area of gender equality and women's empowerment. Different studies agree to the fact that all five key-principles open interesting opportunities to move forward while they at the same time bring along a number of serious risks or at least pressing challenges. If donors and governments are serious about results-orientation and accountability for the equality and empowerment objectives they have endorsed, it necessarily implies serious efforts to grasp opportunities and mitigate risks. Second, there is ample evidence of the fact that gender-blind policies and practices, be it at the micro, meso or macrolevel, are not effective, let alone efficient. Policies and practices which flatly ignore that men and women are facing different constraints, opportunities, incentives and rights just do not work. A gender mainstreaming approach which rallies an integrative and agenda-setting track is the answer. In the context of new aid modalities, insights of gender responsive budgeting (GRB) might be particularly useful. Technically, GRB surmounts some of the difficulties encountered in gender mainstreaming and, even more fundamentally, it puts into perspective the 'exclusiveness' of policy-making and budgetary processes. In hands of non-state actors, GRB may function as a powerful mechanism of 'downward' accountability.

While the rationale for a gender-sensitive PD may be argued on equality, effectiveness and efficiency grounds, the original PD only made a passing reference to gender equality in the paragraph on harmonisation efforts. Further, the initial gender-blindness will remain unveiled as also PD monitoring surveys and evaluations are silent on gender equality and women's empowerment. Being confronted with this sorry state of affairs and in order to avoid further 'gender-retrofitting', different gender and women's mobilising networks started, somewhat late in the day, with advocacy, research and lobbying towards the 2008 Accra III High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness. Efforts of the DAC GENDERNET and CSO networks such as WIDE, AWID, FEMNET have been partially successful. Gender equality and women's empowerment figure more prominently in the AAA, and more opportunities are opened for the integration of a gender perspective. However, none of these opportunities will be automatically realised and particularly agenda-setting initiatives risk to be curtailed when principles of 'country ownership', 'alignment' and 'results-orientation' are interpreted in a 'reductionist' manner. Moreover, changes (or the lack of) in policies and practices of governments and donors risk to go unnoticed as the twelve existing indicators remain gender-blind while no new indicators have been added.

Research on the way gender issues are dealt with on the ground in the context of the PD/AAA reform processes has so far mainly focused on partner countries. While this is in line with the propagated shift in responsibilities, it is as important to document and analyse ongoing reform processes within donor agencies through a gender lens. The Netherlands are an interesting case, being one of the donors which are generally applauded for being *'ahead of the crowd'* when it comes to the implementation of PD/AAA reform processes. As regards commitment, there is outspoken support for a gender-sensitive PD/AAA at the highest political level, while bureaucratic commitment is more uneven. There are important differences among departments, within departments and over time. This is to a certain extent typical for Dutch policy-making where relatively quick changes in frames and values are common. Similar to other cases, 'strategic' framing has proved to be important to get gender and empowerment concerns on the PD/AAA agenda. In this specific context of poverty reduction and aid effectiveness, it is of utmost importance to revive the old distinction among a WID 'poverty reduction/efficiency' approach and a GAD 'gender efficiency' approach and to monitor and evaluate the usefulness of a more instrumentalist framing.

Whereas commitment in terms of general policy-making is relatively high and on the rise, the division of mandates and division of responsibilities is much more ambiguous with different departments having oversight functions and none really responsible for the realisation. In a setting of relatively few stick and carrots, policy evaporation is obviously on the lookout. This may be particularly valid within embassies where increasing levels of devolved responsibilities are combined with a reduction of specific gender expertise. In practice, it particularly circumvents a donor's agenda-setting track of specific targeting towards objectives of gender equality and women's empowerment. In an effort to reverse this tendency, a specific MDG-3 Fund 'Investing in Equality' has been installed and cooperation is sought with Nordic+ donors as to ensure in all Dutch partner countries donor gender expertise. This is obviously an area which needs close monitoring and in-depth case studies, particularly in the absence of a clear incentive structure within the ministry to stimulate gender-sensitivity. Besides few internal stick and carrots, there also exists little external pressure from Dutch non-state actors such as the Parliament and NGOs. Dutch Parliament has shown so far relatively little interest in the PD and its review processes, let alone to its gender-sensitivity. The apparent negligence of the topic within Dutch NGOs is mainly related to their overall critical position towards the PD and the confined involvement of NGO gender expertise in discussions on PD/AAA. In the absence of advocacy and lobbying from the traditional mobilising networks in the Netherlands, international gender accountability mechanisms, such as OECD/DAC peer reviews, the Gender Equality Policy Marker become all the more important to grasp opportunities of PD/AAA for gender equality and empowerment and mitigate risks of sidelining gender and empowerment concerns.

Energies and (dis)connections: the practice of gender mainstreaming in Dutch development cooperation

Anouka van Eerdewijk

SUMMARY

This paper investigates how gender mainstreaming is institutionalized within Dutch development organizations. It attempts to, on the one hand, map actual practices of gender mainstreaming policies, and on the other hand, conceptually reflect how successful gender is being mainstreamed.

In determining this success, the paper looks at the following key aspects of a definition of gender mainstreaming: the extent to which it touches all areas and levels of policy formulation and implementation, the extent to which gender concerns are an integral dimension, and whether the practice of gender mainstreaming is about contributing to gender equality. The paper draws from the 'practice' turn in organizational studies, because this allows for considering the interplay between formal policies of an organization and the actual daily practice among the staff of that organization.

An analytical framework in which components of gender mainstreaming policies were defined, was developed to structure the analysis of gender mainstreaming practices. Six components were selected and further investigated in the paper: (1) character of the gender mainstreaming policy, (2) internal responsibility, (3) input and outreach targets, (4) tools at the level of partner organizations, (5) level of policy formulation and implementation, and (6) staff competences.

This paper focuses on four Dutch development organizations: Oxfam Novib, Hivos, ICCO and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. For each organization, data gathering combined the collection of policy documents with semi-structured interviews. The policy documents included organizational policy documents, gender policy documents, gender evaluations, tools and documentation regarding the implementation of tools and instruments, and other relevant documents. The semi-structured interviews were conducted with a total of 20 interviewees. In each organization, five interviews were held with (a) the head of the gender unit, (b) a top executive or programme director, and (c) programme staff implementing the organizational and gender policies.

It was observed that all four organizations have formulated gender objectives at the highest policy level. Moreover, all four organizations pursue a gender mainstreaming agenda and aim to integrate gender into all policy levels and areas. Despite the differences between the organizations in terms of running a stand alone women & gender programme, for all four the presence of a gender unit and gender experts is seen as pivotal in order to guarantee that gender is not 'away-streamed'.

All four organizations have in common that the responsibility for the implementation of the mainstreaming track lies at the top executive level, and that the gender unit or experts play a role in stimulating, supporting and advising other departments and programmes on how to integrally take up gender.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs and ICCO have decided not to pursue gender mainstreaming through input and outreach targets (component 3). Oxfam Novib and Hivos, by contrast, do work with input and outreach targets. Input targets can be formulated with respect to both the budget for the stand alone gender programme and the mainstreaming track for which other programmes have to spend a set percentage on gender. Outreach targets define the percentage of women among the beneficiaries of non-gender specific programmes.

Whereas the input and outreach targets are valued by staff for keeping gender on the agenda, they also create frustration and lead to complaints. The targets are criticized for narrowing gender down to numbers, and as a consequence leaving the qualitative aspects of the promotion of gender equality and empowerment of women invisible. In addition, staff points out that it is difficult to realize the targets within the priorities set within the thematic departments and programmes.

Finally, the quantitative character and the annual monitoring of the targets create an atmosphere of 'being policed' and as such create negative energies around gender.

Gender assessments are instruments used by the NGOs in the relationships with their counterpart organizations (component 4). They include questions related to both the organizational and programmatic aspects of proposals from counterpart organizations. Staff values these gender assessments for keeping gender 'on the table' when approving and monitoring partner organizations. However, staff again argues that in practice they tend to 'miss the point' and do not guarantee an in-depth consideration of gender concerns in relation to programmes carried out by counterparts. The gender assessments are part of the administrative process, and are vulnerable to being treated in an instrumental and administrative way. Whereas the work with counterpart organizations involved both administrative and conceptual-strategic work, the gender assessments in practice do not necessarily affect the conceptual and strategic part, as this is largely determined by what staff have 'in their head'.

For an integral analysis of gender in relation to programmes and policies, the level of policy formulation between the overall organizational objectives and the actual implementation is of pivotal importance (component 5). The four organizations differ in the extent to which they focus on this level in their attempts to institutionalize gender. Overall, the integration of gender at the in-between policy level is weak.

Finally, with respect to the sixth component of staff competences, training plays a larger role in assuring that staff is capable to integrally address gender in their work than the integration of gender competences in recruitment or performance reviewing procedures of staff. Whereas gender trainings are regularly proposed to improve the gender competences, staff is critical of the trainings received in the past, and underline their need for knowledge on 'how' (rather than 'why') to address gender in their work.

In the final section, the paper critically looks at how the different and sometimes potentially conflicting organizational objectives in development work come to be played out the level of individual staff and counterpart organizations having to deal with targets and gender assessments. There is a need to make connections between these different objectives and bodies of knowledge and experience. It is argued that gender mainstreaming strategies could build more on new knowledge management approaches in which practice-based and tacit knowledge play a prominent role. Finally, it is analyzed how the weak integration of gender analysis into the level of departmental policies contributes to the above mentioned catch-22 situation. The transformative potential of gender mainstreaming could be channeled towards that in-between policy level, where connections between gender and other development objectives can be made and negotiated, gender objectives can be translated into strategic gender issues and the qualitative elements of gender equality and women's empowerment can be addressed more fruitfully. By making these connections, gender mainstreaming policies could tap more into the positive energies that do exist in their organizations.

Anouka van Eerdewijk
Centre for International Development Issues Nijmegen
Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen
a.vaneerdewijk@maw.ru.nl

No instant success...

Assessing gender mainstreaming evaluations

Conny Roggeband

SUMMARY

The Netherlands has been a pioneer in incorporating a gender perspective in field development cooperation. Due too to the mobilisation and strategic framing efforts of feminists, a gender perspective has been introduced across a wide range of key issues ranging from poverty reduction, health, safety, conflict, resource redistribution, and other domains. Long before the Beijing gender mainstreaming revolution, Dutch development cooperation agencies appointed gender experts and created specific equality units. Also, gender awareness training was provided to non expert staff, and specific innovative tools for monitoring and evaluating programmes and policies were developed. Yet, after this early success, feminists faced an important drawback. First mobilizing networks started to demobilize, followed by a decrease in budget for women's organisations and projects, and a decay of equality infrastructures (decentralization, smaller or disappearing gender units). Gender mainstreaming, introduced to turn the tide and integrate a gender perspective as an integral dimension of the entire project and policy cycle, apparently has failed to makes policies and programmes more gender sensitive and place gender equality firm on the organisational agenda.

This paper applies a political process approach (Roggeband & Verloo, 2006) to analyse the different available evaluations of mainstreaming efforts of governmental and non governmental agencies in development cooperation. Analysing the success and failures of mainstreaming practices and policies both at the level of structure (in terms of political/organizational opportunities, including discursive opportunities) and at the level of agency (in terms of mobilising networks and strategic framing), the paper examines three stages of the mainstreaming process: 1) construction, 2) implementation, and 3) monitoring of mainstreaming practices. I have used existing national and international evaluations of gender mainstreaming practices and complemented this information with interviews with external gender experts.

Framing gender mainstreaming

Strategic framing has been crucial in the phase of constructing and implementing gender mainstreaming policies and practices, it has, however, not always resulted in strong practices. An important observation here is that most organisations have not made adaptations of the general definitions provided by the UN or Council of Europe. This implies that there is often no organisational specific strategy, with clear strategic choices, about how to implement gender mainstreaming and what it would mean for specific organizational procedures, structures and decision making processes. As a result many organisations conclude that the mainstreaming strategy is 'too broad and unclear'. Moreover, organisational diagnosis and prognosis are not always culturally and socially sensitive. This implies that more local and specific analyses are needed. Also, gender analyses of specific domains and problems that have been developed, are not always integrated into policies. Gender mainstreaming is mainly left on the shoulders of gender experts as internal motors and motivators, and some ad hoc procedures like monitoring external partners. Introducing more participative-democratic mainstreaming strategies that engages women's groups, individual activists brokers, and external experts may help to create a more dynamic framing process where diagnosis and prognosis are adapted to new emerging needs and perspectives.

Mobilising structures

Strategic alliances and mobilising structures appear to have been in place in the phase of construction and implementation, but not sustained and further developed in later phases of

organisational development. Paradoxically, the implementation of gender mainstreaming has been successful in allowing gender experts an important role in the formation of policies and programmes, and providing legitimacy to gender expertise as a valid tool to improve policies, yet it has often resulted in reducing the scope for wider consultation with outside experts or other actors. Also, as most of the evaluations indicate, the implementation of gender mainstreaming policies often implied a cut down of funding for specific gender projects or women's organisations. Current mobilising structures that struggle to keep gender mainstreaming on the organisational agenda are mainly technocratic, so expert based, and less open for and used by civil society/women's organisations.

Organisational opportunities

After years of 'backlash', some organisations recently witness a revival. There has lately been an upsurge of efforts to elaborate new and compile already existing frameworks and tools for gender-sensitive planning, monitoring and evaluation. Also, as many of the interviewed experts observe there appears to be a new window of opportunities, consisting of political opportunities and an active women's movement that is not only able to seize, but also create new opportunities.

Conny Roggeband, cm.roggeband@fsw.vu.nl
Culture, Organisation and Management, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam

“You shouldn’t be too radical”:

Mapping gender and development studies in Dutch academia

Linda Mans

SUMMARY

Studies of anthropology, development studies, social and cultural geography and International Relations have provided an academic basis for an understanding of, and work in the field of, development cooperation. In that field ‘gender and development’ became a recognized sub-discipline and ‘gender’ gained official status within the discourse of mainstream development. Gender and development has become institutionalized, reflected in Bachelor’s and Master’s courses at universities. This paper seeks to map how gender and development are currently represented in the different departments of anthropology, development studies, social and cultural geography and international relations at eight Dutch university and seven different institutes; the topics covered and their theoretical perspectives. Equally interesting is to find out what has been done on gender equality and gender mainstreaming in the related academia and institutes thus far. Also, it would be interesting to see what caused the increase in interest in gender and development issues and whether there has been a subsequent decrease in interest – as well as how this is related to the official definition of gender mainstreaming. A second aim of this paper is, therefore, to find out what factors influence the mainstreaming of gender into academic institutions, related to international development.

Research questions

1. How are gender and development studies incorporated into different departments of anthropology, development studies, social and cultural geography and international relations at Dutch universities and institutes/institutions?
2. What topics are taught to students in the different departments and how are these topics represented in study guides?
3. What are recent institutional trends with regard to teaching and doing research on gender and development?
4. What factors influence the mainstreaming of gender into academic institutions and research and how can these factors be used to integrate gender and development issues successfully in the different studies?

Methodology

This paper is based on data from academic literature, electronically available policy papers from academic centres and study guides, along with interviews with professors and scholars on gender and development issues. A baseline assessment (quick-scan) was performed to show at which Dutch studies/institutes, which are related to international development, gender (and development) issues are explicitly taught. Interviews were conducted with fifteen individuals: fourteen professors, lecturers and/or scholars and one policymaker. A discourse analysis will be used to discuss the interviews

Results

The screening of electronically available study guides of eight universities and seven institutes exposes the courses of anthropology, development studies, social geography and international relations that explicitly contain education about gender. At four of eight universities, the departments of cultural anthropology and development studies provide compulsory courses that contain gender. At three universities, students of anthropology and development studies learn about gender through electives. Studies related to human geography offer one compulsory Master’s course

at the University of Amsterdam. At other universities, the courses related to gender are electives. The courses of one university were not visible online due to the introduction of a new website.

Major themes that emerged from the transcripts of the interviews are:

(1) theoretical shifts in gender and development – the analytical concept of gender has become complex and multidimensional, but; (2) the concept of gender mainstreaming; (3) influences on teaching and doing research on gender at academia; and (4) strategies for survival.

Theoretical shifts in gender and development according to the interviewees include increased complexity and multidimensionality of gender, and a decreased link with activism and social change. Interviewees are very critical towards the concept of gender and development, as the perception is that the development of this concept got waylaid. Gender mainstreaming is perceived as problematic: it has a conceptual problem – it refers only to women; and, as a policy, seems to dissolve gender. Teaching and doing research on gender at academia are influenced by several factors: the universities' change of climate towards neo-liberalism; the interviewees' positions at universities and institution, as well as space to manoeuvre; the image and value of gender; and the impact of students in market-oriented academia. Interviewees have developed individual strategies for survival to maintain their positions at academic institutions, such as putting gender on the education and research agenda all the time; supporting, training and encouraging their colleagues in the institutions who work in the field of gender; developing 'strategic behaviour', as in not talking about gender too explicitly; and building useful alliances.

Conclusions

A subdivision in compulsory courses on gender and electives indicates that not all students will (automatically) be taught about the concept of gender and/or feminist theories. Many students who become interested in exploring gender issues have little advance knowledge about the concept of gender.

Academic scholars who are struggling to come to terms with the pressure to respond to more market-oriented demands a shift in the universities' and institutions' climate towards neo-liberalism and keeping a core of feminism and gender with an emphasis on social justice and transformation. Due to the progress of theoretical developments, gender has become a more complex and multidimensional analytical concept. At the same time, it seems to have lost its relation to social change and activism. Therefore, new thinking is needed as well as the development of new approaches, both to question the consequences of an uncritical discourse on gender mainstreaming, gender equality and women's empowerment, as well as the need to address the challenges thrown up by the neo-liberal (dis)order. Professors and lectures/ academic scholars should continue to teach their students a critical and nuanced perspective. Students may become future colleagues, who may be able to contribute to this new thinking and development of new approaches.

Background of the author

Linda Mans studied health sciences (health education and gender studies at the Maastricht University, receiving her Master's degree in 1997 with research on violence against teenage girls in South Africa. For many years she conducted research on topics related to sexual and cultural diversity, gender mainstreaming within the medical curricula and patient participation in research. She currently works as a freelance researcher and trainer (Manskracht).

Gender mainstreaming: driving on square wheels

Theoretical review and reflections

Tine Davids, Francien van Driel, Franny Parren

Abstract

This article seeks to review the tensions and dilemmas in feminist theory and practice concerning the mainstreaming of gender within development. In particular it aims to assess the strengths and weaknesses of gender mainstreaming as a conceptual frame work for gender equality, based on relevant literature. It does so by revisiting how gender mainstreaming is conceived both as a policy instrument as well as a means to achieve societal transformation. Besides taking stock of the different debates within this field, the paper will address the possible need for a re-conceptualization of gender and gender mainstreaming in the contemporary context of globalization and neo-liberalization.

SUMMARY

Gender mainstreaming came into widespread use after it was internationally adopted at the 1995 UN Fourth World Conference on women in Beijing, China. However promising and attractive the meanings of gender mainstreaming might have been, its objectives and its practices have proven to be problematic. In assessing the literature on the strengths and weaknesses of gender mainstreaming, it became obvious that two different frames of reference support this problematic character. One frame is based on gender transformation, addressing structural gender inequalities, and the other frame of reference is based on improving policy praxis, addressing policy making and practices. In this paper we question whether these two different frames of reference are mutually compatible and consistent. It is an academic assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of gender mainstreaming, both at the level of gender mainstreaming praxis and at the level of gender theories.

The paper departs from a discussion of the implications of gender mainstreaming praxis as expressed in the literature. The adoption of gender mainstreaming as a policy instrument in all kinds of institutions and organizations has raised serious doubts about its transformative potential. Due to the neo-liberal climate in which gender mainstreaming takes place and the need to secure support for gender mainstreaming endeavours by all policy actors, gender mainstreaming as a policy practice often results in narrowing down a gender perspective to women and women's issues, technocratization, standardization or 'smart economics'. The struggle for gender equality runs the risk of being integrated into schemes of (re-) producing neo-liberal subjectivities, a 'masculine' status quo and hetero-normativity. In those cases where gender equality is not being narrowed down to women and women issues and, instead, emphasis is given to mainstreaming differences, the risk of complicity with policy mechanisms that wrap security goals as human right packages, or rendering gender foremost as a boundary marker, is very real.

The strengths and weaknesses of gender mainstreaming as a concept can not be assessed without considering it as a frame of reference for transformation. We have to explore what is understood by gender equality and by transformation. This transformative potential is discussed at a theoretical-analytical level in which the articulation of gender mainstreaming as a philosophy or frame of gender equality and their implications for a transformative agenda is analysed. The central question there is whether gender mainstreaming is aimed at feminist goals or at goals of improving governance. Defining gender equality as an integration of women, women's issues, needs or rights, implies constraining theorizing on societal transformation within the paradigms of a power analysis that does not fit the complexity of women's daily lives and contemporary societies they live in, nor those of men. Besides the risk of ethnocentrism the integrationist approach on gender mainstreaming as well as the diversity approach (that centres on valuing gender difference), run the risk of fixing gender mainstreaming in very dichotomous schemes that do not tackle the

discriminatory or subordinating mechanisms at hand. As such these two approaches give little or problematic points of reference for theorizing transformation.

In the concluding section we discuss the need to reconceptualise gender mainstreaming, offering thoughts for thinking on doing gender mainstreaming differently and reconsidering the change that we can achieve and want to envision. We conclude that the relation between gender mainstreaming and societal change is still under-theorized and in need for further exploration. By using insights and recommendations expressed by other authors we envision possible innovative ways of thinking and future directions. To counter the implications of using gender as boundary marker and the misuse of gender, for instance Marianne Marchand (fc 2009) sees possibilities in postcolonial feminist theory to dismantle the mechanisms of 'othering'. The vast growing literature and theorizing on migration and the eventual situations of 'in betweenness' this creates for women and men, might also offer a way out to counter othering. The tendency of states and institutions to inscribe totalizing, homogenous (e.g. national, religious, ethnic) subjectivities can be countered by the conceptualisation of Nomadic subjects and ethics (Braidotti 1994 and 2006).

Related questions that need to be discussed then are whether we can achieve progress by going beyond thinking in categories. Is a right based approach, of gender mainstreaming, such as basic freedom of sexuality for everybody, as Amy Lind (fc. 2009) suggests, a sufficient basis to reach beyond the add women and stir strategy in the struggle against hetero-normativity? A problem might be that fighting for rights not necessarily tackles the mechanisms that uphold these schemes of hetero-normativity. Maybe we need to think further along the lines of targeting specific power mechanisms of injustice, as also Jane Papart (fc. 2009) seems to suggest in her option of questioning masculinist power schemes as an entry point for understanding the way power is gendered and limits possibilities for gender transformation.

As policy praxis it is necessary to look beyond gender mainstreaming as the latest fashion of addressing structural gender inequality. Building on thoughts of Subrahmanian and other authors we consider a scaling down of expectations of gender mainstreaming. Taking into consideration that organisations are gendered as well, we have to reconsider what we can expect from mainstreaming gender within different institutional frameworks and by individual gender experts within these institutions. Is (and what kind of) transformation to be expected from state bureaucracies with their own dynamics? Under which conditions can female representation be considered a step forward or achievement without claiming such transformative goals as gender equality? The same questions can be asked with respect to other organisations and NGOs. In order to identify such steps Subrahmanian suggests discarding the term gender mainstreaming and subdividing it into its component parts: policy reform, administrative reform, analytical and conceptual strengthening, and political advocacy, and to recognise the wider political contexts within which these component parts are operating (Subrahmanian 2004:93). The latter, in combination with distinguishing different paths and methods for policy and politics, is in particular important considering unwanted consequences of mainstreaming gender into policy regimes that centre on different and sometimes opposed agendas.