Abstract:

International community has been allocating increasing amount of development assistance to developing countries in order to alleviate poverty and promote sustainable development. One of the essential goals of aid is to empower women and bring about gender equality in order to assure that women benefit equally from development process as men.

In this context, the main objective of this paper is to examine the international aid architecture on gender and development by looking at it from donor's perspective. Stemming from theoretical arguments on gender and development such as Women In Development (WID) and Gender and Development (GAD), this paper will then proceed to examine policies and structures of donors on gender in development. In particular, South Korea will be specifically examined to see where it stands. South Korea was chosen as the case study owing to its importance as the newest emerging donor with dynamic history of women's empowerment of its own.

---

1 Please do not quote without author's permission. This is a working paper in progress.
2 This research was supported by WCU(World Class University) program through the National Research Foundation of Korea funded by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (Grant Number: R32-20077).
I. Introduction

With the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) announced at the United Nations in 2001, developed countries became actively engaged with alleviating poverty and promoting development in developing countries. According to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) database, the amount of Official Development Assistance (ODA) disbursed by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) members alone jumped from around 54 USD billion in 2000 to nearly 128 USD billion in 2010.

In 2010, South Korea (henceforth, Korea) officially became the 24th member of OECD DAC and its membership was significant since it was the first recipient country to have transformed into a DAC donor country since the establishment of DAC. As a new and emerging donor, the Korean government has promised to increase the volume of its ODA to over USD 3 billion and 0.25% ODA/GNI by 2015 (OECD, 2008a) as well as to function as a bridge between developed and developing countries. As part of the effort, the Korean government worked hard to introduce the development agenda at the G20 Seoul Summit in 2010, and hosted the 4th High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in 2011 in Busan, Korea. It also improved its ODA strategy, establishing mid-long term strategy and roadmaps. However, although gender was included in the International Development Cooperation Basic Law in 2010, it has not been realized as a cross-cutting issue throughout Korea’s ODA practices.

Gender equality is considered a crucial issue in development since women will be left out of the development process if the broader societal context of gender inequality remains intact while men will become the primary beneficiaries of development assistance (Momsen 2010). In this context, aid can prevent further perpetuation and negative effects of gender inequality in developing by incorporating the needs and experiences of both men and women in all stages of its policies and practices.

This paper will mainly follow the key variables used by Holvoet (2006) in assessing gender-sensitiveness of Belgian Aid including whole and sector policy papers, human resources and aid budget. Based on the assumption that gender-sensitive policies and practices will ultimately lead to effective outcomes in the field (Holvoet 2006, 8), this paper will also critically examine how gender has been incorporated in Korea’s aid.

This paper will use data and evidence from government and international organization sources for the period of 2006 to present, which represents when gender was incorporated into Korea’s ODA policies. I will use Gender Equality Policy Marker (GEPM) of OECD, the Gender Impact Assessment (GIA) and Gender Responsive Budgeting (GRB) to examine how the four government ministries and aid implementation

---

Korea’s ODA is practiced by four major actors: The Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MOFAT) is in charge of bilateral grant aid policy, which is then implemented by the Korea International Cooperation Agency (KOICA). The Ministry of Strategy and Finance (MOSF) is responsible for concessional loan policy which is implemented by the Korea Export-Import Bank’s Economic Development Co-operation Fund (EDCF) (OECD 2008a, 19).

The time frame of the research will be from 2006 to present due to data availability. Korean government began to apply Gender Equality Policy Marker (GEPM) of OECD and offer the data from 2006.

The GIA policy gives women and men the even benefit of considering the demand and difference according to gender when you plan, execute and assess the policy (MOGEF, Korea).

Gender (Responsive/Sensitive) Budget is to unify the realistic demands of women and men in the process of compilation of the budget and execution of the budget so that women and
agencies have incorporated gender into their policies and financial and human resources.

The rest of the paper is organized into three sections: (1) a critical review of how the two concepts of “women in development” and “gender and development” have developed and realized in development cooperation (foreign aid) policies and programs; (2) a critical analysis of how gender has been incorporated into Korea’s ODA; and (3) conclusion with policy recommendations for the Korean ODA institutions to realize the goal of gender mainstreaming.

II. Gender and Development

Theoretical Background and History of Gender in Development

The topic of gender, or women, surfaced into the sphere of development from the 1970s. The relationship between women and development in the 1970s can be explained with by ‘Women In Development (WID)’, a term coined by female professionals in development sector. They challenged the ‘trickle-down’ effect of development on people, which argued for positive impact for both men and women, for being male biased (Jaquette and Staudt, 2006). Hence, the WID approach proposed to view women as active contributors to economic development and strived for gender equality through participation in the development process such as via programs and projects that specifically target women (Ravazi and Miller, 1995). Such projects were to increase women's economic independence and reduce poverty (Jaquette and Staudt, 2006).

From the late 1970s, WID approach was challenged for how it views gender equality. Since gender equality was caused by the mainstream society that was already unequally structured, simply focusing on women has limitations in tackling the fundamental structure of gender inequality. This criticism was the basis of ‘Gender and Development (GAD)’ who focused not on women, but on gender. For instance, GAD was concerned that programs or projects that simply aimed to provide jobs to women could adversely affect their rights by solidifying traditional gender roles. An example would be providing women with education on sewing which may increase the opportunity for women to enter the job market, but have little effect in changing the status quo (Jaquette and Staudt, 2006; Ma, 2007). Although women-specific activities were still valued, gender and socially constructed power relations were both to be considered to bring women in to the development discourse (Jaquette and Staudt, 2006). Through GAD, gender mainstreaming was eventually officially adopted in the Beijing Declaration at the Beijing Fourth World Conference on Women held in 1995.

According to the report by the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), gender mainstreaming is defined as follows:

Mainstreaming a gender perspective is the process of assessing the implications for women and men of any planned action, including legislation, policies or programmes, in all areas and at all levels. It is a strategy for making women’s as well as men’s concerns and experiences an integral dimension of the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies and programmes in all political, economic and social spheres so that women and men benefit equally and inequality is not perpetuated. The ultimate goal is to achieve gender

...
equality (ECOSOC, 1997: 2).

Gender mainstreaming is crucial in empowering women and promoting gender equality and the benefits can be generated in different areas. For instance, Fernandez-Kelly argued that women’s active participation in the economy leads to attaining advantage in the long run in export-oriented nations in both domestic and international market. Also, gender ‘bridges the productive and reproductive spheres, and greatly affects the social distribution of power (Fernandez-Kelly, 1989: 612).’ That is, women will empower through gender mainstreaming, ultimately changing the gender power dynamics. Moreover, gender mainstreaming can have positive effect internationally where full development will be achieved only when gender is embedded in all parts of development process and policy (OECD, 1999; UNIFEM, 2006).

On the other hand, gender mainstreaming has received concerns despite achievements. Some argued that it can create negative outcome of enhancing gender inequality through dispersion of accountability for gender equality and reinsertion of male preference that leads to decrease in budget and programs that can actually benefit women (Jaquette and Staudt, 2006; Kim et al., 2008). This fundamentally stems from ambiguity of the concept of gender. Many feminists from developing countries have argued that focusing on ‘gender’ than ‘women’ will weaken women-specific policies. It is not even clear theoretically and politically what gender implies. Absence of consensus on the concept of gender and gender mainstreaming resulted in different concepts and applications in different countries (Ma 2007). Hence, words that often appear in talking of gender such as gender mainstreaming and gender equality became a fuzzy and contested concept with different interpretations and applications across organization, personnel, context and time (see Daly, 2005; Eveline and Bacchi, 2005; Walby, 2005; Ma, 2007). This may even lead to mere implementation of policies, methods and procedures only in technical terms, without proper policy agenda to address the gender relations (Daly, 2005).

Gender mainstreaming also plays a pivotal role in enhancing women’s empowerment and gender equality in developing countries as well. In this context, the following problems need to be considered in mainstreaming gender into the development discourse. One is the inability to extensively integrate gender equality in international and domestic governmental organizations of both donor and recipient countries. Aside from the ambiguity, the concept is also maneuvered to fit the taste of the culture and politics of the organization, leading to national variations in framing, embedding and practicing of gender mainstreaming. This can at times negatively influence gender equality and women’s empowerment (Eyben and Napier-Moore, 2009). In addition, as the recipient country of development assistance depends on the financial resources, they might adopt various recommendations and conditionality of donor countries on women’s empowerment without considering it in the local context, hindering establishment of domestic policy agenda on gender equality (Rowley, 2008).

Another is the selective implementation of gender mainstreaming in a few sectors. Quite often, gender mainstreaming has only been applied to a limited number of sectors such as education and health care, not to even mention the small amount of aid allocated for gender equality (Nam, 2009). For example, United States Agency for International Development (USAID) mostly focuses on trafficking, family planning and maternal health, leaving small room for women's empowerment in political and economic sector. The findings on Korea’s Official Development Assistance (ODA) below also show that most of the aid on gender mainstreaming is heavily concentrated on education and health.

Yet, improvements have been made at domestic and international level to embed and mainstream gender into development policies. A number of countries and international
organizations including OECD, World Bank, and the United Kingdom have emphasized the necessity of gender mainstreaming and even acted upon their words (Council of Europe, 1998; Daly, 2005; Walby, 2005). At the same time, measurements were developed which include the Gender Equality Policy Marker by OECD, Gender Score Card by the UN, Gender Equality Toolbox developed by the Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA)\(^7\), and Gender Mainstreaming Manual\(^8\) by Sweden. As for Korea, the Gender Impact Assessment (GIA)\(^9\) and Gender Responsive Budgeting (GRB)\(^10\) are being used by central and regional governments.

**Review of Gender mainstreaming in Korean Official Development Assistance**

Expanding and fully embodying gender mainstreaming in Korea’s development cooperation is deemed important for Korea in carrying out its role and fulfilling its responsibility as a new and emerging donor. In addition, since becoming the newest DAC member country in 2010, it is now obliged to follow guidelines and recommendations of OECD DAC who has pointed out:

There is a focus sector entitled ‘environment and gender’ but according to Korean figures, only 2.5% of ODA goes toward projects with an environmental content, while gender receives insignificant funding. As it builds on a more sophisticated aid programme, Korea will want to give more attention to these (OECD 2008a: 18).

Korea was also recommended Korea to rethink the way to mainstream the cross-cutting issues, one of which being gender, in its programs and projects.

As a national policy, the concept of gender mainstreaming was officially adopted in 1998 with the establishment of the Special Commission of Women and it included the following: increase of women’s participation in all social sectors, integration of gender perspective in all policies and organizations, and shift to gender equality, not women, centered mainstreaming (Shim, 2007). However, implementation of gender mainstreaming in Korea’s ODA has received much criticism. For instance, Korea has passively materialized the concept of gender mainstreaming and promoted leadership or accountability in the issue so as to pursue effective gender mainstreaming in its ODA policy (Ma, 2007; Nam, 2009). It also does not have a legal framework that oversees gender mainstreaming in the ODA policy.

In 2008, the first bill for the ODA Act was proposed and this failed to contain human rights agenda and gender equality (Chung, 2008). It was only in the International Basic Law which was enacted in 2010 where gender equality was included as a goal. Yet, passive embodiment of gender mainstreaming by the Korean government is still evident in its development assistance. For example, Korea is still thought to have insufficient number of participants from social, political arena who are involved in framing, implementing and evaluating gender mainstreaming in its ODA activities (Kim et al., 2008; Kim, 2010).

\(^7\) Link: http://www.danidadevforum.um.dk/en/menu/Topics/GenderEquality/
\(^8\) Link: http://www.regeringen.se/content/1/c6/08/19/82/3532cd34.pdf
\(^9\) The GIA policy gives women and men the even benefit of considering the demand and difference according to gender when you plan, execute and assess the policy (MOGEF, Korea)
\(^10\) Gender (Responsive/Sensitive) Budget is to unify the realistic demands of women and men in the process of compilation of the budget and execution of the budget so that women and men receive the even benefits from public expenditure and improve budget process to the direction that promote equality of both sexes from the budget expenditure (MOGEF, Korea)
Such criticisms show that Korea has not yet fully embraced international action plans and discussions on gender mainstreaming in its ODA policy. Moreover, analysis below also shows the need for Korea to follow up on the DAC recommendations on having an overarching ODA strategy as well as further inclusion of cross-cutting issues (OECD, 2008b).

III. Analysis of Korea's ODA from Gender Perspective

III-1. Legal Framework and Policy on Gender and Development

The issue of gender and development first appeared on government paper in 2004 as part of international issues in which Korea should participate in (PCSD, 2004). Although this paper mentioned the need for gender to be included as a cross-cutting issue in project evaluation stage, this neither called for nor led to policy recommendation on incorporating gender equality in development process.

Korea first enacted the International Development Cooperation Basic Law that functions as an overarching legal framework that stipulates its fundamentals and directions in January, 2010. It was soon after Korea's membership to OECD DAC and was also a reflection of recommendations given by OECD DAC in 2008 Special Review Report (OECD, 2008a). The main goals include poverty alleviation, protection of women and children's rights, gender equality, sustainable development and humanitarian approach. Respecting the UN charter is also mentioned as an essential principle which implies respect for human rights and freedoms without distinctions as to sex, race, language or religion under Chapter 9 Article 55.

Under the enforcement ordinance, the Committee for International Development Cooperation (CIDC) chaired by the Prime Minister is the sole overarching authority in charge of mid-long term policy making and coordination amongst all involved actors. 11 ministries are members and the Minister of the Ministry of Gender Equality and Family (MOGEF) is included as well. CIDC is engaged in decision making process of ODA from policy design, country selection, to evaluation.

Policy-wise, gender was first selected as a priority sector in 2008 in the Midterm Grant Strategy for 2008-2010 announced by CIDC. Through this strategy, 'environment and women' was selected as a priority sector and measures such as human resource development, awareness enhancement, and institutional capacity building were set as means to empower women (Kim et al., 2008). Albeit this was only confined to grant, it provided a framework to achieve gender equality and women's empowerment in development programs.

In 2010, CIDC came up with the Roadmap for Korea's ODA and Korea's ODA was to pursue the following values: poverty reduction, abidance of universal values, and enhancement of national prestige. Women and human rights issues fall under the second category and gender is to be mainstreamed in all development activities. In addition, women's human resource development (HRD) was raised to encourage participation in multilateral aid. Specific plans include internship and employment opportunities as well as developing HRD pool for women (CIDC, 2010). However, unlike the midterm strategy, the Roadmap did not give plans to engage women in developing countries into the development process and to achieve MDGs that directly and indirectly target women. It was more focused on developing strategies and contents for Korea's ODA with small emphasis on gender issues.

The Action Plan for International Development Cooperation announced in 2011 also was disappointing in the sense that although gender equality was emphasized to help achieve the MDGs, it was limited to KOICA which is in charge of grants. There were no mentions of
mainstreaming gender in concessional loans or Knowledge Sharing Program\textsuperscript{11}.

Overall, it can be inferred that Korea has tried to bring gender into its ODA and improvement at policy level could be detected. However, the efforts have been limited to grant, with very little or no effort in concessional loan. In fact, whereas KOICA, the grant implementing organization, has come up with internal gender mainstreaming guideline in 2011 that enables the inclusion of gender perspective from strategy formation, implementation, monitoring, to evaluation through gender analysis (KOICA, 2011), applicable gender mainstreaming policy on concessional loan or Knowledge Sharing Program is still absent. Moreover, although overarching ODA policy declares gender equality as its priority, specific guidelines or approach is not present.

\textbf{III-2. National Gender Mainstreaming Policies}

Ministry of Gender and Family (MOGEF) is in charge of gender policies and it has been trying to integrate gender issues in ODA. In its second and third Basic Plan for Gender Policy, which is a five-year based policy paper to promote gender equality and women's welfare, it asserted the need to secure a larger ODA budget on women's issues and strengthen the ties between ODA and gender policies. Specific plans included provision of training and expertise to developing countries, gender policy development and encouraging participation of Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) (MOGEF 2005, 2007, 2011).

MOGEF is also in charge of two gender mainstreaming policies, which the government ministries are ordered to practice: (1) Gender Impact Assessment (GIA); and Gender Responsive Budgeting (GRB) to ensure and provide equal opportunities to both men and women by eliminating gender discriminative factors.

GIA was officially adopted in 2004 and MOFAT began to submit GIA report from 2007. From 2007 to present, it submitted reports on a few activities implemented by KOICA. Yet, they are limited to a very small number of projects\textsuperscript{12} focused on education and personnel exchange. These projects in general have a small share of women participants,\textsuperscript{13} and are usually short-term programs except for an education program at the master’s level. Thus, it is difficult to assess that these programs are in full compliance with the purpose of GIA. In particular, with the absence of evaluation afterwards, it is questionable whether the rise in female participation rate has actually contributed to gender equality in developing countries. Also, since GIA is a policy that administers activities of governmental organizations, it may not necessarily reflect the divergent needs of different partners that may exist in partner countries (Huh and Kang 2010).

It is critical to point out that MOSF has not provided any assessment report on its concessional loan activities nor the Knowledge Sharing Program. This means that any

\textsuperscript{11} Knowledge Sharing Program is consulting program offered by the Korea Development Institute. The goal of KSP is to assist in enhancing national development capacities and institutional restructuring efforts of the partner countries by sharing Korea's development experience. Although it is counted as grant, it is managed by the Ministry of Strategy and Finance, a factor criticized for going against the Basic Law.

\textsuperscript{12} The Ministry of Gender Equality and Family recommends each central organization to submit 5 reports per year but MOFAT has submitted 2 in 2007 and 2008, and 1 in 2009.

\textsuperscript{13} KOICA implemented a quota system of making participants of the training program for developing countries in Korea women at minimum of 30 percent in 2010. However, other activities involve a smaller quota for women.
progress that has been made on gender mainstreaming in ODA has remained restricted to grants in aid-implementing organizations. In addition, although there have been a sharp increase in development cooperation activities from civil society and the private sector, there is few or no policies and guidelines to encourage, or assess the impact of gender mainstreaming in ODA programs.

Assessment of Gender Responsive Budgeting (GRB) in Korea’s ODA is similar to that of GIA. GRB was adopted in 2006 as part of the National Finance Act, but it was not until 2010 that all ministries were required by law to submit GRB proposal as an attachment under the Gender Budget Act.

MOFAT drafted it first GRB in 2010 with regards to activities of KOICA and the Korea Foundation. Like GIA, activities reported for GRB are also confined to education, such as invitation for training, workshops for foreign educators, etc (Korean Government 2010, 2011; National Assembly Budget Office 2012). They are usually short-term and small-scale except for 2-year education program. Such small volume and number of activities imply that Korea is only at the ‘infant stage of adopting and implementing policies (Huh and Kang 2011: 54).’

In other words, gender mainstreaming policies are insufficient in Korea’s aid. Present policies neither target ODA directly but are also not fully applied to all activities in every sector. Moreover, gender equality is often mistakenly equated with women’s participation rate. Hence it is evident Korea is falling behind on carrying out its commitment on gender equality in development cooperation

III-3. Financial Resource Input on to gender mainstreaming in Korea

An important indicator for realizing gender mainstreaming is through the input of human and financial resources in relevant programs in ODA. GEPM is an important tool along with GRB, to ensure that development cooperation targeting gender equality can be implemented and evaluated. GEPM has been developed by OECD as an indicator to advance gender equality and women’s empowerment, and reduce discriminative factors based on sex. GEPM is used by documenting activities based on the objectives. That is, GEPM 1 is marked to activities in which gender equality is a significant objective and 2 to principal objectives. GEPM 0 is for screened activities that do not target gender equality (OECD 2008b). However, GEPM 0 does not necessarily mean that such activities have little or no impact on gender equality. Rather, it works as a tool to promote benefits to women through development activities (Kim et al. 2008).

| [Table 1] Gender Equality Policy Marker for Korea’s ODA (2006-2009) (Unit: USD Million) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| GEPM 0 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 |
| | 192.665 | 499.868 | 547.187 | 580.174 | 875.757 |
| | (48%) | (95.1%) | (94.56%) | (94.29%) | (93.84%) |

14 The KOICA Gender Mainstreaming Guideline published in November, 2011 is recommended to be used by development related organizations and personnel but actual utilizations require further research.
15 Article 34 Clause 9 and Article 5 of supplementary provisions of National Finance Act
16 To elaborate, GEPM 2 refers to activities that would not have taken place without a gender equality objective (OECD 2007). GEPM 1 are applied to activities where gender equality, although important, are not one of the principal reasons. GEPM 0 are for activities that have been screened against but were found not be targeted to the objective (UN 2012).
Table 1 shows the status of Korea’s ODA allocated to developing countries based on the GEPMs. Three main implications can be generated from the table.

First, GEPM was only applied to grants from 2006 to 2010 in contrast to countries like Germany that also apply GEPM to concessional loans. Considering the high share of concessional loans in Korea's total aid volume, it is crucial to mainstream gender in both types of aid to both expand and assess gender equality effects.

Second, despite the fact that the total volume of ODA activities with GEPM 1 and 2 increased steadily over time, its total ratio remains small. For instance, GEPM 0 accounted for around 94% from 2007 to 2010 which indicates that out of all ODA activities screened against GEPM, only about 6% targeted gender equality. In addition, whereas the volume of ODA with GEPM 2 may have increased, its ratio against total ODA has actually decreased from 2008. In 2010, while total ODA jumped by more than 160% from 2009, aid with objectives in gender equality (GEPM 1 and 2) remained insignificant in proportion. Furthermore, because the Korean aid agencies have yet to practice systematic gender mainstreaming, shift of focus from aid with GEPM 2 to GEPM 1 despite its gradual increase can also be an indication of gender equality objective in Korean aid losing its priority.

Third, GEPM itself does not measure results, outcomes or effectiveness of aid projects or programs (UN 2012). Without evaluation of the projects after completion, GEPM can only indicate commitment to gender equality but not the actual impact. In this context, it can be implied that Korea is not fulfilling its commitment on gender equality despite having it as one of the core values in its Basic Law.

Moreover, gender markers were mostly applied to health and education sectors. Although these two sectors are important for women, it is important to include women in other political, social, economic areas as well. The whole point of gender mainstreaming is to see how gender is incorporated into all policy areas, and not just in heavily women-participating sectors.

Thus, Korea should not only increase its budget allocation for gender, but it should also carry out gender mainstreaming practices across all sectors (Kim et al. 2008; Huh and Kang 2010). It will be critically important to remove barriers that restrain women from

---

17 According to OECD statistics, the ratio of Korea’s Grant/ODA was 64.5%, 68.2%, 63.7%, 59.6% and 61.5% from 2006 to 2010, respectively.

18 OECD DAC notes that in the case of systematic gender mainstreaming practice, gender equality will often be a significant objective (hence GEPM 1) than principal objective (GEPM 2) by being integrated across projects and sectors (OECD 2007, 119)

19 KOICA published KOICA Gender Mainstreaming Guideline in November, 2011.
having access to resources, which is based on the unequal power structure in the whole society.

III-4. Human Resource Input in Gender Mainstreaming in Korea’s ODA

From 2007 to present, human resources on gender in Korea’s ODA has only been present in KOICA, agency in charge of implementing grants. In 2007, gender was under the ‘Environment and Others’ team which was changed to ‘Environment and Gender’ in 2008 (Huh and Kang 2010). Then the ‘Gender Focal Point Task Force (TF)’ was established in 2010 which originally consisted of 7 members including 1 gender specialist (Kang 2010) which still exists although members have rotated.

This team was engaged in different specialties from policymaking, budget, training, data collection while overlooking gender mainstreaming. Then in 2011, the ‘Social Development’ team in charge of forming country strategies was newly formed. Specialists on gender, education and health sectors were all appointed to this team in order to develop an overarching strategy while enabling gender to be included from the policy-making process. This may be positive in tailoring development activities to reflect cultural, social, political settings of developing countries into account. Thus, it can be argued that the Gender TF and organizational reform at KOICA has contributed toward entrenching gender in grants.

On the other hand, there are remaining shortcomings. First, TF members, aside from the gender specialist, have been given gender mainstreaming as additional work, which may weaken the accountability and quality of work (Kang 2010). Also, the gender specialists are often at junior levels with only 1-2 year contract. This kind of personnel rotation could undermine the accumulation of expertise and work know-how.

In sum, absence of high-level gender champion and small TF size may result in difficulty in securing an adequate budget for gender as well as the ability to carry out the work of gender mainstreaming throughout the entire work process including education and training within the organization.

IV. Conclusion

There is no denying that South Korea is in the early stage of practicing gender mainstreaming in its development cooperation. Its aid disbursement on gender equality still remains relatively small and narrowly focused on certain sectors. Moreover, under the two pillar system, progress has been made mostly, if not all, from grant. While KOICA expanded its budget allocation for gender equality targeted activities and set up an internal guideline on gender mainstreaming, no effort was made from organizations that manage concessional loans. Moreover, there is also none for activities by other ministries, the Knowledge Sharing Program, private sector and the civil society despite their growing involvement. If Korea cannot establish a single entity for its ODA, then an overarching policy framework to mainstream and coordinate gender policies in all development activities should be established to enhance its aid effectiveness.

By taking the exemplary cases of for instance other advanced donors into account, Korea should also prioritize gender equality in its development agenda. In particular, the dual organizational system of Korea's ODA should not hinder the establishment of overall framework that can promote understanding of gender mainstreaming in all involved organizations. Gender equality and women's empowerment is detrimental for better aid, its effectiveness and sound development of developed and developing countries.

---

20 The affiliation and major tasks were retrieved from KOICA homepage and Huh and Kang (2010)
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