

Research Report
March 2023

Towards Feminist Development Policy: Prioritizing the Foundational Economy and Universal Basic Services

Corinna Dengler, Karin Schönpflug,
Tommaso Gimelli, Maddalena Landi,
Ilaria De March, Katarina Mladenovicova

Study commissioned by:



Authors

Corinna Dengler, Karin Schönpflug, Tommaso Gimelli, Maddalena Landi, Ilaria De March, Katarina Mladenovicova

Title

Towards Feminist Development Policy: Prioritizing the Foundational Economy and Universal Basic Services.

Contact

Karin Schönpflug

T +43 1 59991-159

E schoenpf@ihs.ac.at

Institut für Höhere Studien – Institute for Advanced Studies (IHS)

Josefstädter Straße 39, A-1080 Vienna

T +43 1 59991-0

F +43 1 59991-555

www.ihs.ac.at

ZVR: 066207973

To the best of our ability and belief, all information contained in this publication is accurate and reliable. Nonetheless, all content is provided without any guarantee. The IHS is not liable for the content or contributions of this report.

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	4
2	Reviewing the existing literature	4
2.1	Foundational Economy (FE)	4
2.1.1	Academic debates	4
2.1.2	Policy debates	7
2.2	Universal Basic Services (UBS)	9
2.2.1	Academic debates	9
2.2.2	Policy debates	12
2.3	Feminist Development.....	15
2.3.1	Feminist development theory.....	15
2.3.2	Feminist development policy (FDP)	18
2.4	Transformative policies	20
2.5	FE and UBS as transformative FDP? A First Synthesis	21
3	Expert interviews	24
4	Synthesis	32
4.1	Research gaps	33
4.2	Coalition opportunities	34
5	Bibliography	34
6	Annex	41
6.1	Interview partners	41
6.2	Guiding questions for expert interviews	42
6.3	List of partners on the ground	43

1 Introduction

This report departs from the research question “In how far can prioritizing the foundational economy (FE) and Universal Basic Services (UBS) in international development cooperation be seen as a transformative step towards feminist development policy?” To tackle this question, the report in a first step reviews academic and policy debates around FE (section 2.1) and UBS (section 2.2) with a focus on links to approaches and interventions from the Global South.¹ In a second step, feminist development theories are introduced, different definitions of feminist development policy are considered (section 2.3), and a benchmark of what constitutes a ‘transformative’ (feminist development) policy is presented (section 2.4).

In order to include and prioritize comments, criticism and related academic, policy and civil society approaches and interventions from the Global South, six expert interviews were conducted (Bogner et al. 2014). The collected data are analyzed according to Kuckartz (2018) and complement the literature review in section 2. Central results of these interviews are presented in section 3. Section 4 synthesizes key results of section 2 and 3 and moreover identifies potential next steps and recommendations with the aim to promote the feminist transformation of international development cooperation.

2 Reviewing the existing literature

2.1 Foundational Economy (FE)

2.1.1 Academic debates

Inspired by Braudel’s view of several existing economies (1981), the concept of the Foundational Economy (FE) was first introduced by Bentham (2013). The framework has been developed as a response to industrial strategies favoring high technology and knowledge-based sectors. Bentham’s **Manifesto for the Foundational Economy** explains:

¹ The term Global South has been suggested by Oxfam Germany, who commissioned this research. The analytical distinction between Global North and Global South is not a geographical, but a political one. While researchers in critical development studies agree that the Global North/Global South distinction is preferable to concepts like ‘developed/developing’ or ‘First/Third World’ countries, which follow the colonial logic of unilinear development paths, the Global North/Global South differentiation still carries some problems. For example, it falls short in capturing heterogeneity within countries and regions and – as feminist and postcolonial scholars have pointed out – reproduces otherness and hierarchical dualisms. At the same time, Global North/Global South are still useful to analyze global injustices arising from the uneven integration of societies into the global capitalist world system. The recent promising shift to talk about the ‘majority world’ instead of the Global South is not reflected in this research.

Against this, our re-discovered object is the mundane production of everyday necessities. What we will call the foundational economy is that part of the economy that creates and distributes goods and services consumed by all (regardless of income or status) because they support everyday life. (Bentham 2013: 7).

The goods and services provided by the FE can be divided into **three domains** (FEC 2018). The first is the **material domain** which refers to essential utilities (electricity, gas, water), transport and communication infrastructure, food production and distribution, and private banking services. Then, the **providential domain** covers activities providing welfare services such as health care and education. The last domain is the more complex notion of the overlooked economy of **“lifestyle and comfort support systems**, which are occasionally purchased out of discretionary income but nevertheless arise from established cultural expectations” (FEC 2018: 52).

The strength of the idea of a FE is its **understanding of collective consumption** which in the foundational zone requires social investment. As Calafati (2019: 17) illustrates, “an individual can buy a smartphone but not a 4G network with comprehensive coverage.” (2019: 17). Additionally, this framework “recognizes the indispensable nature of mutualism and reciprocity, as well as the role of redistribution and public regulation” (Barbera et al. 2018).

While **providing for the everyday necessities of all citizens**, the FE also employs a large part of the population. In England, this number exceeds 40% (Calafati 2019). In terms of supply-side, FE services are distributed according to population rather than market factors, making the foundational “the resilient, stabilizing half of the economy” (ibid: 16–17).

In an age of privatization, austerity measures, and outsourcing, the current models have been leading to shortcomings in terms of social provisioning² (Heslop et al. 2019). These financialization-based models allow for high rates of wealth extraction by undermining wages and long-term investments (Sayer 2019: 43), contributing to a more fragile FE. The COVID-19 Pandemic has shed light on the growing weaknesses of the foundational, “that part of the economy which cannot be shut down” (FEC 2020: 3), as well as **the importance of the foundational for societal flourishing**.

² Marilyn Power’s (2004) paper *Social Provisioning as a starting Point for Feminist Economics* was a key contribution to both feminist economics and research on social provisioning. Her social provisioning approach, which serves as a starting point for all 50 chapters of the *Routledge Handbook of Feminist Economics* (Berik and Kongar 2021), is largely absent in FE debates.

Main topics, challenges, and framework developments

While the idea of FE has been gaining more momentum in both research and policymaking across Europe, specifics as to what actors should be involved, which goods and services should be included, and how this framework should be applied are debated.

Regarding scale, a **multi-level approach redefining collaboration between different governance actors** is applied. While some researchers emphasize the regional scale (Hansen 2022), and others call for broader action from the EU and State levels (FEC 2020: 7), citizens take the central stage in the definition of what foundational means to them. Local assessments of needs and citizen juries are all put forward as essential tools to respond to local foundational specifics. This also opens the discussion for the role of other key actors such as housing associations or food cooperatives who have a stronger tendency in responding to more needs (FEC 2018).

This links to another contribution of the FE, which is the **urgent need to rethink metrics**³ (Calafati 2019; Estela 2019; Bärnthaler et al. 2021) such as the reductive and often problematized metric of GDP as central measurement of both economic activity and social well-being:

To make sense of what really matters to citizens, metrics and indicators (techne) must be enriched by local, specific, and granular knowledge (metis) to understand peculiar social fabrics and inquire into what people collectively value in their communities, e.g., social infrastructure such as libraries or parks. (Bärnthaler et al. 2021: 3)

In short, the shift towards more bottom-up approaches is an essential element in FE thinking. However, recurrent critiques about the **lack of consideration of ecological challenges** (Heslop et al. 2019; Bärnthaler et al. 2021) and **the lack of a deeper understanding of current governance challenges**, such as populist movements (Heslop et al. 2019: 6–7) have led FE thinkers to develop new research avenues along the lines of **Foundational Economy 2.0** (Calafati 2021).

The FE 1.0 already questioned the conventional separation of public/private and state/non-state actions and called for experimental approaches to governance (FEC 2018). The renewal of the framework, however, established a sharper focus on the **power dynamics existing between different actors of governance**, and the incorporation of activism (Russel et al. 2022: 1077). Calafati's FE 2.0 also brings forward the importance of the **environmental aspect** in developing further foundational goods and services. Against this background, the FE 2.0 research agenda focuses on the

³ The need to rethink metrics has been discussed in great depth by feminist economists since Marilyn Waring's (1988) inaugural message in 'Counting for nothing.'

development of **radical social innovation for ecologically and socially more resilient alternatives** (Russel et al. 2022: 1072). This evolution situates the FE within a more radical movement of social-ecological transformation, calling for innovative action.

2.1.2 Policy debates

As mentioned above, the FE framework calls for **social innovation in the field of experimental governance**, with at its center **localized citizen-based approaches**. The most comprehensive guideline for action toward the FE has been presented in the Foundational Economy Collective's *What Comes after the Pandemic? A ten-point platform for Foundational Renewal* (Barbera et al. 2020).⁴ Using the pandemic as a sort of wake-up call to rethink our systems, here are the ten presented points as a policy agenda for different levels with agency:

1. Collective responsibility for foundational basics in the **health and care** sectors that includes tackling inequalities within and between region, as well as investment in both high-tech and preventive medicine and community approaches to health (ibid: 7–8).
2. More government action in association with other non-profit associations to ensure affordability of the **housing and energy** sector, while ensuring the decarbonization of homes (ibid: 8).
3. Better provisioning of **food** through the replacement of unsustainable supermarket business models with more experiments in food supply (ibid).
4. The introduction of **social licensing**, i.e., regulation imposing social and environmental obligations on corporate providers by means of social *quid pro quo* (ibid).
5. **Reforms of taxes on income, expenditure, and wealth** to increase the capacity of governments to raise revenue, as “revenue raising through tax reform is the first most fundamental precondition for defending and extending the foundational basics” (ibid).
6. The **disintermediation of investment from pension funds and insurance companies** so that it goes directly into the provision of material infrastructure to avoid high operating returns of current models that can only be obtained at the expense of other stakeholders, especially in foundational activities (ibid: 10).
7. **Shortening of fragile long supply chains** in foundational commodities and the recognition of local autarchy (ibid).
8. Development of an urban **live/work transition plan** within nation-states and EU enabling frameworks, focused on local specifics and representative democracy to reconcile livability and sustainability without political unrest (ibid).

⁴ Feminist economists, public organizations, NGOs and activists have launched feminist, ecological and decolonial recovery plans with transformative potential, e.g. the one by the Hawaii State Commission (2020); the *Feminist and Decolonial Global Green New Deal* (Muchala 2021); the UN women's *Feminist Plan For Sustainability And Social Justice* (2021); or the FaDA (2020) scholar activist statement *Feminist degrowth reflections on COVID-19 and the politics of social reproduction*.

9. Rebuilding the **technical and administrative capacity at all government levels** to replace austerity measures that led to foundational shortcomings (ibid: 11).
10. The European acceptance of some **responsibility for inadequate foundational systems like health care in adjacent regions** like the Middle East and North Africa, and for taking part in Marshall Aid-type programs (ibid).

Two case studies illustrate the policy implications of a FE:

The Welsh case

Wales was the **first nation in the world to formally implement the FE** in their place-based development repertoire with the Foundational Economy Challenge Fund (Morgan 2021: 4). This allowed localities to rethink their notion of development and adapt it to what is the most suited for them (ibid). One example of such is the application of the FE framework in the **Coastal Housing Group in South Wales**. This not-for-profit Co-operative and Community Benefit Society, regulated by the Government, is known for their successful developments of complex mixed-use city and town center housing-led regeneration schemes (Green 2019: 26). In their case, the application of a FE lens allowed them to establish a more participatory approach with citizen questionnaires that assessed the needs and challenges of the areas to develop (ibid: 27–28). In their project to re-dynamize the main street in Morriston, the group applied the bottom-up approach to create meaningful collaborations with anchor organizations such as the Morriston hospital or the Driver and Vehicle Licensing Agency, which are the main foundational employers in the area. This small-scale example is a good illustration of how to include citizens in decision-making processes, which then allows to identify the different actors to involve further and areas that need development (ibid).

The Barcelona case

The Barcelona city government is promoting various initiatives to regain control and sovereignty over foundational services on a larger metropolitan level and thereby hopes to **reverse the adverse impact that mass privatization** and outsourcing of public services from the 1980s had on the FE (Estela 2019: 37). The services include clean air policies, the return of water supply to municipal control, the establishment of a new food system, the launch of *Barcelona Energia*, a public electric power trading to manage green and local energy, and the further development of affordable housing (ibid: 37–38). This case study also highlights key challenges when shifting development policies toward the FE. For example, giving back water supply control to the municipal level is currently disputed in courts, as the supplying company is demanding compensation. Additionally, as already discussed above, concentrating on the FE requires a shift in the current use of metrics and indicators (ibid: 38–39), especially to **justify more FE-oriented policies**. Overall, the Barcelona example is useful to monitor FE strategies at a larger scale.

2.2 Universal Basic Services (UBS)

2.2.1 Academic debates

The **Institute for Global Prosperity** first advanced the idea of Universal Basic Services (UBS) in 2017, and the name UBS was chosen to signpost a policy alternative to Universal Basic Income (UBI). Key scholars and contributions in developing the concept of UBS include Ian Gough (2019; 2022) – a leading scholar in the **Human Need Theory** tradition –, the Institute for Global Prosperity at the University College of London, and the New Economics Foundation (Button & Coote 2021; Coote 2020, 2021; Coote et al. 2019; Hall & Stephens 2020).

UBS is meant “to describe all those goods and services deemed essential to meeting basic needs and which should therefore be decommodified and provided universally without monetary mediation” (Thompson 2022, 13–14). Hence, ‘services’ refer to collectively generated **activities that serve the public interest**, ‘basic’ refers to services provided to an **essential and sufficient level**, enabling citizens to actively participate and thrive in society, and ‘universal’ points to the fact that everyone is entitled to access these services regardless of their ability to pay for it. Instead of supporting the “single-minded pursuit of individual wants” (Gough 2019: 535), UBS proposals centerstage the satisfaction of common human needs. The provision of these services represents a **‘social wage’ that reduces the dependence of individuals from markets** to meet their basic needs (e.g., participation, health, and autonomy) as well as the ‘intermediate needs’ that must be met to meet the former (e.g., water, nutrition, shelter, education and healthcare, security in childhood, significant primary relationships, physical and economic security).

Basic and intermediate needs are conceptualized as universal, plural, not substitutable, and satiable (Doyal & Gough 1991; Gough 2019). This characterization challenges the mainstream economic assumptions of commensurability and that ‘more is preferred to less,’ such that their provision is geared towards sufficiency rather than abundance making their provision ill-suited to be delivered by capitalist markets and monetization. The **public and collective provision** of these UBS provides a ‘social infrastructure’ which forms the basis for a new social settlement and represents an investment that yields social, environmental, and economic benefits, in line with the **SDG30 agenda** (Hall & Stephens 2020: 5). The core foundation of the UBS paradigm rests on recognizing the existence of shared needs and collective responsibilities in guaranteeing a decent life to all based on the notion of ‘social citizenship’ (Marshall 1965).

Potentials of UBS

The public provision of services has the potential to enhance **equity, efficiency, solidarity, and sustainability** (Coote et al. 2019; Gough 2019). How the services are delivered will determine if and how these four goals will be achieved.

Equity: public services have strong redistributive effects and can reduce income inequality by 20% (Verbist et al. 2012), with positive consequences for individuals and society as a whole (Wilkinson & Pickett 2010). Verbist et al. (2012) show that in OECD countries, people with lower income spend more than 3 quarters of their post-tax income to pay for these services, while for wealthier families the expense amounts to 14%. Via a public provision of these services, families with lower income are provided with a social wage, which allows them to save major parts of their disposable income previously spent on basic services (Gough 2019; Coote et al. 2019).

Efficiency: The private provision of public goods can generate **market failures** such as higher transaction costs, moral hazards, and tendencies to natural monopolies (Coote et al. 2019; Gough 2019). These market risks have historically made state provision of these goods desirable, to avoid exploitation of monopolies and ensure public access (Institute for Global Prosperity 2017). Furthermore, measures of efficiency in public services are more complex than simply evaluating outputs against inputs. Generated value in services that involve relations with human beings, for example care work, often follows a logic of time-spending rather than a logic of timesaving. Implementing a social impact analysis while evaluating efficiency can help include indirect and long-term positive effects, besides the direct and short-term ones (Coote et al. 2019; Gough 2019).

Solidarity: UBS allows societies to take **collective responsibility** for the satisfaction of basic needs. This has the potential to develop and strengthen solidarity and mutual support within society. Crucially, UBS allows the establishment of solidarity towards 'strangers,' as opposed to the promotion of individualism, choice, and competition by neoliberal capitalism (Gough 2019: 540). This forms the basis for a much-needed renewal of the social contract towards a more **comprehensive, updated eco-social contract** (Gough 2022). By calling for collective policy and practice, sharing resources, and acting together to solve social risks that citizens cannot cope with individually, UBS promotes social citizenship and mutual trust, while renewing trust in public institutions, democracy, and the welfare state.

Sustainability: Research has shown that an integrated public provision of certain services is environmentally more sustainable (e.g., Ivanova et al. 2020; Millward-Hopkins et al. 2020; Pichler et al. 2019). UBS allows the adoption of preventive and precautionary public policy by directly influencing the supply of services (Coote et al. 2019). This increases their quality and allows a **direct selection of low-carbon need-satisfiers, while**

fairly redistributing the costs of the social-ecological transition such as improving the energy efficiency of housing stock (Büchs 2021; Gough 2022). Importantly, UBS **disentangle livelihood security from engagement in wage labour**. Potentially, this could reduce labour supply and consumption if people choose to reallocate their time and engage in more time-consuming sustainable activities.⁵ Against this background, UBS can ease the transition towards post-growth regimes shifting the focus of the entire economy “from an obsession with growth to a concern for human wellbeing within planetary limits” (Gough 2019: 540).

Implementation of UBS

Given that UBS is a plan to extend already provided public services to other areas of basic needs, their implementation will **build on existing modes of funding and service delivery** (Institute for Global Prosperity 2017). Nonetheless, the 20th-century welfare state is not the model to follow (Coote 2020), as it is ecologically non-generalizable (Koch & Mont 2016) and – as feminist and postcolonial scholars have pointed out – it reproduces patriarchal and (neo-)colonial continuities (Bhambra & Holmwood 2018; The Care Collective 2020). Along these lines, the traditional top-down model of service provision has been criticized for disempowering citizens and discouraging mutual solidarity and collective forms of provisioning, e.g., via forms of commoning (Dengler & Lang 2022). Taking these interventions into account, UBS could differ depending on the **ownership model, the degree of localization and users’ participation, funding types, and the role of the welfare state in UBS provisioning.**

Models of ownership and service provision: Services can be provided by state bodies or contracted out by public institutions to corporations, social enterprises, cooperatives, charities, and community groups organized around neighborhoods, or shared interests (Cohen 2021; Coote et al. 2019). Partnerships can be formed between public institutions and third-sector organizations that deliver the services.

Degrees of participation and localization: Participation can vary ranging from users being only consulted to their inclusion as co-producers of the services at the planning, design, and delivery stages. Advocates of commoning consider co-production as the best way to identify and meet people’s needs (Coote 2017). In service provision, the principle of subsidiarity should be respected, meaning that the responsibility and the power of service provision should be transferred to the lowest appropriate level (Coote 2020; Coote et al. 2019).

⁵ However, there is also the risk that an increase in the social wage might result in higher disposable income and time to spend in more carbon-intensive non-waged activities, or that people with lower incomes increase their consumption of energy and fuel to meet needs they could not fulfill before (Büchs 2021). Hence, UBS is a window of opportunity, but by no means an automatism, for more sustainability.

Funding: UBS can be fully funded via **taxation** or supported by financial contributions from the users. Public funds can also be distributed as **vouchers** to be tied to specific services needed (Coote et al. 2019). Accessibility should be granted according to need and not to the ability to pay (Gough 2019).

Role of the state: despite strong support for **localization**, the state should ensure that quality standards are enforced (Gough 2019), that resources are collected and equitably redistributed between different localities, and that equity of access is ensured via clear rules and procedures, keeping a democratic dialogue with the people through citizens' assemblies or juries (Coote 2020).

2.2.2 Policy debates

Both theoretical and policy debates around UBS emerged in the UK context. After Institute for Global Prosperity (2017) introduced the concept, it was welcomed by the British Labour and included it in their 2017 election campaign (McDonnell & Wainwright 2018). After an initial hype during the election run-up in the UK, the concept has lost attention until the recent pandemic. In 2021, the **London Borough of Camden** conducted a small experiment and implemented UBS. But also outside of the UK scene, the concept of UBS gained significant traction. For example, research and discussions on UBS have been moderately active in **South Korea** (Lee et al. 2020) and **Chile** (e.g., Borges 2022; Miranda et al. 2021). Within the Chilean debate and constitutional process (2020–2022), UBS proposals led to the formulation of a popular initiative law proposal (Iniciativa popular de norma constitucional N° 18.202) that reached the quorum to be discussed by the constitutional assembly. The formulation of the proposal was supported by international human rights organizations, think tanks, NGOs, and other actors in civil society. In 2021, a group of 25 civil society organizations authored **The Future is Public: Global Manifesto for Public Services** (2021), signed by 225 organizations, along the lines of the concept of UBS. In that manifesto, the quality public services meet the following principles:

1. Universal and accessible for everyone.
2. Participatory, transparent, trusted and democratically accountable.
3. Adaptable, responsive, and transformative to those who use them.
4. Built on a solid foundation of long-term public funding.
5. Founded on solidarity with progressive taxation and debt cancellations.
6. Committed to equality, including gender equality and social justice.
7. Environmentally and ecologically conscious.
8. In proximity (subsidiarity principle).
9. Just, secure, and safe for service users and providers.
10. Protected from the market economy, commercialization, and financialization.

In the original proposal, the authors made the case for **widening and improving the current provision of public services** (i.e., healthcare, education, and the legal and democratic system) to include shelter, food, transport, and access to information and communication. Successive formulations also explicitly included adult and childcare, as well as waste collection and disposal (Coote 2021; Hall & Stephens 2020; The Future Is Public: Global Manifesto for Public Services 2021).

Feminist proposals seem to embrace UBS as a concrete policy proposal more directly, as seen in the UK Feminist Green New Deal Policy Paper (Onaran & Jump 2022), which proposes to shorten the working week and support a transition to a more sustainable economy through public investment in social infrastructure, including UBS (ibid). Coupled with UBS, a participation income is proposed as a complementary policy (Murphy and McGann 2022; McGann & Murphy 2023). McGann & Murphy (2023) specifically make the case that this is preferable to UBI “from both a feminist and capabilities-promoting eco-social policy perspective” (ibid). This is because a targeted approach, rather than a universal one, such as universal basic income, can make it more affordable and prevent the potential diversion of resources away from providing UBS. That a participation income (such as, for example, the care income proposed in the Green New Deal for Europe by DiEM25) carries more transformative potential than a UBI is, however, not uncontested (Dengler et al. 2022). Bärnthaler and Dengler (2022: 15) suggest that “a symbiosis of time politics and UBS has substantial transformative potential, whereas a universal – but not unconditional – guaranteed (minimum) income is an essential element in a transformative policy mix.

Green Infrastructure Socialism and rules of residency

Even though it falls under a different label, the discourse from and around the contributions of Joachim Hirsch (2005) and the Frankfurt group *links-netz* that Candeias et al. (2020) label as “**Green Infrastructure Socialism**” develops a similar argument to the one advanced by the UK literature around UBS. Both discourses focus on a similar range of services deemed as basic entitlements to enable a decent life and effective participation in society that should be provided to everyone residing on a territory as a matter of right.

The reasoning and motivation behind the claim are very similar to the ones presented so far. Interestingly however, the proposal brought forward by the **Rosa Luxemburg Foundation** (Candeias et al. 2020) explicitly chooses to refrain from the concept of citizenship, rather framing the core of the proposal as “the demand for free, basic, and environmentally and socially conscious welfare provisions for all who live in a particular place (irrespective of passport, gender, postcode, or other status)” (ibid: 7). This is based on the recognition that the notion of citizenship is highly exclusive and discriminatory

within immigration-based societies. They refer to the experience and movement of Solidarity Cities (Wenke and Kron 2019) as a positive example of city policies that could facilitate the “democratic participation and access to vital local services and infrastructure for refugees and undocumented people” as well as legal immigrants, such as the “**City Card**” in New York that is currently under discussion in different European cities (Candeias et al. 2020; Frank 2019).

Universalismo Básico and the Dangers of Neoliberal Cooptation

The concept of *Universalismo Básico* was coined in the Latin American context and advanced by the Inter-American Development Bank in 2006 (Filgueira et al. 2006). Similar to UBS, it proposes a strategy to guarantee universal access to a basic level of healthcare and education. In a second step, the provisioning of services would be expanded to ‘non-basic’ levels of these services guaranteeing progressively universal access of quality to basic services at all levels. The argument is that this is a realistic approach to guarantee access to a wider public under limited fiscal resources. Narbondo (2006) heavily criticizes this argument arguing that this would lead to a higher level of commodification through the **privatization of ‘non-basic’ levels of these services** (e.g., universities), which consequently would become inaccessible to the poor. Furthermore, higher classes would have the incentive to push for lower taxation and limited provision of public basic services while investing in the creation (or expansion) of private providers of basic services which ultimately cost them less than bearing the costs for guaranteeing universal access to basic services to the poor, of which they largely do not benefit.

The logic behind this paradigm is the typical model of ‘residual welfare states,’ characterized by a **stratified provision of public services and social security**. This typically results from an alliance between middle and upper class against the interest of lower classes. As an opposite example, the Social-Democratic welfare state typology – based on a political coalition between the middle and working class – “tends towards the universalization of social rights through public financing, free access, or subsidized prices to *all* the technically possible and socially demanded benefits of general social services” (Narbondo 2006: 153, emphasis added). Then, Narbondo (2006) argues that progressive forces should reject the ideological arguments of cost-efficiency and limited fiscal space, which justify this tradeoff between ‘basic’ and ‘non-basic’ provision of services and instead demand higher redistribution to finance an expansion of public provisioning.

Obviously, UBS does not necessarily lead to a stratification of public provisioning, nor require means-testing for its implementation. As amply discussed in the literature around UBS, there is a need for horizontal, democratic, and participatory structures to determine a socially accepted definition of what constitutes a socially accepted need

satisfier and in which quantity and modality UBS should be delivered. However, particular care should be placed in **preventing a neoliberal cooptation of the concept**, for instance in case of public private partnerships, which could lead to dramatically opposite effects than the ones desired. This is potentially even more relevant within development policy, where financing often represents even more of an issue and conditionality on international transfer of funds leaves ample space for neoliberal cooptation.

2.3 Feminist Development

2.3.1 Feminist development theory

Development is a concept **deeply rooted in European colonialism and ideas of progress and modernization** that also constituted the basis of how classical political economists (e.g., Adam Smith, David Ricardo, John Stuart Mill) conceptualized North-South relations. Development theories started to emerge in the 1930s and gained increasing traction after Truman's inaugural address as president of the United States in 1949, in which he famously declared the majority of the world as 'underdeveloped' (Schmidt & Schröder 2016). Modernization theories, which up until today prevail in rather uncritical development discourses, focus on internal reasons for 'underdevelopment' (e.g., corruption) and postulate an **unilinear development path**, where countries of the Global North are seen as the role model for development that in principle can be reached by all countries.⁶ Modernization and (neo-)liberal development theories have been criticized by various political economy development theories, among others by dependency theories, world systems theory, and Neo-Gramscianism for ignoring that historically, the 'developed' countries (the centers) have developed at the cost of the periphery/their satellites and are thus (co-)responsible for their 'underdevelopment.' Development theories like post-development or post- and decolonial theories often share the analysis of political economy approaches but criticize that these approaches remain in the discursive area of development alternatives, while they tend to focus on **alternatives to development** (ibid).

In historically male-dominated development discourses, feminist perspectives have been rare. The first influential feminist contribution to development theories was formulated by Esther Boserup (1970), who pointed out the lack of recognition of **women's role in development projects** (Connelly et al. 2000; Aguinaga et al. 2013). This was at a time when second-wave feminism was gaining momentum, leading to the first

⁶ This is, of course, a highly questionable and flawed assumption. This becomes all the more obvious in times of the climate crisis, where – if wanting to deploy the concept of development at all – the Global North with its imperial mode of living (Brand & Wissen 2018) would be (ecologically) over-developed.

World Conference on Women in Mexico in 1975 (Moser 1993). Feminist scholars started using the term **Women in Development (WID)** which emphasized the need to have development projects that involved women as beneficiaries. The focus at this stage was on recognizing equal opportunities for women and including them in the economic activities of their nations (Connelly et al. 2000). The WID approach did not criticize development, it was in fact a merger between the Western modernization impetus and liberal feminist values (ibid). It took 'women' as a homogenous category and pushed for women-centered policies. A concrete policy of the WID approach is the **implementation of microcredit programs** and increased recognition of the role of women in the productive economy.

The limitations of the WID approach have not gone unchallenged. Critiques from Marxist feminists, for example, underlined WID's **disregard for class structures and power relations**. A new paradigm emerged alongside WID and was termed **Women and Development (WAD)** (Parpart 1989; Rathgeber 1990). WAD proponents argued that it was necessary to adopt an approach that considered the ways in which women's experiences and needs differ from those of men (Connelly et al. 2000). They proposed creating initiatives that were specifically designed to empower and benefit women, rather than simply integrating them into existing systems and structures that were often dominated by men (Aguinaga et al. 2013). Like WID, this approach **focused on income generation for women** (e.g., through microcredit programs), but preserved the idea of care work as belonging to a 'private' sphere that is not important in the context of development (Rathgeber 1990). Neither the WID nor the WAD recognized **women's different experiences along racial lines, nor tackled differences between reproductive and productive work**. The 1980s, with the rise of Third Wave feminism, saw the construction of a new paradigm that moved away from considering "women" as a homogenous category and stressed the necessity to look at other forms of oppression – such as race, sexual orientation, and class – to understand power structures.

The **Gender and Development (GAD)** approach emerged from the grassroots organizing efforts and writings of feminists from financially and economically disadvantaged countries in the Global South (Connelly et al. 2000). It was later formally articulated by a group called Development Alternatives with Women for a New Era (DAWN). DAWN was introduced to the public at the **1985 Nairobi international NGO forum** and argued for a development approach that recognizes the significant impact of unequal power dynamics between genders and among different cultures (ibid). GAD promoted analyses by materialist political economy and radical feminism (Jaquette 2017), thereby distancing itself from the category of women and instead embracing a structuralist approach. Within this method, new gender policy frameworks were developed. The **Moser Gender Planning Framework** emphasizes three main elements (Moser 1993):

the three-pronged role of women in reproductive, productive, and community-managing activities, the differentiation between practical and strategic gender needs, and the different **policy approaches including welfare, equity, anti-poverty, efficiency, and empowerment.**

Moreover, **Marxist feminist perspectives** have been an important influence in WID/WAD critiques. In particular, activists from the Global South found the Marxist perspective to be compelling as their activism was shaped by dependency theory, which posits that so-called underdevelopment is a result of the unequal trade relationships between the Global North and South (Jacquette 2017). The field of development, however, remained heavily influenced by feminist liberal thought throughout the 1960s and 70s. International institutions such as the World Bank and the IMF embraced a **neoclassical human capital policy approach**, as exemplified in the issue in 2010 of the *Gender equality as smart economics* report.

Postcolonial feminist movements challenge the hegemony of Western feminism (Aguinaga et al. 2013) and the dichotomy between the ‘developed North’ and the ‘developing South’ (McEwan 2001). Postcolonial feminists have continuously criticized the universalist approach to development. Scholars such as Mohanty (1988) and Spivak (1990) offered a powerful and widely influential analysis of the limitations of a Western approach, calling out the deeply Eurocentric reasoning behind, for example, Robin Morgan’s (1984) planetary feminism for the 21st century, which she regards as „cross-cultural, cross-age-group, cross-occupation/class, cross-racial, cross-sexual-preference, and cross-ideological assemblage of women’s voices“ (ibid: 3). Instead, postcolonial feminists suggest focusing on specific issues, such as restrictions on reproductive rights, to build solidarity and coalitions at eye level (Mohanty 2003; Spivak 1990).

Another interesting perspective on development theories is opened by variegated streams of ecofeminisms. For example, the *Women, Environment, and Development* (WED) approach, inspired e.g. by Vandana Shiva, emphasized the agency of women in environmental justice struggles and took inspiration, for example, from the Chipko Movement in India (Shiva 1988) and the Green Belt Movement in Kenya (Maathai 1985). While **postcolonial ecofeminisms** are inherently diverse, a common denominator is the critique of classical development theories. Often, they reject an anthropocentric understanding of nature as distinct from humans, which means, for example, that care also includes care for surrounding nature, based on a non-anthropocentric notion of interdependence and relational ontologies that transcend the nature/culture divide (Cielo et al. 2016; Livingston 2019). The policies advanced by ecofeminists vary from pushing for traditional farming practices that preserve ancient seeds and indigenous knowledge of the land (against agri-food industry giants), to development projects that prioritize women farmers and offer them greater autonomy.

2.3.2 Feminist development policy (FDP)

Against the background of this plurality in feminist development theories, the question arises to what extent this is translated to feminist development policy (FDP). FDP can be categorized as a sub-field of broader debates on a **Feminist Foreign Policy (FFP)** (Aggestam et al. 2019). Sweden was the first country to announce the adoption of a FFP in 2014, the associated strategy report was published in 2018 (Swedish Ministry for Foreign Affairs 2018) and set the basis for Sweden's 2019–2022 Foreign Service action plan. The FFP strategy of Sweden is defined as a “working method and a perspective that takes three Rs as its starting point and is based on a fourth R” (ibid: 11) – namely **rights, representation, and resources**, as well as realism, thereby integrating a systematic gender equality lens to foreign policy.

Subsequently, a FFP was implemented by Canada, France, Mexico, Luxembourg, Spain, Libya, Germany, the Netherlands, and Chile, and is currently discussed in various national committees (Friesen & Wisskirchen 2022a). The introduction of a FFP in **Mexico** 2018 was notable (a) because it was the first explicit adoption an FFP in the Global South; and (b) it was the to this date most radical formulation of FFP (Lunz 2022). Amongst other things, the Mexican FFP follows a decidedly intersectional approach to feminisms, establishes the need for systemic alternatives to patriarchal capitalism, and explicitly links gender justice with climate justice (Centro de Investigación Internacional 2020). Beyond a country perspective, a FFP has been proposed for supranational bodies such as the European Union, with the commissioned 2020 report “A Feminist Foreign Policy for the European Union” by the Centre for Feminist Foreign Policy as a milestone in this endeavor.

Although development policies are part of most of the above-mentioned FFP strategy documents, **Canada** was the first country to launch a separate FDP strategy in their 2017 Feminist International Assistance Policy (FIAP) (Lee 2018). The strategy links its action areas to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and includes the commitment to allocate 95 per cent of all bilateral international development assistance initiatives to projects that work towards gender equality by 2021/22 (Global Affairs Canada 2017: 9). Linking the FIAP back to feminist development theories introduced in section 2.3.1, it becomes evident that the way FDP is conceptualized stays largely in line with ideas of modernization and progress displayed for example in WID and WAD approaches and focuses more on symptoms than on the systemic roots of patriarchal oppression. More radical feminist analyses as put forward by GAD, postcolonial feminists, or ecofeminists that question development cooperation more broadly barely enter the Canadian FDP strategy.

In **Germany**, the concepts of FFP and FDP are currently widely discussed. In the Coalition Agreement 2021–25 ruling parties in Germany have agreed to follow a Feminist Foreign Policy (FFP) under the Foreign Minister Annalena Baerbock (The Greens). On March 1st, 2023, Germany's development minister Svenja Schulze (Social Democratic Party), introduced a 40-page report about her strategy for a FDP (BMZ, 2023). FDP is here defined as a strategy that implements "policies that focus on women and girls in all their diversity and dismantle discriminatory norms and structures, gender roles and stereotypes" (ibid: 19, own translation).

The FDP strategy focuses on the three Rs introduced by Swedish FFP (rights, resources, and representation). It aims at interventions at three levels, namely the level of implementation in German official development aid, the level of international cooperation with partner countries and institutions, and the institutional level, where the BMZ as institution also needs to (un-)learn in order to live up to a FDP. The report is surprisingly progressive in its conceptualization of an FDP. It acknowledges patriarchy, racism, sexism, ableism, and classism as intersecting systems of oppression (ibid: 10) as well as the (neo-)colonial and racist legacy of development cooperation. Moreover, it decidedly postulates the necessity of systemic transformation that focuses not on tackling symptoms but the roots of gender inequality (ibid: 17). In doing so, it envisages a postcolonial FDP that ventures beyond modernization theoretical and neoliberal ideas of a unilinear development path (ibid: 11).

Not strictly a feminist development policy, the concept of **Global Public Investment (GPI)** is promoted by an expert working group that includes the prominent feminist economist Jayati Ghosh. GPI fosters the ambitious ideal of transforming and strengthening international public finance, which is sought to fit into a new context to safeguard communities around the world, and the planet itself. Currently the expert working group is working to answer technical questions that at this point still need resolving, including detailed plans which consider institutional, legal, and economic questions to translate GPI into practice.

Despite these (partly) progressive accounts of FFP and FDP, the question to what extent the transformative potential eventuates remains. It is extremely difficult to introduce and live up to these ideals in the context of global patriarchal capitalism. For example, Swedish civil society organizations have continuously criticized that the ever-increasing export of arms strengthens patriarchal structures that are meant to be transformed by FFP (CFFP 2019; Lunz 2022). Similarly, the structure of official development aid inhibits introducing a truly post-colonial and intersectional feminist approach to FDP, not least because this eventually sows its own branch.

2.4 Transformative policies

In recommending ‘transformative policies,’ we use transformative in the sense of Nancy Fraser’s (1997) **distinction between affirmative and transformative strategies**: Affirmative approaches focus on end state outcomes and seek to remedy existing injustices, thereby tackling mainly the symptoms without fundamentally questioning how those outcomes came into being. Transformative approaches, on the other hand, focus on underlying root causes, structures, and mechanisms and “aim to correct unjust outcomes precisely by restructuring the underlying generative framework” (ibid: 27).

Translating this to the realm of FDP, **affirmative policies mainly cushion symptoms**, for example by targeting the comparatively higher vulnerability of women and girls in face of climate change by funding specific development projects. Transformative policies, on the other hand, would tackle patriarchal and neocolonial continuities in development cooperation itself. Although problematic structures in the development sector tend to be very persistent, transformative feminist development policies acknowledge that a ‘more of the same’ approach is not enough to live up to the transformative potential of a truly feminist development policy.

Against this background, **transformative approaches to FDP question the bigger picture** and hence the colonial and patriarchal legacy of the development project. Such an approach needs to focus on both – diversifying and decolonizing development. A diversification implies the prioritization of voices that have historically been and more often than not continue to be marginalized in development discourses (people from the Global South, women, queers, people with disabilities and/or NGOs and activist groups such as Via Campesina, WoMin, or activist marches that call for a feminist reading of development and debt) and – more broadly – a problematization of **Euro- and androcentric institutional exclusion mechanisms**.⁷ A decolonization then goes beyond diversification in the sense that it needs to break with modernization ideas of universal development paths and tackles paternalistic power dynamics of traditional development cooperation. Decolonizing development and aid thus **centerstage the power structures** inherent in development and aid themselves and has the strong objective to overcome traditional conceptions of development.

One potential to more fundamentally questioning the logic of development is by **re-politicizing questions of debt** (as was mentioned also in interview 1), moving towards a reparations-based global justice approach to international cooperation. Debates on ecological debt (e.g. Goeminne & Paredis 2010), colonial debt (Zambrana 2021: 85), and reproductive debt (Cavallero & Gago 2021) that have not only sparked academic but also

⁷ For example, the “Consultation and Cocreation” approach of GPI works at the core of this problem.

(and more so) activist interest in the last years help to fundamentally turn the debtor-creditor relation upside down, thereby regarding “debt from below” (Haiven 2020) as a way of building resistance against dominant social orders (e.g. IMF, World Bank). Supporting these diverse actors that gather around the topic of debt (e.g. Acción Ecológica, Debt for Climate, NiUnaMenos, Black Lives Matter) in their discursive intervention on the question of who owes whom gives legitimacy to demands for reparations and debt cancellation that go hand in hand with such a **reparations-based global justice approach**.⁸

While such a deeply transformative approach to development/FDP can be a horizon to strive towards, transformation also acknowledges that this is a process rather than a rupture. Hence, in the sense of ‘revolutionary realpolitik’ (Luxemburg 1903) or ‘non-reformist reforms’ (Gorz 1967) it is necessary to also talk about **small(er) steps leading up to this transformation**. The rights-based, decommodified provision of essential services holds transformative potential. In order to unfold this potential, it needs to be ensured that gender and – more broadly – intersectional inequalities are not regarded as an afterthought or an add-on in designing FDPs, but instead are integrally considered from the very beginning. A useful method both in the process of policy design and policy evaluation is **Intersectionality-Based Policy Analysis** (IBPA, Hankivsky 2012). By putting an emphasis on intersecting categories of oppression along the lines of for example race, class, gender, and (dis)ability), power structures, reflexivity, multi-level approaches, spatio-temporal contextualization, diverse knowledge systems, equity, and social justice, IBPA can help FDP to live up to its transformative potential.

2.5 FE and UBS as transformative FDP? A First Synthesis

Against the background of a **renewed interest in feminist development policy (FDP)**, the question arises to what extent debates on the foundational economy (FE) and universal basic services (UBS) can be regarded as a transformative step towards FDP. It has been acknowledged that there is a **significant overlap between FE and UBS**. Both approaches share common goals and values and are interconnected in terms of building a sustainable future for society and addressing what is considered most important for human well-being (Coote 2020). Moreover, both approaches acknowledge that there is no blueprint for either a FE or UBS, but that they are **context- and time-specific**. For

⁸ The costs of reparations are difficult to estimate. In 2022, Germany agreed to pay Namibia 1,1 billion Euros in reparation for genocide committed during its colonial-era occupation. Burundi has demanded 43 billion US Dollars from Germany and Belgium. The Caribbean nations’ reparations group has called for European governments to pay 50 billion US Dollars as a starting point of reparations; the total of ‘200 years of free labor’ in the Caribbean are estimated at 7 trillion British pounds. Climate reparations or “loss and damage costs” of Western industrialization and carbonization are a topic of UN climate change conferences (various online sources).

example, Gough (2019) points out that while the needs that UBS aims to satisfy are universal, the *satisfiers* are context-specific in terms of time, space, and history. Similarly, the idea of FE is not to produce one size fits all solutions, but to adapt to the specific givens, especially when it comes to social licensing as explained in section 2.1.2.

Acknowledging this contextual approach, the major problem in tackling the question of UBS and/or FE as FDP is that the **relatively new academic and policy debates on FE and UBS** are both largely formulated in Global North contexts (with a strong focus on the UK) and are not easily translatable to the Global South. Moreover, FE and UBS partly re-create (and at the same time invisibilize) feminist economic discourses by drawing upon already established knowledge and policy proposals (such as the one concerning the Systems of National Accounts, ILO classification of subsistence work and work in the home in GDP accounting processes) of the last decades without accreditation (Trigo and Barren 2022).

For the case of the FE, which was originally drafted as a 3G program – green, gender, and global – feminist and Global South perspectives remain surprisingly absent. Russell et al. (2022) criticizes both (1) FE’s Eurocentric approach, which entails a very specific vision of development; and (2) its blind spot for unwaged work, which is central to FDP.

Regarding the first point, the geographical context of the FE perspective gives the foundation for a **post neo-liberal perspective on development**. It could be argued that development theory can be enriched by FE thinking as it sees economic development as something that should “raise social standards and increase local accountability of economic actors rather than ‘merely’ focus on developing competitive industries” (Hansen 2022: 1034). Another contribution is its critical stance on growth-led approaches to development and pushing for an interventionist agenda (Russell et al. 2022: 1070). From a more global perspective, the ten-point platform for foundational renewal introduced by the FEC does include a point about responsibility concerning the establishment of inadequate foundational systems in adjacent regions (FEC 2020: 11). Nevertheless, the point remains superficial and barely addresses how this would look like. In fact, the concept of FE is anchored in a “**distinctly western gaze**” (Russell et al. 2022: 1072) and remains absent from Global South literature, nor does it include any.

Regarding the second point, the **blind spot on the gendered aspect** of the FE and unwaged work, it is noteworthy that FE conceptualizes the ‘core economy of family and community,’ exemplified by parenting, as ‘non-economic.’ An analysis of the gendered nature of the ‘core economy,’ or the acknowledgement that the core economy is foundational for any production processes in other economic zones are thus largely lacking. This lack of a thorough conceptualization of unpaid care work becomes more

and more evident in FE literature (Heslop 2019; Bärnthaler et al. 2021; Russel et al. 2022):

Given the FE's concern with those parts of the economy that support everyday life there is an intersection with debates on the work of social reproduction. Yet FE literature currently has a blind spot when it comes to unwaged work, which remains overwhelmingly performed by women. Current framings of the providential FE mostly limit their understanding to public services provided by the welfare state (such as unemployment benefits) or para-state (such as elderly care homes or sports facilities), and indeed to work that is predominantly waged. (Russel et al. 2022: 1073).

This research gap appears even more relevant considering how much the FE policy framework resembles feminist literature in terms of acknowledging the paradox that “lowest status workers play the most important role in keeping society safe, sound and civilized” (Morgan 2021: 4). Even more so, the notions of collective consumption and social provisioning **borrow from but at the same time invisibilize feminist research** and their emphasis on the dependence of all individuals on care work – at least in the beginning, but also mostly in the end of their lives as well as numerous times in between. In short, in order to truly be a framework for all (regardless of income and status) (FEC 2020), FE debates will need to deeper explore feminist research on care, social provisioning, and social reproduction and take the highly gendered division of labor into account.

Similar to FE, the theoretical debate around **UBS** has so far mostly focused on the case of the UK. For this context, different implementation avenues have been explored in terms of both governance structures and fiscal aspects (e.g., Institute for Global Prosperity 2017; Women’s Budget Group 2021). Outside of the UK, the concept has attracted theoretical interest (e.g., Bärnthaler & Dengler 2022; Büchs 2021; Yaşar & Lautzenheiser 2022), but there is a **lack of in-depth studies on implementation options for countries in the Global South**. Applying UBS to these countries might present different challenges. For certain countries, the current state of the envisioned services and related infrastructure might fall significantly shorter of basic needs compared to Global North standards or need to be created from scratch. For example, while in most areas in the Global North **minimum standards** to meet basic needs have arguably already been achieved – e.g., in terms of access to clean water and sanitation –, this is still a significant challenge in different areas of the world (WHO/UNICEF 2021).

Furthermore, the **issue of financing** might be even more pressing than in the case of countries in the Global North. One major problem is that UBS discourses often act on the assumption of European welfare states as key actors in the provision of UBS. This

neglects the fact, that state experiences in the Global South radically differ from those in the Global North and that European welfare states have been a privilege of few countries under very specific historical conditions (of exploitation) rather than generalizable models. Moreover, it does not account for dependency structures that force modes of development geared towards the shortsighted development of export-oriented strategies in the interest of global investors rather than long-term investments towards true resilience and sustainability in the interest of local populations – as the implementation of UBS would likely require. Research on the relevancy of UBS in the Global South remains a field for further research (Bohnenberger 2020).

Against this background, paying particular attention to reviewing the existing literature that links UBS/FE and FPE including and prioritizing comments, criticism, and related academic, policy, and civil society approaches and interventions from the Global South could not be done by desk research alone. The hypothesis fleshed out in an internal workshop after completion of the desk research was that a **feminist and decolonial development policy would benefit from looking for “fellow travelers”** (Escobar 2015: 455) of FE and UBS that have been discussed in Global South contexts. To add to the literature review on FE, UBS, and FDP, we now introduce the empirical research.

3 Expert interviews

After an extensive literature review and in order to include and prioritize comments, criticism, and related academic, policy and civil society approaches, and interventions from the Global South, six expert interviews were conducted (Bogner et al. 2014) via Zoom. Interview partners were chosen according to relevant work and expertise in the field. Five of them are feminist economists with four of them being past or present presidents of the *International Association of Feminist Economics* (IAFFE). Their regional areas of expertise are India, Bangladesh, the Caribbean, Ghana and Brazil.

The collected data were evaluated via qualitative content analysis. Based on Kuckartz (2018), a category-based approach with categories central for the analysis was utilized. A systematic approach was used to classify and categorize the data. In a process of reflection (debriefing), essentials were distilled and coded in a uniform structure. The formation of categories corresponds to the research question posed by OXFAM Germany and is both a priori (deductive) linked to the current literature as well as generated from the material (inductive). Categories were established thematically; comparisons allow conclusions on central themes. Results are presented in tabular form and integrated in the synthesis chapter. The research identifies general assumptions, gaps in knowledge and formulates new questions for research (Kuckartz 2018).

In the next section the outcomes of the interviews are collected. Direct comments are displayed as cursive text with a code referring to the interview, sometimes literature is quoted that was suggested by the experts, connections to discourses in feminist economics are made.

Intersectionality, development, and post-colonialism

It is to be noted that some of the experts interviewed were stressing feminist positions as a strong linkage between the Global North and Global South:

There is feminist and there is Global South. And in one way one should not even think of them as separate. They can be intersective I am a feminist economist from the Global South. (Interview 3)

Also, in another interview the economic reality of the similarity of social risks for women anywhere was pointed out:

The social risks women face here are very similar to those they face in the North, compounded by the risks of poverty and informality in the labour market. (Interview 2)

On the other hand, commenting on the appropriateness of Germany's Feminist Development (as in Friesen & Wisskirchen 2022b) that offers a broad understanding of gender and a multitude of marginalized groups along with non-binary people – also age, ability, class, culture, religion, and sexual orientation, it was noted that presenting sexual orientation and gender identity in an intersectional framework may not be strategic in countries with religiously fundamentalist settings.

Regarding historical givens, the experts called for acknowledging colonialism and power differences in present structures of aid. There was some reluctance to use the term "development" – it was proposed to instead use the term "feminist economic policy," including feminist strategies for financial markets.

Feminist development policies

When asked to define feminist development policies, the experts noted instrumentalist and transformational approaches. On the instrumentalist side it was noted that a universalist social policy might be strengthened by women activism, that cooperative activities do not just benefit women but also their families and children, and that increased political participation of women is an indirect effect.

Transformative approaches were defined as such:

We want a development policy that is going to bring about change, so that change should bring in a change in the systems, that is conscious of distributional issues amongst the genders being important. (Interview 3)

To manage transformative change, it was argued that it is important to have a consciousness of distributional issues amongst the genders and a focus on interactions with women as agents of change in designing benefits and distributing outcomes.

Regarding implementation and best practices, Gender Budgeting was considered as a very good and helpful approach, “...in the design of our budget, deciding what expenditures to make, deciding how to generate revenues, we introduce a feminist lens that would bring about some important changes.” (Interview 3) Also, SDG 5 on gender equality was noted as a good anchor, as it focuses on agency and “on political representation, [as well as] gender-responsive budgeting, increasing incomes and employment, violence against women, and having informed choices. (Interview 6)

Lastly it needs to be mentioned that discursive practice on gender justice looks different in the Global South, where gender issues are often not even dismissed but completely ignored:

The strong resistance that you can face to gender issues, sometimes people just switch off. They don't even dismiss you they switch off. They don't even put up an argument because they are not listening. (Interview 3)

Feminist economics in FE

The experts saw overlaps between feminist economics and FE in the choice to not only focus on growth but on health and education, considerations of productivity, and taking account of family and old age care. There was a general accordance with the focus of FE on “the mundane production of everyday necessities, which must form the foundation or base of any economy that is for the majority” (Interview 4). It was noted that the circular notion of FE could improve the intra-household distribution and labor market outcomes for women:

Not only the provision of social services could promote the cause of gender equity (e.g. by help balancing family and work commitments as well as affecting intra-distributional issues within the family), as it could also provide better economic opportunities for women. Public sectors employ proportionally more women than men and display a lower gender wage gap. (Interview 2)

It was argued that like feminist economics, FE addresses key social and environmental problems simultaneously in a transformative way that will help avoid further disaster.

State provision, local approaches, and public private partnerships

The question of state provision is key in implementing UBS. Most experts discussed the role of the state as provisioning based on tax revenues. With FE and UBS the circular flow concept was realized and it was assumed that “the policies are very state centered and assume the reach of the state into agents' lives.” (Interview 6) The largest critique

concerned the question of funding which was seen as largely lacking from the FE concepts, as neither tax nor macroeconomic policy in the specific givens of Global South countries related to the provision of the services is considered.

With empirical data on Brazil, Celia Kerstenetzky argues the structural transformative potential of FE.

“...we need a service welfare state to [...] boost a service socio-economy [boosting] a shift within the service sector from other services to those more directly connected with social needs.” (Kerstenetzky 2021: 751–752)

Still, the view on states’ abilities to successfully provide an FE and/or UBS was seen mostly from a pessimistic angle as *“the state does not have enough of a reach in developing countries – as noted by lack of public services, and low tax/GDP ratio. (Interview 6) (Interview 6)*

Also, the production technology and especially ownership considerations need to be considered from a feminist point of view:

In India women manage most of the farms but do not own them. The informal sector provides livelihoods for a large proportion (sometimes over 50%) of the labor force. (Interview 6)

Work on these issues has been ongoing for decades (see Agarwal 1994).

In the discussion of the aspect of localization it was noted that unlike in the Global North, local economies are of greater importance in the first place.

“Poor people are unable to afford imported goods. But as incomes increase, simple electronics and manufactures are brought into the consumption mix. Health and care sectors are all within the family but severely stressed because women are having to participate in the labor force (even if self-employed in agriculture). (Interview 6)

Regarding localization the experts emphasized that there are large differences in regions concerning wealth and resources that would be equalized in national distribution systems of UBS. Regarding democratic participation it was discussed that localization needs to promote inclusion, as it has to be deliberate, so it is not captured by local elites. There were some warnings about public private partnerships and hence a neoliberal cooptation of UBS.

Resources and production

Access to physical resources is a key problem in the Global South, so “aid” should be reframed in the right direction. In the Global North the question is economic access; in the Global South it is physical access, making FE almost a utopian concept:

In the UK you almost everywhere have water, you have electricity. What FE over there is thinking about is the economic access and should it be incorporated in your social reach. When you come to the developing country context you have to deal with the physical before you get to the economic. That's when I see FE as an ideal – it is as what we would want. (Interview 3)

Water sustainability is of uttermost importance in most countries and there is an absolute priority to *expanding* the more and more stressed access to clean water, not only in terms of supply but in the long term. Basic access to water is also connected to financing questions, economic pressures, and increasingly climate change. Climate change also result in displacement and mass migration that needs to be tackled, including safety in travel, especially for women.

Some experts worried that FE was lacking a focus on macroeconomic policies, making policies on the micro-level rather negligible:

Think about, what are the impacts of austerity on the care economy, what is it on health consequences, on education [...]. We need to look at it at the global, the macroeconomic and then we can start looking at how those effect service delivery. FE is about the service delivery but not talking about all the structures that we need in place in order to get those universal services. (Interview 1)

A more positive outlook on this question is discussed for the case of Brazil:

“No doubt agricultural or energy or transport policies may be more directly impactful than the shifting of sectoral production and jobs generation towards social services when it comes e.g., to limit carbon emissions or ecological footprint. The point here is that sectoral shift if ambitious enough may nonetheless help relieve pressure on natural resources (including averting zoonoses) and energy supply while a universalist welfare state may influence e.g., transport policy in favor of mass public transportation and energy-efficient social housing. Also, social policy can help via a combination of tax-transfer-services smooth environment-friendly adjustments and transitions, e.g., in agriculture, transport and construction, from activities or practices that are detrimental to the environment and thus generate brown jobs toward others with lighter ecological footprints and clean jobs.” (Kestranek 2021: 756)

Omissions

Many of the experts were disappointed with the FE, they found a lack of focus on covering the *“unpaid care economy, essential work, wage inequality, the segregation of employment. All the things that feminist economists talk about,”* (Interview 4) Also, they noted the largely missing attention to climate change and *“how different groups in the population might regard a degrowth agenda.”* (Interview 4). Distribution was of essential interest to the feminist economists and attention for the global level, especially

considering pressure by lenders and financing institutions such as the IMF. Finally, it was noted that the role of the financial sector is generally missing.

Fellow travelers

FE and/or UBS are not widely known outside Europe, but the contents of the concepts ring familiar to all the interviewed experts and frequent “**fellow travelers**” (Escobar 2015: 455):

1. Amongst them is the idea of the **wellbeing economy**, that the OECD describes as the “capacity to create a virtuous circle in which citizens’ well-being drives economic prosperity, stability and resilience, and vice-versa, that those good macroeconomic outcomes allow to sustain well-being investments over time.’ It specifically highlights the need for putting people at the centre of policy and moving away from an attitude of ‘grow first, redistribute and clean up later,’ towards a growth model that is equitable and sustainable from the outset.” (OECD 2019). Feminist economists have worked with the concept of well-being since the discipline was established in the early 1990s (Hill and King 1995). In a recent feminist economics publication, it is stated, that while GDP is not intended to measure well-being there are complementing indicators such as satellite accounts; aggregates like the Human Development Index (HDI) or the Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI); or those that measure the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Whatever indicators there may be used, from a feminist economics perspective, it is of a central importance that “without care there is no well-being (or economy)” (Trigo & Barren 2022: 19). Des Gasper and Irene van Staveren for instance “suggest a more emphatically pluralist characterization of capability, well-being, and value, highlighting the distinct and substantive aspects of freedom, as well as of values besides freedom, in the lives of women and men,” which they illustrate with reference to women’s economic role as caregivers (Gasper & van Staveren 2003). In 1988 Waring already suggested to use “the value of time as a measure of well-being” (Trigo & Barren 2022: 24); still today, in a United Nations publication, Trigo and Barren suggest for the “production of well-being: centring the sustainability of life” and “recovering the invisible; making the undervalued visible and measuring what is valued” (ibid: 41–42).

2. The second concept mentioned and linked to this is **social provisioning** that feminist economists are also utilizing. For instance, Marilyn Power defines economics as the study of social provisioning which emphasizes that at its root, economic activity involves the ways people organize themselves collectively to get a living (Power 2004). Her social provisioning approach entails five core assumptions, namely (1) care work, both paid and unpaid, constitutes the foundation of every economy; (2) Human and planetary well-being are central measure of economic success; (3) Unequal power structures exist,

however, human agency has the potential to transform these structures; (4) Ethical judgements are an invaluable part of economic analysis; and (5) An intersectional approach to economics “in which the interactions of race, gender, and other historically specific social categories can be better understood” (ibid: 5) is required.

3. Another concept that is cited is the **basic needs approach**. “The institutional origins of the Basic Needs Approach go back to the 1976 International Labour Organization’s (ILO) World Employment Conference and a report entitled *Employment, Growth, and Basic Needs: A One-World Problem* that put the Basic Needs Approach on the global development policy agenda. Feminist economists have often discussed basic needs connected to Amartya Sen’s capabilities approach. “The basic needs approach places people at the center of development, but the emphasis on specifying ‘basic needs’ in terms of supplying services and commodities points to a commodities basis rather than a capabilities basis in defining human well-being” (Fukuda-Parr 2003: 304).

One expert called UBS public social services: **Public Social Services (PSS)**, which directly relates to the ambivalences of the modes of state provision.

Finally, one expert suggested as an alternative the **human rights approach** that from a feminist economics perspective needs to be seen in connection with macroeconomic issues.

“The human rights approach constitutes an alternative evaluative and ethical framework for assessing economic policies and outcomes. The goals of social justice are expressed in terms of the realization of rights—both civil and political rights and also economic, social, and cultural rights. [...] Understanding and intervening in macroeconomic policy, then, is a key priority for activists concerned with building a more just and equitable world. (Balakrishnan et al. 2019: 2–3)

The human rights approach must be seen connected to agency and freedom and as more than capabilities:

The realization of rights is fundamentally a political struggle for a different social and economic order on substantive freedoms (not just freedom in law, but freedoms of individuals, seen as active agents of change, rather than as passive recipients of dispensed benefits) and equality for realized outcomes, not just opportunities.” (Balakrishnan et al. 2019: 3)

Most of the experts were irritated by the labelling of for them long established concepts under the header FE and/or UBS. Some of them were worried about rebranding, which is understandable given the history of epistemological silencing and harvesting of feminist research. However, some of them also stressed that it may not be problematic, because if UBS and FE are “*well intended*”, have a similar content, and follow similar goals, it might not be important what they are called.

Recommendations

The recommendations by the experts include handing control to former colonial nations and reparations.

Handing over resources and control to national policymaking is what Germany could do. Returning the profits of colonialism would be a good idea. (Interview 1)

Also, promoting agency and cooperative activities for women is another recommendation; “microcredit and other experiments have allowed us to find that if women are making decisions, they are able to cooperate with other women for economic activities and gains. BRAC’s Palli Shobha is an excellent example. (See Qayum 2021, mentioned in interview 6):

A utilization of the human rights framework in bilateral treatments with trading partners in trade policy that pushes feminist approaches is another suggestion.

Finally, it needs to be deliberated in specific situations whether it would be beneficial to entrust national governments with responsibility over resources (like water) to prevent privatization or whether conditionalities are helpful to ensure distributional fairness in the effects of development programs.

Summary

FE and UBS are not widely known concepts among feminist economists, even though the contents and fellow travelers of the concepts are widely recognized. There was general unhappiness about the rebranding of the work of feminist economics – even though that might not affect the work on the ground. The experts emphasized that a similarity between feminist economics, FE, and UBS is the focus on care and everyday necessities. It is noted that the circular notion of FE could improve the intra-household distribution and labor market outcomes for women. However, they also stressed some important differences. For example, current problems in the Global South are concerning physical rather than economic access, especially the sustainable provision of clean water, which must be primarily considered in UBS. While the experts described the economies in the Global South as more localized already, localization was not unconditionally welcomed as it depends on specific situations of resources and deliberate participation processes to avoid exclusion. Moreover, the role of the state as a provider of social services was contested among the experts, as states may be lacking reach, motivation and/or sufficient funding in Global South countries. Against this background, it needs to be deliberated in specific situations whether conditionalities are helpful to ensure distributional fairness in the effects of development programs. Furthermore, a lack of consideration of macroeconomic contexts, global finance, the IMF, and colonial structures was noted. More generally, the experts called for acknowledging colonialism

and power differences in present structures of aid. There was some reluctance to use the term “development” at all – it was proposed to instead use the term “feminist economic policy,” including feminist strategies for financial markets. Against this background, recommendations by feminist economist include reparations for colonialism, changes in formal and informal institutions, promoting agency and cooperative activities for women, and a focus on distributive effects.

4 Synthesis

Linking those empirical findings to the literature review conducted in section 2 and more broadly to the overall research question “In how far can prioritizing the foundational economy (FE) and Universal Basic Services (UBS) in international development cooperation be seen as a transformative step towards feminist development policy?”, this section fleshes out key take aways from the research, before in a next step formulating recommendations based on these key findings.

The main key take aways are:

1. **Feminist development policy (FDP)** and more broadly discourses on feminist foreign policy (FFP) are **emerging concepts in policymaking**. Strategies for FDP vary from more traditional approaches that focus on development projects targeting the specific needs of women and girls (e.g., Canada) to more transformative formulations that aim at changing the patriarchal and neocolonial roots of increased vulnerabilities (e.g., Germany). Due to persistent power structures in the development sector, the successful implementation of truly transformative policies is difficult and whether a transformation of these structures succeeds remains to be seen.
2. Debates on the **Foundational Economy (FE) and Universal Basic Services (UBS)** have gained increasing attention in European academic and policy debates in the last decade. Both approaches share a focus on universal and rights-based provisioning of basic services through redistributive logics. The focus thereby lies on a **collective satisfaction of basic needs**, i.e., on a context-specific form of a social wage and collective consumption. The way UBS and FE are currently formulated, they do not take the **3G program – Green, Gender, Global** – into account sufficiently. While this approach may unfold transformative potential in the context of European welfare states, its **transferability to other contexts in terms of prioritizing FE and UBS in international development cooperation is doubtful**.
3. Focusing on the content of UBS and FE rather than on their specific formulation, we find that the concepts have manifold **fellow travelers**. For example, the

interviewed experts point to the decades of work in feminist economics linked to the social provisioning literature, the basic needs approach, public social services, the well-being economy, and human rights approaches. Furthermore, as has been indicated in an internal expert workshop, other **modes of collective provisioning**, such as commoning, resemble UBS and FE in putting an emphasis on collective provisioning processes (however, these approaches differ in not being rights-based and universal). The concept of **Global Public Investment (GPI)** as a relatively new and ambitious approach has recently become of interest and has been promoted by feminist economist Jayati Ghosh. Against the background of manifold approaches that share a focus on the collective fulfillment of basic needs and hence extend and prioritize the decommodified provision of essential services, **there must not be a 'global branding'** for that.

4. In sum, we hold that while FE and UBS have so far mostly been discussed in the context of European countries with the historical privilege of welfare states, **approaches that focus on access to essential services are discussed – albeit under different names – by actors throughout the world.** Acknowledging the different roles that the (welfare) state plays in these provisioning processes, we hold that a decommodified provision of basic services has a strong potential to reduce inequality by substantially raising the standard of living, promoting agency, and reducing vulnerability to crises. **If considering feminist interventions as well as interventions from the Global South from the beginning (rather than as add-on), a prioritization of basic services could unleash significant transformative potential.**
5. While rights-based, decommodified provision of essential services holds transformative potential and promotes agency, a truly transformative approach to feminist development policy also needs to **tackle macroeconomic givens, neocolonial and patriarchal structures, also in financial lender institutions, that underly international development cooperation** but also the subordinate integration of the Global South into the world economy more broadly. Instead of development cooperation, this requires a focus on **reparations-based global justice approach** of international cooperation.

4.1 Research gaps

Future research is needed to unravel and make visible epistemological linkages between FE, USS, and the large body of work in feminist economics. Linkages to concepts of commoning and degrowth are worthwhile of exploration. Approaches developed in the Global South, amongst them contributions to postcolonial theory, decolonial studies, and post-development scholarship need to be put in conversation with FE and UBS. A practical engagement with structural racism, androcentrism and ongoing coloniality in

concepts of European origin is another possible research avenue. Also, non-heteronormative conceptions of communities as provided by queer theory need to be reflected. Macroeconomic policies, power relations, relationships with international funders, and global finance need to be worked into the conceptions. Reparations for colonial exploitation but also carbon induced loss and damage costs – not as aid, but as historical and ecological debt – need to be calculated and considered as foundation for a reparations-based global justice approach of international cooperation.

4.2 Coalition opportunities

See the list of possible partners in the annex.

5 Bibliography

- AG Links-netz. (2012). Sozialpolitik als Bereitstellung einer sozialen Infrastruktur, January 19th. <http://wp.links-netz.de/?p=23>
- Agarwal, B. (1994) Gender and command over property. An economic analysis of South Asia. New Delhi: Kali for Women.
- Aggestam, K.; Bergman Rosamond, A.; Kronsell, A. (2019) Theorising feminist foreign policy. *International Relations*, 33(1).
- Anguinaga M.; Lang M.; Mokrani D.; Santillana A. (2013) Development critiques and Alternatives: a feminist perspective. In: *Beyond Development. Alternative visions from Latin America* (Ed. Lang M.; Mokrani D.) Fundación Rosa Luxemburg/Transnational Institute.
- Balakrishnan, R.; Elson, D.; Heintz, J., Walters, J (2019) Auditing Economic Policy For Human Rights. A guide for activists and advocates, Rutgers. https://journalisminitiativeongbv.files.wordpress.com/2019/12/aep_12101.pdf
- Barbera, F.; Jones, I. (2020) *The Foundational Economy and Citizenship: Comparative Perspectives on Civil Repair*, Bristol, UK: Policy Press. <https://doi.org/10.56687/9781447353386>
- Barbera, F.; Negri, N.; Salento, A. (2018) From individual choice to collective voice. Foundational economy, local commons and citizenship. *Rassegna italiana di Sociologia*, 59(2), 371–398.
- Bärnthaler, R.; Dengler, C. (2022) Universal Basic Income, Services, or Time Politics? A Critical Realist Analysis of (Potentially) Transformative Responses to the Care Crisis. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4308613>
- Bärnthaler, R.; Novy, A.; Plank, L. (2021) The Foundational Economy as a Cornerstone for a Social–Ecological Transformation. *Sustainability*, 13(18), 10460.
- Bentham, J.; Bowman, A.; de la Cuesta, M.; Engelen, E.; Ertürk, I.; Folkman, P.; Williams, K. (2013) *Manifesto for the foundational economy*. Manchester: Centre for Research on Socio-Cultural Change.
- Berik, G.; Kongar, E. (2021) *The Routledge Handbook of Feminist Economics*. London: Routledge.

- BMBZ (2023) Feministische Entwicklungspolitik: Für gerechte und starke Gesellschaften weltweit. <https://www.bmz.de/resource/blob/146200/strategie-feministische-entwicklungspolitik.pdf>
- Bogner, A.; Littig, B.; Menz, W. (2014) Interviews mit Experten. Eine praxisorientierte Einführung. Springer VS: Wiesbaden, 71–86.
- Bohnenberger, K. (2020) Money, Vouchers, Public Infrastructures? A Framework for Sustainable Welfare Benefits. *Sustainability*, 12(2), Article 2. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12020596>
- Borges, H. (2022) Convención Constituyente Visión de normas autónomas territoriales que afectan la equidad tributaria: Iniciativa Popular e Iniciativa Constituyente. *Observatorio Económico*, 164, 2–4. <https://doi.org/10.11565/oe.vi164.440>
- Boserup, E. (1973) *Women's role in economic development*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- Brand, U.; Wissen, M. (2018) *The Limits to Capitalist Nature. Theorizing and Overcoming the Imperial Mode of Living*. London: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Braudel, F. (1981) *Civilization and Capitalism, 15th-18th Century*, Collins
- Büchs, M. (2021) Sustainable welfare: How do universal basic income and universal basic services compare? *Ecological Economics*, 189, 107152. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2021.107152>
- Button, D.; Coote, A. (2021) *A Social Guarantee: The Case for Universal Services*. The New Economics Foundation. <https://neweconomics.org/2021/09/a-social-guarantee>
- Calafati, L.; Froud, J.; Haslam, C.; Johal, S.; Williams, K. (2021) Meeting social needs on a damaged planet: Foundational Economy 2.0 and the careful practice of radical policy. Foundational Economy Collective.
- Calafati, L.; Froud, J.; Johal, S.; Williams, K. (2019) Building foundational Britain: from paradigm shift to new political practice? *Renewal: a Journal of Labour Politics*, 27(2), 13–23.
- Candeias, M.; Fried, B.; Schurian, H.; Völpel, E.; Warnke, M. (2020) *The Wealth of the Public—Infrastructure socialism, or: Why collective consumption makes people happy* (ONLINE-Publikation 19/2020). Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung. <https://www.rosalux.de/en/publication/id/43535/the-wealth-of-the-public>
- Cavallero, L.; Gago, V. (2021) *A Feminist Reading of Debt*. London: Pluto.
- Centre for Feminist Foreign Policy (2019) *A Feminist Foreign Policy for the European Union*. <https://centreforfeministforeignpolicy.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/Study-Feminist-Foreign-Policy-for-the-European-Union.pdf>
- Centro de Investigación Internacional (2020) *Conceptualizing Feminist Foreign Policy: Notes For Mexico*. https://www.gob.mx/cms/uploads/attachment/file/545654/Note_6-Feminist_foreign_policy.pdf
- Cielo, C.; Lisset C., Vallejo, I. (2016) Women, Nature, and Development in Sites of Ecuador's Petroleum Circuit. *Economic Anthropology* 3(1): 119–132.
- Cohen, M. (2021) *Revitalising Local Communities*. Women Budget Group. <https://wbg.org.uk/analysis/uk-policy-briefings/revitalising-local-communities/>
- Connelly, P. M. et al. (2000) *Feminism and Development: Theoretical Perspectives*, in *Theoretical Perspectives on Gender and Development* (ed. Parpart, J.L., Connelly, P.M., Barriteau, V.E.), International Development Research Centre.

- Coote, A. (2017) Building a new social commons. New Economics Foundation.
<https://neweconomics.org/2017/05/building-new-social-commons>
- Coote, A. (2020) Universal Basic Services and the Foundational Economy. The Foundational Economy Collective.
<https://foundationaleconomycom.files.wordpress.com/2020/10/ubs-and-fe-working-paper-wp7.pdf>
- Coote, A. (2021) Universal basic services and sustainable consumption. *Sustainability: Science, Practice and Policy*, 17(1), 32–46.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15487733.2020.1843854>
- Coote, A.; Kasliwal, P.; Percy, A. (2019) Universal Basic Services: Theory and Practice—A literature review. [Data set]. Institute for Global Prosperity – University College London.
- Dengler, C.; Lang, M.; Seebacher, L. (2022) Care: An Overview of Strategies for Social-Ecological Transformation in the Field of Care. In: Barlow, N. et al. (eds.): *Degrowth & Strategy: How to Bring About Social-Ecological Transformation*. Colchester: Mayfly, 311–324.
- Dengler, C.; Lang, M. (2022) Commoning Care: Feminist Degrowth Visions for a Socio-Ecological Transformation. *Feminist Economics* 28 (1): 1–28.
- Doyal, L.; Gough, I. (1991) *A Theory of Human Need*. Macmillan Education UK.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-21500-3>
- Escobar, A. (2015) Degrowth, postdevelopment, and transitions: a preliminary conversation. In: *Social Sciences*, 10, 451–462.
- Estela, O. (2019) The Foundational Economy and strategic planning in Barcelona: reshaping the urban economy from the bottom up. *Renewal: A Journal of Labour Politics*, 27(2), 33–39.
- FaDA (2020) Feminist degrowth reflections on COVID-19 and the politics of social reproduction. <https://degrowth.info/blog/feminist-degrowth-collaborative-fada-reflections-on-the-covid-19-pandemic-and-the-politics-of-social-reproduction>
- FEC (2018) *Foundational Economy. The Infrastructure of Everyday Life*. Manchester: Manchester University Press
- Filgueira, F.; Molina, C.; Papadópulos, J.; Tobar, F. (2006) Universalismo básico: Una alternativa posible y necesaria para mejorar las condiciones de vida en América Latina. In C. Molina (Ed.), *Universalismo Básico*. Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo.
- Frank, M. (2019) Eine Karte für alle Fälle. [nd-aktuelle.de](https://www.nd-aktuell.de/artikel/1116690.ausweis-fuer-illegalisierte-eine-karte-fuer-alle-faelle.html). <https://www.nd-aktuell.de/artikel/1116690.ausweis-fuer-illegalisierte-eine-karte-fuer-alle-faelle.html>
- Fraser, N. (1997) *Justice interruptus: Critical reflections on the ‘postsocialist’ condition*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Friesen, I.; Wisskirchen, A. (2022a) Ten recommendations for Germany’s feminist development policy. IDOS Discussion Paper, 17.
<https://doi.org/10.23661/idp17.2022>
- Friesen, I.; Wisskirchen, A. (2022b) Putting gender equality first. Three cornerstones for Germany’s Feminist Development Policy. German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE) https://www.idos-research.de/uploads/media/German_Development_Institute_Friesen_Wisskirchen_02.05.2022.pdf

- Fukuda-Parr, S. (2003) The Human Development Paradigm: Operationalizing Sen's Ideas On Capabilities, *Feminist Economics*, 9:2–3, 301–317, DOI: 10.1080/1354570022000077980
- Gasper, D.; van Staveren, I. (2003) Development As Freedom – And As What Else? *Feminist Economics*, 9:2–3, 137–161, DOI: 10.1080/1354570032000078663
- Global Affairs Canada (2017) Canada's Feminist International Assistance Policy <https://www.international.gc.ca/world-monde/assets/pdfs/iap2-eng.pdf>
- Goeminne, G.; Paredis, E. (2010) The Concept of Ecological Debt: Some Steps Towards an Enriched Sustainability Paradigm. In: *Environment Development Sustainability* 12/5: 691–712.
- Gorz, A. (1967) *Strategy for Labor: A Radical Proposal*. Boston: Beacon Press. □ Chapter 1: Introduction, 3–20.
- Gough, I. (2019) Universal Basic Services: A Theoretical and Moral Framework. *The Political Quarterly*, 90(3), 534–542. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-923X.12706>
- Gough, I. (2022) Two Scenarios for Sustainable Welfare: A Framework for an Eco-Social Contract. *Social Policy and Society*, 21(3), 460–472. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1474746421000701>
- Green, D. (2019) Coastal Housing Group: developing the Foundational Economy in South Wales. *Renewal: a Journal of Labour Politics*, 27(2), 24–32.
- Gudynas E., (2016) Beyond varieties of development: disputes and alternatives, *Third World Quarterly*, 37:4, 721–732
- Gurminder B.; Holmwood, J. (2018) Colonialism, postcolonialism and the liberal welfare state. *New Political Economy* 23.5: 574-587.
- Haiven, M. (2020) *Revenge Capitalism: The Ghosts of Empire, the Demons of Capital, and the Settling of Unpayable Debts*. London: Pluto.
- Hall, M.; Stephens, L. (2020) *Quality Childcare for All*. New Economic Foundation. <https://neweconomics.org/2020/01/quality-childcare-for-all>
- Hamburg Institute for Global Prosperity (2017) *Social prosperity for the future: A proposal for Universal Basic Services*. University College London. <https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/10080175/>
- Hankivsky, O. (2012) *An Intersectionality-Based Policy Analysis Framework*. Vancouver: Institute for Intersectionality Research and Policy.
- Hansen, T. (2022) The foundational economy and regional development. *Regional Studies*, 56(6), 1033–1042.
- Hawaii State Commission on the Status of Women (2020) *Building bridges, not walking on backs: a feminist economic recovery plan for COVID-19*. <https://humanservices.hawaii.gov/wp->
- Heslop, J.; Morgan, K.; Tomaney, J. (2019) Debating the foundational economy. *Renewal: A journal of social democracy*, 27.
- Hill, A.; King, E. (1995) Women's education and economic well-being, *Feminist Economics*, 1:2, 21–46, DOI: 10.1080/714042230
- Hirsch, J. (2003). Eine andere Gesellschaft ist nötig: Zum Konzept einer Sozialpolitik als soziale Infrastruktur, October 19th. <http://wp.links-netz.de/?p=21>
- Ivanova, D.; Barrett, J.; Wiedenhofer, D.; Macura, B.; Callaghan, M.; Creutzig, F. (2020) Quantifying the potential for climate change mitigation of consumption options. *Environmental Research Letters*, 15(9), 093001. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ab8589>

- Jaquette J., (2017) Women/Gender and development: the growing gap between theory and practice, *St Comp Int Dev* 52:242–260
- Kerstenetzky, C. (2021) Why we need an allocative (and resourceful) welfare state. *Brazilian Journal of Political Economy*, vol. 41(4), 745–759, 10–11/2021
- Koch, M.; Oksana M. (2016) *Sustainability and the Political Economy of Welfare*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Kuckartz, U. (2018) *Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse. Methoden, Praxis, Computerunterstützung*. Beitz Juventa.
https://qualitativeinhaltsanalyse.de/Qualitative_Inhaltsanalyse/methode.html
- Lee, D. (2018) What is Feminist Foreign Policy? Analysis of Canada's Feminist International Assistance Policy. University of Ottawa.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.20381/ruor-21648>
- Lee, S. S.-Y.; Lee, J.; Kim, K. (2020) Evaluating Basic Income, Basic Service, and Basic Voucher for Social and Ecological Sustainability. *Sustainability*, 12(20), Article 20.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/su12208348>
- Livingston, J. (2019) *Self-Devouring Growth: A Planetary Parable as Told from Southern Africa*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Lunz, K. (2022) *Die Zukunft der Außenpolitik ist feministisch: Wie globale Krisen gelöst werden müssen*. Ullstein
- Luxemburg, R. (1903) Karl Marx. *Vorwärts* 64, 14th of March.
- Maathai, W. (1985) *The Green Belt Movement: Sharing the Approach and the Experience*. New York: Lantern Books.
- Marshall, T. H. (1965) The Right to Welfare. *The Sociological Review*, 13(3), 261–272.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954X.1965.tb01140.x>
- Martynovich, M.; Hansen, T.; Lundquist, K. J. (2020) Can foundational economy save regions in crisis? *Journal of Economic Geography*.
- McDonnell, J.; Wainwright, H. (2018) The new economics of Labour. *OpenDemocracy*.
<https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/opendemocracyuk/new-economics-of-labour/>
- McEwan C. (2001) Postcolonialism, feminism, and development: intersections and dilemmas, *Progress in Development Studies* 1,2 pp. 93–111
- McGann, M.; Murphy, M. (2023). Income Support in an Eco-Social State: The Case for Participation Income. *Social Policy and Society*, 22(1), 16-30.
doi:10.1017/S1474746421000397
- Millward-Hopkins, J.; Steinberger, J.; Rao, N.; Oswald, Y. (2020) Providing decent living with minimum energy: A global scenario. *Global Environmental Change*, 65, 102168. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2020.102168>
- Miranda, C.; Ruiz, F.; Caviedes, S. (2021) *Servicios Públicos De Calidad: Ideas Para Una Nueva Constitución En Chile*. Fundación Nodo XXI/Coordinadora Chilena de Gremios Afiliados a la Internacional de Servicios Públicos.
<https://www.nodoxi.cl/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/servicios-pu%CC%81blicos-de-calidad-isp-nodo.pdf>
- Mohanty, C. (1988) Under Western eyes: feminist scholarship and colonial discourses *Feminist Review*, 30, 61–88.
- Mohanty, C. (2003) *Feminisms without Borders. Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*, Duke University Press, Durham and London.

- Morgan, K. (2021) After the Pandemic: experimental governance and the foundational economy. *Symphonya. Emerging Issues in Management*, (1), 50–55.
- Morgan, R. (1984) (ed.) *Sisterhood is Global: The International Women's Movement Anthology*. New York: Anchor Press.
- Moser, C. (1993) *Gender planning and development: theory, practice and training*. Routledge, London, UK
- Muchhala, B. (2021) *Feminist Economic Justice for a Feminist and Decolonial Global Green New Deal: Principles, Paradigms and Systemic Transformations*. *Feminist Economic Justice for People & Planet Action Nexus*. https://wedo.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/FemEconClimate-ActionNexus_Brief_FemGND-1.pdf
- Murphy, M.; McGann, M. (2020) *Renewing Welfare Through Universal Entitlement: Lessons From Covid-19*. In: *The Coronavirus and the Welfare State*. Brussels: Social Europe.
- Narbondo, P. (2006) *Reflexiones Críticas Sobre El Universalismo Básico*. *Revista Uruguay de Ciencia Política*, 15, 151–172.
- OECD (2019) *The Economy of Well-Being. Remarks by Angel Gurría, OECD Secretary-General*. 16 September 2019 – Reykjavik, Iceland. <https://www.oecd.org/about/secretary-general/the-economy-of-well-being-iceland-september-2019.htm>
- Onaran, Ö.; Calvert Jump, R. (2022) *A shorter working week as part of a green caring economy: Feminist green new deal policy paper*. *Women's Environmental Network (WEN) – Women's Budget Group (WBG)* <https://wbg.org.uk/fgnd-blog/shorter-working-week/>
- Parpart, J., ed. (1989) *Women and development in Africa: comparative perspectives*. University Press of America, Lanham, MD, USA.
- Pichler, P.; Jaccard, I.; Weisz, U.; Weisz, H. (2019). *International comparison of health care carbon footprints*. *Environmental Research Letters*, 14(6), 064004. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ab19e1>
- Power, M. (2004) *Social Provisioning as a Starting Point for Feminist Economics*, *Feminist Economics*, 10:3, 3–19, DOI: 10.1080/1354570042000267608
- Qayum, N. (2021) *Village Ties. Women, NGOs, and Informal Institutions in Rural Bangladesh*. Rutgers University Press.
- Rathgeber, E. (1990) *WED, WAD, GAD: trends in research and practice*. *Journal of Developing Areas*, 24(4), 489–502.
- Russell, B.; Beel, D.; Rees Jones, I.; Jones, M. (2022) *Placing the Foundational Economy: An emerging discourse for post-neoliberal economic development*. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 0308518X221098745.
- Sayer, A. (2019) *Moral economy, the Foundational Economy and de-carbonisation*. *Renewal: A Journal of Labour Politics*, 27(2), 40–46.
- Schmidt, L.; Schröder, S. (2016) *Entwicklungstheorien: Klassiker, Kritik und Alternativen*. Wien: Mandelbaum.
- Shiva, V. (1988) *Staying Alive – Women, Ecology and Development*. London: Zed Press.
- Spivak, G. (1990) *The post-colonial critic*. Routledge, New York, NY, USA.
- Swedish Ministry for Foreign Affairs (2018) *Handbook: Sweden's Feminist Foreign Policy*. https://www.swedenabroad.se/globalassets/ambassader/zimbabwe-harare/documents/handbook_swedens-feminist-foreign-policy.pdf

- The Care Collective (2020) *The Care Manifesto: The Politics of Interdependence*. Verso Books.
- The Future is Public: Global Manifesto for Public Services. (2021)
<https://futureispublic.org/global-manifesto/#manifesto>
- Thompson, M. (2022) Money for Everything? Universal Basic Income in a Crisis. *Economy and Society* 51 (3): 353–74.
- Trigo, V.; Baron, C. (2022) Decentring GDP: well-being, care and time”, Project Documents. (LC/TS.2022/80), Santiago, Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC).
https://repositorio.cepal.org/bitstream/handle/11362/48157/1/S2200467_en.pdf
- UN women (2021) *Feminist Plan For Sustainability And Social Justice*.
<https://www.unwomen.org/en/digital-library/publications/2021/09/beyond-covid-19-a-feminist-plan-for-sustainability-and-social-justice>
- Verbist, G.; Förster, M.; Vaalavuo, M. (2012) *The Impact of Publicly Provided Services on the Distribution of Resources: Review of New Results and Methods*. OECD.
<https://doi.org/10.1787/5k9h363c5szq-en>
- Waring, M. ([1988], 1999) *Counting for Nothing. What men value and what women are worth*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Wenke, C.; Kron, S. (2019) *Solidarity Cities in Europe*. Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung.
<https://www.rosalux.de/en/publication/id/40039/solidarity-cities-in-europe>
- WHO/UNICEF (2021) *Progress on household drinking water, sanitation and hygiene 2000–2020: Five years into the SDGs*. WHO/UNICEF.
<https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/9789240030848>
- Wilkinson, R.; Pickett, K. (2010) *The Spirit Level: Why Equality is Better for Everyone*. Penguin Books Limited.
- Women’s Budget Group (2022) *Green and Caring Economy. Final Report*.
- Yaşar, Y.; Lautzenheiser, M. (2022) Universal Basic Income (UBI) versus Universal Basic Services (UBS) in a Kaleckian Model. The 26th FMM Conference “Post-Keynesian Economics and Global Challenges,” Berlin.
- Zambrana, R. (2021) *Colonial Debts: The Case of Puerto Rico*. Durham: Duke University Press.

6 Annex

6.1 Interview partners

Prof. Radhika Balakrishnan

Prof. Balakrishnan is the former faculty director at the Center for Women's Global Leadership and professor in Women's and Gender and Sexuality Studies at Rutgers University in New York. She is on the Global Advisory Council for the United Nations Population Fund. Her research and advocacy work has sought to change the lens through which macroeconomic policy is interpreted and critiqued by applying international human rights norms to assess macroeconomic policy.

Publication: *Balakrishnan, Radhika; Heintz, James; Elson, Diane (2016) Rethinking Economic Policy for Social Justice. The radical potential of human rights, Routledge.*

Prof. Farida Khan

Prof. Khan is an economist at Colorado State University. Her research background is in International trade policy, numerical general equilibrium models, and she works on economic development in South Asia, primarily on Bangladesh. She has written on topics related to capital goods, micro-credit, gender, and more recently environmental issues as they connect to indigenous peoples in India and Bangladesh. Her writing also includes topics on the US economy.

Publication: *Khan, Farida (2013) Heterogeneity as Heterodoxy in Development Policy: Tribal communities in Bangladesh and Kerala, International Journal of Development Issues, 2013, 2(1): 4–21.*

Prof. Eudine Barriteau

Prof. Barriteau is a **Caribbean** political scientist, feminist, scholar, and activist with experience in research, senior administration and coordination of regional projects. She was the first Head of the Centre for Gender and Development Studies at The University of the West Indies, Cave Hill Campus.

Publication: *Barriteau, Eudine (2001) The Political Economy of Gender in the Twentieth Century Caribbean, Palgrave.*

Prof. Celia Lessa Kerstenetzky

Prof Kerstenetzky is a political and social scientist based at the Economics Institute, Federal University of Rio de Janeiro. Her current research interests include the analysis

of socioeconomic inequalities, development processes and purposes, and contemporary welfare states.

Publication: Kerstenetzky, Celia (2012) *The Welfare State in the Age of Reason*, Campus.

Prof. Naila Kabeer

Prof. Kabeer is Professor of Gender and Development at the Department of Gender Studies and Department of International Development at the London School of Economics. Her research interests include gender, poverty, social exclusion, labour markets and livelihoods, social protection and citizenship and much of her research is focused on South and Southeast Asia. She is currently involved in ERSC–DIFD Funded Research Projects on Gender and Labour Market dynamics in Bangladesh and India.

Publication: Kabeer, Naila (1994) *Reversed Realities: Gender Hierarchies in Development Thought*, Verso.

Prof. Abena Daagye Oduro

Prof. Oduro is an Associate Professor in the Department of Economics, University of Ghana. Her main areas of research are poverty and inequality analysis, gender and assets, unpaid care work, international trade policy and WTO issues. She is the outgoing president of IAFFE. Areas of Specialisation: Gender and Assets, Poverty Analysis, Inequality Analysis, Unpaid Care Work, International Trade Policy.

Publication: Oduro, Abena; Staveren van, Irene (2015) *Engendering Economic Policy in Africa. Feminist Economics*. 21 (3): 1–22. DOI: 10.1080/13545701.2015.1059467

6.2 Guiding questions for expert interviews

Can "prioritizing the Foundational Economy and Universal Basic Services in Official Development Aid be seen as a transformative step towards feminist development policy?"

- How would you define feminist development policy? Could you give me examples for that?
- What makes a feminist development policy transformative? Could you provide best practice examples?
- Had you heard about the concepts of Foundational Economy (FE) or Universal Basic Services (UBS) before we contacted you? If so, in which context?
- Do these concepts seem familiar to you from so-called Global South or other non-UK contexts, maybe you have encountered them under another name?
- Do you think FE or UBS may be good strategies (or contain good elements for strategies) to employ in the context(s) you are familiar with?
- (How) do you think that FE and/or UBS could be helpful to install feminist development policy in global north frameworks, such as official development aid?
- Do you foresee problems/risks?
- From your perspective, what would be the ideal strategies for ODA (and Oxfam with its focus on inequality and global justice) to employ (transformative) feminist development policies?

6.3 List of partners on the ground

Kazakhstan:

Gender Economics research Center, Kazakhstan, working with organizations in Kazakhstan and Central Asia.

<https://en.narxoz.kz/research/institutes/gerc/>

Maigul Nugmanova
Gender Economics Research Center Director
Narxoz University
Almaty, Kazakhstan, 050035,
55, Zhandosov str.
Tel. +7(727)3772047 and +7(701)3592544

Brazil:

Ecofeminista, feminist activist, feminist economist but also interdisciplinarity. Our focus is the economy through a gender lens (the care economy, the labour market, private home workers, etc.). We are continually creating original content (both articles and data) and we also carry out the biggest activist campaign in Argentina related to menstrual justice (it's called Menstruacion). Our data area is always growing too, we process public information with a feminist perspective that is currently used and consulted by the media, the public sector and by researchers too.

Lucía Espiñeira
espineiralucia@gmail.com
<https://ecofeminista.com/?v=fa868488740a>

USA:

Feminist Agenda FOR A GREEN NEW DEAL

This coalition of women's rights and climate justice organizations came together in early 2019 in recognition that feminist analysis must be part of this discourse. In a conversation focused on envisioning a healthy planet and communities, these groups knew that gender equality was-and is-key. A feminist intervention was necessary. The Feminist Agenda for a Green New Deal, thus, was borne from collective generation, and the future of its campaigns and initiatives, through Fall 2019 and beyond, will also be collectively determine.

<https://feministgreennewdeal.com/>

UK:

Gender and development network

GADN is an influential network of UK-based NGOs and leading experts working with partners worldwide to put gender equality and women's rights at the heart of international development.

<https://gadnetwork.org/who-we-are>

Global:

The Women in Global South Alliance for Tenure and Climate

150 local Collaborators who participate in and support RRI activities.

Rights and Resources Initiative (RRI) tracks the progress on recognition of Indigenous, community, and Afro-descendant land rights worldwide, and examines key elements of the relationship between secure land tenure and climate and development aims. These analyses underpin advocacy by communities, legislators, and policy experts, and strengthen the evidence base on the importance of securing Indigenous, community, and Afro-descendant land rights. RRI's analytical work is supported and verified by a Coalition of national experts and developed with Indigenous and community Partners and Collaborators from around the world.

<https://rightsandresources.org/women-in-global-south-alliance/>

Link to the 150 partners:

<https://rightsandresources.org/who-we-are/the-coalition/partners-collaborators/>

Women's Environment and Development Organization

WEDO creates change through the following strategic approaches:

Advocacy and Influence: Engage in policy processes to ensure policy and actions center gender equality and sustainable development

Capacity Building and Training: Build capacity and facilitate space for women/ feminists to exercise their political voice, power and influence at local, national and international levels

Knowledge Production and Outreach: Build and maintain knowledge base related to feminist analysis and approaches to implementing gender equality, women's human rights, environmental and climate justice across geographies and sociopolitical environments

Redistribute Resources: Support coalition partners to engage in global advocacy and undertake local and regional advocacy activities via sub-grants

<https://wedo.org/>

The Association for Women's Rights in Development (AWID) is a global, feminist, membership, movement-support organization.

For 40 years, AWID has been a part of an incredible ecosystem of feminist movements working to achieve gender justice and women's human rights worldwide.

<https://www.awid.org>

Feminist Alliance for Rights

The Feminist Alliance for Rights (FAR) is a global alliance working to advance gender equality by strengthening accountability for women's human rights. We promote respect for the diversity and complexity of women's lives.

<http://feministallianceforrights.org/about-the-feminist-alliance-for-rights-far/>

Signatories of the Statement of Feminists and Women's Rights Organizations from the Global South and from marginalized communities in the Global North (2000)

500 Women Scientists Montreal
Accao de solidariedade e saúde comunitária ASSC
Afghan women news agency organization
Agrupación Ciudadana por la Despenalización del Aborto-El Salvador
Aid Organization
Akina Mama wa Afrika
Almena Cooperativa Feminista
AMSOPT
Apna Ghar, Inc.
Asociación Calidad de Vida
Asociación Paz y Solidaridad. CCOO. Asturias
Asociación Por Ti Mujer
Asociadas por lo Justo JASS Mesoamérica
Associació Esfera
Associació LIKA
Association des Femmes de l'Europe Méridionale
Association des Marocains en France
Association for Advocacy and Legal Initiatives Trust (AALI)
Association for Sexual Rights-ASR (Association pour les Droits Sexuels ADS)
Association Tunisienne des femmes démocrates
Associazione Dream Team Donne in Rete
Associazione Il Giardino dei Ciliegi
Associazione Maddalena
Associazione Orlando
Associazione Orlando | Centro delle Donne di Bologna
Associazione Risorse Donna
Associazione Topnomastica femminile
Aswat Nissa
AtGender
ATHENA Network
Atria, institute on gender equality and women's history
Aurat March Lahore
AWID
Awmr Italia Donne della Regione Mediterranea
Azad Foundation
Balance AC
Bangladesh Centre for Human Rights and Development (BCHRD)
Bangladesh Model Youth Parliament (Protiki Jubo Sangsahd)
Baobab Women's Project CIC
BAPSA
Believe mental health care organisation
Berliński Kongres Kobiet
Beyond Beijing Committee (BBC)Nepal
Border Crit Institute

BraveHeart Initiative for Youth & Women
Brazilian Network of Population and Development/REBRAPD
Breakthrough (India)
Breakthrough (USA)
Broadsheet, New Zealand's Feminist Magazine
CAFRA Bahamas
Cameroon Women's Peace Movement (CAWOPEM)
Cameroon Women's Peace Movement (CAWOPEM)
Caminando Juntas
Campaign for Lead Free Water
Canadian Association of Latin-American Writers (CCLEH)
Canadian Feminist Network
CARAM Asia
Catholics for Reproductive Health
CEDAW Committee of Trinidad and Tobago
CEDEAL
CEHAT
Center for Building Resilient Communities
Center for gender and sexual and reproductive health, James P Grant school of public health
Center for Hunger-Free Communities
Center for Justice and International Law (CEJIL)
Center for Migrant Advocacy Philippines
Center for Women's Global Leadership
Center for Women's Health and Human Rights, Suffolk University
Center Women and Modern World
Centre for Feminist Foreign Policy
Centre for Gender Justice
Centre for Social Concern and Development (CESOCODE)
Centro de Derechos de Mujeres
Centro de Mujeres ACCION YA
Centro di Women's Studies Milly Villa – Università della Calabria
Centro Mujeres A.C.
Centro Mujeres AC
Centro Mujeres Latinas
Centro Ni una Menos Valdivias
CETEC
Channel Foundation
Chaska, for equality, human rights, for the planet!
China women's film festival
CHIRAPAQ Centro de Culturas Indígenas del Perú
CHOUF
Closet de Sor Juana
CNCD-11.11.11
Coalition for Sexual and Bodily Rights in Muslim Societies (CSBR)
COFEM
Colectiva Feminista Mujeres Andando Procesos Por Autonomías Sororales

Colectiva Lésbica Feminista Irreversibles
Colectivo “Género y Teología para el Desarrollo”
Colectivo “Género y Teología para el Desarrollo”
Collettivo Anguane
Comisión de Antropología Feminista y de Género, Colegio de Etnólogos y Antropólogos Sociales A.C
Comité de América Latina y el Caribe para la Defensa de los Derechos de las Mujeres, CLADEM
CommonHealth
Community Care for Emergency Response and Rehabilitation
Community Healthcare Initiative
Comunicación, Intercambio y Desarrollo Humano en América Latina, Asociación Civil (CIDHAL, A. C.)
Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd
Consejo Sectorial de Igualdad de Bustarviejo
Consortium on Gender, Security and Human Rights
Continental Network of Indigenous Women on the Americas.
Cooperacció
Cooperativa Sociale Centro Donne Mantova
Coordinadora de la Mujer
COSPE
Council of Indigenous Women of Lower Lands of Europe
Courageous people health and development Initiative
CREA
Creativería Social, AC
Dawlaty Organization
DAWN Canada
Debate Feminista CostaRica
Denis Miki Foundation
Design Studio for Social Intervention
DESSI International
Development in Practice, Gender and Entrepreneurial Initiative (DIPGEI)
DHI AC
Digital Women’s Archive North [DWAN]
DIVA for Equality
Doces para sempre – SW
Dorothy Njemanze Foundation
Drac Màgic (cooperativa Promotora de Mitjans audiovisuals)
Dziewuchy Berlin
Echoesofwomeninafrica11@gmail.com
Emergencia Feminista
Emma organization for human development
EMPOWER Malaysia
Empowered At Dusk Women’s Association
EMTHONJENI WOMEN’S FORUM
End Violence Against Women Coalition (UK)
Enhancing Access to Health for Poverty reduction in Tanzania (EAHP Tanzania)

Enlace Continental de Mujeres Indígenas de las Américas ECMIA
Enlightenment and empowerment of northern women initiative
Equality Bahamas
Equality Now
Equidad de Género, Ciudadanía, Trabajo y Familia
Equipo Jurídico por los Derechos Humanos
Equipop
Etihad Peace Minorities Welfare Foundation
Euro-Mediterranean Women's Foundation
EuroMed Rights
European Roma Rights Centre (Brussels, Belgium)
FACICP Disability Plus
Families Planning Association of Puerto Rico (PROFAMILIAS)
Family Planning Association of Nepal
FAMM Indonesia
Federación Feminista Gloria Arenas
Federation for Women and Family Planning
Federation of Sexual and Gender Minorities Nepal
Federazione Femminile Evangelica Valdese e Metodista
Female Safe Environments-Her Safe Place
FEMBUD
Femini Berlin Polska
Feminist Alliance for Rights
Feminist Humanitarian Network
Feminist Internet
Feminist Policy Collective
Feminoteka Foundation
Femmes leadership et développement durable
FEMNET – African Women's Development and Communication Network
Fiji Women's Rights Movement (FWRM)
First Future Leadership
Flash Dynamic Concepts
FOKUS-Forum for Women and Development
Fondazione Pangea onlus
Fondo Centroamericano de Mujeres
Food Corporation of India Handling Workers Union
Food Sovereignty Alliance, India
For Violence-Free Family Coalition
Forum Against Oppression of Women
Forum against Sex Selection
Four Worlds Europe
Fund for Congolese Women
Fundación Aequitas
Fundación Arcoíris por el respeto a la diversidad sexual
Fundación Código Humano
Fundacion Desafío
Fundacion Estudio e Investigacion de mujer FEIM

Fundación María Amor
Fundación Mujer & Mujer
Fundación Puntos de Encuentro
Fundacja “Inicjatywa Kobiet Aktywnych”
Fundacja Dziewuchy Dziewuchom
Furia vzw
GAMAG
Gamana Mahila Samuha
Gantala Press, Inc.
GAYa NUSANTARA Foundation
Gender and Environmental Risk Reduction Initiative(GERI)
Gender and Sociology Department, Institute of Sociology, Czech Academy of Sciences
Gender at Work
Gender Awareness Trust
Gender Equality,,Peace and Development Centre
GenDev Centre for Research and Innovation, India
Gimtrap AC
GirlHQ Foundation
Girls Health Ed
Girls Not Brides LAC
Girls Voices Initiative
Girlupac
Global Alliance Against Traffic in Women
Global Alliance for Tax Justice
Global Fund for Children
Global Fund for Women
Global Justice Center
Global Network of Women Peacebuilders
Global Rights for Women
Global Rights for Women
Global South Coalition for Dignified Menstruation
Global Women’s Institute
Graduate Women International
Grandmothers Advocacy Network
Grupo de Estudos Feministas em Política e Educação (GIRA/UFBA)
Grupo Guatemalteco de Mujeres-GGM
Hablemos de Derechos Humanos
HAWAA ORGANIZATION FOR RELEF AND DEVELOPMENT
Hawai’i Institute for Human Rights
Helsinki Citizens’ Assembly Banjaluka
Herstoire Collective
Hollaback! Czech
Hope for the Needy Association
Humanity in Action Poland
ICW – International Community of Women Living with HIV
Icw argentina
ICWIN

Identities Media

If/When/How: Lawyering for Reproductive Justice

IMMAHACO Ladies COOPERATIVE Society 87 set

INCLUSIVE BANGLADESH

Initiative Pananetugri pour le Bien-être de la Femme (IPBF)

iNItiatives for Nigeria

Institut Perempuan (Women's Institute)

Institute for Economic Justice

Institute for Gender and Development Studies-University of the West Indies

Institute for Young Women Development

Institute of Gender Studies, University of Guyana

Instituto de Estudos de Gênero da UFSC e NIGS UFSC

Instituto de Investigación y Estudios en Cultura de Derechos Humanos CULTURADH

Instituto de Transformación social de pr

Instituto dela Mujer

Instituto RIA

Interamerican Network of Women Shelters

International Alliance of women

International Center for Advocates Against Discrimination (ICAAD)

International Commission on Global Feminisms and Queer Politics (IUAES)

International Women's Rights Action Watch Asia Pacific

International Women's Rights Project

International Youth Alliance for Family Planning

Ipas CAM

Islamic Women's Initiative for Justice, Law and Peace (IWILAP)

Istituto Comprensivo Statale "Don G. Russolillo"

Itach-Ma'aki: Women Lawyers for Social Justice

Itack-Maaki

Izquierda Unida en Córdoba

Jaringan Muda Setara

Jaringan Perempuan Yogyakarta – Yogyakarta Women's Network

Jeunes volontaires pour la Santé

Jordanian National Commission for Women

Journal of International Women's Studies

Justice Institute Guyana

DER (Association For Support of Women Candidates)

Kali Feminists

Kenya Female Advisory Organization

Kenyan Citizen 4 Good Governance

King's Gender Studies Network, King's College London

Kirmizi Biber Derneği – Red Pepper Association

Kiverstein Institute

Kotha

L'union de l'action féministe

La Cadejos Comunicación Feminista

LABIA – A Queer Feminist LBT Collective

Latin American and Caribbean Womens Health Network

Le kassandre
Le Maestre Ignoranti
Lesbianas Independientes Feministas Socialistas – LIFS
LGBTI+ Gozo
..Mente Donna ets
Liberian women Humanitarian Network
Life in Leggings: Caribbean Alliance Against Gender-based Violence
Lon-art Creative
LOOM
MADRE
Mahila Sarvangeen Utkarsh Mandal (MASUM), Pune
Malcolm X center for Self Determination
MAMA NA MTOTO INITIATIVE(MAMI)
Manifest Wolnej Polki
Manushya Foundation
MAP Foundation
Marche mondiale des femmes
Marie Stopes International
Martha Farrell Foundation
McMaster University
Medica Mondiale e.V.
Mesa Acción por el Aborto en Chile
MEXFAM AC
Migrant Support Network – Guyana
Millennial Womxn in Policy
Movimiento de Mujeres de Chinandega
Movimiento de Mujeres de El Oro
Movimiento Nacional ‘Mujeres por la vida’
MOVULAC ONG
MOWA Band of Choctaw Indians
MPact Global Action for Gay Men’s Health & Rights
Mt Shasta Goddess Temple
Mujer Y Salud en Uruguay-MYSU
Mujeres+Mujeres
Mulier
MUSAS Peru
Musawah, Global Movement for Equality and Justice in the Muslim Family
NAO Foundation
NAPM
NAPOLINMENTE a.p.s.
Narasi Perempuan
Naripokkho
National alliance of women human right defender/Tarangini foundation
National Alliance of Women’s Organisations
National Birth Equity Collaborative
National Forum of Women with Disabilities
National Network for Immigrant and Refugee Rights

National Platform for the Rights of the Disabled
NDH LLC
Nederlandse Vereniging Gender & Gezondheid
NEPEM – Center of feminist studies at Federal University of Minas Gerais
Network for Community Development
Nigerian Feminist Forum
Nigerian Professional Working Women Organization
Nightwood Theatre
NINA WARMI
No se metan con nuestras hijas
Nobel Women’s Initiative
Nodo Género y Políticas de Equidad
NoMore234NG
A.B.I.: Organization for Abused and Battered Individuals
Observatorio de Género y Equidad
Odri Intersectional rights
Ombre
Omni Center for Peace, Justice & Ecology
ONG ESE:O
Organización Artemisas
Organización Caminando Juntas
Orikalankini
Orion Grid for Leadership and Authority Association
Our Bodies Ourselves Today
Our Generation For Inclusive Peace
OutRight International
Oxfam International
Oxford Human Rights Hub
Pan African Positive Women’s Coalition-Zimbabwe
Parteciparte
Pastoralist Girls Initiative
Pathways for Women’s Empowerment and Development (PaWED)
PAX
Peasants Dragnet
Perempuan Mahardhika
PERETAS (Organization of Women in Arts and Culture), Indonesia
Perhimpunan Pembela Masyarakat Adat Nusantara (PPMAN) – Indigenous Lawyers
Association Archipelagos
Perkumpulan Lintas Feminist Jakarta / Jakarta Feminist Association
Persons Against Non-State Torture
PES Women
PICUM- Platform for International Cooperation on Undocumented Migrants
Pittsburgh Human Rights City Alliance
Plan International
Plataforma de Mujeres Caminando hacia la Igualdad
Plataforma Feminista d’Asturies
Por la Superación de la Mujer A.C.

Power in her story / Manila Feminista
Programa de Investigacion Feminista, CEIICH UNAM
Programa Género, Cuerpo y Sexualidad de la FHCE/UDELAR
Promundo-US
Punto Género
Qbukatabu
Queer Women in Business + Allies
Race, Racism and the Law
Radha Paudel Foundation
Raising Voices
RALI – Reborn Athena Legal Initiative
Rassemblement Contre la Hogra et pour les Droits des algériennes :”RACHDA
Rays of Hope Community Foundation
Red Chiapas por la Paridad Efectiva
Red de Educación Popular entre Mujeres – REPEM
Red de la No Violencia contra las Mujeres-REDNOVI
Red de Mujeres contra la violencia
Red de Mujeres por una Opinión Pública con Perspectiva de Género en Campeche AC
RED INTERAMERICANA DE MUJERES PROFESIONALES POR LOS DERECHOS HUMANOS
Red Mexicana de ciencia tecnología y genero
Red Nacional de Refugios AC
Red Nacional Universitaria por la Equidad de Género en la Educación Superior
Red Thread
Rede Nao Cala USP – Network of professors against gender violence at the University
of Sao Paulo
REF – Réseau Euromed France
Remember Our Sisters Everywhere
Reporteros de investigacion
Réseau Siggil Jigéen
RESEAU SOLIDARITE POUR LE DROIT DES TRAVAILLEUSES DU SEXE
Restless Development Nepal
Rutgers WPF Indonesia
P.E.A.K (moslim women collectief)
Sacred Circle of Indigenous Women of Europe
SAFE SxM
SAHAJ
SAHAYOG
Salamander Trust
Samsara
Sanctus Initiative for Human Development and Values Sustainability (SIHDEVAS]N
Sangsan Anakot Yawachon Development Project
Save Generations Organization
Sehjira Foundation
Service Workers In Group Foundation Uganda
Sexual Violence Research Initiative
Shayisfuba feminist collective
Shedecides

Shifting the Power Coalition – Pacific
Shirakat – Partnership for Development
Shirley Ann Sullivan Educational Foundation
Shishu Aangina
Simavi
Society for the Improvement of Rural People(SIRP)
Society of Gender Professionals
Solidarite Des Jeunes Filles Pour L’education Et L’integration Socioprofessionnelle,
Sojfed
Solidarité Féminine pour la Paix et le Developpement Integral “SOFEPADI “
Sonke Gender Justice
Soroptimist International
S.P.E.A.K (Muslim woman collective) Holland
SPACE UNJ
Spatium Libertas AC
Spinifex Press
Stop au Chat Noir
Stop violencies
Stowarzyszenie Kobieta na PLUS
Studentato universitario San Giuseppe
Success Capital Organisation
Suppressed Histories Archives
T’ruah: The Rabbinic Call for Human Rights
Tag a Life International (TaLI)
Tanzania Home Economics Association
Tarangini Foundation
Tata Institute of Social Sciences
TEDS TRUST and DAWNS
THE (Together for Health and Education) SOCIETY
The Center for Building Resilient Communities
The Citizens’News
The female gender
The Gender Security Project
The Global Interfaith Network For People of All Sexes, Sexual Orientations, Gender
Identities and Expressions
The Institute for Gender and Development Studies, RCO
The International Community of Women Living with HIV
The Kvinna till Kvinna Foundation
The Queer Muslim Project
The Story Kitchen
The Syria Campaign
The Well Project
Todos Ciudadanas, AC
Toponomastica femminile
Trannational Decolonial QTPOC
Transgenders Fiji Network
Transnational United Front against Fascism

UBC
Ukrainian Association for Research in Women's History
Unchained At Last
Union Women Center Georgia
United African Diaspora
University of Namibia
University of Vigo
UNME Unión Nacional de Mujeres del Ecuador – Sede San Lorenzo
Urgent Action Fund for Women's Human Rights
US Human Rights Network
Utthan
VaGina Flor de Vida ec
Variant B – Centre for psychological counselling and psychotherapy
Vida Reavivada AC
Visible Impact
Visthar
VOICE
Wave – Women against violence Europe
We Will Speak Out South Africa
WE-Change Jamaica
WEAVING TIES
Welfare Rights Organization
Wen (Women's Environmental Network)
WESNET
WIDE+ (Women In Development Europe+) (Belgium)
WIDE+ (Women In Development Europe+) (Netherlands)
Widows Development Organisation
Widows Rights International
WILDAF-AFRIQUE DE L'OUEST
WILPF-ITALY Women's International League for Peace and freedom
Winner's women
WO=MEN Dutch Gender Platform
Wokovu Way
Womankind Worldwide
Women Advocates Research and Documentation Center
Women Against Rape(WAR) Inc.
Women against Sexual Violence and State Repression
Women Against Violence
Women and Gender Resource Centre
Women and Girls of African Descent Caucus:Descendants of Enslaved Persons brought to the Americas During the Transatlantic Slave Trade Era
Women and Health Together For The Future (WHTF)
Women and Law in Southern Africa – Mozambique
Women Democratic Front
Women Enabled International
Women Entrepreneurs Association of Nigeria (WEAN)
Women for a Change

Women for Peace and Gender Equality Initiative
Women for Peace and Unity Growth Initiative
Women for Women's Human Rights – New Ways
Women Foundation of Nigeria WFN
Women Health Together for Future
Women in Distress Organisation
Women inspiration Development Center
Women Liberty and Development Initiative
Women March Lampung
Women Transforming Cities International Society
Women Working Group (WWG)
Women's Earth and Climate Action Network (WECAN)
Women's Global Network for Reproductive Rights
Women's Human Rights Education Institute
women's initiative "One of Us"
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom Canada
Women's Legal and Human Rights Bureau, Inc. (WLB)
Women's Link Worldwide
Women's Museum in Moscow
Women's Rehabilitation Centre (WOREC) Nepal
Women's Resource and Advicacy Centre / WOMEN 2030
Women's All Points Bulletin, WAPB
Women's All Points Bulletin, WAPB
Women's Legal Centre
Women's Probono Initiative(WPI)
Women's rights and health project
World Pulse
Y Coalition
Young Feminist Europe
Youth Action Nepal
Youth Changers Kenya
Youth Development Center
YUWA
Yuwalaya
Zamara Foundation
ZamiZemiProprietorship
Zimbabwe Women's Resource Centre and Network
Zin-Ko-Doz arte sobre ruedazAanu' Rotimi



This publication was produced with the financial support of the European Union. Its contents are the sole responsibility of Oxfam DE and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Union.

PARTNERS

