

EIGE/2013/OPER/20.

**METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH TO ESTIMATE THE OVERALL BENEFITS OF SPECIFIC
POLICY REFORMS WITHIN THE GENDER POLITICAL AGENDA
ELECTORAL APPROACH TO
THE BENEFITS OF GENDER EQUALITY**

Prof. Dr. Gloria Alarcón García
University of Murcia, Spain

PROJECT PROPOSAL, BACKGROUND AND METHODOLOGY

1. Gender and public infrastructures

The need for the introduction of the gender perspective in public infrastructures is closely related to the type of socio-economic development that is intended. If we take the model pursued by the United Nations¹, human development and achievements must be measured in terms of the quality of life achieved by every person in the society, the level of well-being, of equality and the capability development of men and women.

In the last years, much has been done in equal opportunity and women's rights worldwide, in general, and in Europe, in particular. The question is to verify, with actual examples and in every sphere of public performance, if women and men really have equal opportunities to gain personal, social and economic well-being in Europe, by carrying out the actions embraced by the European agenda.

Public infrastructure planning must be conducted by considering each above-mentioned reality, as infrastructures exist to meet structural needs. It is then necessary to take into account that men and women have different duties, opportunities, needs and interests. In this way, the complete effectiveness and sustainability of the project will be granted. Infrastructures are essential to attain an empowered society that effectively uses all human resources.

One of the reasons why gender is left out of public infrastructures is because it has traditionally been a male field. Actually, women are far away from technologies and infrastructures as shown by the small number of them enrolling in these academic studies. The share of women in the total number of students, professors, researchers and managers in technological careers is small, which may be extrapolated to their presence in professional associations and in the decision-making public service.

Therefore, there is a weak participation of women in the identification, planning, execution, monitoring and assessment of policies, programs and projects on infrastructure development. Additionally, women's needs that are supposedly met by this type of investment are determined by men, logically, from a male perspective that may fail to appropriately assess the social usefulness for women of these projects.

¹ Human Development Report 2010, *The Real Wealth of Nations: Pathways to Human Development*, UN Development Programme http://www.undp.org/publications/hdr2010/es/HDR_2010_ES_Complete.pdf, downloaded on March 3rd 2011.

Thus, the gender approach must be considered in the decision-making processes of the infrastructure sphere, as this is the way to meet people's collective and integral needs and to attain general wellbeing.

The policies of public infrastructures play a fundamental role in the existence or nonexistence of changes in the current gender division of labor, the right to health and leisure, among others.

This can be inferred from the Report 2011², as it underlines that "recent analyses show to what extent power imbalance and gender inequality at national level are linked, with less access to clean water and improved sanitation". Access to clean water and improved sanitation involve policies of public infrastructures.

Like in other fields, in the sphere of infrastructures, removing the disadvantaged position on women means to achieve a major equality in opportunities and results.

Anna Bofill Levi (1998) points out that cities have been planned and built on the assumption that both sexes have some roles given by society. On the other hand, she underlines that nuclear family is the only domestic structure taken into account when projecting houses, services and facilities, leaving all new family structures apart.

Mar García Ferrer (2003), taking the works by Dolores Hayden (2003; 2004) as reference, affirms that contemporary town planning is based on the principle of *zoning*. This means that the city has different places where the main functions are developed (living and working). These functions are related to the different roles of men and women, and the male-oriented modern city planning is clear.

By performing an analysis of public policies related to the design, projection and implementation of infrastructures, Inés Sánchez de Madariaga (2004; 2006) considers that, in western countries, the transformation of gender relations and the sexual division of labor has changed the needs for services supporting families, especially, dependent persons. However, in social and urban planning policies, the answer to this situation is weak and varies depending on the country. She also considers urban planning and design of infrastructures as a key element to achieve sustainability. The level to which infrastructures can meet individuals' basic needs will determine the quality of life.

María José Lasaosa Castellanos (2006) supports that cities have been planned by men given that they reflect an organization based on their interests. This can be seen in new suburban planning, as they hardly favor women's capability development.

² Human Development Report 2011. *Sustainability and Equity: A Better Future for All*, UD Development Programme.

http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/HDR/2011%20Global%20HDR/Spanish/HD_R_2011_ES_Complete.pdf, downloaded on September 23rd 2012.

Helen Morrell (1998) considers that safety must be a key component in the implementation of public policies (Alejandra [Massolo](#) 2005) as it is an issue mainly affecting women and it is related to measures of maintenance and control that imply economic costs.

Transport policies are another key aspect in planning and performing public policies of infrastructures. They are a determinant factor in the labor market and affect people's well-being. That is why the approach from which they are dealt with will affect gender equality (Hoai Anh Tran and Ann Schlyter, 2010). There are studies that prove that public transport is used mainly by women (Carme Miralles-Guasch, 2012). Investing in this public policy gives women the chance to access the labor market and improve the quality of life. An analysis of transport-related public policies from a gender perspective would allow for an in-depth perspective.

In the field of economics, little attention has been paid to this sphere of public policies, as reflected in the scientific literature on this matter. There are few works dealing with expenditure in public infrastructures from a gender perspective.

The relevance of infrastructures in women's well-being is ever more present in the literature. Anu Rammohan and Meliyanni Johar (2009) consider that physical mobility is a key aspect to the autonomy of married women in Indonesia. Sarah Gammage (2010) examines unpaid employment in Guatemala and points out that the investment in small infrastructures and the ownership of an electric or gas stove has the potential to reduce time and income poverty in Guatemala, primarily by alleviating women's time burden and making their unpaid household work more efficient. Ragui Assaad, Deborah Levison, and Nadia Zibani (2010), when studying the effect of domestic work in school age girls, support that investing in infrastructures that reduce the drudgery of household labor is more efficient in preventing girls from such work in Egypt than those policies that attempt to ban such domestic work.

Although it is not possible to deal with every infrastructure and its impact on well-being because of little space, we will focus on the urban sphere, as it is necessary to point out that, despite its apparent neutrality and universal nature, most urban infrastructure projects lack an appropriate gender approach:

- a) The city is mostly lived and experienced by women, as they are the ones that most use the public urban space to fulfill the everyday management tasks of the household (Bofill, 1998).
- b) Women's excessive time load because of their different roles: reproductive, productive and community.
- c) Women have a limited voice in the decision-making process, because of the little control of production resources and the small share of women in senior positions.
- d) Lack of women's mobility, due to cultural factors and male dominance in transport means. Mobility has been always studied from a technical perspective by traffic engineering to make people's mobility as fast as possible, with a special focus on commuting at expense of the mobility related with household

management.

e) Safety is a key aspect that mainly affects women (Morrell, 1998) and implies maintenance and control measures that, because of economic costs, have been paid little attention to when planning public infrastructures (Massolo, 2005).

That's mean that the most relevant infrastructures for women, although sometimes they are manly related to the female role, are the following:

- Basic infrastructures:

1. Public development (squares, streets, districts, green areas)
2. Commercial development (commercial parks)
3. Public lighting
4. Electricity (installation of electricity/energy/heating)
5. Road networks (roads, roundabouts, entrances and exits of the city)
6. Water (Improvements in the drinking water supply system and sewerage system)
7. Cemeteries (Construction and rehabilitation of cemeteries)

- Social infrastructures

1. Education (nursery schools, music schools, primary schools...)
2. Sports (pools, football pitches...)
3. Social services (cultural, social, occupational centers)
4. Health (health centers, day centers...)

Nevertheless, there is little attention paid to public infrastructures and public transport from the gender perspective in developed countries.

It is necessary to avoid the disadvantageous position of women (in terms of well-being or access and control of the production factors, among others) in the sphere of infrastructures, as this means working on attaining equal opportunities and results and empowerment of women, resulting in an equal development model from the gender standpoint.

2. The EU policies

As for the EU policies on this matter, the most relevant document may be the monographic on regional investment in social development and inclusion³. It highlights two main groups of investment taking place under this heading: social inclusion activities supported mainly by the ESF and social infrastructure supported mainly by the ERDF.

Investment in **social infrastructure funded mainly by the ERDF** is delivered in all MS.

The categories reported are as follows:

³http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/how/policy/doc/strategic_report/2013/factsheet11_social_inclusion_infra.pdf

- Education infrastructure
- Health infrastructure
- Childcare infrastructure
- Housing infrastructure
- Other social infrastructure

And also the assessment of the European fund from a gender standpoint⁴. In this case, there is no investment in infrastructures, but a complementation of action to increase the number of working women, such as the investment in nursery schools that are usually supported by the DG Regio and the budget of every country⁵.

However, if applying the rule of mainstreaming of gender, we are forced to analyze the DG actions related to this subject and their annual reports⁶, and then, their budgets. From this approach, it is interesting to rapidly analyze the reports by DG Move and DG Regio.

In a very rapid overview, it is crucial to underline that there is NO SECTION or MOMENT that includes the actions planned from a gender approach.

However, in the DG Move report, this could be drawn from the following sections:

1. Promote safe and secure transport
2. Promote quality transport services and working conditions.
3. Promote a modern urban mobility

In the first section, “A report has been produced on the implementation of Directive 2003/59/EC concerning the training of professional drivers, highlighting in its conclusions the wide difference in the training systems of the various Member States”. Why does not it ensure the promotion of women as professional drivers?

As to the second one, is the gender perspective included in the study on jobs and working conditions across all modes of transport has been entrusted to the JRC-IPTS14 Seville in 2012 conducted. The work will include a modelling-based quantitative analysis of employment and skills issues backed by a qualitative analysis of potential shortages. It will be completed in January 2014. In order to examine the possibility of organizing a conference of European Works Councils (EWC) contacts are underway with the social partners concerned¹⁵.

Finally, in the third section, “Promote a modern urban mobility”, The Commission launched a review on the implementation of urban mobility action plan and identification of further action. Furthermore, Vice-President Kallas announced for 2013 an urban mobility package and, in this context, a public consultation and an impact assessment study were launched. Three new CIVITAS¹⁷ projects were successfully launched at the end of 2012. In total CIVITAS demonstration projects now represent an investment volume of well over €300 million. A conference has been held in

⁴ Nota a pie de p. 21, p. 83.

⁵ That is the case of Bélgica, Chipre...

⁶ http://ec.europa.eu/atwork/synthesis/aar/index_en.htm

September 2012 for the 10th anniversary of CIVITAS. A three-year Europe-wide awareness-raising campaign has been initiated, worth €3 million (www.dotherightmix.eu). On 10 July 2012, the Commission launched the Smart Cities and Communities European Innovation Partnership ('EIP'). The partnership proposes to pool resources to support the demonstration of energy, transport and information and communication technologies (ICT) in urban areas. Is the gender approach considered in this action?

From the superficial analysis of these DG activities, it is easy to think that there are not disaggregated data of the actions by gender, which is totally advisable and, even, an imperative.

As to the report by Directorate-General for Regional and Urban Policy -DG REGIO-, from a quickly analysis, it is necessary to consider whether “the main trends show a shift towards R&D, business support, sustainable energy, cultural and social infrastructure, roads and labor market across the EU-27”, and of in 2012, the main activities of the DG REGIO were organized around the following axes:

- Achieving the sound and efficient use of Funds (including Pre-accession Funds) to channel investments for growth and jobs
- Enhancing the added value and effectiveness of Cohesion Policy
- Preparing the implementation of Cohesion Policy post-2013 in line with the Europe 2020 Strategy, and advancing as far as possible with the negotiations on the legislative package
- Coordinating specific EU territorial policies
- Improving the efficiency and quality of key internal processes

The gender approach must be present in every axis. But this is not the reality or, at least, the report does not show so.

Besides, this should be included in the Policy results and contribution to the Europe 2020 Strategy to date on the Smart Growth and on the Inclusive Growth, in which there are transport and environmental infrastructure projects.

If we look at the Examples of investments for Major Projects approved by the Commission, we wonder if they have considered the gender approach.

Anyway, we suggest that the gender approach is included in the Pilot projects and preparatory actions under the 2012 budget of the DG REGIO and data on the beneficiaries are collected for future actions.

The DG REGIO implemented pilot projects initiated by the European Parliament and preparatory actions, including:

- The continuation of the pilot project ‘Definition of a government model for the Danube Region’ and the preparatory action ‘Towards a common regional identity, reconciliation of nations and economic and social cooperation including a Pan-European Expertise and Excellence Platform in the Danube Macro-Region’ for the EU Strategy for the Danube Region

- The continuation of the Technical Assistance action for the EU Strategy for the Baltic Region
- The continuation of the preparatory action RURBAN Partnership for sustainable urban-rural development
- The continuation of the Pilot Project 'Promotion of EU Regional Policy' and the implementation of the related preparatory action; • a new preparatory action for supporting the overseas region, Mayotte (see also section below 1.5.1

Another key aspect is that in 2012, DG Regional and Urban Policy continued to undertake its evaluation work on the current programs, especially through the Expert Evaluation Network, which is now in its third year of operation. Every year the expert network produces country reports on the achievements of Cohesion Policy and on a selected theme. For 2012, the network of experts produced 27 policy papers on the topic of financial instruments whose main findings were summarized in a synthesis report (see also section 1.1.2.8 on FEI). The network also produced a report on the achievements of Cohesion Policy for each Member State, whose main findings are summarized in a synthesis report. This commission should include experts in gender to assess the achievements of Cohesion Policy and on a selected theme.

This would be a must also in order to guide Member States and Regions with their preparations for the next programming period, a "Common Strategic Framework" (CSF) will provide strategic direction on how to achieve an integrated development approach using the European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF) coordinated with other Union policies and instruments in order to achieve the objectives and targets of the Europe 2020 strategy in order to work together to achieve smart and sustainable growth.

Gender perspective should have been present in the first "Urban Forum" organized by the DG REGIO in February 2012, a political dialogue on future urban challenge which has set the scene for a dialogue between the European Commissioner for Regional Policy and Cities on the future urban dimension of Cohesion Policy. But was it?

In the monitoring stage of the DG REGIO projects, experts in public and gender policies must be present in every phase of the process, taking part in the Code of Conduct for Commissioners and auditing the projects, to ensure the correct monitoring of implementation of all programs and audit activities.

Finally, it seems to be necessary for the DG REGIO to establish collaboration relationships with the EIGE, as they do with the European Court of Auditors and OLAF to present its conclusions in a first section dedicated to share management (ERDF, Cohesion Fund, IPA-Cross Border Cooperation component).

3. The Capability approach

The Capability Approach advises to study the effects of public policy on the capability development of men and women, as it considers that the economic development must focus on the development of everyone's capabilities (Amartya Sen 1980; 1985 and

1985a; Martha C. Nussbaum 2002; 2009). This means that the capability assessment can be used for different purposes, from poverty evaluation to the assessment of human rights or human development (Amartya Sen 2004).

According to these authors, well-being and development must not be measured in accordance with the resources available but with those things people are able to do or be. Additionally, Martha C. Nussbaum (2009) highlights that capability means “opportunity to choose”, which implies that the freedom to choose is within the concept of capability.

This approach implies that the indicators to be taken into account when assessing economic development and progress must provide direct information on the quality of life, well-being and degree of satisfaction of individual and collective needs, as well as the freedoms the individuals can enjoy (Mozaffar Qizilbash, 2005). Additionally, it is necessary to establish a minimum threshold, under which human dignity is not guaranteed (Martha C. Nussbaum, 2002). We can then define the poverty line as a minimum level of capabilities, and measure the equality of groups in a society, or equality across societies, by the equality of capability sets (Keiht Dowding, 2006).

The approach of human capabilities pursues an economic and social model that is sustainable and fair by providing a legal framework for the assessment and ranking of the well-being of people and social organization, in order to design public policies and make suggestions of social changes in an organized group (Ingrid Robeyns 2005). From this perspective, it is necessary to admit the differentiated situation of men and women in relation to their well-being and capability development when it comes to deciding on public policies (Paloma Villota et al. 2009). Regarding infrastructures, Sen has warned that urban planning is a little studied field but really relevant from the capability approach (Amartya Sen 2009).

4. The capability approach and the expenditures in public infrastructures and transport

To apply the capability approach and the measure the level of the well-being in a society, Martha C. Nussbaum (2009) and also Robeys (2005) elaborated a list of capabilities. We have adapted those lists to an economic approach to simplify the construction of indicators.

Our capability list is the following:

1. Physical and mental health
2. Integrity and security
3. Social Relationships
4. Education and culture
5. Unpaid work (Care and domestics works)
6. Labor market
7. Environment
8. Mobility
9. Leisure

4.1. The method

We have shortlisted Martha Nussbaum (2012) and Ingrid Robeyns (2005) range of capabilities to a total of 9 capabilities. We have also made our own interpretation of some of their concepts. That was necessary because, in the case of Martha Nussbaum work, her terminology is too philosophy-tailored, and we do economic research. And we have proposed to our male and female students (November 2012) to rate each s in a 1-5 (one to five) range, being the highest rate the most relevant and the lowest the least relevant.

Public infrastructures and capabilities (Women average)

	PUNTUACIÓN								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Education									
1.1 Nursery schools.	3,6 3	3,3 8	4,5 0	4,1 7	3,0 0	3,7 5	2,5 4	3,1 3	3,2 9
1.2 Primary and Secondary Schools	3,9 2	3,5 0	4,7 1	4,5 4	2,9 6	4,2 5	3,0 0	3,2 5	3,4 2
2. sports									
2.1. Football pitches	2,5 0	2,2 5	3,4 2	2,0 8	1,8 3	1,5 8	2,0 8	2,5 0	3,5 0
2.2. Sports courts	3,2 9	2,5 8	3,5 4	2,5 8	2,2 1	1,9 6	2,2 1	2,6 3	3,9 2
2.3 Pools	3,8 3	3,0 8	3,7 9	2,7 9	2,3 8	1,9 2	2,2 9	2,8 8	4,2 1
3. Health and social services									
3.1. Senior Centers	3,4 2	3,5 0	4,0 8	3,0 0	3,3 3	2,2 1	2,0 8	2,6 3	3,4 6
3.2. Geriatric Center	3,4 2	3,2 5	2,9 6	2,0 4	3,0 4	2,4 2	1,9 2	2,5 8	2,2 1
3.3. Health Centers	4,4 6	3,8 8	2,5 8	2,1 7	2,7 1	3,0 8	2,1 7	3,2 1	1,6 7
4 Public Development									
4.1 Improvements in pedestrian areas	3,4 2	4,3 3	2,9 2	2,4 2	2,6 7	2,3 3	2,9 6	3,9 6	2,9 6
4.2 Cemeteries	2,0 0	2,0 0	2,2 1	1,8 8	1,9 2	1,2 9	2,1 7	2,1 7	1,8 3
4.3 Churches, convents, chapels ...	2,1 3	2,0 4	2,4 2	2,4 2	2,1 3	1,5 4	1,7 5	2,0 8	2,0 0
4.4 Public Lighting	3,2 1	3,9 2	3,1 7	2,4 6	2,6 3	2,3 3	2,5 0	3,5 8	3,0 4
4.5 Municipal markets and commercial development	2,6 7	3,1 3	4,0 0	3,1 3	2,9 6	2,8 8	2,2 1	3,1 7	3,8 8
4.6 Parks	3,8 3	3,5 4	4,4 2	3,2 1	2,9 2	2,1 3	3,9 6	3,1 3	4,4 2

7. Transport										
5.1 Public Transport	2,9 2	3,5 4	3,6 3	3,0 4	2,8 3	3,5 4	5,0 0	4,2 1	3,2 5	
5.2 Private transport	2,9 2	3,4 2	4,3 3	2,2 9	3,2 5	3,3 8	2,2 1	4,4 6	3,6 7	
6. Environment:										
6.1 Sewerage	3,8 8	3,7 1	1,6 7	2,3 3	2,2 1	2,2 1	3,5 4	2,0 0	1,7 5	
6.2 Drinking Water supply	4,5 8	3,9 6	2,3 3	2,9 6	2,3 3	2,5 0	3,6 3	2,3 8	2,0 4	
6.3 Waste Containers	4,0 8	3,7 1	2,0 8	2,7 9	2,4 2	2,3 3	4,2 9	2,8 8	1,9 2	
6.4 Green areas and environmental complexes	4,2 5	3,7 9	3,8 8	3,4 6	2,8 3	2,7 5	4,5 0	2,6 7	3,7 9	

Public infrastructures and capabilities (Men average)

	PUNTUACIÓN								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Education									
1.1 Nursery schools	4,5 6	3,7 6	4,5 6	4,6 4	2,5 6	 3,6	 3,2	3,2 4	3,3 2
1.2 Primary and Secondary Schools	4,4 4	3,6 8	 4,8	4,8 8	2,9 6	4,2 8	3,3 6	3,4 8	3,6 8
2. sports									
2.1. Football pitches	3,9 6	2,4 8	 4,2	2,7 2	2,2 8	 2,2	2,7 2	3,0 8	4,7 6
2.2. Sports courts	 4,4	2,7 6	4,4 8	3,0 4	2,4 4	2,5 2	2,6 8	3,0 4	4,6 4
2.3 Pools	 4,4	3,0 4	3,7 6	2,7 6	 2	2,2 8	2,4 4	2,7 6	4,4 4
3. Health and social services									
3.1. Senior Centers	3,7 2	3,9 6	4,2 4	 3	2,5 6	 1,8	2,5 6	2,3 6	3,6 4
3.2. Geriatric Center	 3,6	3,9 6	3,5 6	2,6 4	2,6 8	1,9 2	2,5 6	 2,2	2,9 6
3.3. Health Centers	4,5 2	4,3 6	 2,6	2,4 4	2,5 6	2,8 4	2,6 4	2,5 6	2,0 8
4 Public Development									
4.1 Improvements in pedestrian areas	3,2 8	4,1 2	 2,4	2,2 4	 1,8	2,2 4	3,1 2	 4,4	3,1 2
4.2 Cemeteries	1,6 8	1,9 6	1,9 2	1,6 4	1,5 6	1,3 6	2,2 4	1,9 6	1,8 8
4.3 Churches, convents, chapels ...	 1,6	1,5 2	2,1 6	2,1 2	 1,8	1,2 4	1,5 2	1,6 4	1,6 8
4.4 Public Lighting	3,2	3,7	2,8	2,1	1,7	2,1	2,8	3,7	3,1

	4	6	4	6	2	2		6	2
4.5 Municipal markets and commercial development	2,9 6	2,8 8	3,5 2	2,4	1,7 6	2,9 6	2,5 2	2,7 6	3,1 6
4.6 Parks	3,6 4	3,3 6	4,3 6	2,8 4	2,1 6	1,8 4	4,3 2	3,2 8	4,2 8
7. Transport									
5.1 Public Transport	2,4 4	3,1 2	3,4	2,5 6	2,1 2	3,5 2	4,0 4	4,3 2	2,8 4
5.2 Private transport	2,9 2	3,3 2	2,3 6	2,2 4	2,1 2	3,7 6	2,1 6	4,5 6	3
6. Environment:									
6.1 Sewerage	3,5 2	3,2	1,6 4	1,8	1,6	2,2 4	4,4	2,6 4	1,7 6
6.2 Drinking Water supply	4,3 2	3,8 8	1,8	2,0 4	1,9 2	2,4	4,3 2	2,4 4	1,9 2
6.3 Waste Containers	4,0 8	3,8	1,6	2,2	2,0 4	2,2	4,7 6	2,3 6	1,9 6
6.4 Green areas and environmental complexes	4,2 4	3,5 2	3,3 2	2,8 8	2,1 2	2,2 4	4,7 2	2,6 8	3,3 2

Transport and capabilities (Women average)

	PUNTUACIÓN								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Mobility									
1.1. Be able to leave home	4,6	4,3	4,9	4,3	4,0	4,1	3,1	4,5	4,7
1.2. Do many daily trips	3,8	3,4	4,3	3,7	3,3	3,9	2,6	4,1	3,8
1.3. Do few daily trips	3,0	3,2	2,8	2,8	3,0	2,4	3,1	2,6	2,7
1.4. Long trips	3,0	2,6	3,3	2,8	3,1	2,9	2,4	3,6	3,0
2. Means of transport									
2.1. Use private bicycle	4,0	3,4	2,9	4,7	3,3	2,8	4,6	3,6	3,1
2.2. Use public bicycle	3,6	3,4	3,1	3,3	3,2	2,6	4,7	3,8	3,2
2.3. Use railway transport	3,2	3,8	3,6	3,3	2,9	3,3	3,7	4,0	2,9
2.4. Use public road transport	3,2	3,6	3,8	3,5	2,9	3,4	3,8	4,0	3,0
2.5. Use collective road transport	3,2	3,4	3,8	3,5	2,9	3,3	3,8	4,1	3,0
2.6. Use private transport as a driver	3,4	3,5	2,8	2,9	2,7	3,5	1,8	4,1	3,6
2.7. Use private transport as a passenger	3,1	3,2	3,5	2,8	2,9	3,0	2,2	3,6	3,6
3. City									
3.1. Pedestrians areas	3,9	4,1	3,8	3,2	3,2	3,0	3,8	3,7	3,5
3.2. Multifunctional Spaces	4,1	3,7	4,3	3,8	3,2	3,5	3,2	3,4	4,0
3.3. Industrial parks near home	2,2	2,3	2,4	2,2	2,7	3,5	2,1	3,2	2,6
3.4. Playgrounds near home	4,1	4,1	4,2	3,5	3,3	3,0	3,6	3,4	4,2
3.5. Motorways near industrial parks housing	2,1	2,3	2,5	2,5	2,8	3,6	2,1	4,0	2,9

3.6. Motorways near industrial parks	2,7	2,5	2,1	2,2	2,4	3,8	2,0	3,7	2,0
3.7. Motorways near shopping malls	3,6	3,0	3,5	2,5	3,0	3,0	2,2	4,1	3,8
3.8. Train/metro station near home	3,4	3,2	3,4	3,3	3,1	3,8	2,8	4,1	3,8
3.9. Train/metro station near industrial parks	3,0	3,0	2,6	2,3	2,6	3,8	2,7	3,6	2,5
4. Accessibility									
4.1. Get to work on foot	4,1	4,1	3,7	3,4	3,5	3,6	4,7	3,9	2,6
4.2. Get to leisure area on foot	4,0	3,8	4,1	3,2	3,5	2,8	4,3	3,9	3,9
4.3. Get to the doctor's / hospital on foot	3,9	3,7	3,0	2,9	3,8	2,8	4,3	3,7	2,7
4.4. Get to shopping center on foot	3,8	3,6	4,0	3,2	3,6	2,6	4,6	3,9	3,8
4.5. Get to work by public transport	3,6	3,7	3,6	3,2	3,3	3,9	3,9	4,1	2,8
4.6. Get to leisure area by public transport	3,6	3,4	3,6	3,0	3,3	2,9	3,7	4,1	3,8
4.7. Get to the doctor's / hospital by public transport	3,8	3,4	3,0	2,7	3,4	2,9	3,5	4,0	2,9
4.8. Get to work by private transport	3,5	3,5	2,4	2,9	2,9	3,8	2,2	4,4	2,6
4.9. Get to leisure area by private transport	3,5	3,5	2,8	2,5	2,6	3,0	2,2	4,4	3,6
4.10 Get to shopping center by private transport	3,5	3,4	2,6	2,4	2,8	2,8	1,9	4,2	3,5
5. Environment:									
5.1. Use CO2 emitting transport	2,2	2,4	2,4	2,6	2,4	2,7	2,2	3,5	2,6
5.2. Use non-polluting transport	4,1	4,0	3,1	3,5	2,8	3,1	4,2	3,5	3,2
5.3. Traffic noise environment	2,0	1,8	1,7	1,8	2,0	2,3	1,9	2,4	2,0

Transport and capabilities (Men average)

	PUNTUACIÓN								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Mobility									
1.1. Be able to leave home	4,8	3,8	4,9	4,5	3,2	4,8	3,4	4,8	4,8
1.2. Do many daily trips	3,5	2,9	3,8	3,5	2,5	3,9	2,6	3,7	3,9
1.3. Do few daily trips	3,2	3,5	2,7	2,9	2,5	3,3	3,2	3,2	3,0
1.4. Long trips	2,6	2,5	2,7	2,8	2,4	2,9	2,2	3,1	2,8
2. Means of transport									
2.1. Use private bicycle	4,4	2,7	3,0	2,8	2,6	3,0	4,0	4,0	3,4
2.2. Use public bicycle	3,7	2,7	3,2	3,0	2,6	3,0	3,8	3,8	3,2
2.3. Use railway transport	3,1	3,4	3,5	2,9	2,3	3,5	3,4	3,8	3,1
2.4. Use public road transport	3,0	3,2	3,6	3,1	2,3	3,5	3,3	4,2	3,2
2.5. Use collective road transport	3,0	3,1	3,8	3,1	2,5	3,4	3,3	3,6	3,3
2.6. Use private transport as a driver	3,3	3,3	2,2	3,0	2,8	4,2	1,9	4,1	3,7
2.7. Use private transport as a passenger	2,8	2,9	3,3	3,0	2,3	3,9	2,2	3,9	3,5
3. City									
3.1. Pedestrians areas	3,7	4,0	3,3	3,2	2,5	3,0	3,7	3,5	3,3
3.2. Multifunctional Spaces	4,2	3,7	4,0	3,5	2,7	3,0	3,4	3,4	3,7

3.3. Industrial parks near home	2,4	2,5	2,5	2,2	2,2	3,9	2,4	3,3	2,6
3.4. Playgrounds near home	3,3	3,5	3,7	3,0	2,5	2,7	3,3	3,5	3,5
3.5. Motorways near industrial parks housing	3,0	2,6	2,1	2,3	2,8	3,8	2,5	4,5	3,0
3.6. Motorways near industrial parks	2,9	3,0	2,3	2,3	2,3	4,0	2,4	3,9	2,4
3.7. Motorways near shopping malls	3,3	2,9	2,9	2,5	2,4	3,5	2,4	3,8	3,3
3.8. Train / metro station near home	3,0	3,0	2,8	2,9	2,3	3,5	2,7	3,7	3,1
3.9. Train / metro station near industrial parks	2,9	3,1	2,6	2,3	2,6	3,8	2,8	4,0	3,1
4. Accessibility									
4.1. Get to work on foot	3,8	3,3	3,3	3,2	2,9	3,9	4,4	3,8	3,3
4.2. Get to leisure area on foot	3,8	3,5	3,5	3,1	2,8	3,5	4,3	3,7	3,7
4.3. Get to the doctor's / hospital on foot	3,7	3,7	2,8	2,8	2,6	3,1	4,3	3,9	3,3
4.4. Get to shopping center on foot	3,6	3,2	3,3	2,6	2,7	3,2	4,2	3,8	3,3
4.5. Get to work by public transport	3,2	3,0	3,2	2,9	2,5	3,7	3,9	4,1	2,9
4.6. Get to leisure area by public transport	3,3	3,2	3,4	3,0	2,6	3,2	3,4	4,1	3,6
4.7. Get to the doctor's/hospital by public transport	3,5	3,3	2,9	2,5	3,0	2,8	3,3	4,3	3,4
4.8. Get to work by private transport	3,3	3,0	2,2	2,4	2,4	3,7	2,5	4,2	3,4
4.9. Get to leisure area by private transport	3,3	2,9	2,4	2,4	2,5	3,4	2,5	4,1	3,4
4.10 Get to shopping center by private transport	3,3	2,9	2,4	2,5	2,8	3,1	2,3	4,0	2,9
5. Environment:									
5.1. Use CO2 emitting transport	2,4	2,2	1,7	2,0	2,3	2,8	1,7	3,5	2,5
5.2. Use non-polluting transport	3,8	3,4	2,4	2,7	2,4	2,8	4,3	3,4	2,3
5.3. Traffic noise environment	1,9	2,0	1,6	1,9	1,9	2,5	2,5	2,4	1,9

5. Conclusions

The design and implementation of public infrastructures is a crucial issue to achieve sustainability in a gender perspective and to make human rights of every person –men and womens- as a real think. They are meant to meet the basic needs of citizens who are different regarding gender, given the different roles played by men and women in the European society.

It is necessary to avoid the disadvantageous position of women (in terms of well-being or access and control of the production factors, among others) in the sphere of infrastructures, as this means working on attaining equal opportunities and results and empowerment of women, resulting in an equal development model from the gender standpoint.

However there is little attention paid to public infrastructures and public transport policies from the gender perspective in developed countries.

In particular, public policies designed by the EU DGs Move and Regio do not include, in any case, this perspective, which, in my opinion, is very wrong and should be quite different.

The capability approach is a good tool to measure how public policies affect the well-being of women and men, and is therefore a tool that should be used when projecting such policies.

Some quickly results of our research that can give us some answer to the questions we first put.

We will start with the case of lighting. According to our Surrey, lighting brings to women benefits that are going far beyond the mere light it provides. Just watch item number 5 unpaid work and number 2, integrity and security.

In case of sport, infrastructures are perceived differently by men and women in terms of all capability listed

By public transport: Women can rate higher than men public transport when it comes to most of the capabilities, with the only exception of mobility, nº 9.

6. Bibliography

Assaad, Ragui; Levison, Deborah & Zibani, Nadia. 2010. "The effect of domestic work on girls' schooling : evidence from Egypt." *Feminist economics* 16 (1): 79-128.

Bofill Levi, Anna. 1998. *De la ciudad actual a la ciudad habitable*.
<http://www.lamujerconstruye.org/encuentros/es/iencuentro.htm>

Dowding, Keith. 2006. "Can Capabilities Reconcile Freedom and Equality?." *The Journal of Political Philosophy* 14 (3): 323-336

Gammage, Sarah. 2010. "Time pressed and time poor: unpaid household work in Guatemala." *Feminist Economics* 16(3): 79-112.

García Ferrer, Mar. 2003. "Infraestructuras para la vida cotidiana", *Segundo Seminario Internacional sobre Género y Urbanismo Infraestructuras para la vida cotidiana* Madrid, 27 y 28 de mayo de 2002,
<http://www.generourban.org/seminario%202002PDF/Ferrer%20Garcia%20Mar%20Generourban%202003.pdf>, (upload 20/1/2012)

Hayden, Dolores. 2003. *Building Suburbia: Green Fields and Urban Growth, 1820-2000*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Hayden, Dolores and Wark, Jim. 2004. *A Field Guide to Sprawl* New York: W.W. Norton.

Informe sobre Desarrollo Humano 2010, La verdadera riqueza de las naciones: Camino al desarrollo humano, Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo en http://www.undp.org/publications/hdr2010/es/HDR_2010_ES_Complete.pdf, descargado el 3 de marzo de 2011.

Lasaosa Castellanos, María José. 2006. "Ciudad y mujer." <http://www.ciudaddemujeres.com/articulos/Ciudad-y-Mujer>

Massolo, Alejandra. 2005. "Género y seguridad ciudadana: el papel y reto de los gobiernos locales." [ECA: Estudios centroamericanos](#) 681-682: 643-658.

Miralles-Guasch, Carme. 2012. "Las divergencias de género en las pautas de movilidad en Cataluña, según edad y tamaño del municipio", *Revista Latino-Americana de Geografía e Género* 3 (2) <http://www.eventos.uepq.br/ojs2/index.php/rlagg/article/viewArticle/3254>.

Morrell, Helen. 1998. "Seguridad de las mujeres en la ciudad", in Booth, C, Darke, J. y Yeandle, S. (ed.): *La vida de las mujeres en las ciudades. La ciudad, un espacio para el cambio.* pp. 131-146. Madrid: Narcea.

Nussbaum, Martha C.:

- 2002. *Las mujeres y el desarrollo humano. El enfoque de las capacidades*, Barcelona: Ed. Herder,
- 2009. "Creating capabilities: The human development approach and its implementation." *Hypatia, Special Issue: Transgender Studies and Feminism: Theory, Politics, and Gendered Realities* 24(3): 211-215.
- 2012. *Crear capacidades. Propuesta para el desarrollo humano*, Barcelona: Espasa.

Qizilbash, Mozaffar. 2005. "Sen On Freedom And Gender Justice." *Feminist Economics, Taylor and Francis Journals* vol. 11(3): 151-166.

Rammohan, Anu & Johar, Meliyanni (2009): "The determinants of married women's autonomy in Indonesia." *Feminist Economics* 15 (4): 31-55.

Robeyns, Ingrid. 2005. "The capability Approach: a theoretical survey." *Journal of Human Development* 6 (1): 93-114.

Sánchez de Madariaga, Inés.:

- 2004. "Infraestructuras para la vida cotidiana y la calidad de vida." *Ciudades* 8:101-133.
- 2006. *Urbanismo con perspectiva de género*, Instituto Andaluz de la Mujer, Junta de Andalucía. En: *Foro Social Europeo*. Sevilla. Upload on 20-01-2012 <http://www.juntadeandalucia.es/institutodelamujer/institutodelamujer/ugen/sites/default/files/documentos/98.pdf>

Sen, Amartya:

- 1980. *"Equality of What"* in McMurrin, S. (ed.) *Tanner Lectures on Human Values*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 1985. *Commodities and Capabilities*, Amsterdam: North Holland.
- 1985a. *"Well-being, Agency and Freedom: The Dewey Lectures 1984"*. *Journal of Philosophy*, 82.
- 2004. *Elements of a Theory of Human Rights*, *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 32 (4):315.
- 2009. *La idea de justicia*, Madrid:Taurus Pensamiento.

Villota, Paloma: Jubeto, Yolanda & Ferrari, Ignacio. 2009. *Estrategias para la integración de la perspectiva de género en los presupuestos públicos*, Instituto de la Mujer, Madrid: Ministerio de Igualdad.

Tran, Hoai Anh & Schlyter, Ann. 2010. *"Gender and class in urban transport: Cases of Xian and Hanoi."* *Environment and Urbanization* 22 (1): 139-155.