



ROOM DOCUMENT NO. 3

DAC WORKING PARTY ON AID EVALUATION

EVALUATION AND GENDER

Submitted by AusAID

[This note is submitted for consideration. Please note that the shaded paragraphs in the report indicate a new issue or an aspect of the study not previously discussed.]

Agenda item 4i.

**36th meeting
29-30 May 2002**

PROGRESS REPORT: REVIEW ON GENDER AND EVALUATION

Purpose of this Progress Report

1. This Progress Report provides an update on the Review on Gender and Evaluation. It summarises and seeks comment on the review framework, the database for the review, some preliminary findings, the next steps to be taken, and areas where collaboration is needed with other Members.

Background to the Review on Gender and Evaluation

2. A discussion paper in 2001 by the Secretariat outlined 3 options for future work on gender and evaluation.¹ These 3 options have been integrated in the approach to the current review. Terms of Reference for the review were drafted in February 2002 and circulated for comment among interested Members. This resulted in a broadening of scope for the review, and a more realistic time frame. Australia contracted a consultant to begin the review in March 2002, and expects to circulate a draft final report for comment in early October 2002.

Review Methodology and Proposed Outputs

3. **Annex 1 summarises the draft framework for review** of evaluation documents. The methodological framework has a positive focus on distilling and sharing experience in 3 areas:

- i. The use of innovative, practical and effective **evaluation methodologies, approaches or tools** for evaluating changes in gender equality, gender mainstreaming or women's empowerment.
- ii. **Institutional approaches and change mechanisms** which have successfully responded to recurrent obstacles to gender mainstreaming.
- iii. Assessments of **whether gender analysis and gender mainstreaming improves the achievement of overall development results.**

4. A Data Sheet for assessing evaluation reports has been developed and tested using both thematic and non-thematic evaluation reports. In response to comments by interested Members, a questionnaire has been drafted (but not yet tested) for follow up of innovative methods and tools identified in evaluation reports (see Annex 3).

5. **Annex 2 summarises steps in the review process leading to final outputs** envisaged in the Secretariat's 2001 Discussion Paper:

- i. A discussion note or "toolbox" on innovative approaches/tools
- ii. A short policy note or communiqué on institutional approaches
- iii. A study or report synthesising the implications of gender sensitive approaches and links to improved development results.

¹ "Options for Future Work on Gender Equality by the DAC Working Party on Evaluation: A Discussion Paper" (Note by the Secretariat) DCD/DAC/EV(2001)4, October 2001.

Database of the Review

6. The Terms of Reference for the Review identified 2 types of evaluations to be included in the database:

- Thematic evaluations conducted since 1999 which have been specifically designed to evaluate gender equality, gender mainstreaming and women's empowerment efforts. WP-EV's planned matrix of evaluations indicated that up to 21 documents in this category may be available for the review.
- Non-thematic evaluations conducted since 1999 which have not been specifically designed to evaluate gender equality policies or initiatives, but which have included significant gender analysis. (Three criteria for selection of these evaluations are outlined in paragraph 3 above.) WP-EV's Inventory of evaluations indicated that up to 66 documents in this category may be available for the review.

7. **Annex 4 summarises documents received** to date:

- 23 thematic evaluations have been received compared with a total of 32 identified, and 7 of those received (30%) have been reviewed.
- 35 non-thematic evaluations have been received compared with a total of 66 identified, and 17 of those received (49%) have been reviewed.
- 11 other documents have also been submitted to the review, including 5 evaluation guides; 4 reviews of experiences, lessons, good practices and case studies; and 2 evaluation reports from non-government organisations (NGOs).

8. During consultation with interested Members on the Terms of Reference, it was recommended that other material, other than evaluation reports, also be included in the database, such as reviews, lessons learned and other assessments conducted by agencies on gender analysis and quality. It was suggested that direct contact should be made with Gender Focal Points in member agencies, to access other relevant documents, particularly those which address institutional approaches and change mechanisms. This will be undertaken after evaluation documents have been assessed, so that further research is well-targeted and informed by review findings.

9. To date, the evaluation database for the review has been confined to evaluations undertaken by member agencies and observers. Some innovative work is being undertaken on gender audit methods, mostly led by NGOs. **It is recommended that a selection of gender audit methods and reports be included in the review** (primarily from NGOs), to provide a more comprehensive overview of innovative and participatory evaluation tools and methods.

Preliminary Findings

10. The review is still in stage 1 (document review, see Annex 2). Follow up by questionnaire and through interviews (stages 2 and 3, by phone, email or in person) has yet to begin. Despite the very preliminary stage of the review, the following points can be made:

- i. Some **innovative tools and approaches** have been identified for follow up and for potential inclusion in the toolbox, which may help to provide guidance to members on information and analysis requirements for gender sensitive evaluation, and their links to standard evaluation criteria.
- ii. Significant agreement on successful strategies and design features **for addressing recurrent institutional obstacles** to gender mainstreaming is emerging from evaluations reviewed to date. Evidence relates to various

levels of institutionalisation (policy formulation, policy dialogue, country strategies, donor organisation, partner organisation, intervention/activity/project level, and community level), and for the most part confirms findings from other studies and good practice examples.

- iii. So far, there is little evidence in evaluation reports on the **links between gender mainstreaming and improved development outcomes**. However, it is expected that areas for further research will be identified. (One area of agreement in evaluations reviewed to date is the need to make explicit links between gender equality and other development cooperation goals, particularly poverty reduction.) It will also be possible to identify specific gender mainstreaming initiatives which are more likely, on current evidence, to improve development outcomes.

11. Many non-thematic evaluations reviewed to date reveal a limited approach to analysing gender issues and outcomes. The final review report will include a summary of attention to gender issues in non-thematic evaluations. This will enable a comparison to be made with findings from the previous review undertaken in 1999.²

Next Steps and Collaboration Needed With Other Agencies

12. In consultations on the draft Terms of Reference, some members highlighted the importance of following up the document review by conducting interviews with agency staff and consultants who have undertaken evaluations. Preliminary work undertaken to date confirms the value of this approach for assessing how evaluation tools have been applied. Participatory fieldwork methodologies and tools are rarely described in detail in evaluation reports. While email and telephone interviews will help to fill out the picture, face-to-face interviews will be required in some cases. Collaboration with another member at this stage of the review will assist to achieve greater coverage.

13. A workshop on Gender and Evaluation is proposed, focusing on each of the 3 areas of the review, before outputs are finalised. The purpose of the workshop will be to share findings from the review in all areas, receive input on the discussion note and toolbox on evaluation methods and tools (which will assist with design, quality and targeting of the “toolbox”), and identify areas for further follow up work on institutionalisation and the links between gender equality and development outcomes. Another lead or collaborating agency needs to be identified by WP-EV for facilitation of this workshop, which should ideally take place in 2003. Collaboration will also be requested to finalise outputs from the review (see paragraph 5 above and Annex 2).

² Woodford-Berger, Prudence 1999 “Evaluating Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment: A DAC Review of Agency Experiences 1993-1998” Final Draft Report, Prepared for the DAC Working Party on Aid Evaluation; Keller, Bonnie 2000 “Report on the DAC Workshop on Evaluating Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment, 25-26 November 1999, Stockholm” Prepared for the DAC Working Party on Aid Evaluation.

ANNEX 1:

DRAFT FRAMEWORK FOR REVIEW OF EVALUATION DOCUMENTS

Criteria 1: Evaluation Methodology	Criteria 2: Institutional Approaches & Change Mechanisms	Criteria 3: Linking Gender Mainstreaming with Improved Development Outcomes
<p>1.1 Features of evaluation methodology</p> <p>1.1.1 Description of tools, frameworks, processes, sampling methods</p> <p>1.1.2 Details of participatory & social analysis methods used (community based; involvement of local partners; applications where participatory approaches were not used during planning or implementation)</p> <p>1.1.3 Approaches to data collection where information on gender issues is scarce</p> <p>1.1.4 Approaches to data collection where there has been no/little gender mainstreaming</p> <p>1.1.5 Assessment of tools/frameworks/approaches: is the approach innovative? How? Should it be included in the final product (“toolbox”)?</p>	<p>2.1 Institutional blocks to gender mainstreaming</p> <p>2.1.1 Does the evaluation include any information or analysis on institutional blocks to gender mainstreaming?</p> <p>2.1.2 Identify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Donor / partner / other stakeholder / community perspective? ▪ Different levels of institutionalisation ▪ Type of assistance 	<p>3.1 Link between gender mainstreaming & improved development outcomes</p> <p>3.1.1 Were program/project objectives or other parts of program/project design improved through gender analysis?</p> <p>3.1.2 Has a gender sensitive approach during implementation improved development outcomes (whether or not the design & objectives were gender sensitive)?</p>
<p>1.2 Evaluation TORs (non-thematic) *</p> <p>1.2.1 Attention to gender analysis information & analysis requirements (potential gender issues; reference to gender sensitive indicators)</p> <p>1.2.2 Attention to gender expertise & team/team leader responsibilities for incorporating gender analysis</p> <p>1.2.3 Attention to partner/stakeholder participation & consultation</p>	<p>2.2 Information or analysis on successful responses to institutional blocks</p> <p>2.2.1 What has been successful & why?</p> <p>2.2.2 What has not been successful & why not?</p> <p>2.2.3 Identify perspective, levels of institutionalisation & type of assistance (see above)</p>	<p>3.2 Millennium Development Goals</p> <p>3.2.1 Refer to millennium development goals where relevant: poverty reduction; primary & secondary education; reduction in infant/child mortality; reduction in maternal mortality; access to reproductive health services; sustainable development.</p>

<p>1.3 Information & analysis requirements</p> <p>1.3.1 Gender sensitive performance indicators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Methods/approaches used to identify quantitative & qualitative indicators ▪ Examples of meaningful gender sensitive indicators: eg. for participation; empowerment; changes in gender relations & decision making at household, community & organisation levels (practical & strategic changes); for assessing benefits, outcomes & unintended effects; & for newer areas of focus (poverty reduction, governance, conflict resolution, policy dialogue & SWAps) <p>1.3.2 Analysis of sex-disaggregated quantitative & qualitative information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Content/depth of gender analysis undertaken ▪ Attention to partner capacity & dialogue on gender equality ▪ Attention to resource requirements 	<p>2.3 Case studies?</p> <p>2.3.1 Are there case studies that are a high priority for follow-up in consultations?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Why? ▪ Which features/findings need to be followed up? 	<p>3.3 Case studies?</p> <p>3.3.1 Are there any case studies of the above that are a high priority for follow-up in consultations?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Why? ▪ Which features/findings need to be followed up?
<p>1.4 Standard evaluation criteria & principles</p> <p>1.4.1 Does the evaluation apply gender equality & women's empowerment concepts to standard evaluation criteria & principles? (rationale, achievement of objectives, overall development results, effectiveness, sustainability, alternatives, efficiency, impact & effects, lessons learned)</p>	<p>2.4 Other issues areas for follow-up?</p> <p>2.4.1 In consultations?</p> <p>2.4.2 In the literature on institutionalisation of gender equality commitments?</p> <p>2.4.3 In the WP-EV Workshop on Gender & Evaluation</p>	<p>3.4 Other issues/areas</p> <p>3.4.1 What other issues/areas for investigation & dialogue in follow-up consultations?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Refer to other evidence re links between gender equality & development outcomes <p>3.4.2 Follow-up in WP-EV Workshop on Gender & Evaluation</p>
<p>1.5 Effectiveness of tools, frameworks approaches used</p> <p>1.5.1 Is it possible to make an assessment of the effectiveness of tools, frameworks or approaches, based on the evaluation report?</p> <p>1.5.2 Is this evaluation a high or low priority for follow up in consultations? Why?</p> <p>1.5.3 Areas for discussion/investigation in follow-up consultations.</p> <p>1.5.4 Identify tools/methods/frameworks for inclusion in Discussion Note/toolbox</p>	<p>2.5 Each of the above to be considered: (depending on content of database)</p> <p>2.5.1 From donor & partner perspectives, & from the perspective of other stakeholders & women & men in communities</p> <p>2.5.2 For different levels of institutionalisation (agency, program, project/activity/intervention)</p> <p>2.5.3 Different types of assistance (policy dialogue, SWAps, program/project, NGO)</p>	

* This framework is used both for thematic evaluations on gender equality and women's empowerment, and more general evaluations which include significant gender analysis.

ANNEX 2:

REVIEW SCHEDULE AND APPROACH

Stages of the Review & Follow Up Work	Approach to Criteria 1: Evaluation Methodology	Approach to Criteria 2: Institutional Approaches & Change Mechanisms	Approach to Criteria 3: Linking Gender Mainstreaming with Improved Development Outcomes	Comments
1. Document review	Yes	Yes	Yes	Decision needed on inclusion of key NGO work
2. Follow-up questionnaire to agency staff &/or consultants	Yes, focused on innovative & effective methods, approaches & tools	Depends on content in the evaluation database	Depends on content in the evaluation database	
3. Interviews with agency staff &/or consultants	Yes, may be by email, phone or in person	Depends on content in the evaluation database	Depends on content in the evaluation database	Collaboration with another WP-EV member?
4a. Draft report for comment 4.b Final review report	Summarise findings & identify further steps needed to develop discussion note on recommended tools, frameworks & approaches for inclusion in a “toolbox”	Summarise findings & identify elements of Terms of Reference for further work on effective institutional mechanisms, prior to the workshop on gender & evaluation	Summarise findings & identify elements of Terms of Reference for further work on links between gender analysis/mainstreaming & development outcomes, prior to the workshop on gender & evaluation	WP-EV to determine responsibility for follow up work in stages 5, 6 & 7
5. Workshop on Gender & Evaluation	Review findings to feed into workshop agenda	Review findings to feed into workshop agenda	Review findings to feed into workshop agenda	Lead agency to be discussed at May WP-EV meeting
6. Other steps needed to finalise outputs	Circulation of draft discussion note/toolbox	Depends on outcome of review	Depends on outcome of review	Collaboration required from other member(s)
7. Final output envisaged in Secretariat Discussion Paper (Oct 2001)	Discussion note/toolbox on evaluation methodologies	Short policy note or communiqué	Report synthesising the implications of gender sensitive approaches	Collaboration required from other member(s)

ANNEX 3:

DRAFT QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ASSESSMENT OF TOOLS AND APPROACHES

<p>1. Brief Description of the tool/framework/approach:</p> <p>1.1 What were the most important features of the tool, framework or approach used in the evaluation methodology?</p>
<p>2. Applications:</p> <p>2.1 What circumstances (if any) are needed for this tool, framework or approach to evaluation methodology to be used successfully?</p> <p>2.2 Are there any adaptations to the approach/tool which are important to know about?</p>
<p>3. Strengths:</p> <p>3.1 What are the major strengths of this tool, framework or approach?</p>
<p>4. Learning:</p> <p>4.1 What could have been done better?</p> <p>4.2 Can we learn anything from the way the tool, framework or approach was developed or applied?</p> <p>4.3 Impact – what impact has the tool/framework/approach had on the agency, or on development activities & programs (where relevant)?</p>
<p>5. Resourcing:</p> <p>5.1 Comment (if possible) on finance, people/skills, time and other resources needed.</p>
<p>6. Other comments:</p> <p>6.1 Any other comments on the tool, framework, approach which will assist other evaluators and/or gender specialists to apply or adapt it?</p>

ANNEX 4: DOCUMENTS RECEIVED

1. THEMATIC EVALUATIONS ON GENDER EQUALITY, GENDER MAINSTREAMING AND WOMEN'S EMPOWERMENT

Member Agency	Evaluation Focus/Title	Year	Received	Follow-up?	Criteria Addressed		
					1	2	3
AusAID	“Gender and Development Review: Findings and Recommendations”	2001	✓	high	✓	✓	
Belgium	“Terms of Reference for the Evaluation of Poverty Reduction Incidences, Part 1: An external evaluation of the gender aspects in a selected number of project of the Belgium Survival Fund and their incidence on poverty reduction”	2000	✓		✓	?	✓
Belgium	“An External Evaluation of Gender and Its Influence on Poverty Reduction: Hoima-Kibaale Integrated Community Development Project, Uganda, June – August 2000”	2000	✓		✓	?	✓
Belgium	“Evaluation of Poverty Reduction Incidences and Gender Aspects in the Luapula Valley “Project for Improving Household Food Security and Nutrition in the Luapula Valley of Zambia (IHFSAN)”	2000	✓		✓	?	✓
		2000	✓		✓	?	?
Belgium	“Evaluation of Belgium Survival Fund Support to Kenya Women’s Finance Trust (KWFT)” Volume I and Volume II (Annexes)	2000	✓		?	?	?
Belgium	“Evaluation Thematique Genre et Pauvrete du Pim Niger (Programme integre Maradi)”	2000	French		?	?	?
Belgium	“Evaluation Thematique Genre/Reduction de la Pauvrete du projet Fenu au Mali: Aménagement et gestion des terroirs villageois du Sené-gondo”	2000	French		?	?	?

Member Agency	Evaluation Focus/Title	Year	Received	Follow-up?	Criteria Addressed		
					1	2	3
BMZ	“German Development Cooperation: Summary of the Series evaluation ‘Gender-specific differentiation of the target group” in selected FC/TC projects - trans-sectoral analysis” (English Summary)	2000	✓	? main doc is in German	?	✓	✓
CIDA	“Caribbean Gender Equity Fund Performance Review: Umbrella Report, Final Report” January 2000	2000	✓		?	?	?
CIDA	Performance Measurement Framework for GE Policy	2001	Not avail	Try again			
CIDA	“Evaluative Review of Ghana Girl Child Education Project (GGCEP)”	1999	✓		?	?	?
CIDA	“Evaluation: Women’s Initiatives Fund (WIF) Project, Phase II”	1999	✓		?	?	?
CIDA	“South America Regional Gender Equity Funds: Evaluation Report”	1999	✓		?	✓	?
Danida	WID India (4 NGOs)	2002	TOR in early April	Try again			
DFID	Gender Review	2001/2	?	Follow up			
EC	“Thematic Evaluation of the Integration of Gender in EC Co-operation with Third Countries: Terms of Reference (Final)”	2002	✓		✓		
Irish Aid	Gender Thematic Evaluation	2000		Follow up	✓		
Irish Aid	Follow up to Gender and Environment Guidelines	2000		Follow up			
JICA	Poverty/Gender in Agriculture-Nepal	1999		Follow up			
JICA	Poverty/Gender in Ag-Paraguay	2000		Follow up			
JICA	Social & Gender Analysis-Indonesia	2001		Follow up			
Norway	“WID/Gender Units and the Experience of Gender Mainstreaming in Multilateral Organisations” Gisela Geisler, Bonnie Keller and Anne-Lene Norman, March 1999	1999	✓			✓	

Member Agency	Evaluation Focus/Title	Year	Received	Follow-up?	Criteria Addressed		
					1	2	3
Sida	“Evaluation of Sida’s Support for the Promotion of Gender Equality: Synthesis Report” Volumes 1 & 2	2002	✓	high	✓	✓	✓
	“Evaluation of Sida’s Support to Development Co-operation for Promotion of Gender Equality: Revised Inception Report March 2001” (and separate volume of Annexes, February 2001)	2001	✓		✓		
Sida	“Empowerment of Women through Panchayati Raj in Rajasthan and Orissa, India” Sida Evaluation 00/31, D.K. Manavalan	2000	✓		?	?	?
Sida	“Vietnam Women’s Union: Promoting gender Equality” Sida Evaluation 00/16, Wanjiku Kaime-Atterhög and Tran Thi Van Anh	2000	✓		?	✓	?
Sida	“Swedish-Danish Fund for the Promotion of Gender Equality in Vietnam” Sida Evaluation 01/17, Shashi R. Pandey, Darunee Tantiwiranmanond and Ngo Thi Tuan Dung	2001	✓		?	✓	?
USAID	Women in Post-Conflict Situations	1999		Follow up			
ADB	“Special Evaluation Study on Gender and Development”	2001	✓		✓	✓	✓
AfDB	Women Dev in Education Program	2000		Follow up			
AfDB	Impact of Gender Dev Projects	2000		Follow up			
World Bank	“Integrating Gender in World Bank Assistance” Report No. 23035, OED, October 25, 2001	2001	✓		✓	✓	
World Bank	“The Gender Dimension of Bank Assistance: An Evaluation of Results” Report No. 23119, OED, January 17, 2002	2002	✓	high	✓	✓	✓

Notes on Follow up:

- “high” indicates that the evaluation is a high priority for follow-up in consultations, for the Workshop on Gender and Evaluation, or for possible inclusion in the “toolbox” (final output of the review on evaluation methods and tools).
- “Follow up” and “try again” indicates that reports have not yet been received.

Notes on Criteria Addressed: “?” indicates that review of the report is not complete.

2. GENERAL EVALAUTIONS WHICH MAY INCLUDE SIGNIFICANT GENDER ANALYSIS

Donor	Title of Evaluation Report	Year	Received	Follow-up?	Criterion		
					1	2	3
AusAID	“Evaluation of Australian Government Funded NGO Projects in Africa” Quality Assurance Series No. 25, December 2000	2000	✓	no			
AusAID	“Developing Integrated Rural Health Care Systems: An Evaluation of the Kadavu Rural Health Project in Fiji” Quality Assurance Series No. 24, December 2000	2000	✓	no			
AusAID	“Developing Rural Communities in Marginal and Rainfed Areas: Contributions of Agricultural Projects in the Philippines” Quality Assurance Series No. 23, September 2000	2000	✓	no			
AusAID	“Qinghai Community Development Project: Evaluation Report” Quality Assurance Series No. 21, June 2000	2000	✓	no			
AusAID	“Increasing Rural Incomes: An Evaluation of Three Rural Sector Projects in Samoa” Quality Assurance Series No. 19, July 2000	2000	✓	no			
AusAID	“Assisting Local Communities: Evaluation of Government Funded NGO Projects in Vietnam” Quality Assurance Series No. 18, March 2000	2000	✓			✓	
AusAID	“Wells, Taps and Toilets: Safe Water and Sanitation for Eastern Indonesia” Quality Assurance Series No. 17, November 1999	1999	✓			✓	
AusAID	“Growing Rice and Protecting Forests: An Evaluation of Three Food Production Projects in South East Asia” Quality Assurance Series No. 15, June 1999	1999	✓			✓	
AusAID	“Targeting Poor Farmer: Contributions to Rural Development in Thailand” Quality Assurance Series No. 16, June 1999	1999	✓			✓	✓
BMZ	“Prospects of Success of Basic Education Projects” (English Summary)	2001	summary			✓	
BMZ	“Prospects of Success of Primary Education Projects, Partial Evaluation Senegal (Summary of the Sector Evaluation)” (English Summary)	2001	summary	no			

Donor	Title of Evaluation Report	Year	Received	Follow-up?	Criterion		
					1	2	3
Belgium	“Report of the Special Evaluator for International Cooperation to the Belgian Parliament” June 2001 (refers to 5 thematic evaluations – see other list)	2001	✓				✓
CIDA	“Infrastructure Services Performance Review: Executive Report” (Synthesis Report) Performance Review Branch, October 2001 “Infrastructure Services Performance Review” (Background Report) Performance Review Branch, October 2001 “Infrastructure Services: Policy Dialogue Study, International Telecommunication Union (ITU), Evaluation Report” 2001 “Infrastructure Services: Global Knowledge, A Policy Dialogue Study, Canada’s Role at the Global Knowledge 97 Conference and in the Global Knowledge Partnership, Consultation Draft” 2001	2001	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓			✓	
CIDA	“Review and Monitoring Report: SWIF Project Phase I”	2000	✓		?	?	?
CIDA	“Canada-Thailand Trilateral Environment (CTTE) Project: End of Project Review, May-June, 2000”	2000	✓		?	?	?
CIDA	“Regional Aids Training Network, Mid-Term Evaluation, Final Report”	2000	✓		?	?	?
CIDA	“Evaluation of Inter Pares Program in Peru: Final Report”	2000	✓		?	?	?
CIDA	“Final Report on Evaluation of Inter-Church Action for Development, Relief and Justice for CIDA”	2000	✓		?	?	?
CIDA	“Executive Summary of Final Program Evaluation Report - Presbyterian Church in Canada: Presbyterian World Service and Development (April 1st 1997 - March 31st 2000 Program)”	2000	✓		?	?	?
CIDA	“India Oilseeds Development: End of Project Evaluation, Final Report”	2000	✓		?	?	?
CIDA	“Final Report Operation Eyesight Universal Institutional Assessment”	1999	✓		?	?	?
CIDA	“Evaluation: Strengthening of Civil Society and Rural Development in Nampula Province, 1997/99, Cooperation Canada Mozambique, Final Report	1999	✓		?	?	?
CIDA	“Final Report: Assessment of the Society of Friends of Nepal (SOFON)”	1999	✓		?	?	?

Donor	Title of Evaluation Report	Year	Received	Follow-up?	Criterion		
					1	2	3
CIDA	“Private Enterprise Accelerated Resource Linkage (PEARL): Mid-term Review Report”	1999	✓			?	
Danida	“Evaluation of Danish Bilateral Assistance to Health 1988 – 1997” (2000/4)	2000	✓			✓	
Danida	“Evaluation: Danish-Burkinabè Development Cooperation 1996 – 2000” (2001/4)		✓			✓	
DfID	Strengthening Primary Education Project (SPRED)	1999		Follow up			
EC	“Evaluation of Voter Education in the Context of EU Electoral Support, Final Report”	2001	✓			✓	
EC	“Synthesis Report on EC Activities in the Field of Human Rights, Democracy and Good Governance, Synthesis Note”	2001	✓				
IBRD	Morocco - Country Assistance Evaluation	2001		Follow up			
IBRD	IDA's Partnership for Poverty Reduction (FY94-FY00) An Independent Evaluation	2001		Follow up			
IBRD	Uganda Country Assistance Evaluation	2001		Follow up			
IBRD	India Country Assistance Evaluation (REACH)	2001		Follow up			
IBRD	IDA review background paper - review of poverty reduction in IDA10-12	2001		Follow up			
IBRD	Kenya - Country Assistance Evaluation	2000		Follow up			
IBRD	Ghana Country Assistance Evaluation	2000		Follow up			
IBRD	Philippines: From Crisis to Opportunity	1999		Follow up			
IBRD	Yemen: Country Assistance Review	1999		Follow up			
IBRD	World Bank Agricultural Extension Projects in Kenya	1999		Follow up			
IBRD	The World Bank and Microenterprise Finance: From Concept to Practice	1999		Follow up			
IBRD	OED Precis: Grassroots Pastoral Organizations in Mauritania	1999		Follow up			
JICA	The Extension Program of the Bagamoyo Irrigation Development Project	1999		Follow up			

Donor	Title of Evaluation Report	Year	Received	Follow-up?	Criterion		
					1	2	3
Netherlands	“Smallholder Dairy Support Programme (SDSP)” IOB Evaluations No. 286, November 2001	2001	✓		?	?	?
Norway	“Performance Assessment of IPPF: Policy and Effectiveness At Country and Regional Levels – Synthesis Report” Julie Skjaeraasen, Bo Stenson and Ian Thomas, March 1999	1999	✓			?	
SDC	Strengthening of Vocational Training Centers (SVTC) in Vietnam. Joint Evaluation. Final Report	1999		Follow up			
SDC	Country Programme South Africa 1994-1999 Evaluation of the Activities of the Swiss Department of Foreign Affairs	1999		Follow up			
SDC	Evaluation of the First Phase of the CORICAM Project	1999		Follow up			
SDC	Social Forestry Support Project, Phase 2. Report on Mid-Term Review, October 15, 1999	1999		Follow up			
SDC	External Evaluation of Southern Highlands Dairy Development Project (SHDDP)	1999		Follow up			
SDC	Penipe Project Phase III Evaluation Report	1999		Follow up			
SDC	Strengthening of Vocational Training Centers (SVTC) in Vietnam. Joint Eval Final Report	1999		Follow up			
Sida	“Strengthening Democracy on the Atlantic Coast in Nicaragua” Sida Evaluation 00/19, Hans Peter Buvollen, Mario Rosales Ortega and Leticia Velásquez Zapeta	2000	✓				
Sida	“Democracy and Human Rights: An evaluation of Sida’s support to five projects in Georgia” Sida Evaluation 01/11, Birgitta Berggren and Patrik Jotun	2001	✓			✓?	

Donor	Title of Evaluation Report	Year	Received	Follow-up?	Criterion		
					1	2	3
UNDP	Strengthening Capacity in Policy Formulation and Management of Ethnic Minority Development in Vietnam	1999		Follow up			
UNDP	Capacity Building for Poverty Alleviation	1999		Follow up			
UNDP	GEF Small Grants Programme	1999		Follow up			
UNDP	Fuel Efficiency in Road Transport Sector	1999		Follow up			
USAID	Promoting primary education for girls in Guinea	1999		Follow up			
USAID	More, but not yet better: USAID's programs and policies to improve girls' education	1999		Follow up			
USAID	Impact of family planning on women's lives : cooperative agreement USAID/CCP-A-00-93-00021-05 -- final report (September 20, 1993-March 31,1999)	1999		Follow up			
USAID	Promoting primary education for girls in Pakistan	1999		Follow up			
USAID	TRAINING FOR AFRICAN MANAGERS - PHASE II	1999		Follow up			
USAID	Final OFPEP (on-farm productivity enhancement program) report: USAID cooperative agreement no. FAO-0158-A-00-2054-00	1999		Follow up			
USAID	Promoting primary education for girls in Malawi	1999		Follow up			
USAID	Partnership and household livelihood security : final evaluation	1999		Follow up			

Notes on Follow up:

- “high” indicates that the evaluation is a high priority for follow-up in consultations, for the Workshop on Gender and Evaluation, or for possible inclusion in the “toolbox” (final output of the review on evaluation methods and tools).
- “Follow up” and “try again” indicates that reports have not yet been received.

Notes on Criteria Addressed: “?” indicates that review of the report is not complete.

3. OTHER DOCUMENTS RECEIVED

Donor	Title of Document Received ³	Year	Received	Follow-up?	Criterion		
					1	2	3
CIDA	“How to Perform Evaluations: Gender Equality” Performance Review Branch, No.4 May 2001 “CIDA Evaluation Guide – Work in Progress” Performance Review Branch, January 2000 and other guides in the “How to Perform Evaluations” series	2001 2000/ 2001	✓	High-include in final product	✓		
CIDA	“A Results Approach to Developing the Implementation Plan: A Guide for CIDA Partners and Executing Agencies” March 2001	2001	✓				
CIDA	“RBM Handbook on Developing Results Chains: The Basics of RBM as Applied to 100 Project Examples” Results-Based Management Division, December 2000	2000	✓				
Danida	“The Challenge of Working with Gender: Experiences fro Danish-Ugandan development cooperation” Danish Contribution to Beijing + 5, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, by Bonnie Keller, Anne-Lise Klausen and Stella Mukasa	2000	✓				
Netherlands	Case Studies on gender equality in SWAps: Annex 1 – Experiences in health sector programs Annex 2 – Experiences in education sector programs Annex 3 – Experiences in agricultural sector programs	2001?	✓				
Netherlands	WP-GEN Task Force on Gender Equality in SWAps – reference guide & case study on G mainstreaming in health sector in Bangladesh	?	Recommended- follow up				
World Bank	“Gender in Monitoring and Evaluation in Rural Development: A Tool Kit”	2001			✓		

³ Some of the items listed have not been passed on to the reviewer by the agency concerned, but by other stakeholders in the review process.

4. DOCUMENTS FROM OTHER AGENCIES

Agency	Title of Document Received ⁴	Year	Received	Follow-up?	Criterion		
					1	2	3
APC WNSP	“GEM: A guide to integrating gender analysis into evaluations of initiatives that use Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) for social change”	?	✓		✓		
Bridge	“Gender and monitoring: a review of practical experiences” Bridge Report No. 63, Paola Brambilla, 2001	2001		Follow up			
Bridge	“National Machineries for Women in Development: experiences, lessons and strategies” Bridge Report No. 66, Emma Bell et al, February 2002	2001	✓			✓	
North-South Institute	“Gender Mainstreaming: Good Practices from the Asia Pacific Region”, Heather Gibb, The North-South Institute and Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), Ottawa and Singapore	2001	✓			✓	?
Novib	“En Route: Evaluation of the Gender Route Project” Evaluation Study by Ria Brouwers with Donny Meertens, October 2001	2001	✓		✓	✓	
Oxfam CAA	“The Final Workshop Report on Philippines Field Gender Audit, 21 – 30 August 2001” Oxfam Community Aid Abroad	2001	✓		✓	✓	

⁴ Some of the items listed have not been passed on to the reviewer by the agency concerned, but by others interested in the review process.