



ROOM DOCUMENT NO. 1

DAC WORKING PARTY ON AID EVALUATION

Review on Gender and Evaluation

Note submitted by Australia

The attached report has been written by consultants Juliet Hunt and Ria Brouwers. It is submitted for consideration under Item 4i) of the agenda of the DAC Working Party on Aid Evaluation meeting on 27 – 28 March 2003.

**37th meeting
27-28 March 2003**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ACRONYMS	3
CHAPTER 1: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
CHAPTER 2: INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND TO THE REVIEW	10
Purpose of the review	10
Background and history.....	10
CHAPTER 3: SUMMARY OF REVIEW METHODOLOGY.....	12
Database for the Review.....	12
Review Framework	13
Comparisons between previous reviews and the current review	16
CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS ON EVALUATION METHODOLOGY.....	18
Introduction.....	18
Profile	18
Scope and focus	19
Overall quality of gender analysis in general evaluations	22
Methods and tools	22
Expertise and quality	26
Conclusions and lessons	27
CHAPTER 5: INSTITUTIONAL APPROACHES AND CHANGE STRATEGIES.....	30
Introduction.....	30
Partnerships and dialogue on gender equality: fundamental factors for successful change strategies	30
Policy and country assistance strategies	31
Donor organisations and the activity/project cycle	32
Making progress towards gender equality at the community level	35
Conclusions and lessons	36
CHAPTER 6: BENEFITS FOR WOMEN, GENDER ANALYSIS, AND DEVELOPMENT OUTCOMES	38
Introduction.....	38
Evidence of benefits for women and changes in gender relations	38
Evidence of a causal relationship between attention to gender issues and benefits for women.....	40
Evidence that benefits for women or changes in gender relations leads to improved development outcomes	42
Conclusions and lessons	43
CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FOLLOW-UP	46
Introduction.....	46
Evaluation methodology.....	46
Institutional approaches and change strategies	49
Benefits for women, gender analysis, and development outcomes	50
Dissemination and targeting of findings.....	51
ANNEX 1: DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED TO THE REVIEW	52

ANNEX 2: FRAMEWORK FOR REVIEW OF EVALUATION DOCUMENTS	61
ANNEX 3: GENDER AUDITS	62
ANNEX 4: FEATURES OF EVALUATION METHODOLOGY WHICH FACILITATE ATTENTION TO GENDER ISSUES.....	64
ANNEX 5: SUMMARY OF INDICATORS USED IN EVALUATIONS	66
ANNEX 6: ILLUSTRATIONS OF BENEFITS TO WOMEN,GENDER ANALYSIS AND LINKS TO DEVELOPMENT OUTCOMES.....	70
ANNEX 7: TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR DAC WP-EV REVIEW ON GENDER AND EVALUATION	79

Boxes

Building partnerships on gender equality	31
--	----

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to thank staff in donor agencies who took the time to submit reports to the review; and both staff and consultants who assisted with follow-up interviews and discussions by email and phone. Thanks also to members of the reference group of WP-EV, WP-GEN and the DAC Secretariat, who submitted thoughtful comments during the review process and on the first draft of this report.

LIST OF ACRONYMS

ADB	Asian Development Bank
AusAID	Australian Agency for International Development
BMZ	Bundesministerium für wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit und Entwicklung (German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development)
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
DAC	Development Assistance Committee of the OECD
Danida	Danish International Development Assistance
DFID	Department for International Development, United Kingdom
EC	European Commission
ILO	International Labour Office
JICA	Japan International Cooperation Agency
NL	Netherlands
NORAD	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation
NZAID	New Zealand Agency for International Development
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
PRA	Participatory Rural Appraisal
SDC	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
Sida	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
SWAps	Sector Wide Approaches
TORs	Terms of Reference
UNIFEM	United Nations Development Fund for Women
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WFP	World Food Program
WP-EV	Working Party on Aid Evaluation
WP-GEN	Working Party on Gender

CHAPTER 1: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Purpose of the review and summary of methodology

This report presents findings from a review on gender and evaluation, which builds on previous work undertaken by the DAC in this area (see chapter 2 and the TOR attached at Annex 7). The review has been carried out collaboratively by Australia and the Netherlands with Australia as the lead agency.

The purpose is to distil experiences with evaluating gender equality objectives, in order to improve evaluation practice and the achievement of development outcomes. There were 3 areas of focus:

1. **evaluation methodologies**, approaches or tools for evaluating changes in gender equality, gender mainstreaming and women's empowerment
2. **institutional approaches and change strategies** which have successfully responded to recurrent obstacles to gender mainstreaming
3. assessments of whether/how gender analysis and gender mainstreaming improves the achievement of **overall development outcomes**

The database from the review includes 86 evaluations from 14 DAC members (see chapters 3 and 4 and the database attached at Annex 1):

- 42 **thematic evaluations** conducted by 12 DAC members and 5 multilateral agencies, which were specifically designed to evaluate gender equality, gender mainstreaming and women's empowerment efforts; and
- 44 **general evaluations** from 10 DAC members, which were not designed specifically to focus on gender equality policy or initiatives, but which include some gender analysis or references to gender issues.

The review has employed a qualitative assessment method using a detailed data sheet. Each evaluation in the database was assessed in relation to the 3 areas of enquiry noted above (see chapter 3 and Annex 2).

Summary of findings and recommendations

Evaluation methodology (see chapter 4)

For thematic evaluations, the review has highlighted methodological problems associated with treating gender mainstreaming as a goal, rather than as a means to the long-term objective of achieving gender equality. A number of thematic evaluations have focused on evaluating institutional mainstreaming, without considering the extent to which this leads to changes in gender relations. It is important for future thematic evaluations to focus on results, as well as on institutional mainstreaming practices. Problems also arose when evaluations were designed based on the assumption that mainstreaming leads to gender

equality outcomes. It proved to be more useful to find positive or negative results of interventions first, and then to examine the factors that promote good or poor performance.

The conclusion from reviewing both thematic and general evaluations is that a good gender-focused evaluation is first of all a good evaluation. This means that there is a clear and simple objective, a transparent design, with findings based on evidence, clear evaluation criteria and gender-specific indicators. The weaknesses identified in both types of evaluations (see below) suggest a need for overall improvements in evaluation capacity, as well as improvements specific to undertaking gender analysis in evaluations. This suggests the need for training and courses on the whole process of evaluation, which also have a strong focus on how to address gender equality issues.

Key findings on evaluation methodology include:

1. Few general evaluations employ gender sensitive indicators. Not surprisingly, all reports which did include gender sensitive indicators have a higher quality of gender analysis and tend to include more information on benefits to women.
2. Many evaluations were faced with lack of sex-disaggregated baseline data and limited monitoring information, particularly on gender relations and benefits. Faced with these problems, some evaluations used qualitative data collection techniques to assess results. However, many others did not, due to inadequate time and resources. Few studies have sound or comprehensive quantitative and qualitative data about progress made for women and men over the period evaluated.
3. Overall, general evaluations are characterised by poor analysis, even when some significant sex-disaggregated quantitative and qualitative data may have been collected. Discussion of gender issues is often limited to considering the participation of women. There is little examination of unintended impacts for women, or any other group such as men and women living in poverty.
4. Most of the evaluations which have satisfactory gender analysis have used participatory methods of data collection. However, many general evaluations did not use participatory methods, and the use of these methods did not always lead to adequate attention to gender issues.
5. Very few evaluations provide information on the use of local expertise. Follow-up interviews with a few evaluators showed that local expertise was considered indispensable in thematic evaluations, although it requires adequate resourcing and training. Very few evaluations considered the involvement of local evaluators as a capacity building exercise.
6. There is no indication from the sample of evaluations reviewed that donors are working towards more joint evaluations (either joint donor or joint donor-partner), as might be expected in line with changes towards sector-wide approaches and increased emphasis on national ownership.
7. Many thematic evaluations did assess the capacity and commitment of partners to work on changing gender relations. However, this was very limited in general evaluations and confined largely to evaluations of NGO programs.

8. Many general evaluations in the sample do not include Terms of Reference. Those that do, tend to include vague references to women or gender. Most require gender expertise on the evaluation team, but about one-third do not.
9. Many evaluations use the word 'gender' as a synonym for 'women'. Men are missing from most reports. This means that there is little or no focus on gender relations and on the impact of development activities on gender equality, and little focus on how gender relations may influence women's capacity to participate or benefit. On the positive side, for those studies that do report on gender equality, the focus is usually on changes in women's decision making at community level.

Features of evaluation capacity that need to be improved are:

- the capacity to determine appropriate research questions to investigate potential differences in participation, benefits and impacts between women and men;
- the capacity to identify and collect sex-disaggregated information using a mix of different methods, including the capacity to develop gender sensitive indicators;
- the capacity to analyse data collected in relation to the activities being evaluated in a systematic way.

<p>Recommendation 1 to the DAC:</p> <p>It is recommended that further work on evaluation capacity building with members and partners continue with a strong focus on how to address gender equality issues in evaluations.</p> <p>Recommendation 2 to agencies:</p> <p>It is recommended that agencies finance staff and partners to attend courses on evaluation which have a strong focus on gender equality perspectives.</p> <p>Recommendation 3 to the DAC:</p> <p>It is recommended that the DAC set up an area on its web-site which has links to existing gender-sensitive evaluation tools. This should be accompanied by brief descriptions and commentaries, to guide users to the tools which best suit their needs. The location of the site should ensure that tools are easily accessed by evaluators.</p>
--

Findings from all areas of the review highlight the fundamental importance of working in close collaboration with partner agencies on all aspects of gender equality. In general, evaluations did not adequately assess partner capacity and commitment, nor did they address the links between gender equality and poverty reduction. The need for further exploration of these links is also highlighted in the findings on institutionalisation and on development outcomes.

<p>Recommendation 4 to the DAC:</p> <p>It is recommended that a joint WP-EV/WP-GEN workshop be held on <u>evaluation capacity building</u>, with a strong focus on how to address gender issues. One area for discussion should be the weaknesses in evaluation capacity found by this review, and agencies' experience of how to address these weaknesses. However, the workshop should primarily be forward-looking and cover new ground which has not been adequately addressed in the sample of evaluations included in this review, or in previous DAC workshops. For example, the workshop should focus on the evaluation of poverty reduction strategies and outcomes, SWAPs, and other program-based approaches. Involvement of partner agencies is essential. The workshop could also be a forum for determining further collaborative work on gender and evaluation, including priorities for future research and evaluation.</p>
--

Institutional approaches and change strategies (see chapter 5)

There is a very high degree of consensus about what change strategies have been successful at ensuring that gender issues are addressed, at various levels and across different types of assistance. **Building partnerships on gender equality through dialogue** emerges as a most urgent matter from both the findings on institutionalisation in chapter 5, and those on development outcomes in chapter 6. **Successful change strategies** for building partnerships and promoting dialogue are generally characterised by 4 fundamental factors:

- national or partner ownership, including a shared vision on gender equality either at country assistance or intervention level;
- consensus between donors and partners on clear objectives, which are transparently relevant to partner government policies and commitments;
- the need for stakeholder involvement in advocacy and direction-setting (including partner agencies, civil society, and particularly women's organisations); and
- long-term commitment from donor agencies.

Explicit links between poverty reduction and gender equality objectives at policy, country assistance strategy and intervention level are needed. Findings from all 3 areas of the review indicate that these links are rarely made at any level, including in activity design, and indicate that this is an area for urgent attention.

Accountability to gender equality policies is highlighted as a continuing ongoing problem, including a failure to integrate gender equality perspectives into agency procedures. Leadership and commitment have been found to be essential to address this obstacle, and overall agency plans have been useful for some agencies.

Recurring obstacles in activity design and implementation include:

- Lack of attention to gender issues in design, specifically lack of baseline data, lack of participation by women, poor needs analysis, lack of gender and social analysis expertise, and a failure to address gender issues at the level of activity objectives.
- Where gender analysis has been undertaken in design, it is often not linked coherently to the activities to be implemented, to overall social analysis, or to expected results (including poverty reduction). Lack of an explicit gender strategy which is integrated into overall design is also identified as a constraint.

There are high levels of agreement regarding **successful change strategies for activity/intervention design, implementation and monitoring**. These include: ensuring that gender equality issues are adequately addressed in design; addressing responsibilities for implementing gender equality policy in job descriptions and Terms of Reference through the activity cycle; and the use of gender sensitive indicators as a minimum standard for design, implementation and monitoring.

Participatory approaches, strengthening women's leadership capacity, and working with women's organisations as agents of civil society, have been identified as effective approaches for making progress towards gender equality at community level.

Recommendation 5 to the DAC:

It is recommended that the DAC consider tasking the Working Party on Gender to develop a short policy note or communiqué on the basis of the report findings, in collaboration with the Working Party on Aid Evaluation. This should focus on successful strategies for building partnerships on gender equality, other successful change strategies on which there is a high degree of consensus, and links between poverty reduction and gender equality.

Recommendation 6 to agencies:

It is recommended that agencies also take note of the evidence presented in this report on successful change strategies for building partnerships on gender equality and in other areas, and continue their best efforts to ensure accountability to gender equality policies.

Benefits for women, gender analysis, and development outcomes (see chapter 6)

In general, the quality of gender analysis in evaluations is inadequate for agencies to assess differences in benefits between women and men and their relationship to overall development outcomes. Systematic attention to gender issues in activity design, implementation and monitoring also appears to be rare, except for those activities which are specifically and directly aimed at promoting gender equality.

There is clear evidence that attention to gender issues in activity design and implementation is essential if agencies want to increase the likelihood that both men and women will participate and benefit, and to ensure that they are not disadvantaged. However, this is a necessary but insufficient condition to ensure that benefits are achieved and sustainable.

Overall, most of the benefits identified address women's practical needs. Evaluations of interventions which aim to promote gender equality, and which are targeted at women (such as Gender Equality Funds), show the strongest evidence of strategic changes in gender relations, most often increased participation in decision making. Whether or not strategic changes in gender relations have been planned, findings reinforce the importance of local social and institutional context and partner commitment in order for benefits to be sustained. Strengthened women's group identity and organisational capacity in relation to men, and the empowering effects of some training opportunities are key factors in promoting and sustaining benefits for women, and strategic changes in gender relations.

There is evidence to support the proposition that benefits for women will improve the effectiveness of development interventions and their outcomes at the activity, community or micro level. (For example, women's participation in local governance structures and in project activities, groups and committees has increased the effectiveness of development interventions. Where women do gain control of income, there is evidence that they are likely to use this for basic family needs and schooling for children, which has both direct and indirect impacts on poverty reduction at micro level.) However, there is no evidence for this proposition in the database of evaluations focused at the macro level, where partner capacity and commitment and the socio-economic and political context are key determinants of the sustainability of development impacts. This may be because so few agencies have investigated these links, or because attention to gender issues at any level has been limited in most cases in the interventions evaluated. Further research is needed in this area. More evaluations which make links between micro, meso and macro levels are also required if agencies want to explore issues relating to overall development effectiveness and outcomes at the macro level.

A priority for future research and evaluation is to investigate the links between benefits for women, gender equality and poverty reduction. This should be an area for joint agency and partner evaluation, at a country and/or sectoral level, to look at the work of multiple donors in one country, rather than the work of one donor in dissimilar countries. Other fruitful areas for future research are outlined in chapter 6 and 7 (see paragraph 170ii).

Dissemination of findings

It is important for the findings of this review to be disseminated to development practitioners. The audience for these findings is broad. It includes both agency staff and consultants/contractors who play a key role in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of development interventions. Evaluators, gender specialists, sectoral specialists and development managers at various levels all need to be targeted to learn the lessons outlined in this review, if evaluation practice is to be improved, and successful change strategies implemented so that both women and men will benefit from development interventions. In addition to recommendation 7 below, consideration could also be given to using a mix of dissemination strategies appropriate to different audiences, such as the development of short summaries of key findings. For example, key findings on evaluation methodology could be included on the web-site referred to in recommendation 3 above. A summary of findings on successful strategies for institutionalisation, and on the links between benefits for women and effective development outcomes at micro level, could be included on the WP-GEN tipsheets website, as part of the process of developing short policy note or communiqué (see recommendation 5).

Recommendation 7 to the DAC:

<i>It is recommended that the findings of this review be disseminated through the publication of this report</i>
--

CHAPTER 2: INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND TO THE REVIEW

Purpose of the review

This report presents findings from a review on gender and evaluation undertaken during 2002 and early 2003. The purpose is to distil experiences with evaluating gender equality objectives, in order to improve evaluation practice and the achievement of development outcomes. There were 3 areas of focus:

1. **evaluation methodologies**, approaches or tools for evaluating changes in gender equality, gender mainstreaming and women's empowerment
2. **institutional approaches and change strategies** which have successfully responded to recurrent obstacles to gender mainstreaming
3. assessments of whether/how gender analysis and gender mainstreaming improves the achievement of **overall development results**

Chapter 3 summarises the review methodology, and chapters 4, 5 and 6 discuss findings, conclusions and lessons from each of the above areas of enquiry. Chapter 7 summarises overall conclusions and suggests recommendations for follow up.

Background and history

The review builds on previous work undertaken by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) on the integration of gender equality perspectives into evaluation methodology. This includes: 2 previous reviews focusing on gender and evaluation undertaken by the Working Party on Evaluation (WP-EV) in 1994 and 1999 in collaboration with the Working Party on Gender (WP-GEN); a joint WP-EV/WP-GEN workshop on Evaluating Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment in 1999; and publications of WP-GEN which address gender equality perspectives in evaluation¹.

The 1994 review² was undertaken as a contribution to the 1995 United Nations 4th World Conference on Women held in Beijing. One of 3 themes was an assessment of Women in Development as a cross-cutting issue in evaluations. Conclusions were that limited attention had been given to women and gender issues in the evaluation studies reviewed, and that the evaluations themselves focused on outputs, rather than impacts, because agencies were only just beginning to develop methodologies for impact assessment. On the positive side, there had been steady progress in attention to gender issues in evaluations since 1989. Recommendations were that agencies should give more attention to gender issues in Terms of Reference for evaluations, adopt more participatory approaches in project design, and take action to improve the overall quality of evaluations.

-
1. OECD 1998 DAC Sourcebook on Concepts and Approaches Linked to Gender Equality Paris; OECD 1999 DAC Guidelines for Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment in Development Co-operation Development Co-operation Guideline Series, Paris.
 2. OECD 1994 "Assessment of DAC Members' WID Policies and Programs", Paris.

The 1999 review³ was designed to assess whether improvements had been made in evaluation design and implementation since the first review in 1994. Sixteen agencies used a reporting guide to assess their own work since 1993, and 3 DAC members (Canada, Sweden and Australia) undertook desk studies of around 40 evaluation reports each. The conclusion of the 1999 review was that uneven progress had been made: while there was some increase in quality and quantity of information on gender issues, this varied considerably within and between agencies. Terms of Reference were addressing gender issues more frequently, but the depth and relevance of discussions on gender issues in evaluation reports had not improved much. Recommendations were that agencies should improve evaluation methodologies by using more sex-disaggregated data and more consistent use of participatory approaches, and take action to improve evaluation capacity among both donors and partners. The follow-up workshop to the review held in 1999 in Stockholm had similar recommendations. Comparisons between the 1999 review and the current review are discussed in chapter 3.

The current review

Preliminary ideas for possible follow-up of the 1999 workshop were presented to the DAC Secretariat by Australia in 2001. This was followed up by a Secretariat Discussion Paper to WP-EV, which identified the 3 areas of enquiry for the current review⁴. Australia developed a Terms of Reference for the current review (see Annex 7) and contracted a consultant to begin work on the review in March 2002. A Progress Report including a draft database was submitted to WP-EV for its 36th meeting in May 2002. The Netherlands Government offered financial support for the review following the May WP-EV meeting, and a consultant was appointed from the Netherlands in August 2002. The Progress Report (including an updated database) was also circulated at the October meeting of WP-GEN, which was attended by the Netherlands consultant.

Specific outputs were envisaged for each of the 3 areas of enquiry in the DAC Secretariat discussion paper. Chapter 7 lists these outputs, and suggests follow-up based on the findings of this review.

-
- 3 . Woodford-Berger 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.
 - 4 . Development Co-operation Directorate, Development Assistance Committee, Working Party on Aid Evaluation "Options for Future Work on Gender Equality by the DAC Working Party on Aid Evaluation: A Discussion Paper (Note by the Secretariat)" Submitted for discussion to the 35th meeting of the Working Party on Aid Evaluation on 14-15 November 2001.

CHAPTER 3: SUMMARY OF REVIEW METHODOLOGY

Database for the Review

Thematic and general evaluations

The database for the review includes 2 types of evaluations carried out by DAC members and other agencies since 1999.

- **Thematic evaluations** specifically designed to evaluate gender equality, gender mainstreaming and women's empowerment efforts.
- **General evaluations** of development work which were not specifically designed to evaluate gender equality policy or initiatives, but which include some gender analysis or references to gender issues.

A total of 86 evaluations were included in the review. Table 1 of Annex 1 lists 42 thematic evaluations from 12 DAC members and 5 multilateral agencies; and Table 2 of Annex 1 lists 44 general evaluations from 10 DAC members. Eight DAC members have submitted both thematic and general evaluations. Of the total of 22 DAC members⁵, 14 have evaluations included in this review. With very few exceptions, only reports produced in English were reviewed.

One feature of both the thematic and general evaluations included in the review is the high degree of diversity regarding the type of assistance evaluated, the number and size of activities evaluated, the scope of the evaluations, and their objectives. In most cases all evaluation reports have come from evaluation sections of agencies. In other cases, evaluations have originated in program sections. (Tables 1 and 2 of Chapter 4 summarise the scope and type of evaluations reviewed.)

The database was identified from various sources. WP-EV's Planned Evaluation Matrix (November 2001) was the first source for thematic evaluations; WP-EV's Evaluation Inventory (accessed February 2002) was the first source for non-thematic evaluations. Initial research indicated that 21 thematic and up to 66 general evaluations may be available. The original draft database does not closely resemble the final database in Annex 1 for a number of reasons. Some thematic evaluations did not go ahead as planned. A number of evaluations were deleted from the database (for example, from the World Bank) where a large thematic meta-evaluation was undertaken which had already distilled findings and lessons from other reports (World Bank 2001 and 2002). Agencies were asked to screen general evaluations to ensure that they contained material on at least 1 of the 3 areas of enquiry for the review. Some agencies did this and indicated that general evaluations on the WP-EV inventory did not have

5. DAC Members are: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, the United States, The Commission of European Communities. (Underlining indicates that the review includes evaluation reports from those members).

sufficient attention to gender issues to submit them to the review. Some agencies sent alternative reports. Others sent any evaluations they had which referred to women or gender issues. A number of agencies did not submit reports at all despite a number of requests, and it was necessary to search their websites, although web searches were limited to only a few agencies due to time constraints. The Netherlands consultant attended WP-GEN's meeting in Paris in October 2002, and requested gender specialists to forward any further evaluation reports which were relevant to the review. This resulted in some additional thematic reports being included in the database. The total number of evaluation reports actually reviewed by the consultants is much larger than the list included in Annex 1.

For many of those agencies who did submit reports, the database probably gives an accurate representation of the number of evaluations which give some attention to gender issues. However, it is not known whether the database is representative in any way of evaluations undertaken by all DAC members⁶.

Other material submitted to the review

During consultation with interested members on the Terms of Reference for the review, it was suggested that other material be included in the review, in addition to evaluation reports. Tables 3 and 4 of Annex 1 list other documents submitted or accessed by the consultants. These documents are also characterised by significant diversity in type and focus. While all these documents have been reviewed, they have generally not been included in the analysis of findings in chapters 4, 5 and 6. In the time available, and for the sake of coherent analysis, it was necessary for the consultants to focus on the evaluation reports.

The list of tools included in Table 3 of Annex 1 is by no means comprehensive. Many include excellent advice on how to conduct gender sensitive evaluations. One set of tools which was received very early in the review process was CIDA's Evaluation Guide, a work in progress which includes separate "How to Perform Evaluations" guides on various topics. One of these separate guides focuses on gender equality, and gender equality issues are also integrated into model Terms of Reference and a separate guide to participatory evaluations. CIDA evaluation staff offered to conduct interviews with selected gender specialists and program staff regarding the use of the gender equality and evaluation document, and the main findings from this survey are included in chapter 4.

Review Framework

Comprehensive qualitative assessments were undertaken of each evaluation report in the database. A data sheet was developed and tested using a sample of both thematic and general evaluations. The data sheet guided assessment of each evaluation report in relation to the 3 areas of enquiry of the review. A summary of the framework for the review is attached in Annex 2.

6 . It is impossible to determine how the number of evaluations in the database compares with the total number of evaluations conducted from 1999-2002. At the end of November 2002, there were 661 evaluations included on the DAC WP-EV evaluation inventory for the period 1999 to 2002. A key word search of 'women' and 'gender' yields 128 evaluation reports, which includes both thematic and general evaluations with some focus on gender issues. This suggests that about 19% of total reports submitted to the inventory pay some attention to women or gender issues. However, the sample included in the review is not a clear sub-set of those evaluations included on the inventory. While many reports reviewed do appear on the inventory, a lot of others in the final database do not.

Evaluation methodology

For the first area of enquiry on evaluation methodology, the datasheet investigated a very wide range of questions including:

- Scope and focus of the evaluations.
- Features of evaluation methodology, including descriptions of tools, frameworks and processes used, details of participatory and social analysis methods employed, and assessment of whether any tools or frameworks could be included in a ‘toolbox’⁷.
- Quality and quantity of information and analysis in evaluations, including the use of gender sensitive indicators, and the collection of sex-disaggregated information, with a focus on the quality and depth of gender analysis undertaken, attention given to partner capacity and dialogue on gender equality, and attention given to resource requirements for gender sensitive development approaches.
- Attention to gender issues in Terms of Reference (TOR) for evaluations, including attention to sex-disaggregated information and gender analysis requirements in the TOR, identification of the need for gender expertise and the use of local consultants, and attention to partner and stakeholder participation and consultation in the review process.
- The use of standard evaluation criteria and the application of gender equality and women’s empowerment concepts to those criteria.

Many evaluation reports addressed few of the issues and questions included on the data sheet, although this varied considerably both between and within agencies. For example, in some cases reports either did not include TORs, and/or there was little detail about the evaluation methodology employed. This applied to both thematic and general evaluation reports, although most thematic policy reports included significant details on their methodology. In addition, more than a third of the general evaluation reports gave scant attention to gender issues (see Table 3 in Chapter 4).

A questionnaire format was developed and tested for follow-up regarding methods and tools used by evaluators in thematic evaluations. In practice, this questionnaire was used as a general guide only and was modified extensively for each agency, according to the scope and objectives of their evaluations, and depending on whether follow-up occurred by phone or by email. Both staff and consultants engaged in conducting evaluations for the following agencies were contacted:

- Asian Development Bank (ADB), 1 interview
- AusAID, 5 interviews and/or questionnaires
- Belgium, 1 interview

7. A ‘toolbox’ or discussion note on innovative approaches and tools was envisaged as a possible output from this area of enquiry in the DAC Secretariat discussion paper (see chapters 2 and 7).

- CIDA, 2 questionnaires distributed and collated by staff from CIDA's performance review branch (see paragraph 35 above)
- Oxfam Community Aid Abroad, 6 responses to questionnaires (see Table 4 of Annex 1 for the reference to this evaluation)
- Sida, 2 interviews
- World Bank, 2 responses including 1 interview

Institutional approaches and change strategies

For the second area of enquiry on institutional approaches and change strategies, the data sheet investigated:

- obstacles to gender mainstreaming (widely interpreted as obstacles to having gender issues addressed);
- successful strategies which have actually worked in practice to facilitate attention to gender issues; and
- recommendations and other comments made in reports regarding actions needing to be taken to ensure that gender issues are properly addressed.

A matrix was used to record findings from each evaluation, which focused on the following levels of institutionalisation in relation to each of the 3 questions above: agency policy; policy dialogue between donors and partners; donor country assistance strategies; donor organisations; partner organisations; activity or intervention design; activity or intervention implementation; activity or intervention monitoring and evaluation; and making progress towards gender equality at the community level.

There is an extensive literature on institutional obstacles to gender mainstreaming, and many frameworks and strategies exist to address these. However, good practice case studies on the institutionalisation of gender equality approaches are often based on intention, rather than outcome, and few are based on evidence from program and project evaluation. While previous DAC reviews have addressed the issue of institutionalisation, the value added by the current review is to collate evidence on what has actually been shown to work in practice, based on the evaluations included in the database. This is a new perspective on this area of work. Findings are presented in chapter 5.

Benefits for women, gender analysis and development outcomes

The original research question for this area was to assess whether gender analysis and gender mainstreaming improves the achievement of overall development results. This area of the review presented the most significant challenges from a methodological point of view, which are outlined in detail in the introduction to chapter 6.

The Terms of Reference for the review indicated that if this area of enquiry was to yield significant findings, members would need to identify evaluations which did in fact make a link between the inclusion of gender perspectives in design and implementation, and successful or improved development outcomes. In fact, less than a handful of evaluations explicitly address these links at the macro level of overall development outcomes. As noted in the TOR (see Annex 7) the size of the database for this area of enquiry was unknown when

the review commenced. Being a meta-review, the consultants were unable to conduct any research using primary sources to more closely examine the links between gender analysis and mainstreaming and development outcomes. Furthermore, some members were interested in achievements related to the Millennium Development Goals. There were very few references in the evaluations to these goals, and no findings in this area are reported in chapter 6.

As a result of these difficulties, changes were made to the review framework, and questions on the data sheet were re-formulated as the review progressed, to ensure that all relevant information relating to links between benefits for women and men, attention to gender issues in the activities evaluated, and development outcomes, could be gleaned from reports⁸. This refinement of the methodology has enabled some interesting and useful findings to be extracted from the reports, and points towards the need for more research in this area. Chapter 6 presents findings, and Annex 6 illustrates these findings with examples from the evaluation database.

Note on terminology

The term 'results' is used to refer generally to a change which has come about due to a development intervention. A result may be a short-term change (an output), a medium-term outcome or benefit, or a longer-term impact. The term 'activity' is used to refer to a development intervention, which may be a whole program or project. The word 'activities' refers to tasks or actions which form a part of a project or program, and which need to be undertaken to achieve outputs. In chapter 4, the terms 'institutional' and 'institutionalisation' refer to evaluations which focus on assessing the extent to which gender equality policy commitments are integrated into overall agency policy, strategies, and procedures for planning, design, implementation and monitoring. Chapters 5 focuses on obstacles to the institutionalisation of gender equality policy, and successful strategies which facilitate institutionalisation at various levels. The term 'management' in chapter 4 refers to evaluations which focus primarily on the management of projects and programs, such as partner policy, project structures and administrative procedures, which are not specifically related to gender equality.

Comparisons between previous reviews and the current review

While there are some similarities in focus with the 2 previous WP-EV reviews (1994 and 1999), the current one departs from earlier reviews in significant ways: by focusing on evidence about strategies which promote institutionalisation of gender equality commitments (area 2 above); and by focusing on the links between benefits for women, gender analysis and gender mainstreaming efforts, and overall development outcomes (area 3 above).

The major area of similarity between all 3 reviews is the focus on evaluation methodology, which is the subject of chapter 4. However, direct comparisons with the 1999 review on evaluation methodology are difficult. This is because findings from the 1999 review are often quantified according to agency (whereas this review quantifies findings according to evaluation report); and because findings from the 1999 review were inconclusive in some areas.

8 . This area of the review was discussed at the October 2002 meeting of WP-GEN and concern was expressed regarding preliminary findings reported to the meeting. Although some changes had already been made to the methodology for this area, the data sheet for the review was refined further following this meeting to respond to the concerns raised.

One example illustrates this point: it is unclear whether participatory methods for including beneficiaries in general evaluations is more common now, than in 1999. Chapter 4 reports that 39% of general evaluations included participatory approaches with beneficiaries. For the remainder, many were not expected to include consultation or participation with beneficiaries because of their limited scope and focus, and for others there was simply inadequate information in the evaluation reports to assess whether a participatory approach has been taken. Another confounding factor is that both reviews are based on a sample of reports coming from only about half the total of DAC members. While there is some considerable overlap between the sets of agencies participating in the 1999 and current reviews, they are not exactly the same. Of the 12 agencies included in the database for the previous review, 9 reported that they used participatory approaches in most evaluations, leading Woodford-Berger to conclude that the 1999 review “did not provide conclusive evidence on these issues”.

There were very few thematic evaluations on gender equality, gender mainstreaming and women’s empowerment undertaken before the 1999 review. This is a major and positive sign of change. Attention to gender issues in TORs for general evaluations has probably improved since 1999 in terms of the number of TORs which now include some mention of the need to address gender issues in the evaluation, but the detail remains vague in most cases (see chapter 4). In other areas, progress appears to be rather slow and uneven: some evaluations present quality gender analysis supported by adequate sex-disaggregated information and the use of sex-disaggregated indicators; in other cases, there are no apparent indicators, little information, and less analysis. This varies markedly both between and within agencies, as it did at the time of the 1999 review.

CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS ON EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The major distinction in the sample is between thematic evaluations and general evaluations. Both have been reviewed for identifying lessons about the specific methodology they have used and, in the case of general evaluations, to learn about the extent to which gender issues were integrated into the overall methodology.

The two categories of thematic and general evaluations were sub-divided into different types for the purpose managing the review (for example, policy, cluster or project evaluations, see Tables 1 and 2). Where these sub-categories yield significant differences in findings, this is explicitly referred to in the analysis below; otherwise the findings cover the whole sample.

This chapter starts with a profile of the evaluation studies, and continues with an assessment of their scope and focus, of the methods and tools, including the use of indicators and frameworks, of the expertise involved and of the quality of the studies. The chapter ends with a summary of lessons learned.

Profile

Thematic evaluations

A total of 42 thematic evaluations have been submitted by 12 DAC members, plus World Bank, Asian Development Bank, Unifem, ILO and World Food Program. They may be categorized as individual project evaluations, evaluations of gender equality funds, clustered projects evaluations and studies, and evaluations of gender equality policy (see Table 1 below).

The evaluations of individual projects and of gender equality funds deal with projects focused on women and/or gender equality exclusively. The usual aim is to assess the performance and achievements, compared to the stated objectives and/or to make recommendations for the future. While most of the reports specify the goals of the evaluations, they seldom make clear why the evaluation was undertaken, or how it will be used and by whom.

The cluster studies are either examining the results of a group of projects for women and/or gender relationships or they look particularly at the dynamics of gender mainstreaming, in order to enhance the understanding of the issues by project and policy staff, and to help them improve their work in these areas.

The policy evaluations are broader than the cluster studies, covering a wider range of aspects. Often they have the double function of making judgements about gender equality features in the agency's programs and of learning lessons for the future. Some of the evaluations have primarily been set up to assess the results of gender equality policy⁹; several

9 . NL 1998, Sida 2002a, World Bank 2002, ADB 2001.

others have the character of an audit with groups of staff assessing the processes and procedures for mainstreaming applied in the organisation¹⁰.

General evaluations

A total of 44 general evaluations have been submitted by 10 DAC members, 8 of which have also provided thematic evaluations. This includes 20 project and cluster evaluations, 17 country, program or sector reviews, and 7 evaluations of NGO programs and projects (see Table 2). The size and scope of the studies varies considerably, ranging from studies that address one intervention only to studies that cover a few hundred project activities in a particular sector¹¹. The reason why evaluation studies have attended to gender issues varies. It may be that the project has an explicit objective on participation of women and/or gender equality; it may also be that gender issues are taken into account because they are a cross-cutting policy issue.

The amount of information on methodology included in the reports of general evaluations varies. Several reports provide little or no information on aspects of methodology, so that it is unknown how the studies have measured benefits for women and men, and what indicators and criteria have been used to assess progress towards gender equality. Others are fairly complete, including Terms of Reference, information about the involvement of stakeholders and beneficiaries in the evaluation process, information on data collection methods, indicators and criteria. Most of the information in the following paragraphs comes from the last group, although efforts have been made to derive information about the methodology used by the first group as well, on the basis of the findings in the reports.

Scope and focus

The 1999 Gender Review¹² found particular weaknesses in the assessment of development results and impact. Has this changed? In other words, how wide is the perspective of the evaluations? Do they focus primarily on institutional and managerial arrangements, do they mainly address results and impact for beneficiaries, or is their scope covering all of these aspects?

Thematic evaluations

The focus of the thematic evaluations is summarised in Table 1. Two-thirds (10/15) of the project evaluations deal with institutional and managerial aspects. This is not only the case when the object of evaluation is an institution, but it also goes for projects that were intended to improve the lives of women and men, so that opportunities to assess the results of the projects for ultimate beneficiaries have been under-used. When the studies do address benefits, the information provided is mostly about activities (for example, number of women trained), seldom about impacts.

10 . AusAID 2001, CIDA 2001a and ILO 2002.

11 . BMZ 2001a, Danida 2000a, DFID 2001b. The large sector or program wide studies have generated sub-reports, which have not been part of this Gender Review. Whatever specific information they may have about a gender focus in their data collection could only be taken up in this Review to the extent that it was included in the main report.

12 . Prudence Woodford-Berger 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.

Table 1: Scope of Thematic Evaluations

Scope	Policy	Cluster	Project	GE Fund	Total
Focus primarily on results		Belg 2001 JICA 2001 JICA 2000 USAID 2001b USAID 1999d	CIDA 1999a CIDA 1999b NZAID 2002a Sida 2000a USAID 2001a	CIDA 2000b CIDA 1999c USAID 1999c	13
Focus primarily on institutionalisation of gender equality policy commitments	AusAID 2001 CIDA 2001a ILO 2002 NORAD 1999b Unifem 2002 WFP2002	BMZ 2001b DFID 2000a DFID 2000b DFID 2000c DFID 1999a	CIDA 2002a NZAID 2002b SDC 2000 Sida 2002c		16
Focus on both results and institutionalisation	ADB 2001 NL 1998 Sida 2002a WB 2002	BMZ 2000			4
Focus on management issues			CIDA 1999d NORAD2001 NORAD 2000 NORAD 1999a USAID 1999a USAID 1999b		9
Total	10	11	15	6	42

Note: The focus on results is minimal in a number of cases. See paragraph 46 for explanation of the terms 'institutionalisation' and 'management'.

The scope of fund and cluster evaluations is more balanced. Half of these have focused on the implementation and results of the interventions. Those focusing on institutional or managerial aspects do so because they were explicitly designed to examine the gender-specificity in policy and planning, procedures, resources, monitoring and evaluation processes.

The policy evaluations present a varied picture. Four overall gender policy evaluations focus on both results and institutional aspects. The core question of the Sida 2002a evaluation is whether the mainstreaming strategy has influenced results with regard to the promotion of gender equality, with emphasis on interventions in 3 selected countries. The World Bank 2001 study has an institutional focus and looks at the gender analysis of the Bank's analytical work and gender integration in Country Assistance Strategies. The World Bank 2002 study is results-focused, taking the country as the unit of evaluation (12 countries have been selected) and evaluates i) the extent to which the Bank has helped reduce gender disparity in health and education sectors, ii) has helped increase the participation of women in economic activities, and iii) has influenced institutional changes that support the advancement of women. The Netherlands evaluation is also focused on results for women, analysing 2 country programs for this reason, in addition to assessing the policy and institutional structure at headquarters and embassies for their contribution to these results. The ADB evaluation addresses both institutional aspects and results for beneficiaries in 3 countries. The focus of all other policy studies in the sample is primarily on institutionalisation, which means that they assess the extent to which gender equality concerns are integrated into policy, strategy and procedures for planning and implementation. Some of the studies are gender policy audits.

General evaluations

The scope and focus of the general evaluations is summarised in Table 2. It shows that the majority of project and cluster evaluations are results-focused, the majority of the NGO evaluations are management-focused, while the country/programme/sector reviews tend to focus on both results and management issues.

Table 2: Scope of General Evaluations

Scope	Project and Cluster	Country, program or sector reviews	NGO Programs	Total
Focus primarily on results	AusAID 2002b AusAID 2000b AusAID 2000c AusAID 2000d AusAID 2000f AusAID 1999a AusAID 1999b AusAID 1999c AusAID 1999c CIDA 2000h SDC 1999a SDC 1999d SDC 1999e	AusAID 2000e CIDA 2001b SDC 1999b	AusAID 2000a AusAID 2000g	18
Focus primarily on management issues	CIDA 2000c NL 2001 SDC 1999c	NORAD 1999c	CIDA 2000f CIDA 1999e CIDA 1999f CIDA 1999g	8
Focus on both results & management issues	CIDA 2000d CIDA 2000g Sida 2001b Sida 2000c	BMZ 20001a Danida 2002a Danida 2002b Danida 2001a Danida 2001b Danida 2000a Danida 2000c Danida 1999 DFID 2002 DFID 2001b EC 2001a EC 2001b NL 2002	CIDA 2000e	18
Total	20	17	7	44

Note: See paragraph 46 for explanation of the term 'management'.

'Focusing on results' does not necessarily mean that these general evaluations focus on results related to gender equality, or on benefits for women. It means that their overall focus is on results of the project/program. The quality of the integration of a gender analysis in the general evaluations is the subject of the next section.

Overall quality of gender analysis in general evaluations

Table 3 presents the overall quality of gender analysis in the general evaluations.

Table 3: Assessment of General Evaluations¹³

Satisfactory attention to gender issues	Unsatisfactory attention to gender issues	Highly unsatisfactory attention to gender issues
6 AusAID 1 BMZ 3 CIDA 5 Danida 2 DFID	4 AusAID 3 CIDA 1 Danida 1 Netherlands 1 NORAD 1 SDC	2 AusAID 4 CIDA 1 Danida 2 EC 1 Netherlands 4 SDC 2 Sida
17	11	16

Note: Definitions of satisfactory, unsatisfactory and highly unsatisfactory are included in the paragraph below. The total sample of general evaluations is 44.

Table 3 shows that:

- Seventeen evaluations (39%) are rated as having a satisfactory gender analysis. These reports have assessed the participation of women in activities. They also provide at least one piece of information on how women have benefited from program or project activities, or they have made at least one statement about the impact of activities on women. A few have also included some information or assessment of changes in gender relations.
- Eleven evaluations (25%) are rated as having unsatisfactory gender analysis. These evaluations have assessed the participation of women in project or program activities in a limited way. They have not provided information on how women have benefited, nor are there any statements about impact on women.
- Sixteen evaluations (36%) are highly unsatisfactory in their treatment of gender issues. These evaluations do not assess women's participation, benefits or impact on women. In some cases, references to women or gender in the text are superficial and state the intention to assess benefits to women, but little or no data is presented. They may describe agency policy commitments to gender equality, or they may suggest that more gender analysis is needed¹⁴.

Methods and tools

How are the evaluations conducted? Are they desk reviews, have field studies been carried out, what has been the involvement of stakeholders and beneficiaries? Are

-
13. Inevitably, with any rating system based on qualitative assessments, there will be cases which are difficult to categorise, due to the diversity in type, scope and objectives of evaluations in the database. Where these difficulties have arisen between satisfactory and unsatisfactory attention to gender issues, we have erred on the side of generosity and rated the evaluation as having satisfactory gender analysis. The table and supporting analysis should not be seen as representative of agencies' overall evaluations, due to bias in the review sample: agencies were requested to submit evaluations which have addressed gender issues; evaluations which gave no attention to gender issues were culled from the sample.
14. In some cases these evaluations are limited by scarce sex-disaggregated data due to poor activity design and monitoring, or the evaluators may note that there was inadequate time to deal with all evaluation issues.

frameworks developed, criteria and indicators applied, have special tools been used or developed, and how did this work out?

Thematic evaluations

The individual project evaluations and the evaluations of funds are usually conducted in a standard way: desk studies are combined with brief field visits (of 1 to 2 weeks) to interview stakeholders, mainly project/counterpart staff, with meetings with direct primary beneficiaries. In general, the studies have not been carried out very systematically; evaluation criteria such as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability (standards mentioned in the DAC definition of evaluation) have been applied in an *ad hoc* way. Only 4 of 15 project evaluations make explicit use of gender sensitive indicators. Others may have used indicators in the evaluation process, but these have not been documented. Participation of beneficiaries is found in a little over one-third of the evaluations, participation usually meaning that beneficiaries have been consulted. A more active form of participation was found in one CIDA project evaluation, where partner agencies had direct input into recommendations based on problems and achievements identified by beneficiaries and other stakeholders¹⁵.

The methods used in the 11 cluster studies varies considerably. Those initiated to study experiences with mainstreaming are mainly desk studies, in incidental cases complemented by interviews with staff. On the other hand, the project evaluations included in the Belgian (2001) cluster study are designed to be very participatory, with a high level of involvement of primary stakeholders. Many of these studies went off track, mainly due to the complexity of the evaluation design, which is based on the assumption of causality between changes in gender relations and poverty reduction. The USAID study of the education sector in multiple countries is a good example of a well-designed study¹⁶, which systematically apply gender-sensitive criteria and indicators, contrary to many of the other studies in this category.

The bigger policy studies are the most interesting in terms of methods and tools. The World Bank, Sida, ADB and Netherlands evaluations are all systematically laid out, with analytical frameworks either for the whole evaluation or for parts of it. Gender-sensitive indicators and evaluation criteria have been applied throughout. All of the studies include desk reviews, staff surveys, stakeholder consultations and participatory beneficiary assessments in the countries involved. For the sake of participation, a range of tools has been applied, varying from well-known PRA tools to separate village studies (that is, outside the context of project evaluations) for the purpose of understanding the perceptions of the population on developments in their area. Participation of stakeholders and beneficiaries is part of the design of all four studies, mainly in the form of consultation. The World Bank explains that this approach responded to the lack of available sex-disaggregated data for assessment, making it necessary to collect data directly from beneficiaries during the evaluation. The success of a participatory approach depends largely on the available time and resources to carry out the studies; frustration is encountered when they had to be fitted into a regular two-weeks country field visit.

The qualification 'interesting' does not automatically imply that the methods yield good evaluation results. In one case (Sida 2002b) the design was too ambitious and complex to address the Terms of Reference. The evaluation design was based on the idea ('hypothesis') that gender mainstreaming would have effects on gender equality and that the projects

15 . CIDA 1999a.

16 . USAID 1999d.

selected would provide the lessons of how this worked. When the expected effects were hardly found (most of the projects had only nominally implemented the mainstreaming strategy yet, and several were mainly of an institutional nature making it difficult to assess direct benefits for women and men), the evaluation team pursued two tracks. The first track was lessons on processes for introducing and implementing gender equality mainstreaming. The other track was to look ahead and share ideas on how Sida's gender equality policy could be strengthened and better integrated with the overall poverty reduction strategy. In hindsight, alternative sampling of interventions could have been better matched with the objectives of the evaluation.

Gender auditing is a new method of establishing accountability towards gender concerns (see also Annex 3). The features distinguishing a gender audit from an evaluation are its focus on mainstreaming policy commitments and its involvement of a large group of agency staff. Two of the three gender audits submitted are examples of participatory self-assessment methods. The ILO audit was designed to promote learning by participants and to facilitate their ownership of the findings, in the expectation that this will lead to direct action on their side to improve gender mainstreaming. This is a major strength of the participatory approach to gender auditing, although it is too soon to assess whether gender audits will fulfil these expectations. A weakness of most gender audit methodologies is that links to development outcomes and impact are limited or absent.

Concerns about the lack of a gender equality focus in Sector-Wide Approaches and in Poverty Reduction Strategies has brought about studies examining the process of these strategies and the critical factors for women's participation in them¹⁷. The studies submitted are promising examples for promoting the gender equality focus in these new areas of the development agenda, provided the lessons are taken to heart.

General evaluations

With a significant number of reports providing little information about methodology, it is impossible to quantify how many evaluations have applied certain methods. Most of the evaluation studies that are rated as having a satisfactory attention to gender issues (Table 3) have collected both quantitative and qualitative data. Quantitative data focuses mainly on inputs and activities, such as the participation of women in training, the number of women in groups, the number of women's groups, or the number of loans provided. Qualitative data tends to focus on benefits and /or impact.

For the collection of qualitative data, participatory methods were employed: at least 17 of the general evaluations (39%) have involved beneficiaries of the community, while some others have used participatory methods of data collection with project staff and stakeholders. Most of the evaluations which have satisfactory gender analysis have used participatory methods at some level. However, participatory methods were also applied by evaluations which have unsatisfactory gender analysis, indicating that participation does not always lead to adequate attention to gender issues. Very few reports have indicated whether they have used separate data collection processes with women and men, to ensure that women's perceptions of benefits and impacts are heard.

Only 7 evaluations (16% of the sample of general evaluations) explicitly report that they have used gender sensitive indicators (see Annex 5 for a summary of the types of indicators used). This figure may under-report the use of gender sensitive indicators in general evaluations, because the larger country, program and sector studies do not provide sufficient

17 . BMZ 2001b, DFID 2000c.

detail on methodology to assess whether indicators have been used. Not surprisingly, all reports which did include gender sensitive indicators were rated as having satisfactory gender analysis. In many cases, these indicators have been formulated at the evaluation stage (rather than during intervention design or implementation), and therefore have not been linked to monitoring and information systems. Moreover, it appears that most have not been formulated in a collaborative manner between donors and partners. The indicators include:

- process indicators focused on the institutionalisation of gender equality commitments through the project cycle, and in organisations
- indicators to measure the participation of women in development activities
- indicators to measure benefits to women and changes in gender relations, including empowerment indicators.

In most of the general evaluations, the application of gender analysis concepts¹⁸ is rather *ad hoc*, and often key information relating to the activity, sector or program is missed. Satisfactory evaluations have more consistently used and applied concepts which are relevant to the activity being evaluated.

Overall, the evaluations are characterised by poor analysis, even when some significant quantitative and qualitative data may have been collected. The implication is that discussion of gender issues is often limited to considering the participation of women. There is little or no examination of unintended impacts for women, or any other group such as men and women living in poverty. However, to be fair, these questions were beyond the scope of some institutional reviews included in the sample.

Some reports in the sample include Terms of Reference (TORs). Those that do, have generally only a vague reference to women or 'gender', usually among a long list of objectives or questions that evaluators are required to address. Some refer to the agency's gender policy, others require an assessment of whether "gender aspects have been integrated". Most reports which do include TORs require some gender expertise on the team, but about one-third of these do not.

Special gender evaluation tool

CIDA developed a dedicated tool to support evaluators, partners and staff to focus on gender equality (2001e), as part of the agency's Evaluation Guide (CIDA 2001i). As part of this review, CIDA offered to examine the application and use of the gender equality evaluation guide. CIDA cautioned that the gender equality evaluation guide was published only 18 months prior to the examination, with minimal publicity. The results of a limited number of interviews with Gender Equality specialists (4) and program staff (9) show that the guide has hardly been used by program staff; only 2 out of 9 program staff surveyed used it, 4 never did and 3 didn't know about its existence. Questions in the survey about how to improve the focus on gender relations in evaluations evoked answers like: ensure a proper

18 . The consultants assessed the use/application of the following gender analysis concepts in evaluations: gender division of labour, access to and control over resources, understanding women's and men's different needs, understanding constraints and barriers to male and female participation, assessment of strategies for working with females and males, assessment of practical needs or strategic interests identified or met, and changes in gender relations, including in decision making and leadership.

baseline on gender equality in project design, ensure gender expertise and understanding on the team, and ensure a better understanding of evaluation itself.

Annex 4 illustrates some of the features of evaluation methodology discussed above, which facilitate attention to gender issues.

Expertise and quality

What kind of expertise was called for in the evaluations, and what was the level of involvement of partner agencies? Did evaluations assess the capacity of partners to work on changing gender relations? What is the quality of the basic material that evaluators have to work with, but also what about the quality of the evaluations submitted?

Information about who is involved in the evaluations and about their level of expertise is far from complete, but the available data suggest that local consultants are hired in combination with international consultants in the case of thematic evaluations carried out in the field. Some agencies have been very explicit about ensuring an equal or larger share of local expertise in the teams. Use of local partner/consultants is less obvious in general evaluations. In rare cases, donors conducted 'joint reviews' meaning a review together with representation of the local partner, or with a consultant selected by the partner. There is no indication that donors are working towards more joint evaluation practices, either joint donor or joint donor-partner, as might be expected in line with the changes in development practices, such as sector-wide approaches and emphasis on national ownership.

Information about the experiences with local expertise in evaluations is not provided in the reports, hence some interviews conducted for this review addressed this particular question. Answers showed that local expertise is found to be indispensable both from the point of view of the quality of the evaluation and of its reliability and truthfulness. Putting people from different backgrounds to work together, however, requires careful and skilful preparation and training in collecting appropriate information on gender issues and impacts, and on participatory methods. This needs adequate resources of time and money, and should be budgeted properly. The World Bank and the Netherlands considered the involvement of local evaluators also as a capacity-building exercise. ADB found that local sector specialists were better performers than gender specialists without sectoral knowledge.

Many thematic evaluations did assess the capacity of the partner to work on changing gender relations. All of the Fund evaluations did, almost all of the cluster evaluations did, as did two-thirds of the project evaluations, and a large part of the policy evaluations, including all the overall policy studies. In contrast, only one-third of the general evaluations looked at partner capacity or commitment, and these only in a limited way. NGO institutional evaluations were most likely to consider this issue while some others did at least recognize (though not analyse) the crucial importance of commitment and capacity of government and/or partners for a successful change in gender relationships.

The quality of the basic material with which evaluators had to work was often weak. Over one-quarter of the general evaluations have explicitly identified lack of sex-disaggregated information as a constraint to assessing the participation of women in activities evaluated, and to assessing results. The thematic evaluations had similar problems: lack of baseline data and limited monitoring information, an absence of sex-disaggregated data on gender relations and on benefits. Faced with these problems, evaluators took recourse in qualitative data collection techniques to assess results. Particularly the larger evaluations had the opportunity and capacity to go out and collect such data themselves. However, many others did not, due to inadequate time and resources, so that they were not able to produce

concrete information. Overall, few studies show sound quantitative and qualitative data about progress made for women and men over the period evaluated; many limit themselves to general remarks, unsupported by evidence.

Despite the shift from ‘women in development’ to ‘gender equality’ or ‘gender and development’ approaches at policy level, the evaluations focus overwhelmingly on women. This is so in the gender sections of the general evaluation reports, but also in the thematic evaluations. Most frequent is the use of the word ‘gender’ as a synonym for ‘women’. Few studies have consistently qualified ‘gender’ and used it correctly in connection with ‘relationships’, ‘equality’, roles or responsibilities. Men are missing from most reports. This means that there is little or no focus on gender relations and on the impact of development activities on gender equality, nor is there any focus on how gender relations may influence women’s capacity to participate or benefit. This points to an apparent contradiction: while donors have adopted the gender language and have ‘gender equality’ stated as their official policy, the implementation process seems not to be oriented towards gender equality. Evaluations face these problems, which may well be one of the reasons for much confusing terminology in evaluation reports. On the positive side, for those studies that do report on gender equality, the focus is usually on changes in women’s decision making, most often at community level.

Conclusions and lessons

Objectives of evaluations

The objective of ‘learning lessons’ was stated repeatedly in all types of evaluations. This assumes:

- that there are lessons to be learned in practice (frequently, this was less so than expected)
- that the evaluation team has the ability to pass on these lessons (many evaluation reports showed that they lacked this capacity)
- that there is someone listening and taking the lessons to heart (a minority of the evaluations reports makes explicit who will be the users of the evaluation)

Scope and focus

Mainstreaming is merely a means to an end, and not an end in itself. However, many evaluations have focused only on evaluating institutional mainstreaming, without considering the extent to which this really leads to the desired changes in gender relations. In some evaluations, this may be the result of limited resources, or a decision to focus on what the agency can control or influence, in the context of attempts to increase agency accountability to gender equality policy. It is important for future thematic evaluations to focus on results, as well as on institutional mainstreaming practices. Also problematic was designing an evaluation on the basis of the assumption that mainstreaming leads to effective gender equality outcomes. Instead, it proved to be more useful to find positive or negative outcomes of interventions first, and then to examine the factors that promote good or poor performance.

Methods and tools

The study does not point to any one particular magic method or tool for evaluating gender equality, but the following lessons can be drawn:

1. A good gender-focused evaluation is first of all a good evaluation. This means that there is a clear and simple objective, a transparent design, with findings based on evidence, clear evaluation criteria and gender-specific indicators. Some of the thematic studies developed good frameworks, that can be adapted to other evaluation studies¹⁹.
2. The design of the evaluation needs to match the objectives: if lesson-learning is the first objective, the selection of projects needs to be handled very carefully and flexibility should be allowed to adapt the study if necessary.
3. Consistent sex-disaggregation of quantitative and qualitative data is crucial for a good evaluation. Baseline data (disaggregated by sex, as well as by age, ethnicity and other key socio-economic variables) needs to be collected during design. Without a baseline, and sex-disaggregated information collected through implementation, it is difficult to measure change, and potential differences in results for women and men. If data is not available at the time of the evaluation, efforts should be made to collect it in an efficient way.
4. The whole range of participatory rural appraisal (PRA) techniques, including focus group discussions, will only bring out satisfactory information about gender relations if these are conducted with women and men separately.
5. The findings resulting from PRA techniques can be cross-checked with findings from using other methods. This will limit the bias of any one method only and will solve the problem of the small numbers of people involved in PRA data collection methods.
6. No matter how good the methods and tools, it requires human and financial resources to operate them. This requires a capacity to undertake gender analysis, as appropriate to the scope and objectives of the evaluation, specifically: the capacity to determine appropriate research questions to investigate potential differences in participation, benefits and impacts between women and men; the capacity to formulate sex-disaggregated indicators; the capacity to identify and collect sex-disaggregated data; and the capacity to analyse the data collected in relation to the activities being evaluated. It also means sufficient time and resources to do a good job. If expertise is lacking, if insufficient time and money is allowed, the most beautiful design will fall into pieces.

Expertise and quality

The quality of the evaluations is very mixed. There are good and sound evaluations, but there are also a lot of poor evaluations. The latter concern studies with a high level of improvisation, characterised by the absence of evaluation criteria, gender-specific indicators and a framework for the evaluation. Sometimes, evaluation designs are too complex to be carried through, leading to disagreement among the team, descriptive instead of evaluative reports, highly impressionistic findings, describing views of the researchers that cannot be traced back to data presented. Apparently, there is considerable ignorance about evaluation as an instrument to assess a project, programme or policy, both among evaluators and agency

19. World Bank 2002, ADB 2001, NL 1998.

staff. This is reinforced by interviews with a small sample of CIDA staff which indicate that CIDA officers could benefit from courses in how to manage evaluations which would include integrating a gender equality perspective at all stages in the process of evaluation.

Recommendations for follow-up are addressed in the conclusions in chapter 7.

CHAPTER 5: INSTITUTIONAL APPROACHES AND CHANGE STRATEGIES

Introduction

This chapter presents findings from both thematic and general evaluations on institutional approaches and change strategies which respond to recurrent obstacles to gender mainstreaming. While there is an extensive literature on the institutionalisation of gender equality approaches²⁰, the value added by this current review is that it distils evidence based on agency evaluations. The word “evidence” is important here: many of the evaluations in the database contain suggestions or recommendations for ways to increase attention to gender issues. This chapter does not report on those suggestions and recommendations. Unless otherwise stated, the strategies and change mechanisms discussed below are drawn from evaluators’ assessments of **what has actually worked in practice**.

Different types of reports tend to focus on different levels of institutionalisation. Thematic policy and cluster reports tend to focus more on policy dialogue, country assistance strategies and obstacles relating to donor and partner institutions, whereas individual project and program and small cluster evaluations tend to focus on obstacles in the program/project cycle. Comparatively few evaluations focus on making progress towards gender equality at the community level.

There is a very high degree of consistency in the findings about the major obstacles, and about strategies which have supported increased attention to gender issues at various levels. Unless otherwise stated, only those change strategies which have been identified by 3 or more evaluations as successful are noted below. To avoid repetition, successful change strategies are discussed under the following sub-headings:

1. Partnerships and dialogue on gender equality
2. Donor policy and country assistance strategies
3. Donor organisations and the activity/project cycle
4. Making progress towards gender equality at the community level

What institutional obstacles to addressing gender issues do the evaluations report on? What change strategies and factors have been successful for addressing gender issues? In other words, what has actually worked in practice?

Partnerships and dialogue on gender equality: fundamental factors for successful change strategies

One major obstacle identified in a number of reports is the lack of attention given to assessing and strengthening partner capacity and commitment for gender sensitive and

20 . A review of the literature in this area is beyond the scope of the current review.

participatory design and implementation²¹. Others identify lack of ownership of gender equality goals and strategies at intervention level as a key problem²². This also applies to NGOs. As the ADB points out, the capacity to implement gender provisions in design is often assumed²³.

Box 1. Building partnerships on gender equality

There are a number of recurring factors which emerge as fundamental elements for successful change strategies. There is a very high degree of consistency across agencies and types of assistance about the importance of these factors for successful *policy dialogue*²⁴, for the incorporation of gender equality issues into *country assistance strategies*²⁵, and for successful attention to gender equality issues and women's needs in *activity design, implementation and monitoring*²⁶. These fundamental success factors are:

- *National and/or partner institution ownership*, which needs to be translated into a shared vision between donor and partner agencies regarding how gender equality is relevant to country strategies and individual interventions, in the prevailing socio-economic and political context.
- *Explicit consensus on clear and simple objectives* (focused on meeting women's and girls' needs, or on gender equality), which are transparently relevant to partner government policies and commitments, and which result in agreed decisions regarding investments and activities.
- *The involvement of stakeholders from civil society* in advocacy and direction-setting appears to play a key role in facilitating the incorporation of gender equality objectives into country assistance strategies. Strengthening civil society is also mentioned as a strategy for overcoming problems with partner institution commitment, or with gaps between commitments and practice. The importance of national machineries for women, NGOs, women's organisations and other local gender equality advocates are highlighted by some evaluations in this regard²⁷.
- *The need to make long-term commitments* is important for making progress towards gender equality at both macro and micro levels.

Regular and consistent dialogue between donor agencies and partners has been highlighted as a key factor resulting in a shared vision, and clear objectives. In the education sector, all the above factors have been fundamental to developing successful programs to expand access to universal primary education²⁸.

Policy and country assistance strategies

Those reports which have focused on policy level obstacles note that agencies have crowded policy agendas, which results in a failure to prioritise gender equality objectives in country strategies. This goes hand-in-hand with a lack of guidance on how to operationalise

21 . AusAID 2001, ILO 2002, CIDA 2001d, CIDA 1999c, Sida 2001a, Sida 2000b.
 22 . Danida 2002a, Sida 2002a, AusAID 2000d.
 23 . ADB 2001: iii, 22. For NGOs, see CIDA 2000c, CIDA 1999f and ADB 2001: 20.
 24 . Sida 2002a, Sida 2002c, CIDA 2001d, CIDA 2000b, WFP 2002, CIDA 1999c, USAID 1999d, World Bank 2001, SPC 2001 (see Annex 1 Table 4 for reference).
 25 . World Bank 2001, World Bank 2002, Unifem 2002, NORAD 1999b.
 26 . Sida 2002a, Sida 2000b, CIDA 2002a, CIDA 2002b, CIDA 1999c, ADB 2001, AusAID 1999b, DFID 1999a, JICA 2000, AusAID 2001, NZAID 2002b, World Bank 2002, AusAID 2000b.
 27 . Sida 2002a, Sida 2001b, NORAD 1999b.
 28 . USAID 1999d: 14-15.

policy. Evaluations call for stronger and more explicit links to be made between gender equality and poverty reduction policies, and how these are to be addressed in country strategies and interventions²⁹. No clear successful strategies have emerged to address these issues in the reports reviewed.

Donor organisations and the activity/project cycle

Donor Organisations

Although evaluations list a number of different obstacles within donor organisations, the main area of consensus is that there is a lack of accountability to gender equality commitments, which are not anchored into general agency procedures, instruments and overall policy implementation monitoring systems³⁰. For example, one of AusAID's general evaluations notes that 3 projects were rated highly on AusAID's primary management and reporting tool, despite the fact that gender issues were very poorly addressed in 2 of these projects³¹.

Only two evaluations note that having agency-level targets and plans has helped to address some of the issues above³², and one points to the need for such a plan (for example, AusAID 2001). Others note that leadership and commitment have been key factors in creating an enabling corporate culture³³.

Some evaluations note that training is often ineffective at assisting staff to integrate gender equality concerns into their immediate work tasks³⁴. A related problem is a lack of conceptual clarity, for example, treating gender mainstreaming as a goal, rather than as a strategy, or confusing women-focused and gender equality approaches³⁵. The likelihood of training being applied to work tasks increases when it is sector-specific, hands-on, and/or directly linked to individual project contexts and activities³⁶.

Four evaluations mention lack of gender analysis tools as a constraint, but each has a different perspective on the matter. One Sida evaluation mentions that there are no tools and little expertise for addressing gender issues in SWAps; the ILO notes that there is a lack of effective or accessible tools (partly due to poor institutional memory); and AusAID's policy evaluation identifies a need for sector-specific tools. Sida's policy evaluation identifies the problem as a **lack of use of existing tools**³⁷. No evaluations identify tools as having assisted

29 . Sida 2002a, WFP 2002, World Bank 2002, DFID 1999a, NORAD 1999b, AusAID 2001, ILO 2002, see also chapter 6.

30 . BMZ 2000:3, AusAID 2001: vi, Sida 2002c, WFP 2002: 27, NORAD 1999b: 2-4, CIDA 2002a, World Bank 2001: 24, 31.

31 . AusAID 1999c: 42.

32 . WFP 2002, ILO 2002.

33 . NORAD 1999b, Unifem 2002, Sida 2002a.

34 . AusAID 2001, WFP 2002, NORAD 1999b, World Bank 2001.

35 . AusAID 2001, ILO 2002, WFP 2002, Unifem 2002.

36 . Sida 2002a, ILO 2002, EC 2001b, AusAID 1999b, DFID 1999a.

37 . Anecdotal evidence also suggests existing tools are rarely used. (Juliet Hunt, 2000 "Institutionalising gender equality commitments in development organisations and programs" Winston Churchill Memorial Trust of Australia, Canberra: 13). Sida 2002c, ILO 2002, AusAID 2001: vii, Sida 2002a.

with attention to gender issues, unless the development of the tool has been used as a training or learning exercise³⁸.

Activity/Intervention Design and Implementation - Obstacles

There is much consensus in the reports that a lack of attention to gender issues in design is a critical constraint to gender sensitive activity implementation. Lack of participation by women in activity design, poor needs analysis, lack of baseline data on key gender differences, and a failure to address gender issues at the level of activity objectives are all highlighted³⁹.

A more specific obstacle identified by some evaluations is the fact that when gender analysis is undertaken in design, it is often not linked in any meaningful way to the activities to be implemented, or to the expected results⁴⁰. This makes it exceedingly difficult to seriously address gender issues during implementation, and increases the likelihood that attention to women will be marginalized to individual components⁴¹. Other reports identify the lack of a coherent approach to addressing gender issues in an intervention, particularly the lack of an explicit gender strategy, as a key obstacle⁴².

Some evaluations note the lack of gender and social analysis expertise as a constraint during implementation⁴³. A lack of integration between gender analysis and overall social analysis undertaken for design is also identified as a constraint⁴⁴. Findings on evaluation methodology (see chapter 4) suggests that this problem (a marginalisation of gender analysis from overall social analysis) is extensive. Without integrated analysis, agency staff are far less likely to be able to make concrete links between poverty reduction and gender equality objectives, and to strategically apply the fundamental success factors noted in the section above. A DFID review of gender mainstreaming in 3 countries puts a fine point on this issue: the evaluator pointed out that DFID devotes far greater resources to gender mainstreaming in the Pakistan program, where the scale of the problem is great, the opportunities for working in partnership limited and the likelihood of sustainable short-term change minimal; compared with the Southern African program, where the opportunities for working in partnership are great and the consequent possibilities for sustainable change considerable⁴⁵.

Activity/Intervention Design and Implementation - Change Strategies

Not surprisingly, there is much consensus that addressing gender issues in design is an important strategy for ensuring that they are properly addressed in implementation. While many evaluations are vague about the details, others specify key success factors: participatory strategies involving both women and men in design and implementation, ensuring that there is

38 . NORAD 1999b.

39 . AusAID 2000g, EC 2001b, DFID 2002a, World Bank 2001, JICA 2000, Danida 2001b, AusAID 1999b, AusAID 2000f, EC 2001a, AusAID 2000g, ADB 2001, WFP 2002.

40 . CIDA 2001d, CIDA 2000d, Danida 2001b, AusAID 2001, Sida 2002a, CIDA 2001a, ADB 2001, CIDA 2002b, ILO 2002.

41 . BMZ 2000.

42 . AusAID 1999a, Danida 2001b, Danida 2000c, CIDA 2002b, JICA 2000.

43 . DFID 1999a, Sida 2002c, AusAID 2001.

44 . World Bank 2001, Sida 2002a, WFP 2002, EC 2001b.

45 . DFID 1999a: paragraph 2.3.11.

adequate time for field-based studies, having adequate baseline data, and ensuring that gender issues are incorporated into activity objectives⁴⁶. Other evaluations note that an explicit gender strategy for the intervention is critical, but most qualify this by saying that the strategy has to be of high quality, pragmatic, and of course, it must actually be implemented⁴⁷. While Sida's policy evaluation does not explicitly identify a gender strategy as a success factor, it does note the importance of key elements which should be included in any strategy, including: concrete exploration of what gender equality means for each situation and intervention, as a step towards identifying expected goals, results and indicators⁴⁸.

There is an emerging consensus that including explicit responsibilities for achieving gender equality objectives in Terms of Reference, Scopes of Services and job descriptions increases the likelihood of gender issues being addressed. This applies to all personnel engaged in design, implementation and monitoring⁴⁹. The importance of having gender aware, competent and committed staff and stakeholders in the field to implement and manage activities is noted by many evaluations as a key to success⁵⁰, and one DFID evaluation highlights having designated staff who have time, resources and support to fulfil their responsibilities⁵¹. Others identify in-country gender expertise as having been a key success factor where gender issues have been addressed⁵².

Activity/Intervention Monitoring

As one would expect from the findings in chapter 4, a number of evaluations have identified weak monitoring processes as a serious constraint. Specific issues highlighted include:

- lack of attention to or capacity for impact monitoring⁵³;
- lack of baseline data preventing assessment of impact⁵⁴;
- lack of gender sensitive indicators and sex-disaggregated information⁵⁵;
- lack of qualitative gender equality indicators⁵⁶.

46 . ADB 2001, AusAID 2001, AusAID 2000b, AusAID 2000g, AusAID 1999a, AusAID 1999b, BMZ 2000, CIDA 2001a, DFID 1999a, EC 2001b, JICA 2000, JICA 2001, Sida 2002a.

47 . CIDA 2002 a, CIDA 2002b, CIDA 2001a, AusAID 2000d, AusAID 1999a.

48 . Sida 2002a: xv, 98.

49 . ADB 2001, AusAID 2001, CIDA 2001a, CIDA 2002b, EC 2001b, JICA 2001, Sida 2002a.

50 . ILO 2002, JICA 2000, CIDA 2002b, DFID 1999a, WFP 2002, AusAID 2000d, EC 2001b, Danida 2002a.

51 . DFID 1999a.

52 . NL 1998, ADB 2001, JICA 2000: 285, AusAID 2000c, AusAID 1999c, Sida 2002a.

53 . AusAID 1999c, BMZ 2000, Sida 2000b, NZAID 2002b, EC 2001b, NORAD 2000.

54 . AusAID 2000c, JICA 2000, JICA 2001, WFP 2002.

55 . AusAID 1999b, AusAID 2000a, AusAID 2000b, BMZ 2000, CIDA 2002b, ILO 2002, World Bank 2001, AusAID 2000f, AusAID 1999a, CIDA 1999c, CIDA 2001c.

56 . ADB 2001, CIDA 2000d, EC 2001a, Sida 2002a, WFP 2002.

AusAID's policy review also notes the lack of resources for collecting data where gender equality objectives are not included in logframes and monitoring and evaluation plans⁵⁷.

The strategy used successfully to address this obstacle is of course to develop and use gender sensitive indicators. Some evaluations note that this has facilitated attention to gender issues during implementation⁵⁸.

Making progress towards gender equality at the community level

Obstacles

Lack of effective targeting of women to ensure that they participate in key training and other project activities is identified as a problem by 3 AusAID reports⁵⁹, whereas 3 other evaluations focus on the lack of participatory processes in project implementation as a constraint⁶⁰. Mandatory requirements, or even just the expectation that women should participate has sometimes resulted in increasing women's overall burdens, without yielding any economic returns, which also leads to women dropping out of project-led activities. The assumption that women will provide unpaid labour to participate is also identified as a problem⁶¹.

Other evaluations highlight the difficulty of moving from women participating, to their being involved in decision making and actually controlling resources⁶². While some evaluators note that "cultural constraints" inhibit women from participating and benefiting⁶³, few reports actually identify what those specific constraints are, which is an essential first step to actually addressing them (for example, USAID 2001b). The need for dialogue and involvement of men to achieve benefits for women or changes in gender equality is rarely identified as an issue⁶⁴.

*Successful change strategies*⁶⁵

Participatory approaches are highlighted as successful for bringing about changes in gender relations at community level. Leadership training, group formation with women, involving women in decision making bodies, and ensuring that they have access to project

57 . AusAID 2001: 15-16. Only one agency (ILO 2002) indicated that general understanding of indicators is poor, as distinct from gender sensitive indicators.

58 . ADB 2001, ILO 2002, CIDA 2002b, JICA 2000.

59 . AusAID 2000a, 2000d, 2000f.

60 . AusAID 1999a, Sida 2002a, World Bank 2001.

61 . World Bank 2002, CIDA 2002b, ADB 2001.

62 . AusAID 1999a, CIDA 2000c, WFP 2002, World Bank 2002.

63 . AusAID 2001, ADB 2001, AusAID 1999b.

64 . Sida 2002a, CIDA 1999c, CIDA 2000g.

65 . See Annex 6 for examples of how women have benefited from the interventions evaluated. Chapter 6 examines evidence of a causal relationship between attention to gender issues and the benefits identified.

resources are all mentioned as having been successful, along with networking and support for women's advocacy with local men⁶⁶.

A number of reports note that the use of female staff and extension agents facilitates effective targeting and participation of women⁶⁷. The importance of supporting women's organisations as agents of civil society is a very strong feature of success in some programs⁶⁸.

Conclusions and lessons

There is a very high degree of consensus about the obstacles to addressing gender issues, and about what change strategies have been successful. The list of strategies above is neither new nor comprehensive. However, it is based on evidence of what has worked in the field. It also reinforces the experience of program planners, implementers and gender specialists about what actions need to be taken to improve implementation of gender equality policy in development interventions.

Lessons include:

1. Lack of attention to partner capacity and ownership emerge as a key obstacles across all levels of institutionalisation.
2. Building partnerships on gender equality through dialogue needs to be seen as a fundamental aspect of any change strategy. There is a high degree of consensus regarding the importance of 4 factors to support this process: national or partner institution ownership, consensus on clear objectives, the need for stakeholder involvement, and long-term commitment.
3. There is an urgent need to make explicit links between gender equality and poverty reduction objectives, at policy level, in country assistance strategies, and in individual activities or interventions.
4. Lack of accountability to gender equality policy within donor agencies, and the related failure to mainstream gender equality perspectives into general agency procedures is an ongoing concern. While there are no simple solutions to address these obstacles, leadership and commitment is essential, and overall agency plans have been useful for some agencies.
5. There is an emerging consensus that including responsibilities for implementing gender equality policy into job descriptions and terms of reference of key personnel has helped to ensure attention to gender issues in design, implementation and monitoring. While few evaluations are specific about how this responsibility needs to be addressed, it may be assumed that vague references to policy will be less effective than specific requirements relating directly to the intervention and tasks of personnel.
6. Evidence suggests that the use of gender sensitive indicators needs to be seen as a minimum standard requirement for intervention design, implementation and

66 . AusAID 1999b, AusAID 1999c, AusAID 2000c, CIDA 2000b, CIDA 2000e, CIDA 2000g, EC 2001b, JICA 2000, Sida 2000a, WFP 2002: 9.

67 . AusAID 1999b, CIDA 1999e, Danida 2000c, AusAID 2000b, AusAID 2000c, JICA 2001.

68 . USAID 2001b, USAID 1999c, Sida 2001a, CIDA 2000a.

monitoring. This will improve attention to gender issues, in addition to providing more information on benefits and impacts (see chapters 4 and 6).

7. Participatory approaches, effective targeting of women, and strengthening their leadership capacity can be effective strategies for making progress towards gender equality at community level. (Chapter 6 points to the need to underpin these strategies with sound analysis of gender relations and other factors in the socio-economic and political context.) The importance of supporting women's organisations as agents of civil society emerges as an important factor both at macro and micro levels for making progress towards sustainable changes in gender relations.
8. Given the very high degree of consensus in evaluation reports regarding successful strategies, a short policy note or communiqué from the DAC on institutional approaches is recommended as a follow-up to this study.

CHAPTER 6: BENEFITS FOR WOMEN, GENDER ANALYSIS, AND DEVELOPMENT OUTCOMES

Introduction

This chapter addresses the third area of enquiry for the review: whether gender analysis or gender mainstreaming actions have improved the achievement of overall development results. This research question posed challenges because most evaluations included in this review were not tasked to investigate links between gender analysis, benefits and overall development outcomes. This type of attribution is not self-evident, and requires a level of sophistication in gender analysis that most evaluations do not have. (It also assumes a high level of attribution from development interventions in general.) Furthermore, most reports in the sample are themselves evaluating activities which also had poor gender analysis, where evaluators were faced with a scarcity of data on participation in activities, let alone benefits and impacts. Systematic approaches to gender analysis and mainstreaming in the activities evaluated appears to be rare. (Annex 6 provides examples which illustrate the extent of this problem.) Where there is some evidence of attention to gender issues, it is usually difficult to determine whether this occurred in design or implementation.

In retrospect, it is clear that the database for this study is inadequate to answer the research question posed⁶⁹, although it does suggest areas for future research and evaluation. Because of the difficulties outlined above, research questions for this theme were reformulated during the review to focus on key elements of the original question, and to capture from the database the information on these general issues which did exist. Findings are summarised under the 3 sub-headings below and illustrated in Annex 6:

1. evidence of benefits to women and changes in gender relations
2. evidence of a causal relationship between attention to gender issues in activity design or implementation, and benefits for women
3. evidence that benefits for women or changes in gender relations leads to improved development outcomes

Evidence of benefits for women and changes in gender relations

What evidence do the evaluations provide of benefits to women and/or changes in gender relations? What types of benefits are being identified?

Around 60% of the total sample of thematic and general evaluations have reported on benefits or impacts, but for many of the general evaluations, there is only minimal information (see Tables 1, 2 and 3 in chapter 4). One quarter of evaluations in the sample are of women-specific projects or gender equality funds. Few evaluations have specifically

69 . The Terms of Reference for the review (see Annex 7) foresaw some of these difficulties and noted that the size of the database for investigation of this area was unknown.

investigated differences in benefits between men and women, or reported on changes in gender relations.

Overall, most of the benefits identified address women's practical needs. However, this varies according to the type of evaluation report. Thematic policy and general evaluations have generally identified practical benefits for women. Evaluations of projects and programs which aim to promote gender equality, and which are targeted at women, tend to identify strategic changes in gender relations.

Usually, where reports identify benefits addressing practical needs, evaluators also note that these benefits are limited to a few areas of project/program activity. Some also mention that there are no strategic changes in gender relations, or identify negative impacts alongside the positive benefits⁷⁰. Qualifications regarding benefits typically occur in evaluations which employ more systematic gender analysis. Some reports illustrate how meeting practical needs may also contribute to strategic changes in gender relations and empowerment of women⁷¹. Sida's policy evaluation highlights strengthened women's group identity and organisational capacity in relation to men as key factors⁷²; others focus on the empowering effects of training opportunities.

Several reports address benefits in girls' education at the macro level. Evidence of increased enrolments varies considerably from one country and study to another, and serious questions about the sustainability of increased girls' enrolments are raised due to the impact of increased enrolments of boys and girls on educational quality⁷³.

There are 21 evaluations of projects and programs specifically targeted at women or gender equality in the total sample for the review. Half of these identify strategic changes in gender relations, but many of these initiatives are small-scale. Five are evaluations of gender equality program funds which support local government, national machineries for women or NGO activities.

These reports are an interesting sub-set of the database because they evaluate activities aimed at creating an enabling social and political environment for gender equality. Political participation of women, particularly at the local level, is an outcome of half the gender equality program funds⁷⁴. Other activities have resulted in increased public discussion on gender issues and violence against women⁷⁵. USAID's Women's Empowerment Program in Nepal is an example of a project which has successfully focused on individual empowerment at the household level⁷⁶. Evidence of women's increased participation in decision making at various levels is a commonly cited impact from most of these programs and projects.

70 . For example, BMZ 2000, Danida 2000c, AusAID 2000f.

71 . Belgium 2001c, JICA 2001: 54, AusAID 2000g: 35.

72 . Sida 2002a: xiii.

73 . World Bank 2002, USAID 1999d, CIDA 1999a.

74 . CIDA 1999c, CIDA 2000b, USAID 1999c.

75 . Sida 2001a, NZAID 2002a, CIDA 2000a.

76 . USAID 2001a.

Evidence of a causal relationship between attention to gender issues and benefits for women

Is there evidence that attention to gender issues in design or implementation leads to benefits for women, or changes in relations?

Where benefits are identified, many reports provide no explanation or analysis of how or why these benefits came about (see discussion on the quality of gender analysis in the database in Chapter 4). For those evaluations which do discuss how benefits arose, there are 3 broad groups of evidence regarding a causal relationship between attention to gender issues in activity design or implementation, and benefits for women or changes in gender relations. The first two groups are supportive of this proposition, and the third is not.

The first group of evaluations concludes that women have benefited, because attention has been given to gender issues in activity design or implementation, even where this is limited. Attention to gender issues has taken the form of gender or social expertise being available in design or implementation, the use of participatory design or implementation strategies which involve women, training for women, or ensuring that women have access to other resources provided by the program or project (see Annex 6 for examples)⁷⁷. Targeting of women is cited most commonly as a key strategy for ensuring that women benefit by a number of reports. The strongest evidence comes from cluster evaluations where 1 or 2 projects show benefits for women, because gender issues have been addressed in some way, whereas other activities included in these evaluations have given little or no attention to women⁷⁸.

Evidence of a causal relationship between attention to gender issues and women's participation was also found in the Netherlands policy review, but women were still far behind men and benefiting mainly in economic activities. Sida's policy review found that the 2 projects which had explicit gender equality objectives had the most evidence of positive gender equality impacts⁷⁹.

Only one evaluation in the database was actually designed to assess whether the introduction of a gender strategy had increased results for women, in an NGO managed micro-finance and co-operative development project in Guatemala. This shows that women were more likely to access project resources (training and credit) and to participate as members and decision makers in co-operatives. Sensitisation of men was identified as essential for ensuring increased participation⁸⁰.

A second group of evaluations concludes that women have not benefited equally or have suffered adverse impacts, because gender analysis was not undertaken and little or no attention was given to their needs during activity design or implementation⁸¹. In some cases,

77 . AusAID 2000d, Danida 2000c, CIDA 2000g, CIDA 2000e, CIDA 1999e, NORAD 1999c, WFP 2002.

78 . JICA 2000, JICA 2001, AusAID 1999c, AusAID 1999b.

79 . NL 1998, Sida 2002a. Specific activity design and implementation features which assist with institutionalisation of gender equality objectives are discussed in detail in chapter 5.

80 . CIDA 2002b: 5, CIDA 2002a.

81 . BMZ 2000, AusAID 2000g, AusAID 2000f, AusAID 2000d, AusAID 1999a.

benefits are seen as coincidental or unintended, because no provision was made to ensure that women participated, or that their needs were met⁸².

The third group of evaluations (mainly policy, sectoral or program studies at macro level) concludes that the local cultural, institutional and policy context of interventions is a far more important determinant of whether women benefit, and whether benefits will be sustained, than any specific actions on addressing gender issues during activity design or implementation⁸³. Sida's policy evaluation also highlights the importance of public discussion of gender equality to influence factors such as political support and cultural resistance. DFID's review of support to health sector reform goes furthest in making this point:

*“Inclusion of participation and gender equity in project design has had little impact on their successful adoption in public sector health systems, **except where prevailing policies and practices of partner governments have been favourable**”⁸⁴..*

The World Bank's evaluation presents examples that fall into each of these 3 categories. There are many instances cited where gender blind activity design results in an adverse impact on women's economic activities. It seems clear that at project level, results for women tend to be better if gender considerations are integrated into activity design and implementation. However, there is also evidence of the critical importance of institutional and other contextual factors in education and economic assistance. There were some instances where the Bank's assistance may not have given attention to gender issues, but partner institutions did, and that is the critical point:

“In Poland and Vietnam, both men and women were able to benefit equitably from largely gender blind Bank assistance because implementing agencies stepped in with targeting mechanisms for women, or because both women and men were able to access benefits”⁸⁵.

Findings from activities specifically aimed at promoting gender equality and changes in gender relations reinforce the importance of local social and institutional context, and partner capacity. Where there is some sound evidence that gender relations are changing, key factors appear to be the relevance and consistency of interventions with partner government priorities and policies for the advancement of women, ownership of interventions by local country stakeholders who participate in decision making regarding the type of strategic change areas to be targeted, and capacity within local implementing organisations to ensure sustainability of outcomes⁸⁶. However, it is still rare for evaluations to acknowledge that men also have a role to play in changing gender relations.

82 . CIDA 2001c, Danida 2001a.

83 . DFID 1999a, BMZ 2001a, Danida 2000c, AusAID 2000d, EC2001b, Sida 2002a.

84 . DFID 2001b: 4, emphasis added.

85 . World Bank 2002: 14-16

86 . Sida 2001a, Sida 2000b, Cida 2000b, CIDA 2000a, CIDA 1999c, USAID 1999c.

Evidence that benefits for women or changes in gender relations leads to improved development outcomes

Is there evidence that benefits for women lead to improved development outcomes?

This section summarises findings from thematic policy evaluations, findings from activities which demonstrate changes in gender relations, and findings in sectoral areas from all types of evaluations.

The Netherlands policy evaluation found that although women were participating more in 1995 than in 1985, and benefiting from small-scale economic activities, there was “no real change in the dynamics of rural areas ... The small scale of the interventions in general and the predominantly small-scale nature of the activities of women do not appear to stimulate economic growth in a broader sense”⁸⁷. The World Bank policy evaluation explores the links between investments in human capital of women (health and education) and poverty reduction for women:

“Improving women’s health and increasing enrolments of girls—although essential to sustaining growth—are not adequate in and of themselves to result in poverty reduction for women. The Bank focused effectively on increasing girls’ enrolments, but failed to focus attention on issues related to employment for girls entering the labour force after secondary education. ... In addition to investing in women’s human capital, supporting the increased participation of women in economic activities is a critical dimension for poverty reduction and the enhancement of overall welfare of women”⁸⁸.

The issue of sustainability is critical for considering whether benefits will lead to improved development outcomes. BMZ’s policy evaluation notes that sustainability of interventions was questionable precisely because gender issues were not addressed in health and water projects, in HIV/AIDS and family planning interventions (where it is essential to have men’s involvement and acceptance of new measures), and in an agricultural project that required women to do extra work (which they will only do if they receive additional benefits)⁸⁹.

Both Sida’s and the ADB’s policy evaluations conclude that more research is needed on the links between gender equality and development outcomes, particularly poverty reduction. The ADB evaluation stresses that research findings need to be published in national languages. One difficulty encountered by the Sida evaluation was that links between gender equality and poverty reduction goals were rarely explicit in activity design. However, the evaluation team found these linkages “in the voices of the poor” – for example, women who saw equality as a necessary condition to escape from poverty⁹⁰. Other evaluations also highlighted the need to clarify links between poverty reduction and gender equality mandates (see also chapter 5)⁹¹.

Evaluations of activities aimed at promoting gender equality, by strengthening local women’s organisations to set their own mainstreaming agenda, show the strongest evidence

87 . NL 1998: 243.

88 . World Bank 2002: 13-14.

89 . BMZ 2000.

90 . Sida 2002a: ix-x, 41, ADB 2001: iv.

91 . World Bank 2002: 29, AusAID 2001: vi-vii, WFP 2002.

of strategic changes in gender relations. Here it is assumed that it is women's right to participate and benefit from development. Generally, these evaluations have not sought to link gender equality efforts with the instrumentalist view that they ought to improve economic growth, and few have explored links with poverty reduction. However, some have explored how these activities have improved governance processes, and a few general evaluations have also made similar links.

The strongest set of conclusions comes from 4 evaluations which have explored the impacts of targeting women in post-conflict situations. For example, USAID assistance to women's associations in Rwanda was effective at directly addressing poverty (because women's associations were successful at targeting the most vulnerable, including female headed households), and also had a direct effect on reducing social tensions and promoting unity. WFP and CIDA evaluations and a broader study of post-conflict situations by USAID found similar impacts from working through women's groups⁹².

Sida's evaluation of support to women through Panchayati Raj in India has found that women's involvement in local government resulted in an extension of local government programs to the most needy. Other evaluations report that women's involvement in local governance structures, or in project activities, groups and committees has increased the effectiveness of development activities and outcomes at project level⁹³. However, it should be noted that most of these interventions were small-scale and half were implemented through NGOs or small grant schemes.

In general, the evaluations which included water supply projects have not found much evidence of women's involvement in their implementation. However, where women have been involved, the World Bank concluded that this improved utilisation and sustainability of physical facilities⁹⁴.

Control over income, spending and benefits is not thoroughly investigated in most evaluations of income-generation activities. However, those that do investigate these matters find that women are more likely to send children to school⁹⁵, and to spend their income on basic family needs⁹⁶. These outcomes have both direct and indirect impacts on poverty reduction at the micro level.

Conclusions and lessons

The findings above suggest the following conclusions:

1. In general, the quality of gender analysis in evaluations is inadequate for agencies to assess differences in benefits between women and men, and to learn lessons about what facilitates equal and sustainable benefits and impacts. In the sample of projects reviewed, unintended impacts on women (or any other vulnerable group) are hardly being investigated. This information is essential if agencies want to learn about how

92 . USAID 1999c: 3, 5; WFP 2002: paragraph 151; CIDA 2000e; USAID 2001b.

93 . Sida 2000a: 18, AusAID 2000g: 35, CIDA 2000g, AusAID 1999b, AusAID 2000d, JICA 2000.

94 . World Bank 2002: 16.

95 . Belgium 2001b, USAID 1999d, CIDA 1999d, USAID 2001a.

96 . USAID 2001a, JICA 2000: 283, AusAID 2000d: ix, 43.

to increase benefits to women, and to promote gender equality according to their policy mandates (see also chapter 4).

2. It appears that practical needs of women are most often being addressed, but sometimes these are leading to strategic changes, particularly greater involvement of women in decision making. In some cases these strategic changes are not planned. Further research is needed to identify the factors and types of interventions that are more likely to promote strategic changes and in different social, political and institutional environments.
3. Systematic attention to gender issues in activity design, implementation and monitoring is still rare, except for some activities which are specifically and directly aimed at promoting gender equality.
4. *Attention to gender issues in activity design and implementation is essential if agencies want to increase the likelihood that both men and women will participate and benefit, and to ensure that they are not disadvantaged. However, this is a necessary but insufficient condition to ensure that benefits are achieved and sustainable.*
5. Women may receive some benefits from gender-blind interventions. This appears to depend on key factors in the institutional and social environment and more research is needed in this area.
6. Very few evaluations assess partner capacity or commitment to the promotion of gender equality, or the relationship of these factors with social context. These are critical determinants of whether and how women can participate and benefit, and the likely sustainability of benefits. An analysis of these factors should provide guidance regarding the different types of interventions on gender equality that might be successful in different country and partner contexts, and the types of gender strategies which are appropriate within those contexts. Given that very few agencies have been successful at employing quality gender analysis in activity design and implementation, it is essential that gender analysis be integrated into other forms of social analysis, particularly poverty and sectoral analyses.
7. Lessons from evaluations of activities which are specifically aimed at promoting gender equality have broad applicability to all interventions which aim to benefit women. Policy dialogue to develop agreement with partners on shared goals and strategies is essential to achieve relevance, ownership and sustainability on changes in gender relations. This needs to be followed up by activities which strengthen in-country institutions to undertake gender sensitive development.
8. There is some evidence to support the proposition that benefits for women will improve the effectiveness of development interventions and their outcomes at the activity and micro level. However, there is no evidence for this in the database at the macro level. This may be because so few agencies have investigated these links, or because attention to gender issues at any level has been limited. Further research is needed in this area. More evaluations which make links between micro, meso and macro levels are also needed if agencies want to explore issues relating to overall development effectiveness and outcomes.

Potential areas for future research and evaluation include:

1. There is a need to investigate the links between benefits for women, gender equality and poverty reduction. This should be an area for joint agency and partner evaluation, at a country and/or sectoral level. In order to learn lessons about successful strategies for sustainable and equitable development, the findings of this review point to the need to look at the work of multiple donors in one country, rather than the work of one donor in dissimilar countries.
2. Another fruitful area of research would be to investigate, at a country or multi-country level, what the predominant changes in gender relations are over a period of time, and what women and men themselves see as having caused those changes. In this context, the impact that development interventions have on changes in gender relations could be examined, in addition to the types of interventions which are needed in future to benefit women and promote gender equality. Again, a joint agency and partner approach is recommended. It is acknowledged that attribution here is a highly complex issue. Nevertheless, it is important to investigate the role that development cooperation can play in changing gender relations, in the context of other social, political and economic changes. A multi-year study may yield the most useful findings, although this would require more resources and a longer-term commitment from participating agencies.

It is essential to employ participatory methods for both areas identified above. This implies longer evaluation and research time-frames (over and above the standard 2-weeks in-country undertaken by many evaluations), and adequate resourcing and training of local evaluators and researchers (see chapter 4). Evaluation design should take into account the need to build evaluation capacity in partner countries. The possibility of a pilot study involving a number of donors and partners should be considered for the second research area suggested above on changes in gender relations.

CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FOLLOW-UP

Introduction

Compared with the 1999 DAC gender review, progress overall has been slow and uneven. One major positive sign of change is the large number of thematic evaluations on gender equality, gender mainstreaming and women's empowerment compared with 1999. However, there is still much work to be done to improve attention to gender equality issues in evaluations, and to institutionalise gender equality policy commitments, in order to ensure that both women and men receive the benefits of development cooperation.

The Terms of Reference⁹⁷ for this review, drawing on previous work undertaken by the DAC Working Party on Evaluation and the DAC Working Party on Gender, envisaged 3 possible areas of follow-up for this review. These were:

1. *On evaluation methodology*, a discussion note or “toolbox” on innovative approaches and tools which addresses gender issues.
2. *On institutional approaches and change strategies*, a short policy note or communiqué on successful strategies for addressing gender issues at various levels of institutionalisation.
3. *On the links between benefits for women, gender analysis, and development outcomes*, a study or report synthesising the implications of gender sensitive approaches and links to improved development results.

Findings and lessons on each area of the review are included in chapters 4, 5 and 6, and also in some detail in chapter 1, so they will not be repeated in full here. This chapter highlights only the most important conclusions and recommendations for follow up.

Evaluation methodology

Thematic evaluations

For thematic evaluations, the review has highlighted methodological problems associated with treating gender mainstreaming as a goal, rather than as a means to the long-term objective of achieving gender equality. A number of thematic evaluations have focused on evaluating institutional mainstreaming, without considering the extent to which this leads to changes in gender relations. It is important for future thematic evaluations to focus on results, as well as on institutional mainstreaming practices. Problems also arose when evaluations were designed based on the assumption that mainstreaming leads to effective gender equality outcomes. It proved to be more useful to find positive or negative results of interventions first, and then to examine the factors that promote good or poor performance.

97 . See Annex 7.

Thematic evaluations and general evaluations

A good gender-focused evaluation is first of all a good evaluation. This means that there is a clear and simple objective, a transparent design, with findings based on evidence, clear evaluation criteria and gender-specific indicators. The weaknesses identified in both types of evaluations suggest a need for overall improvements in evaluation capacity, as well as improvements specific to undertaking gender analysis in evaluations. This suggests the need for training and courses on the whole process of evaluation, which also have a strong focus on how to address gender equality issues.

Features of evaluation capacity relating to gender equality that need to be improved are:

- the capacity to determine appropriate research questions to investigate potential differences in participation, benefits and impacts between women and men;
- the capacity to identify and collect sex-disaggregated information using a mix of different methods, including the capacity to develop and use gender sensitive indicators appropriate to the activities being evaluated;
- the capacity to analyse data collected in relation to the activities being evaluated in a systematic way.

It should be noted that most agencies employ consultants or contractors to carry out their evaluations. However, training consultants, or encouraging consultants to seek training, is beyond the mandate of most donors. This highlights the importance of ensuring that agency staff have the capacity to recognise and manage a gender sensitive evaluation process, to select consultants who have the skills identified above, and to brief consultants or work together with them in identifying appropriate research questions and methods to investigate gender equality issues and impacts.

The findings on evaluation methodology do not point to the need for a new toolbox to be developed by the DAC (see paragraph 152i above). While some of the thematic evaluations have developed sound frameworks, these would need to be adapted to the specific circumstances of evaluations to be conducted by other agencies. Moreover, there are already a number of tools dealing with gender equality issues in evaluation. (Some gender sensitive evaluation tools are included in Table 3 of Annex 4, but this is not a comprehensive list.) The number of development workers who actually use tools appears from our findings to be rather small (see findings in chapters 4 and 5). However, it is possible that this may change if evaluation managers assertively require a higher standard of evaluations, where gender equality issues are systematically and comprehensively addressed; if tools are linked to training or introduced during training activities; and if evaluation tools can be easily accessed on one web-site. Brief descriptions and commentaries on tools are needed to guide users to those which best suit their needs.

Recommendation 1 to the DAC:

It is recommended that further work on evaluation capacity building with members and partners continue with a strong focus on how to address gender equality issues in evaluations.

Recommendation 2 to agencies:

It is recommended that agencies finance staff and partners to attend courses on evaluation which have a strong focus on gender equality perspectives.

Recommendation 3 to the DAC:

It is recommended that the DAC set up an area on its web-site which has links to existing gender-sensitive evaluation tools. This should be accompanied by brief descriptions and commentaries, to guide users to the tools which best suit their needs. The location of the site should ensure that tools are easily accessed by evaluators.

It has been beyond the scope of this review to investigate existing training courses, or to comprehensively assess all existing tools. However, the latter would be a relatively discreet exercise which could result in cost-effective and concrete follow-up if a web-site area is established. Care should be taken to consider the various target audiences for an evaluation tools web-site, to ensure that evaluators, sector specialists and gender specialists will all access it. Consideration could also be given to including a summary of the findings of this review on the web-site, and including model examples of Terms of Reference for gender sensitive evaluations.

Findings from other areas of the review (see chapters 5 and 6 and below) highlight the fundamental importance of working in close collaboration with partner agencies on all aspects of gender equality. The Working Party on Evaluation already has a significant program of work focused on evaluation capacity building which is aimed at both members and partners⁹⁸.

The database for the review had few evaluations focused on new forms of assistance such as Sector Wide Approaches (SWAs), or evaluations of Poverty Reduction Strategies and their outcomes. In general, evaluations did not address the links between gender equality and poverty reduction. The need for further exploration of these links is highlighted in the findings of on institutionalisation and on development outcomes.

98. Development Co-operation Directorate, Development Assistance Committee, Working Party on Aid Evaluation "Summary Record of the 36th Meeting, held on 29-30 May 2002" DCD/DAC/EV/M(2002)1/PROV, 12 July 2002: paras 28-29.

Recommendation 4 to the DAC:

It is recommended that a joint WP-EV/WP-GEN workshop be held on evaluation capacity building, with a strong focus on how to address gender issues. One area for discussion should be the weaknesses in evaluation capacity found by this review, and agencies' experience of how to address these weaknesses. However, the workshop should primarily be forward-looking and cover new ground which has not been adequately addressed in the sample of evaluations included in this review, or in previous DAC workshops. For example, the workshop should focus on the evaluation of poverty reduction strategies and outcomes, SWAps, and other program-based approaches. Involvement of partner agencies is essential. The workshop could also be a forum for determining further collaborative work on gender and evaluation, including priorities for future research and evaluation.

Institutional approaches and change strategies

Among those evaluations which do analyse lessons on institutionalisation, there is a very high degree of consensus about what change strategies have been successful at ensuring that gender issues are addressed, at various levels and across types of assistance. Building partnerships on gender equality through dialogue emerges as a most urgent matter from both the findings on institutionalisation in chapter 5, and those on development outcomes in chapter 6. Successful change strategies for building partnerships and promoting dialogue are generally characterised by 4 fundamental factors: national or partner ownership, including a shared vision on gender equality either at country assistance or intervention level; consensus between donors and partners on clear objectives, which are transparently relevant to partner government policies and commitments; the need for stakeholder involvement in advocacy and direction-setting (including partner agencies, civil society, and particularly women's organisations); and long-term commitment from donor agencies.

Explicit links between poverty reduction and gender equality objectives at policy, country assistance strategy and intervention level are needed. Findings from all 3 areas of the review indicate that these links are rarely made at any level, including in activity design, and indicate that this is an area for urgent attention.

Accountability to gender equality policies is highlighted as a continuing ongoing problem, including a failure to integrate gender equality perspectives into agency procedures. Leadership and commitment have been found to be essential to address this obstacle, and overall agency plans have been useful for some agencies.

There are high levels of agreement regarding successful change strategies for activity/intervention design, implementation and monitoring. These include: ensuring that gender equality issues are adequately addressed in design; addressing responsibilities for implementing gender equality policy in job descriptions and Terms of Reference through the activity cycle; and the use of gender sensitive indicators as a minimum standard for design, implementation and monitoring.

Participatory approaches, strengthening women's leadership capacity, and working with women's organisations as agents of civil society, have been identified as effective approaches for making progress towards gender equality at community level.

Recommendation 5 to the DAC:

It is recommended that the DAC consider tasking the Working Party on Gender to develop a short policy note or communiqué on the basis of the report findings, in collaboration with the Working Party on Aid Evaluation. This should focus on successful strategies for building partnerships on gender equality, other successful change strategies on which there is a high degree of consensus, and links between poverty reduction and gender equality

Recommendation 6 to agencies:

It is recommended that agencies also take note of the evidence presented in this report on successful change strategies for building partnerships on gender equality and in other areas, and continue their best efforts to ensure accountability to gender equality policies.

Benefits for women, gender analysis, and development outcomes

In general, the quality of gender analysis in evaluations is inadequate for agencies to assess differences in benefits between women and men and their relationship to overall development outcomes. Systematic attention to gender issues in activity design, implementation and monitoring also appears to be rare, except for those activities which are specifically and directly aimed at promoting gender equality. As a result, it was very difficult to properly address the question of links between benefits for women, gender analysis and development outcomes.

Notwithstanding these difficulties, there is clear evidence that attention to gender issues in activity design and implementation is essential if agencies want to increase the likelihood that both men and women will participate and benefit, and to ensure that they are not disadvantaged (see paragraphs 130 – 134 and examples in Annex 6). However, this is a necessary but insufficient condition to ensure that benefits are achieved and sustainable.

There is evidence to support the proposition that benefits for women will improve the effectiveness of development interventions and their outcomes at the activity, community or micro level. (For example, women's participation in local governance structures and in project activities, groups and committees has increased the effectiveness of development interventions. Where women do gain control of income, there is evidence that they are likely to use this for basic family needs and schooling for children, which has both direct and indirect impacts on poverty reduction at micro level.) However, there is no evidence for this proposition in the database of evaluations focused at the macro level, where partner capacity and commitment and the socio-economic and political context are key determinants of the sustainability of development impacts. This may be because so few agencies have investigated these links, or because attention to gender issues at any level has been limited in most cases in the interventions evaluated. Further research is needed in this area. More evaluations which make links between micro, meso and macro levels are also required if agencies want to explore issues relating to overall development effectiveness and outcomes at the macro level.

Potential areas for future research and evaluation include:

1. There is a need to investigate the links between benefits for women, gender equality and poverty reduction. This should be an area for joint agency and partner evaluation, at a country and/or sectoral level. In order to learn lessons about successful strategies for sustainable and equitable development, the findings of this review point to the need to look at the work of multiple donors in one country, rather than the work of one donor in dissimilar countries.
2. Another fruitful area of research would be to investigate, at a country or multi-country level, what the predominant changes in gender relations are over a period of time, and what women and men themselves see as having caused those changes. In this context, the impact that development interventions have on changes in gender relations could be examined, in addition to the types of interventions which are needed in future to benefit women and promote gender equality. Again, a joint agency and partner approach is recommended. It is acknowledged that attribution

here is a highly complex issue. Nevertheless, it is important to investigate the role that development cooperation can play in changing gender relations, in the context of other social, political and economic changes. A multi-year study may yield the most useful findings, although this would require more resources and a longer-term commitment from participating agencies.

Dissemination and targeting of findings

It is important for the findings of this review to be disseminated to development practitioners. The audience for these findings is broad. It includes both agency staff and consultants/contractors who play a key role in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of development interventions. Evaluators, gender specialists, sectoral specialists and development managers at various levels all need to be targeted to learn the lessons outlined in this review, if evaluation practice is to be improved, and successful change strategies implemented so that both women and men will benefit from development interventions. Evaluators are frequently consultants who may have little access to workshops such as that included in recommendation 4. Nor can it be assumed that consultants will attend courses focused on evaluation capacity building (recommendation 2). While senior development managers will be targeted by the policy note included in recommendation 5, development practitioners directly involved in design, implementation and monitoring will be more likely to access findings through other means. In addition to recommendation 7 below, consideration could also be given to using a mix of dissemination strategies appropriate to different audiences, such as the development of short summaries of key findings. For example, key findings on evaluation methodology could be included on the web-site referred to in recommendation 3 above. A summary of findings on successful strategies for institutionalisation, and on the links between benefits for women and effective development outcomes at micro level, could be included on the WP-GEN tipsheets website, as part of the process of developing short policy note or communiqué (see recommendation 5).

Recommendation 7 to the DAC:

It is recommended that the findings of this review be disseminated through the publication of this report.
--

In conclusion, it is important to contextualise the findings of this review. Changing gender relations is a complex undertaking, with a variety of economic, political, social and cultural obstacles. As a result, institutional change is incremental, and the role that development cooperation can play in changing gender relations needs careful thought, planning, collaboration with partners, and future investigation through well-designed research and evaluation.

However, it is also important to note that many of the findings of this review are not new. This applies to both the weaknesses in evaluation methodology identified in chapter 4, and the strategies needed to institutionalise gender equality policy which are highlighted in chapters 5 and 6. We now have a strong basis in evidence regarding actions which need to be taken to improve attention to gender issues through the activity/intervention cycle. This reinforces the need for agencies to take assertive follow-up action to this review, both collaboratively and individually, and to ensure that findings are disseminated to development practitioners.

ANNEX 1: DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED TO THE REVIEW⁹⁹

Table 1: Thematic Evaluations on Gender Equality, Gender Mainstreaming and Women's Empowerment

<i>Agency & Year</i>	<i>Thematic Evaluations: Title of Evaluation Report</i>	<i>Type of evaluation</i>
ADB 2001	“Special Evaluation Study on Gender and Development” OED, October 2001	Policy
AusAID 2002a	“Gender and Development: GAD lessons and challenges for the Australian aid program” Published report, September 2002	Policy audit
AusAID 2001	“Gender and Development Review: Findings and Recommendations” Unpublished report	Policy audit
Belgium 2001a	“Report of the Special Evaluator for International Cooperation to the Belgian Parliament” June 2001	Cluster
Belgium 2001b	“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”	Project
Belgium 2001c	“Evaluation of Belgium Survival Fund Support to Kenya Women's Finance Trust (KWFT)” Vol I & Vol II (Annexes)	Project
Belgium 2001d	“An External Evaluation of Gender and Its Influence on Poverty Reduction: Hoima-Kibaale Integrated Community Development Project, Uganda, June – August 2000”	Project
Belgium 2001e	“Project for Improving Household Food Security and Nutrition in the Luapula Valley of Zambia (IHFSAN)”	Project
Belgium 2001f	“Evaluation Thematique Genre et Pauvrete du Pim Niger (Programme integre Maradi)”	Project
Belgium 2001f	“Evaluation Thematique Genre/Reduction de la Pauvrete du projet Fenu au Mali: Aménagement et gestion des terroirs villageois du Sené-gondo”	Project
BMZ 2001b	“The Integration of Gender Issues in PRSPs: The Example of Ghana”, Birte Rodenberg, Deutsche Institut für Entwicklungspolitik, December 2001, German language, Executive summary in English	PRSP Review
BMZ 2000	“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) “Geschlechterspezifische Differenzierung der Zielgruppe in ausgewählten F2/T2 – Vorhaben”	Cluster

99 . Some agencies did not submit reports to the review. In some cases the consultants relied on web searches of agency evaluation reports and read all reports with relevant titles. Only those reports which included some references to women or gender issues are included on this list, which constitutes the database for the review. Thematic evaluations from multilateral agencies are also included in Table 1.

CIDA 2002a	“Self-management and sustainability: An impact study – Study on PADEL’s contribution to the reduction of poverty and inequities between men and women” (Executive Summary)	NGO Project
CIDA 2002b	“Summary of the Systemization Document: Incorporating gender equity into cooperative organizations in Guatemala: a local development initiative” Socodevi, February 2002	
CIDA 2001a	“Gender Equality Review” Prepared for Indonesia Program, CIDA, Goss Gilroy Inc, Internal document, not available for circulation	Policy audit
CIDA 2000a	“Caribbean Gender Equity Fund Performance Review: Umbrella Report, Final Report” Universalia	GE Prog Fund
CIDA 2000b	“Review and Monitoring Report: SWIF Project Phase I”, Veronica Huddleston	GE Prog Fund
CIDA 1999a	“Evaluative Review of Ghana Girl Child Education Project (GGCEP)”, Patrick Cummins and Akosua Anyidoho	Women’s project
CIDA 1999b	“Evaluation: Women’s Initiatives Fund (WIF) Project, Phase II, Project No: 344/14537”, Mary Lynch, Ali Anwer and Wafik Arif	Women’s project
CIDA 1999c	“South America Regional Gender Equity Funds: Evaluation Report”, Juanita Barreto, Marisela Benavides, Celsy Campos, Paola Cappellin, María Cui, Christine Ouellette, and Ana Quiroga	GE Program Fund
CIDA 1999d	“Final Report: Assessment of the Society of Friends of Nepal (SOFON)” Sheila Robinson and Jamal Devi Shrestha, July 1999	NGO women’s project
DFID 2000a	“Promoting Equality Between Men and Women” SD Scope Paper No.2, Nazneen Kanji and Sarah Salway	Cluster
DFID 2000b	“A Participatory Gender Review and Support Consultancy for DFIDB’s Rural Livelihoods Projects” Eva Jordans, Faria Zaman and Amita Dey	Cluster
DFID 2000c	“Mainstreaming Gender Through Sector Wide Approaches in Education” Andy Norton, Mo Sibbons, David Smawfield, Helen Poulsen, Amanda Gibbard and Amanda Seel	SWAP review
DFID 1999a	“Mainstreaming gender equality in project implementation: Botswana, Pakistan and South Africa” Helen Derbyshire	Cluster
ILO 2002	“ILO Gender Audit 2001-02: Final report” Internal Report of the Bureau for Gender Equality, Geneva, May 2002	Policy Audit
JICA 2001	Chapter 2, Section II Thematic Evaluation: ‘Poverty and Gender in Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries Cooperation (Nepal)’; and ‘Poverty and Gender in Agriculture and Forestry Cooperation (Paraguay)’ in “Annual Evaluation Report FY 2001”, December 2001	Cluster
JICA 2000	Chapter 3, Section II Thematic Evaluation: ‘Women in Development (WID)/Gender (Sri Lanka) in “Annual Evaluation Report FY 2000”, June 2000	Cluster
Netherlands ¹ (NL) 1998	“Women and Development: Policy and Implementation in Netherlands Development Cooperation 1985-1996” Policy and Operations Evaluation Department “Women in Kenya and the Netherlands Development Cooperation 1985-1995” “Women in Burkina Faso and the Netherlands Development Cooperation”	Policy
NORAD 2001	“Review of the regional Diploma Course in Women’s Law, Zimbabwe” by Patricia Kameri-Mbote, Mette Topnes and Bodil	Project

	Maal, September 2001	
NORAD 2000	“Joint Review, Women’s Economic Programme Phase II” (India) September/October 2000	Project
NORAD 1999a	“Evaluation of the Gender in Development Division (GIDD) at the Cabinet Office, Zambia”	Project
NORAD 1999b	“WID/Gender Units and the Experience of Gender Mainstreaming in Multilateral Organisations” Gisela Geisler, Bonnie Keller and Anne-Lene Norman, March 1999	Institution-alisation review
NZAID 2002a	“...a wind of change: review of NZODA gender and development project in Kiribati”, Patti O’Neill and Rose Namoori-Sinclair, February 2002	Project
NZAID 2002b	“Review of NZODA support for gender mainstreaming in the Mekong River Commission, Report on Review Mission” (DRAFT), Helen McNaught, May 2002	Project
SDC 2000	“Validacion de la Fase Inicial y Definicion de la Segunda Fase de la Estrategia de Genero Corlap, Cosude Bolivia” by José Baldivia, Chrystel Ferret and Sylvia Cardona, September 2000	Project
Sida 2002a	“Mainstreaming Gender Equality: Evaluation of Sida’s Support for the Promotion of Gender Equality in Partner Countries” by Britha Mikkelsen, Ted Freeman, Bonnie Keller et al, Sida Evaluation Report 02/01	Policy
Sida 2002b	“Reflection on Experiences of Evaluating Gender Equality: Working Paper” UTV, Sida, COWI and Goss Gilroy, November 2002	
Sida 2002c	“Sweden’s and Holland’s Strategies for the Promotion of Gender Equality Policy in Bolivia”	Project
Sida 2001a	“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	GE Program Fund
Sida 2000a	“Empowerment of Women through Panchayati Raj in Rajasthan and Orissa, India” Sida Evaluation 00/31, D.K. Manavalan	Project
Sida 2000b	“Vietnam Women’s Union: Promoting Gender Equality” Sida Evaluation 00/16, Wanjiku Kaime-Atterhöög and Tran Thi Van Anh	GE Program Fund
UNIFEM 2002	“Desk Review: Gender Mainstreaming in the CCA and UNDAF Processes – Presented to The Inter-Agency Taskforce on Gender Mainstreaming in the CCA/UNDAF Process, Inter-Agency Network on Women and Gender Equality (IANWGE)”, Alicia Mondesire, June 2002	Institution-alisation review
USAID 2001a	“Final Evaluation Survey of the Women’s Empowerment Program (WEP)” Submitted to PACT by Ava Darshan Shrestha, and Janardan Khatri-Chhetri, September 2001	NGO women’s project
USAID 2001b	“Aftermath: Women and Women’s Organisations in Postconflict Societies, The Role of International Assistance” Krishna Kumar, USAID Program and Operations Assessment Report No. 28, Center for Development Information and Evaluation, July 2001	Cluster
USAID 1999a	“Midterm evaluation: developing Mayan-based health care for rural women and children, Project Concern International”, Melody Trott and Barbara Schieber, September 1999	Women’s project
USAID 1999b	“Freedom from Hunger credit with education for women program, final evaluation”, C. Stark Biddle, March 1999	NGO women’s project
USAID 1999c	“Evaluation of USAID/OTI’s (Office of Transition Initiatives)	GE

	women in transition initiative in Rwanda”, Hannah Baldwin and Catherine Newbury, Office of Transition Initiatives and the Center for development Information and Evaluation, USAID	Program Fund
USAID 1999d	“More, But Not Yet Better: An Evaluation of USAID’s Programs and Policies To Improve Girls’ Education”, Chloe O’Gara, Sharon Benoliel, Margaret Sutton and Karen Tietjen, USAID Program and Operations Assessment Report No.25, June 1999	Cluster
World Bank 2002 2001a	“The Gender Dimension of Bank Assistance: An Evaluation of Results” Report No. 23119, Operations Evaluation Department (OED), January 17, 2002 “Integrating Gender in World Bank Assistance” Report No. 23035, OED, October 25, 2001	Policy
World Food Program (WFP) 2002	“Final Evaluation of WFP’s Commitments to Women 1996-2001, Full Evaluation Report, Final Report”, Camillia Fawzi El-Solh, 26 May 2002	Gender Institution- alisation review

1. At its May 2002 meeting, WP-EV agreed to include reports produced prior to 1999 in special cases. The innovative methodology used qualifies these reports for special consideration.

Two ongoing thematic evaluations have not been included in the database for the review: Danida “Terms of Reference: Evaluation /Impact Study of Four Training Projects for Farm Women in India” (report available mid 2003); and EC “Thematic Evaluation of the Integration of Gender in EC Co-operation with Third Countries: Terms of Reference (Final)” (report available early 2003). One evaluation was received too late to incorporate findings: DFID 2003 “DFID China Gender Review” Nazneen Kanji and Du Jie, Department for International Development, UK, January 2003

Total Number of Thematic Evaluations: 42

Total number of DAC member agencies with thematic evaluations: 12

Table 2 General evaluations which include references to gender issues or gender analysis

Agency & Year	General Evaluations: Title of Evaluation Report	<i>Type of evaluation</i>
AusAID 2002b	“Water and Primary Health Care for Tibetan Villagers” Quality Assurance Series No. 29, February 2002	Project
AusAID 2000a	“Evaluation of Australian Government Funded NGO Projects in Africa” Quality Assurance Series No. 25, December 2000	NGO Program
AusAID 2000b	“Developing Integrated Rural Health Care Systems: An Evaluation of the Kadavu Rural Health Project in Fiji” Quality Assurance Series No. 24, December 2000	Project
AusAID 2000c	“Developing Rural Communities in Marginal and Rainfed Areas: Contributions of Agricultural Projects in the Philippines” Quality Assurance Series No. 23, September 2000	Cluster of 3 projects
AusAID 2000d	“Qinghai Community Development Project: Evaluation Report” Quality Assurance Series No. 21, June 2000	Project
AusAID 2000e	“Improving Access to Land and Enhancing the Security of Land Rights: A Review of Land Titling and Land Administration Projects” Quality Assurance Series No. 20, September 2000	Sector
AusAID 2000f	“Increasing Rural Incomes: An Evaluation of Three Rural Sector Projects in Samoa” Quality Assurance Series No. 19, July 2000	Cluster of 3 projects
AusAID 2000g	“Assisting Local Communities: Evaluation of Government Funded NGO Projects in Vietnam” Quality Assurance Series No. 18, March 2000	NGO Program
AusAID 1999a	“Wells, Taps and Toilets: Safe Water and Sanitation for Eastern Indonesia” Quality Assurance Series No. 17, November 1999	Project
AusAID 1999b	“Targeting Poor Farmers: Contributions to Rural Development in Thailand” Quality Assurance Series No. 16, June 1999	Cluster of 3 projects
AusAID 1999c	“Growing Rice and Protecting Forests: An Evaluation of Three Food Production Projects in South East Asia” Quality Assurance Series No. 15, June 1999	Cluster of 3 projects
AusAID 1999d	“Building for Development: An Evaluation of Four Infrastructure Projects in Tonga and Samoa” Quality Assurance Series No. 14, May 1999	Cluster of 4 projects
BMZ 2001a	“Main Report on the Series Evaluation: Prospects of Success of Basic Education Projects” (English version) “German Development Cooperation with Senegal: Summary of the Sector Evaluation ‘Prospects of Success of Primary Education Projects’, Partial Evaluation Senegal (Summary of the Sector Evaluation)” (English Summary)	Sector
CIDA 2001b	“Infrastructure Services Performance Review: Executive Report” Performance Review Branch, October 2001	Sector
CIDA 2001c	“Infrastructure Services Performance Review: Background Report”, Valerie Young, Philip Chan and Chris Stanley, Performance Review Branch, October 2001	
CIDA 2001d	“Infrastructure Services: Policy Dialogue Study, International Telecommunication Union (ITU), Evaluation Report 2001”, John Gilbert, Performance Review Branch (May 1999) “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” Charles Morrow and Associates, Performance Review Branch (July 1999)	
CIDA 2000c	“Canada-Thailand Trilateral Environment (CTTE) Project: End of Project Review, May-June, 2000”, Fred Meth, September 2000	Project
CIDA 2000d	“Regional Aids Training Network, Mid-Term Evaluation, Final Report”, Ron Titus, Joe Decosas and Bruce Waring, August 2000	Project
CIDA 2000e	“Evaluation of Inter Pares’ Program in Peru: Final Report”, Catherine Gander, NGO Division of CIDA, May 2000	Institutional NGO review
CIDA 2000f	“Final Report on Evaluation of Inter-Church Action for Development, Relief and Justice for CIDA”, John Doran, March 2000	Institutional NGO review
CIDA 2000g	“Final Program Evaluation Report, Presbyterian Church in Canada: Presbyterian World Service and Development (April 1st 1997 - March 31st 2000 Program)”, Ursula Mount, Canadian Partnership/NGO Division, March 2000	Institutional NGO review
CIDA 2000h	“India Oilseeds Development: End of Project Evaluation, Final Report”, Ron Titus, Bob Jiggins, Nancy Higginson, Elise Rafuse and Sanjay Phansalkar, January 2000	Project
CIDA 1999e	“Final Report, Operation Eyesight Universal (OEU) Institutional Assessment”, Sheila Robinson and Philip Cox, NGO Division, CIDA, December 1999	Institutional NGO review
CIDA 1999f	“Evaluation: Strengthening of Civil Society and Rural Development in Nampula Province, 1997/99, Cooperation Canada Mozambique (COCAMO), Final Report” Brigitte Bagnol, September 1999	Institutional NGO review
CIDA 1999g	“Private Enterprise Accelerated Resource Linkage (PEARL): Mid-term Review Report”, Raynald Brassard and M.M. Lynch Consultants International Inc, April 1999	Project
Danida 2002a	“In the wake of a Flagship, the Noakhali project in Bangladesh”	Program
Danida 2002b	“Danish Assistance to Vocational Education and Training”	Sector
Danida 2001a	“Private Sector Development Programme” October 2001	Program
Danida 2001b	“Evaluation: Danish-Burkinabè Development Cooperation 1996 – 2000” (2001/4)	Country Program
Danida 2000a	“Evaluation of Danish Bilateral Assistance to Health 1988 – 1997” (2000/4)	Sector
Danida 2000c	“Rakai district development programme in Uganda”	Program
Danida 1999	“Danish Support to Promotion of Human Rights and Democratisation”	Sector Program
DFID 2002a	“From Projects to SWAs: an Evaluation of British Aid to Primary Schooling, 1988-2001” by Samer Al-Samarrai, Paul Bennell, Christopher Colclough, September 2002	Program
DFID 2001b	“ODA/DFID Support to Health Sector Reform and Health Management: Synthesis Study”, Andrew Cassels and Julia Watson, January 2001	Sector
EC 2001a	“Evaluation of Voter Education in the Context of EU Electoral Support, Final Report”, Karen Kenny, Sophie Laguény and Florence Burban, September 2001	Sector

EC 2001b	“Synthesis Report on EC Activities in the Field of Human Rights, Democracy and Good Governance, Synthesis Note, 10 August 2001” Emery Brusset, Emma Achilli, Christine Tiberghien, Evaluation Unit of the EuropeAid Co-operation Office	Sector
EC 2001c	“Rapport du Synthese des Activites de la Communaute Europeenne dans le Champ des Droits de L’Homme, de la Bonne Gouvernance et de al Democratie: Rapport de référence, 10 août 2001”, Emery Brusset, Emma Achilli, Christine Tiberghien	
Netherlands (NL) 2002	“Health, Nutrition and Population, Burkina Faso, Mozambique, Yemen – Evaluation 1995-1999” IOB Evaluation No. 288, Policy and Operations Department, May 2002	Program
Netherlands (NL) 2002	“Smallholder Dairy Support Programme (SDSP)” IOB Evaluations No. 286, November 2001	Project
NORAD 1999c	“Performance Assessment of IPPF: Policy and Effectiveness At Country and Regional Levels – Synthesis Report” Julie Skjaeraasen, Bo Stenson and Ian Thomas, March 1999	Program
SDC 1999a	“Strengthening of Vocational Training Centers (SVTC) in Vietnam. Joint Evaluation. Final Report”	Project
SDC 1999b	“Country Programme South Africa 1994-1999 Evaluation of the Activities of the Swiss Department of Foreign Affairs”	Country Program
SDC 1999c	Social Forestry Support Project, Phase 2. Report on Mid-Term Review, October 15, 1999	Project
SDC 1999d	External Evaluation of Southern Highlands Dairy Development Project (SHDDP)	Project
SDC 1999e	Penipe Project Phase III Evaluation Report	Project
Sida 2001b	“Democracy and Human Rights: An evaluation of Sida’s support to five projects in Georgia” Sida Evaluation 01/11, Birgitta Berggren and Patrik Jotun	Cluster of 5 projects
Sida 2000c	“Strengthening Democracy on the Atlantic Cost in Nicaragua” Sida Evaluation 00/19, Hans Peter Buvollen, Mario Rosales Ortega and Leticia Velásquez Zapeta	Project

Total Number of General Evaluations: 44

Total number of DAC member agencies with general evaluations: 10

Table 3 Tools and other documents on gender sensitive evaluation methodology

Agency & Year	Title of Document
APC/WNSP 2002?	“GEM – a guide to integrating a gender analysis into evaluations of initiatives that use Information and Communication Technologies”
CIDA 2002c	“Draft Framework for Gender Equality Integration into Programs for CIDA-CPB Program Partners” May 2002
CIDA 2002d	“Draft Checklist for Gender Equality Integration into Projects for CIDA-CPB Project Partners”
CIDA 2001e	“How to Perform Evaluations: Gender Equality” Performance Review Branch, No.4 May 2001
CIDA 2000i	“CIDA Evaluation Guide – Work in Progress” Performance Review Branch, January 2000 and other guides in the “How to Perform Evaluations” series
CIDA 2000j	“A Results Approach to Developing the Implementation Plan: A Guide for CIDA Partners and Executing Agencies” March 2001
CIDA 2000k	“RBM Handbook on Developing Results Chains: The Basics of RBM as Applied to 100 Project Examples” Results-Based Management Division, December 2000
CIDA 1997	“Guide to Gender-Sensitive Indicators” Tony Beck and Morton Stelcner, August 1997
DFID 2002b	“Gender Manual: A Practical Guide for Development Policy Makers and Practitioners” April 2002
ILO 1995	<p>“Guidelines for the Integration of Gender Issues into the Design, Monitoring and Evaluation of ILO Programmes and Projects”, Evaluation Unit, Bureau of Programming and Management, January 1995</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Checklist 2: Gender Considerations in progress review reports • Checklist 3: Gender Considerations in self-evaluation reports • Checklist 4: Gender Considerations in Terms of Reference (TORs) for independent evaluation missions
World Bank 2001b	“Gender in Monitoring and Evaluation in Rural Development: A Tool Kit”

Table 4 Evaluation reports from other agencies, and other reports

Agency & Year	Title of Document Received
AfDB 2002	“Monitoring and evaluating gender issues and women’s empowerment in Kenya” Paul A. Ogula in “Monitoring and Evaluation Capacity Development in Africa” Selected proceedings from a seminar and workshop organised by the Development Bank of Southern Africa, the African Development Bank, and the World Bank, Johannesburg, 25-29 September 2002
Bridge 2001	“Gender and monitoring: a review of practical experiences” Bridge Report No. 63, Paola Brambilla, 2001
DFID 2002c	“Sector Wide Approaches: Opportunities and challenges for gender equity in health” Sally Theobald, Rachel Tolhurst and Helen Elsey
DFID 2002d	“What’s behind the budget? Politics, rights and accountability in the budget process” Andy Norton and Diane Elson
DFID 2001a	“First Annual Review of the Gender Equality Strategy, Progress on Country Strategy Objective on Gender Equality”, Lina Payne
DFID 2000d	“Gender Mainstreaming: Emerging Lessons from Ghana” Elizabeth A. Akpalu, Esther Ofei-Aboagye and Helen Derbyshire
DFID 2000e	“Gender Equality Strategy for DFID Bangladesh” Julie Lawson-McDowall
DFID 1999b	“Report on the First Phase of DFIDB Gender Review” Anne Coles
Heinrich Böll Foundation 1999	“Empowerment, A study of women’s projects abroad”, Birte Rodenberg & Christa Wichterich, Heinrich Böll Stiftung, November 1999
Netherlands (NL) 2001b	WP-GEN Task Force on Gender Equality in SWAps – reference guide & case studies on gender mainstreaming in Bangladesh: Annex 1 – Experiences in health sector programs Annex 2 – Experiences in education sector programs Annex 3 – Experiences in agricultural sector programs
Novib 2001	“En Route: Evaluation of the Gender Route Project” Ria Brouwers and Donny Meertens, October 2001
OCAA 2001	“The Final Workshop Report on Philippines Field Gender Audit, 21 – 30 August 2001” Oxfam Community Aid Abroad
SPC 2001	“Review of the Pacific Women’s Resource Bureau, Secretariat of the Pacific Community”, August 2001
Netherlands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Good Practice in the Development of PRSP Indicators and Monitoring systems”, David Booth and Henry Lucas, Overseas Development Institute, July 2002 • “Recommendations for Integrating Gender into the Poverty reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) and related processes”, Tanzania Ministry of Community Development, Women’s Affairs and Children, no date • “Information Pack on Key Gender Issues in Different Sectors”, Mary Rusimbi, Gemma Akilimali, Tanania Gender Networking Programme (TGNP), Debbie Budlender, Community Agency for Social Enquiry (CASE)

ANNEX 2: FRAMEWORK FOR REVIEW OF EVALUATION DOCUMENTS¹⁰⁰

Area 1: Evaluation Methodology	Area 2: Institutional Approaches & Change Strategies	Area 3: Benefits for Women, Gender Analysis and Development Outcomes
<p>1. Scope & focus of the evaluation</p> <p>2. Features of evaluation methodology Description of tools, frameworks, processes, sampling methods Details of participatory & social analysis methods used Assessment of tools, frameworks, approaches for a final product – ‘toolbox’</p> <p>3. Quality & quantity of information & analysis Use of gender sensitive indicators Collection of quantitative & qualitative sex-disaggregated information Content/depth of gender analysis undertaken (including use of gender analysis concepts) Attention to partner capacity, commitment & dialogue on gender equality Attention to resource requirements for gender sensitive development</p> <p>4. Evaluation TORs Attention to gender analysis information & analysis requirements (potential gender issues; reference to gender sensitive indicators) Attention to gender expertise & use of local consultants Attention to partner &/or stakeholder participation & consultation</p> <p>5. Standard evaluation criteria & principles Use of evaluation criteria Application of gender equality & women’s empowerment concepts to evaluation criteria (relevance, achievement of objectives, impact, development results, effectiveness, sustainability, alternatives, efficiency, lessons learned)</p>	<p>1. Recurrent institutional blocks identified in evaluation reports</p> <p>2. Successful strategies based on evidence & findings in evaluation reports What has been successful & why? What has not been successful & why not?</p> <p>3. Comments, other learning & recommendations on strategies identified in evaluation reports</p> <p>4. All the above identified according to level of institutionalisation: Agency policy Policy dialogue between donors & partners Donor country assistance strategies Donor organisations Partner organisations Activity or intervention design Activity or intervention implementation Activity or intervention monitoring & evaluation Community level – making progress towards gender equality</p>	<p>1. Evidence of benefits to women &/or changes in gender relations Does the evaluation specify how women/men have benefited from the interventions? Are there differences in benefits between women & men? If so, how are these differences addressed or explained?</p> <p>2. Evidence of a causal relationship between attention to gender issues and benefits for women Is there evidence that attention to gender issues in design or implementation leads to benefits for women, or changes in gender relations? Is there evidence that projects specifically & directly targeted at women produce strategic gender equality results for women? Is there evidence of other factors being important in producing benefits for women?</p> <p>3. Evidence that benefits to women or changes in gender relations leads to improved development outcomes micro/activity level macro level</p>

100. This framework is a simplified version of the review methodology and includes revisions made to the methodology during the review process.

ANNEX 3: GENDER AUDITS

Gender auditing is a new area of evaluation methodology. This has been pioneered by NGOs, drawing on social auditing principles rather than those of financial auditing¹⁰¹. Distinguishing features of a gender audit are accountability to gender equality and mainstreaming policy commitments, and a broad agency or program scope of enquiry.

Four gender audits have been submitted to the review, 2 from DAC members (AusAID, 2001 and CIDA, 2001a)¹⁰² and 2 from other agencies (ILO, 2002 and Oxfam Community Aid Abroad, OCAA, 2001). AusAID, ILO and OCAA have all involved groups of staff in assessing mainstreaming processes, whereas the CIDA methodology used questionnaires to gather data on mainstreaming. Two gender audits submitted to the review are examples of participatory self-assessment methods using facilitated workshops (ILO and OCAA). Both have been designed to promote learning by participants and ownership of findings in addition to policy accountability, in the expectation that this will lead to direct action to improve gender mainstreaming approaches. This is a major strength of these approaches, although it is too soon to assess whether they will fulfil their promise as effective methods for promoting action. One weakness of audit methodologies is that their use of standard evaluation criteria (relevance, effectiveness, and sustainability) is not explicit. Links to development outcomes are also weak in most gender auditing approaches, particularly the assessment of impact on women and on gender relations. Beneficiaries are not generally involved in the process, although OCAA's method is an exception to this.

The **ILO audit** included a desk review of documents and publications, a series of participatory 2-day gender audit workshops in 15 ILO work units at headquarters and in the field, interviews with key staff and meetings with constituents, partners and women's organisations. The participatory self-assessment approach contributed to team building, and identified a number of more general organisational learning and management issues which senior management has made a commitment to address.

“The Gender Audit has set in motion for the first time a collective process of gender analysis ... enhanced capacity for gender analysis, ... and identified good practices and ways of strengthening performance. Some participants made important discoveries that will change the ways they work: for instance that incorporating the gender dimension in HIV/AIDS work means putting men back into the picture; or that doing gender or women-specific projects without a gender analysis ... falls short of genuine transformative outcomes.” (ILO, 2002: 23)

According to ILO staff, the audit resulted in rich learning on strategies for institutionalising gender equality commitments, and some work units have already begun to implement recommendations. At the agency level, the ILO has made a commitment to continue the process in other work units.

CIDA undertook a desk review of 26 projects in the Indonesia program, which aimed to provide a baseline survey of the integration of gender equality considerations, against which

101 . Hunt, Juliet 2000 “Institutionalising gender equality commitments in development organisations and programs”, The Winston Churchill Memorial Trust of Australia, Canberra, 2000.

102 . Neither AusAID nor CIDA have identified their evaluations as audits. This terminology has been applied by the consultants for the current review.

future progress could be compared. Tools developed for the review included a project file questionnaire for reviewing documentation, and questionnaires to CIDA field representatives and executing agencies. These tools describe a comprehensive set of gender mainstreaming questions for the project cycle, focusing on: gender analysis requirements, gender equality integration into project design, the development of a gender equality strategy, budget allocations, and integration of gender equality commitments into contractual documents. Most of these questions could readily be adapted for use as **gender mainstreaming indicators**.

AusAID's Gender and Development review used a "rapid panel assessment" tool to assess 20 randomly selected projects, which were all currently being implemented. Each project was assessed using 14 **gender mainstreaming indicators** focused on design, professional management of the project by the contractor and partner agency, the likelihood of the project achieving its objectives and gender-related benefits, and the likely sustainability of gender-related outcomes. Panels of AusAID staff and external consultants assessed the attributes of each project based on summaries of project documents, in addition to interviews with team leaders and AusAID staff. The indicators allow staff to systematically assess gender mainstreaming across activities and sectors. The method also involves staff in a participatory assessment of gender mainstreaming processes, which promotes peer learning and ownership of findings. However, the methodology provided little insight into benefits and impact.

A facilitated participatory self-assessment approach was also in **Oxfam Community Aid Abroad's** (OCAA) field gender audit in the Philippines in 2001. Partner organisations, head office and field staff used a gender audit tool to guide their assessment of selected projects in a 6-day audit workshop. The audit process also included a further 3 days of field visits to communities, using qualitative methods to assess benefits and impacts, particularly community perceptions of changes in gender relations and the major causes of those changes (which sometimes had little to do with program interventions). Partners and staff collectively analysed the implications of their assessments, focusing on: gender analysis requirements through the project cycle, strategies for working with communities to address gender issues and promote equality and empowerment, and implications for strengthening partner capacity in these areas. The self-assessment process used a **gender audit tool** that includes 25 questions focusing on project design features, application of key gender analysis concepts, monitoring processes, approach to addressing gender equality and empowerment, project resources, and how to strengthen the focus on women's empowerment and gender equality in NGO partner work.

ANNEX 4: FEATURES OF EVALUATION METHODOLOGY WHICH FACILITATE ATTENTION TO GENDER ISSUES

The tables below illustrate some of the critical features required to ensure that evaluations pay adequate attention to gender issues. The set of evaluations by AusAID is used as an example to illustrate overall findings. Table 1 presents the features of those evaluations which have been assessed as having satisfactory attention to gender issues, and table 2 presents features of those which have been rated as unsatisfactory or highly unsatisfactory¹⁰³.

Addressing gender issues in Terms of Reference (TOR) is undoubtedly necessary as a first step towards a gender-sensitive evaluation, and the employment of local consultants is often cited as being desirable for many different reasons. The AusAID example below suggests that whether a TOR addresses gender issues in brief, or in a substantive way, does not have much impact on attention to gender issues in the evaluation. Similarly, the employment of local consultants appears to have little impact on whether gender issues are adequately addressed.

Many reports in the total sample collected some qualitative and/or quantitative information on gender issues. Often this information was not analysed. Other reports presented some analysis of gender issues, but evaluators did not present sex-disaggregated data to back up this analysis or their conclusions regarding benefits and impact on women. Very few evaluations have coherently linked information collected with analysis of gender issues. Similarly, very few reports explicitly used gender sensitive indicators, and those that do generally have achieved satisfactory attention to the participation of women and the extent to which they benefited from activities.

The lessons from the database regarding features of evaluation methodology to ensure adequate attention to gender issues are not new, and they highlight the importance of both general evaluation and gender analysis capacity. These lessons are:

- It is essential to link sex-disaggregated information collected with analysis.
- The likelihood of adequately addressing gender issues in general evaluations is increased where attention is given to a “critical mass” of evaluation features. No one feature (such as collection of qualitative data only, or employment of local consultants) is sufficient.
- The capacity to determine critical research questions and indicators to guide sex-disaggregated data collection and analysis is essential, especially when most evaluations have very large agendas for investigation.

103 . See footnotes to the tables for definitions of the terms satisfactory, unsatisfactory and highly unsatisfactory. Inevitably, with any rating system based on qualitative assessments, there will be cases which are difficult to categorise. Where difficulties have arisen between satisfactory and unsatisfactory attention to gender issues, the evaluation has been rated as having satisfactory gender analysis.

Table 1: AusAID evaluations with satisfactory attention to gender issues¹⁰⁴

Project (location, sector)	Attention to gender issues in TOR ¹	Local consultant on the team	Quantitative information	Qualitative information	Analysis of information	Use of gender sensitive indicators
China community dev	brief	no	yes	yes	yes	no
Vietnam NGO	brief	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Indonesia WSS	substantial	yes	yes	yes	limited	yes
Thai rural dev	brief	yes	yes	no	yes	yes
SE Asia agric	brief	yes	yes	limited	limited	no
Samoa rural	no TOR	yes	limited	yes	yes	no

1. No TOR means that no Terms of Reference was included in the evaluation report.

Table 2: AusAID evaluations with unsatisfactory or highly unsatisfactory attention to gender issues¹⁰⁵

Project (location, sector)	Attention to gender issues in TOR	Local consultant on the team	Quantitative information	Qualitative information	Analysis of information	Use of gender sensitive indicators
Fiji health	substantial	yes	limited	limited	limited	no
Philippines agriculture	brief	yes	limited	limited	limited	no
Africa NGO	brief	yes	limited	limited	limited	no
Tibet WSS	brief	no	yes	limited	no	no
Pacific infra	brief	yes	limited	limited	no	no
Global land titling	no TOR	no	no	no	no	no

104 . Evaluations with satisfactory attention to gender issues have assessed the participation of women in activities, and provide at least one piece of information on how women have benefited from activities, or they have made at least one statement about the impact of activities on women and/or on gender relations.

105 . Evaluations with unsatisfactory attention to gender issues have assessed the participation of women in project or program activities in a limited way. They have not provided information on how women have benefited, nor are there any statements about impact on women. Evaluations with highly unsatisfactory attention to gender issues do not assess women's participation, benefits or impact on women, although they may include references to women or gender issues in the report.

ANNEX 5: SUMMARY OF INDICATORS USED IN EVALUATIONS¹⁰⁶

The tables below provide a brief summary of the types of indicators used in evaluation reports. Indicators are divided into 3 types: gender mainstreaming indicators which may be useful at agency level, indicators of women's and men's participation, and results indicators which describe benefits for females and males.

Table 1: Indicators Used in Thematic Reports

Agency/ Report	Gender mainstreaming indicators	Participation indicators	Results indicators
AusAID 2001 gender mainstreaming policy audit	Focus on project design, including project objectives, partner capacity, assessment of socio-economic & political context, identification of constraints & strategies, resources, monitoring, & capacity of contractor	Women and men involved in data collection, women's involvement in decision making groups	Women's perception of benefits, practical gender needs & strategic gender interests addressed
CIDA 2002a Padel (NGO credit & training project)		Women members of community based organisations/groups; active women members (attendance at meetings); women in executive positions; women participants in training; % of active women members participating in training; women with access to credit; organisations with women's committees	
CIDA 2001a Gender mainstreaming audit of a country program	A 3-page questionnaire - can be re-formulated as indicators. Focus is on attention to gender issues in project documents. Includes quality of analysis, baseline study, gender strategy, resources, MOU. Also a 4-page questionnaire for executing agencies.		Focuses on whether project documents identify expected gender equality results at output, outcome & impact levels

106 . Many reports included evaluation questions, which could be re-formulated as indicators. These have not been included here, except where this has been noted. Other evaluations (eg ADB 2001) developed specific gender sensitive indicators for each project, but these are not included in the ADB evaluation report.

CIDA 1999a Ghana Girl Child Education project	Focus is on attention to gender issues in education plans, policies, existence of a permanent unit within the Ministry of Education, an information system on girls' education & transmission of information to Ministry of Education	Number of female teachers, participation in classroom activities	Retention rates, positive role models, attention to female students, greater participation of women in community decision making, reduction in barriers to girls' education, gender sensitive curricula & teaching materials, gender sensitive teachers & education officers, gender sensitive infrastructure
CIDA 1999b Women's Initiative Fund Egypt		Number of enterprises created, loan funds disbursed, jobs created	
ILO 2002 Gender Audit, Annex VIII Document Analysis Sheet	Overall attention to gender issues in documents, including analysis of context, gender mainstreaming in objectives, indicators & budget, technical cooperation, capacity building in the ILO work unit, knowledge & information management in the organisation, M&E systems, choice of partner agency, products & public image, human resources, & organisational culture	Participation and decision making by women in meetings	
USAID 2001a Women's Empowerment Program, Nepal			Empowerment indicators include decision making for self needs, children's needs, family needs & for community activities. Decision making indicators distinguish between sole decision making, joint decision making, participation in decision making but with less than decisive influence, and participation with no influence. Indicators for expenditure include direct well-being expenditures, indirect well-being, and expenditures not related to well-being.

USAID 1999d Girls' Education	Covers regulations regarding pregnancy & age, policy/practice regarding repetition, policy frameworks for quality improvement		Access indicators focus on enrolment, completion & retention, availability & appropriateness of facilities. Indicators for quality need to be extrapolated from the findings of the report, which focus on quality of instruction, curricula, family & teacher support, & engagement with communities.
World Bank 2001 & 2002	Annex IIA of the 2001 report includes indicators & rating systems for attention to gender issues in a range of documents including country assistance strategy, poverty assessments, public expenditure reviews, sector reports & project appraisal documents Overall indicators for relevance included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ soundness of underlying gender analysis work; ▪ adequacy of integration of gender issues into country assistance strategy – understanding of critical gender issues; indicators & benchmarks; realism of the strategy proposed in the country context 		Results of bank assistance were assessed according to 3 broad criteria/questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ increased human capital – outcomes in education, sustainability in education, results in health, sustainability in health, institutional strengthening in health & education sectors ▪ increased participation of women in economic development - increased opportunities for income generation, increased access to credit, & other service, increased participation in training or skills upgrading ▪ improved/strengthened institutional framework - strengthened development institutions to deliver gender aware programs, strengthened NGOs or community groups

Table 2: Indicators Used in General Reports

Agency/ Report	Gender mainstreaming indicators	Participation indicators	Results indicators
AusAID 2000g NGO program in Vietnam	Strategies incorporated to address “WID/GAD issues” in the planning & implementation of the project	Efforts were made to involve women in project activities	The project had a positive impact on women
AusAID 1999a Water & Sanitation in Indonesia		Organised community structures (for management of water facilities at village level) have adequate representation of rich & poor, men & women	A sufficient majority have access to water & sanitation facilities (rich/poor, men/women)
AusAID 1999b: 39, Rural development in Thailand		Indicators for achievement of “WID/GAD objectives” were: women have a say in development decision making; increased women’s participation in implementation	Impact was measured by: enhanced women’s role and status in public
CIDA 2000e: 34- 35, Inter Pares Peru (NGO program)	Indicators for institutional results include: adoption of gender policy, strengthening capacity of women’s organisations, & strengthening gender focus in other counterpart organisations	Number of women trained (in various areas, including training of women leaders), forming micro-enterprises, using seed banks, educated about health issues	List of indicators focuses on developmental results (economic, social, political) & individual results (increased self-esteem & confidence). Economic: increased yields & income; Social: improved nutrition, decreased rates of domestic violence, improved awareness of domestic violence in the community. Political: improved capacity of women’s leaders, improved gender perspectives in decision making, increased ability of women’s organisations to negotiate with government, increased respect for women leaders (from family, community)
CIDA 1999e: 113-121, NGO Eyesight program	Gender policy adopted, supported & understood within donor & partner NGOs, sex disaggregated data collected on management & administration activities, gender balance in volunteer profile, board is representative of both men & women	Degree to which women participate as full & equal partners throughout & after the project	

ANNEX 6: ILLUSTRATIONS OF BENEFITS TO WOMEN, GENDER ANALYSIS AND LINKS TO DEVELOPMENT OUTCOMES

This annex illustrates points made in chapter 6 on the links between benefits for women, attention to gender issues in activity design or implementation, and development outcomes.

This is not intended to be a comprehensive list of benefits identified across the sample of 86 reports reviewed. Rather, it provides selected case study examples from some of those reports which do provide detail on benefits to women or changes in gender relations, some of the qualifications provided by evaluators about those benefits, and sometimes, assessments of how those benefits arose. Links to overall development outcomes are also made where possible in the sectoral summaries below.

Systematic approaches to gender analysis and mainstreaming in the activities evaluated are rare:

BMZ's review of basic education projects illustrates the extent of this problem: out of 21 projects included in 7 countries, only 1 had undertaken gender analysis, and the recommendations were only partially implemented¹⁰⁷. Moreover, where analysis has been undertaken and documented in activity design, it is often incomplete. For example, in the ADB's evaluation, projects were selected for the evaluation precisely because they had given some attention to gender issues in design or implementation:

“All the projects reviewed provided practical benefits to women and men ... However, in general, the project designs were based on inadequate baseline data on gender issues, and as such, there was an overall tendency for the project provisions for gender equity to be vague. Accordingly, the designs lacked recognition of the most relevant gender issues, and (lacked) effectiveness in targeting provisions”¹⁰⁸.

Sida also selected projects on the grounds that some gender mainstreaming had been undertaken in either design or implementation. However the evaluators found that “rather than a coherent and integrated mainstreaming process, most interventions exhibited the presence of only a few mainstreaming elements, and in general showed only embryonic evidence of working with gender mainstreaming processes”¹⁰⁹.

AusAID's policy review presents a positive assessment of attention to gender mainstreaming which is not really reflected in the database as a whole: “Since the introduction of the policy, AusAID has made progress in mainstreaming gender into aid activities, with forty five per cent of the sample activities rated satisfactory overall for gender mainstreaming”¹¹⁰. However, the review also identifies the lack of gender sensitive indicators in logframes as a serious constraint during implementation and monitoring, and notes that most activities only collect sex-disaggregated data on male/female participation in training.

107 . BMZ 2001a: 40.

108 . ADB 2001: iii.

109 . Sida 2002a: xxii, 3.

110 . AusAID 2001: v.

Examples of benefits for women¹¹¹:

Usually, where reports identify benefits addressing practical needs, evaluators also note that these benefits are limited to a few areas of project/program activity. Some also mention that there are no strategic changes in gender relations, or identify negative impacts alongside the positive benefits.

For example, BMZ's thematic evaluation of financial and technical cooperation concluded that women are profiting from projects, but less than men. The most positive results identified for women included better food, higher income, lower workload and improved health. However, there are little improvements identified in social, economic and judicial equality, women's access to resources remains less than men's, and no changes in traditional roles were identified¹¹². Danida's evaluation of the Rakai district development program in Uganda identified positive results for girls in education and women benefited from a targeted credit scheme, but little priority was given to women's interests in other program areas including health and infrastructure activities¹¹³.

There are some examples in the database of women benefiting from agriculture activities, but the findings are often mixed. For example, AusAID's evaluation of 3 rural projects in Samoa found that practical needs had been met through increased family income, and that some women had benefited directly from training and employment as extension agents. However, women received less access to needed agricultural information than men, and the introduction of village fish reserves restricted women's and older men's access to shellfish collection sources¹¹⁴. The World Bank found that scant attention had been paid to gender issues in agricultural activities, such as disparity in access to land, and different roles and responsibilities for agricultural production:

“Although 42 of the 180 interventions were in the agricultural sector, only 14 projects included components or activities to benefit women. The components were ad hoc and appended, but resulted in small positive results for women”¹¹⁵.

Belgium's evaluation of an integrated community development project in Uganda found that poverty reduction initiatives address practical needs such as health care and water. The project did not invest in women's strategic needs, but sometimes women's ability to make decisions about external resources has increased, even though this has not changed social and cultural factors that prevent women from exercising equal decision making¹¹⁶.

Participatory design was a key factor documented in the success of a number of projects in achieving benefits for women, which then had other spin-off effects for development in general. This occurred across sectors and was a key factor in the success of a community development and watershed conservation project in Nepal¹¹⁷. While income increases were marginal, evaluators identified “self-development skills” (confidence and skills gained) and “group development capability” including decision making and organisational capacity as key qualitative impacts.

111 . More examples are provided in other sections below.

112 . BMZ 2000.

113 . Danida, 2000c: 22.

114 . AusAID 2000f: xiii, 47.

115 . World Bank 2002: 14-15.

116 . BMZ 2001c.

117 . JICA 2001: 54.

Examples of a causal relationship between attention to gender issues and benefits for women:

Understanding the constraints which had prevented women from accessing benefits in the past, and using that analysis to target women more effectively, emerged as two important design features in WFP's review of its commitments to women. For example, increasing the number of female food monitors has increased the effectiveness of reaching female target groups, and ensuring that they are aware of their entitlements. In some programs, women from female-headed and polygamous households directly receive food aid through a ration card system which recognises their status as individuals¹¹⁸.

Both the specific targeting of women, and understanding constraints to their participation also emerge as key factors in JICA's policy reviews. Of 5 projects included in the JICA 2000 evaluation, 2 showed clear benefits for women, and the other 3 either did not benefit women, or men benefited more than women. These 2 projects either undertook gender analysis, or incorporated targeting strategies. Access to training and other resources were also key factors in whether or not women benefited. Of 8 projects included in the JICA 2001 evaluation, 1 included gender analysis in design. This project also had the involvement of a female social analyst, and a series of seminars for forestry extension workers integrating social and gender issues. This project and a second had specific targeting strategies for women. Evaluators found that only these 2 of the 8 projects reviewed showed benefits for women¹¹⁹.

Three projects were included in AusAID's review of rural development in Thailand. Of these, only the Ubon-Ratchathani Land Reform Area Development Project (ULRAP) has any significant gender analysis or a gender strategy. Small gains for women in the other 2 projects were found to be largely unsustainable due to the lack of gender strategies and poor monitoring. In contrast, evaluators found that ULRAP had a substantial impact on women's participation, status and public roles. This impact was achieved by a strategy of starting with women's income-generation and savings groups to build confidence, and moving promptly to encourage women's participation in mainstream development or local government activities. Although increases in family income were small, the leaders of these groups moved in a short time to elected positions in local government.

"The impact of effective gender strategies was that the level of local development capacity was realised more quickly and the balance of local decision making was improved, compared to the likely rate of progress with male-centred strategies. ... While women's participation in public life remains low relative to men, it has increased markedly in recent years and local people attribute this to opportunity, training and encouragement provided through this project. ... Village leadership skills have increased for both women and men ... Projects that corralled women into traditional craft groups seemed to make less progress and have less active and effective local government"¹²⁰.

The evaluation concluded that serious and effective attention to gender issues in project design and implementation yielded faster progress in community development generally and more balanced local government decisions. Other key features of the strategy to address gender issues were:

- an emphasis on genuine participation by local men and women, utilising NGO input;
- close alignment with the policies and priorities of the Partner Government agency;
- effective monitoring of the achievement of gender and development objectives and impacts.

118 . WFP 2002a: paras 11-12.

119 . JICA 2000: 277-286; JICA 2001: 48-71.

120 . AusAID 1999b: xiii, 30-34, 65.

In 2002, CIDA requested an evaluation of the impact of a gender strategy introduced into a cooperative development project in Guatemala in 1998. Elements of the strategy included: equipping women with skills, organising women, sensitising both women and men to gender issues, and the formation of a cooperative with women. Much hard data is provided on the impact of the strategy including: significant increases in the number of active women cooperative members, in executive positions, participating in training, and accessing credit. The report also asserts that there have been qualitative changes, including an improvement in the quality of women's participation in training activities, women's opinions being taken into account in cooperatives, and increased recognition of women's role in the family. However, the evaluation notes that while passive resistance to women's involvement in decision making has been overcome, their participation in project benefits is limited to income generation, and they have not set up their own organisations. The evaluation notes the importance of sensitising men (husbands and male leaders) to ensure that women can participate equally. One difficulty faced by the implementing NGO was the fact that organised and active participation by women requires a great personal effort in terms of time and unpaid labour, which in some cases leads to women becoming fatigued and disillusioned, causing them to drop out of the program. Unfortunately, the evaluation did not investigate whether women retained control over any income or assets earned from the use of credit¹²¹.

Example of a gender strategy being detrimental to addressing gender issues:

One example was found in the database of a gender strategy having a detrimental impact on a project's capacity to address gender issues properly. CIDA's evaluation of the Regional AIDS Training Network in southern Africa found that gender analysis undertaken early in project implementation resulted in an unrealistic gender strategy, with recommendations which were beyond the scope of the project. Failure to have an approved gender strategy meant that some areas where gender issues should have been addressed had been overlooked. The review recommends a mainstreaming approach (rather than a separate planning process to address gender issues) to ensure that gender strategies are relevant and specific to the scope of the project¹²².

Findings on girls' education – benefits for women and development outcomes:

The World Bank's thematic evaluation found that overall reductions in gender disparities were relatively small. Girls' enrolments increased by 2% and 4% respectively in Bangladesh and Gambia, but did not increase in other countries where efforts were made to address the issue. In Vietnam and Sri Lanka, girls' enrolments increased despite largely blind design. However, a study on girls' education by USAID showed significant increases in girls' enrolments (between 50% and 89%) in Guinea, Malawi and Pakistan, and a decrease in enrolments in Egypt. Boys enrolments also increased over the same period, but not by the same amounts. A third study by CIDA in Ghana found that boys' and girls' enrolments increased at approximately the same rate due to institutional problems at national level and project management problems. However, the evaluators conclude that targeted interventions aimed at increasing enrolments is responsible for the small gains that have been made, particularly in increased community and parental commitment to girls' education¹²³.

The USAID study concludes that targeting girls' schooling improves overall development outcomes in education:

121 . CIDA 2002a, CIDA 2002b.

122 . CIDA 2000d.

123 . World Bank 2002: 8-10, USAID 1999d: 39, CIDA 1999a.

“When systems are geared up to solve the problems that keep girls out of school or prevent them from learning in school, the solutions have broad applicability and relevance to both sexes. Boys, especially those belonging to vulnerable groups or who live in remote rural areas, face many of the same problems as girls meeting their basic learning needs: lack of nearby schools, poor school quality, and lack of parental resources, support or participation in a child’s education”¹²⁴.

Girls’ education initiatives benefited all children by initiatives which:

- Strengthened investment and capacity of primary education institutions, such as through training teachers and supplying instructional materials
- Increased supply of primary schools, including expanding the supply of school places and different options for schooling
- Staffing schools with female teachers, who were preferred by parents for teaching young boys in some places
- Reduced schooling costs

Four reports also present evidence that the education of women through non-formal literacy, empowerment or credit programs has a positive impact on education enrolments of both boys and girls. Three cases were reported from Nepal¹²⁵, and one case from India¹²⁶. An additional evaluation from Kenya of a credit initiative reports that women are now able to pay school fees for children, which they were not able to do before¹²⁷.

Three reports consider the quality of education in relation to initiatives to increase girls’ enrolment¹²⁸. Each indicates that efforts to improve quality have had limited impact and identifies this as serious sustainability issue for the future, with the potential to undermine the gains that have been made in increasing both girls’ and boys’ enrolments.

Examples of gender sensitive programming in post-conflict situations:

Four reports included in this review make explicit links between gender-sensitive programming and improved outcomes at community level in post-conflict situations. These include a review by WFP of its commitments to women, an extensive USAID study on the impact of international assistance to women’s organisations in post-conflict societies, an evaluation of USAID small grant assistance to women’s associations in Rwanda, and an evaluation of a CIDA-funded NGO program in Peru¹²⁹. The USAID study notes that the international community channelled assistance through women’s organisations because they were more effective than mixed or male-dominated organisations at reaching out to women faced with extreme poverty and deprivation, and because they were successful in empowering women by raising gender awareness, facilitating political participation and putting gender issues on the national agenda of

124 . USAID 1999d: 6-7.

125 . USAID 1999d; CIDA 1999d; USAID 2001a;

126 . CIDA 2000g.

127 . Belgium 2001b.

128 . USAID 1999d; CIDA 1999a; World Bank 2002.

129 . WFP 2002, USAID 2001b, USAID 1999c, CIDA2000e

governments¹³⁰. In Rwanda, the USAID-funded Women in Transition Initiative provided small project funds to local rural women's associations for agricultural, livestock and micro-enterprise activities. The evaluation found that this contributed to the participation of women in new political structures, because of the opportunity these projects provided for women to take part in local decision making, including implementation of local development activities. In addition to directly addressing poverty (the women's associations were successful at targeting the most vulnerable, including female headed households), the evaluation concludes that these activities had a direct effect on reducing social tensions and promoting unity:

“Grants to women's associations in Rwanda are the foundation for rebuilding local communities and social trust, and are making a contribution to peaceful reconstruction”¹³¹.

The Inter Pares program in Peru focused on strengthening women to identify how they were affected by political violence, and to communicate this to government. This had a positive influence on government policy and programming. The evaluation concluded that the provision of assistance through women's organisations and federations resulted in both a reactivation of agricultural production and a “reweaving of the social fabric that was torn during the violence”¹³². Inter Pares worked with 12 NGOs with the aim of promoting economic and democratic reconstruction of communities affected by violence. Institutional strengthening inputs included providing technical assistance in agriculture, and training in gender, human rights, leadership and political participation, in addition to training activities specifically targeting women's organisations and federations to empower women. Results included improved gender focus and programming with partner NGOs, women's involvement in decision making and leadership at community and local political level, the election of a number of women as municipal councillors, increased ability of women's organisations to negotiate with local government and other institutions, responsiveness of these institutions to women's demands, and evidence of men supporting these changes in women's roles.

WFP's findings highlight the importance of male involvement and support, and the danger of marginalisation:

“A positive impact has been noted where women of different ethnic groups have been actively supported to participate jointly in food management and distribution committees. In contrast to the elders' committees dominated by men and which operate along ethnic divides, women in this case generally tend to work and cooperate with one another, thus contributing to overcoming the divides that are the cause of much civil strife and conflict. This also points to the possibly positive impact of supporting women-only groups when care is taken to ensure that they are not socially and economically marginalized. Though available documentation also reveals that such groups will tend to be more sustainable and therefore more likely to attain the anticipated impact where male support is actively sought and secured”¹³³.

Examples of women's participation in project activities or governance processes, which result in the achievement of project objectives or improved development outcomes:

In addition to the examples from post-conflict situations above, other reports make some link between the participation of women in project activities, which enhances their leadership capacity, and either the achievement of project objectives or more effective governance processes. Participatory planning and

130 . USAID 2001b.

131 . USAID 1999c: 3, 5.

132 . CIDA 2000e: 43.

133 . WFP 2002: para 151.

monitoring processes, and ensuring that women have access to training appear to be key factors. However, many of these projects have been either implemented by NGOs, or work on a relatively small scale.

An AusAID evaluation of NGO work in Vietnam highlighted the following example:

“The Dengue Surveillance and Control Project was outstanding in its use of gender sensitive participatory process in implementation, monitoring & evaluation despite women’s lack of involvement in project design. Utilization of women collaborators from the Vietnam Women’s Union has proved a very effective mechanism to convey information to communities about the dengue mosquito and to promote household stagnant water cleanup campaigns around housing areas. ... Women have achieved considerable status as a result of training and community activities and appear to be very well respected as leaders by both men and women within their communities”¹³⁴.

The evaluation of NZAID’s Gender and Development project in Kiribati reported that women now have greater confidence to speak up about domestic violence and to report incidents. This has been achieved through training of the Kiribati Police Force and a program of community awareness activities on this issue¹³⁵.

Sida’s support for the empowerment of women through Panchayati Raj in India has focused on training and preparing women to become effective partners in decision making in local government structures. The evaluation reports that women learned about panchayat administration, gained respect in the community, took initiatives to solve community problems, acquired confidence to share their experiences and learn from their peers, were able to meet with higher authorities to put their problems before them, acted as agents of change, identified problems in panchayat and state government administration, became sensitised to social problems, demonstrated eagerness to work for social justice for the marginalised and underprivileged, and have started organising women’s groups for income-generation. One impact of these benefits is that women’s participation (through meeting, suggestions and involvement in decision making) has resulted in increased efficiency in the running of local government programs, the completion of programs, and the extension of social justice and entitlements of these programs to the needy¹³⁶.

CIDA’s Social and Women’s Initiative Fund in Vietnam has funded 31 small projects over 5 years, with the aim of empowering Vietnamese women through a series of training programs and other institutional strengthening activities. Results include an increased number Vietnamese women in economic and political decision making at local and national levels, and an improved capacity by some public and private institutions to plan and deliver program which benefit women¹³⁷. In India, local NGOs have organised women into groups around income-generation activities. In this way, women have participated in project planning and implementation and have begun to take a greater place in civil society, collectively petitioning local government for the provision of essential services such as water, sewerage, electricity and garbage removal in urban slums¹³⁸. In the Caribbean, evaluators found that small projects focused on the political participation of women (supported through CIDA’s Gender Equity Fund) have increased popular participation in politics in general, and are expected to increase accountability to electors¹³⁹.

134 . AusAID 2000g: 35.

135 . NZAID 2002a.

136 . Sida 2000a: 18

137 . CIDA 2000b.

138 . CIDA 2000g.

139 . CIDA 2000a: 13.

Other reports which evaluate activities in the governance sector have either given inadequate attention to gender issues to draw conclusions regarding overall impact on development outcomes (lack of time on field visits is noted by evaluators as a constraint in some cases); or the evaluators indicate that poor gender analysis in activity design and implementation, lack of sex-disaggregated information and weak monitoring processes make it impossible for them to evaluate gender impacts¹⁴⁰.

AusAID's evaluation of the Qinghai Community Development Project found that women were poorly served by cash for work, credit and training inputs, with men dominating benefits received in all areas. Despite this overall finding, there were also some useful lessons learned about the effectiveness of targeting women and the contribution they can make to achieving development objectives. The evaluation found that employing female credit extension agents improved targeting both to the poor in general and women, and resulted in better loan recovery performance. Social and group cohesiveness, where the poor helped one another to repay loans and get through times of hardship, also occurred where women were group members who controlled their own loans. The report acknowledged that loan repayment did place exceptional demands on women in terms of increased labour time/demands (especially where children were at school), but that this did not have a serious impact on loan repayment where groups were cohesive and recognised joint responsibility. Their conclusion was that work with women, particularly in minority national areas, may reduce the vulnerability of the poor by reinforcing patterns of cohesiveness and mutual support¹⁴¹.

Women's control over income and links to poverty reduction:

There were numerous evaluations of programs and projects in the sample which include a credit or small business component, either targeted at women, or at communities in general. Most of these do not provide sex-disaggregated data on critical issues such as who benefits from and controls loans, assets or income from the use of loans¹⁴². Without such information, it is impossible to draw links between the targeting of women for credit provision, empowerment of women, and poverty reduction. To be fair, in some of these cases the evaluators do note that no detailed sex-disaggregated information was available on the uses of credit. The following examples are from evaluations which do provide more detailed information:

The USAID-funded Women's Empowerment Program in Nepal aimed to empower women in three strategic areas of literacy, legal rights, and economic participation. Project activities targeted to women (literacy training, awareness-raising and credit) have resulted in increased decision making by women on a range of household matters, which have both direct and indirect impacts on poverty reduction. Direct impacts are that more household resources are being spent on family well-being, on food, clothing, education and health care. Indirect impacts relate to women taking individual or collective action with local authorities to improve various aspects of their lives (for example, on domestic violence, alcohol abuse, property settlement after divorce, polygamy, and community perceptions of women's work and behaviour)¹⁴³.

JICA's evaluation of 5 projects in Sri Lanka found that women involved in a handcrafts production sub-project spend their money on domestic necessities¹⁴⁴. AusAID's evaluation of the Qinghai community

140 . EC 2001a, EC 2001b, Sida 2001b, Sida 2001c.

141 . AusAID 2000d: xiii, 23-49.

142 . CIDA 1999b, CIDA 2002a, USAID 1999b, USAID 1999c, AusAID 2000c, AusAID 1999a, AusAID 1999b.

143 . USAID 2001a.

144 . JICA 2000: 283.

development project in China found that men dominated as credit recipients, and that even where women did take out loans, this was generally in name only. When women did manage to control income (from cash for work activities), there was evidence that they spent it on basic family and household needs such as school fees, medicines and food, whereas men tended to regard additional cash as a “windfall” and spent it on gambling and alcohol consumption ¹⁴⁵.

Most credit projects included in the World Bank evaluation were assessed as gender-blind in design. In one case, a gender blind design did benefit both women and men, but this was principally due to the involvement of NGOs which ensured women’s access¹⁴⁶. However, both the World Bank and the ADB evaluation find mixed results regarding female control over assets or income from credit. At one end of the spectrum, women can only borrow through their husbands and have little or no control over spending. At the other end, there is a mix of male, female and joint male-female control over expenditure of income earned from credit targeted to women, with female control in a minority¹⁴⁷.

Examples of findings from water supply projects:

Despite the considerable amount of work which has gone into raising awareness and developing tools for ensuring that gender considerations are taken into account in water supply and sanitation projects, few evaluations document that women have participated in planning, implementation or management of activities in this sector. The World Bank evaluation found that most water supply projects were gender-blind and that sustainability is a major concern. However, where women had been involved (in the Philippines), the Bank concluded that this improved utilisation and sustainability of physical facilities¹⁴⁸.

No other such lessons emerged from evaluations of other water supply projects. In one case the evaluation itself had very poor quality gender analysis, which assessed participation in a limited way and did not assess benefits or impact¹⁴⁹. In another case, evaluators concluded that there was no gender strategy, and that outcomes would have been better if strategies to involve women had been put in place, although they did find that the whole community benefited from water supply construction¹⁵⁰. In a third case, the evaluation reports positively about attention to gender issues in water supply projects, but no analysis is made of links to poverty reduction or other development objectives¹⁵¹. BMZ’s evaluation notes that drinking water projects reviewed seldom saw the need for gender specific information¹⁵². One water supply and sanitation project was included in the ADB evaluation. Although this project did have gender provisions in the design, these were poorly implemented with water user committees being male-dominated and female sanitation promotion volunteers were inactive¹⁵³.

145 . AusAID 2000d: ix, 43.

146 . World Bank 2002: 18-19.

147 . ADB 2001: 6-9, 46-100.

148 . WB 2002: 16.

149 . AusAID 2002b.

150 . AusAID 1999a.

151 . CIDA 2001c: 45.

152 . BMZ 2000.

153 . ADB 2001: 8, 74-79.

ANNEX 7: TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR DAC WP-EV REVIEW ON GENDER AND EVALUATION¹⁵⁴

Background

A Discussion Paper on “Options for Future Work on Gender Equality by the DAC Working Party on Aid Evaluation”, presented to the 35th meeting of the Working Party, outlined 3 options for future work on using evaluation tools and processes more effectively to enhance donor activities in relation to gender equality and women’s empowerment. Australia agreed to develop the options further in consultation with interested Members of WP-EV, WP-GEN and the Secretariat. The 3 options build on previous work of the DAC dating from 1991, which is outlined in the Discussion Paper, along with the rationale, objective and outputs expected from each option.

The 3 options outlined in the Discussion Paper are:

1. Reviewing institutional approaches among donors for integrating gender equality and women’s empowerment in development co-operation activities and management systems
2. Improving the gender dimension in evaluation methodologies and processes
3. Assessing whether engendering development activities improves the achievement of overall results

The 2nd option received the most support from Members, and was considered the one most closely linked to the mandate of WP-EV. It was suggested that options 1 and 2 could be combined. Options 1 and 3 received equivalent support¹⁵⁵.

STEP 1: Integrating the 3 Options in a Review of Selected Recent Evaluations

The Discussion Paper proposed that work on options 2 and 3 should begin with a review of selected recent evaluations focused on gender equality and women’s empowerment, with the final outcome from option 2 being a guidance note or “toolbox” of innovative and effective evaluation approaches drawn directly from the review. AusAID proposes to contract a consultant to undertake this review, using a methodological framework which integrates elements from each of the 3 options. This approach is responsive to Members’ support for all options.

WP-EV has undertaken 2 previous reviews of attention to gender issues in evaluations. The most recent review culminated in a workshop organised by Sida in 1999, and drew on a database of Member evaluations up to 1998¹⁵⁶. The current review will build on this work.

154 . This copy of the TOR does not include the original database (Annexes 1 and 2) or the work schedule referred to in paragraph 14 , which are now out of date.

155 . Extract from Working Party on Aid Evaluation “Summary Record of the 35th Meeting held on 14-15 November 2001” DCD/DAC/EV/M(2001)2/PROV, point 8.

Database for the Review

The database for the current review includes 2 broad types of evaluations:

1. Thematic evaluations conducted since 1999 which have been **specifically designed to evaluate gender equality, gender mainstreaming and women's empowerment efforts**. WP-EV's matrix of planned evaluations indicates that between 16 and 21 evaluations may be available for review (see Annex 1), depending on progress with the finalisation of reports.
2. Evaluations conducted since 1999 which have **not** been specifically designed to evaluate Members' gender equality policies, but which have included significant gender analysis. Selection of evaluations in this category will give priority to evaluations which: have developed or applied innovative approaches or tools; add to our knowledge of institutional approaches; and/or which demonstrate the impact of including gender perspectives on overall development results. WP-EV's Inventory of evaluations indicates that up to 66 evaluations may be available. It is expected that a number of evaluations will be culled from the review after initial assessment. Assistance from Members with the selection of evaluations which meet these criteria, using the list attached in Annex 2 as a starting point, will expedite the selection process.
3. Other material not available on the inventory would also yield relevant and important information on issues, such as reviews, lessons learned and other assessments conducted by agencies on gender analysis and quality.

Members who have undertaken evaluations in these categories will be requested to send final or draft reports by email to AusAID's consultant by 15 March 2002. It is expected that this database will capture evaluation experience for activities where gender perspectives have not been mainstreamed, as well as activities where gender equality and women's empowerment were explicit as a primary or secondary objective. In order to undertake the review, full copies of evaluation reports will be required, rather than abstracts. Due to resource constraints, only reports available in English will be included in the Review.

Following review of the material and other documentation from agencies, the study will conduct interviews, both electronic and through site visits, to discuss aspects of the tools and methodologies not evident from the published reports. Discussion with those who have used various tools and approaches would allow more in-depth analysis of the variables affecting gender analysis and the issues and gaps in information that may need to be addressed at later stages in the study. A questionnaire may be a useful means of eliciting this information.

Review Framework

The methodological framework for the review has a positive focus on distilling and sharing of experiences in the following areas, which integrates the 3 options for future work proposed in the Secretariat's Discussion Paper:

1. Innovative, practical and effective evaluation methodologies, approaches and tools for evaluating gender equality and women's empowerment in Member programs and projects (option 2).

156 . OECD 1994 "Assessment of DAC Members' WID Policies and Programmes", Paris; 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, Sweden" Prepared for the DAC Working Party on Aid Evaluation.

The need for guidance on gender sensitive evaluation approaches has been highlighted in previous work for WP-EV¹⁵⁷. The review will focus on: the effectiveness of different methods for evaluating gender equality and women's empowerment across programs, and for different sectors and types of assistance (depending on the database); quantity and quality of information and analysis, including the use of indicators to assess participation, changes in gender equality, women's empowerment and gender relations; innovative and participatory methods for collecting information (particularly where data is scarce, and where gender perspectives have not been mainstreamed through design, implementation and monitoring); how gender analysis is linked to key evaluation criteria, and to the assessment and attribution of outcomes, benefit and impact.

2. Institutional approaches and change mechanisms which have successfully responded to recurrent obstacles to gender mainstreaming (option 1).

There is an extensive literature on institutional obstacles. However, good practice case studies on the institutionalisation of gender equality approaches are often based on intention, rather than outcome, and few are based on evidence from program and project evaluation. The review will distil experience on addressing institutional blocks and strategies from both donor and partner perspectives, and in relation to different levels of institutionalisation and types of assistance¹⁵⁸. This will assist to develop Terms of Reference for further work needed on Option 1.

3. Assessing whether gender analysis and gender mainstreaming improves the achievement of overall development results (option 3).

If this aspect of the Review is to yield significant results, it will be important for Members to identify evaluations which make the link between including gender perspectives, and successful or improved development outcomes. The size of the evaluation database for this area is unknown. Of the 3 areas of focus for the review, this presents the most methodological challenges. Depending on information available in the database, the review will attempt to distinguish between activities where activity design has been improved by gender analysis, and activities where a gender sensitive approach to implementation has improved development outcomes, whether or not activity objectives or design were modified to address gender equality concerns.

Output from the Review

The initial output from the review will be a report (approximately 20 pages, in addition to annexes) which summarises findings in each of the 3 areas above, and which identifies ways forward to complete work on each option. Close attention will be given to identifying steps needed to achieve a relevant and accessible output for each option, which can be disseminated and utilised by evaluation and gender specialists, and other stakeholders in the development process.

The WP-GEN will be approached to provide guidance and peer review comments on the study and to facilitate contacts with members in collection and discussion on the material and reports. A progress report will be prepared for members and circulated for comment prior to the May 2002 meeting of the Working Party on Aid Evaluation.

157. Woodford-Berger 1999; Keller 2000; and Hunt, Juliet 2001 "Discussion Note for the DAC Working Party on Aid Evaluation: Options for Further Work on Evaluating Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment" Prepared for AusAID for the Working Party on Aid Evaluation Meeting, 22-23 May 2001.

158. These issues were raised by Members in comments on the Secretariat's Discussion paper. The extent to which it is possible to focus on these areas (donor and partner perspectives, and different levels of institutionalisation) will depend on attention to these issues in the evaluation database.

Further steps

The Discussion Paper recommended that workshops be held to discuss findings from initial work for options 1 and 3. For option 2, discussion of review findings with agency staff and evaluators involved in gender evaluation studies was also seen as an essential step, before finalising a discussion note or toolbox on innovative approaches and tools for gender sensitive evaluation. With an integrated approach to the review of evaluations, an integrated workshop agenda is considered the best option. Collaboration with a Member other than Australia, both in the development of the study and in the planning and organisation of the of the workshop would be sought.

Other donors may also take the lead role in finalising outputs for each option. These were summarised in the Discussion Paper as:

1. Evaluation methodologies: Development of a discussion note on recommended innovative approaches/tools.
2. Institutional approaches: Short policy note or communiqué. The review report will identify further work which needs to be undertaken prior to the workshop on Gender and Evaluation.
3. Improving development results: A study which synthesises the implications of gendered approaches. The review report will identify any further work which needs to be undertaken prior to the workshop on Gender and Evaluation.

Scheduling of the review and follow-up work

The table below summarises the timetable of work for the review and makes suggestions for scheduling further follow-up work.