



IEG
INDEPENDENT
EVALUATION GROUP

WORLD BANK GROUP
World Bank • IFC • MIGA

WHAT WORKS



Integrating Gender into IEG Evaluation Work

Integrating Gender into Evaluation Work

by Elena Bardasi and Gisela Garcia

© 2016 International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / The World Bank

1818 H Street NW

Washington DC 20433

Telephone: 202-473-1000

Internet: www.worldbank.org

This work is a product of the staff of The World Bank with external contributions. The findings, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in this work do not necessarily reflect the views of The World Bank, its Board of Executive Directors, or the governments they represent.

The World Bank does not guarantee the accuracy of the data included in this work. The boundaries, colors, denominations, and other information shown on any map in this work do not imply any judgment on the part of The World Bank concerning the legal status of any territory or the endorsement or acceptance of such boundaries.

Rights and Permissions

The material in this work is subject to copyright. Because The World Bank encourages dissemination of its knowledge, this work may be reproduced, in whole or in part, for noncommercial purposes as long as full attribution to this work is given.

Any queries on rights and licenses, including subsidiary rights, should be addressed to World Bank Publications, The World Bank Group, 1818 H Street NW, Washington, DC 20433, USA; fax: 202-522-2625; e-mail: pubrights@worldbank.org

Table of Contents

Abbreviations.....	v
Acknowledgments.....	vii
PREFACE.....	ix
I. Introduction	1
II. What are we evaluating?	2
IEG and the World Bank Group gender strategy	2
III. Integrating Gender into IEG Evaluation Work: Challenges and Entry Points	9
Gender Equality: Which Indicators?	11
Gender indicators: what are they?	15
Quantitative or qualitative indicators?	16
Outcome or output indicators?	16
Who are the female beneficiaries?.....	17
Sources of information	18
IV. Integrating Gender in Specific IEG Products	18
Project Validation.....	18
Country Evaluations	20
IFC validation products	24
Project Evaluations	27
Thematic Evaluations.....	33
References	39
Appendix 1. Country Evaluations: Gender Flag Guidelines for CLRs (<i>draft for discussion</i>)	41
Appendix 2. Country Evaluations: Gender Guidelines for CPEs (<i>draft for discussion</i>).....	43
Appendix 3. Gender Section of the ICR Review Template (“ICRR Gender Flag”)	50
Appendix 4. Master questionnaire – Women’s empowerment questions	54
Appendix 5. Focus Groups – Women’s empowerment and gender roles in the household and the community	55
Running of the focus groups	55
Appendix 6. The “Gender Resource” database for evaluators.....	72

Abbreviations

AS	Advisory Services
BP	Bank Policy
CAS	Country Assistance Strategy
CASCR	Country Assistance Strategy Completion Report
CCSA	Cross-Country Solutions Area
CGA	Country Gender Assessment
CLRR	Country Learning and Review Report
CPE	Country Program Evaluation
CPF	Country Partnership Framework
DHS	Demographic and Health Survey
DOTS	Development Outcome Tracking System
EGCG	External Gender Consultative Group
E&S	Environmental and Social
ESIA	Environmental and Social Impact Assessment
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
FY	Fiscal Year
GAD	Gender and Development
GAP	Gender Action Plan
GP	Global Practice
IBRD	International Bank for Reconstruction and Development
IDA	International Development Association
IEG	Independent Evaluation Group
IFC	International Finance Corporation
ICR	Implementation Completion and Results Report Implementation Completion and Results Report Review
ICRR	Review
IS	Investment Services
LSMS	Living Standards Measurement Study
MAR	Management Action Record
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MIGA	Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
OMS	Operational Manual Statement
OP	Operational Policy
OPCS	Operations Policy and Country Services
PDO	Project Development Objective

PPAR	Project Performance Assessment Report
PREM	Poverty Reduction and Economic Management
RMES	Results Measurement and Evidence Stream
RMS	Results Monitoring System
SCD	Systematic Country Diagnostic
SEP	Stakeholder Engagement Plan
TTL	Task Team Leader
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
WEAI	Women Empowerment in Agriculture Index
WID	Women in Development

Acknowledgments

This paper has been funded by an Externally Financed Output (EFO) provided by the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs to support the development of methodological work in evaluation at the Independent Evaluation Group (IEG) of the World Bank Group. The paper (whose main authors are Elena Bardasi and Gisela Garcia) reflects the results of several activities undertaken by IEG during 2014 and 2015. These activities, coordinated by Elena Bardasi, have involved a number of consultants: Gisela Garcia, Nathyeli Yethzi Acuna Castillo, Javier Bronfman, Zukhra Shaabdullaeva, Katherine Vaughn, Trufat Woldesenbet, Disha Zaidi, as well as World Bank Group country teams, project teams, and survey firms in Lao PDR, Nepal, and Burkina Faso. Thanks are due to the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs for the financial support, IEG management for championing this work, and all the IEG staff that offered ideas and feedback, collected gender data, and integrated gender into their work.

Integrating Gender into IEG Evaluation Work

PREFACE

In recent times there has been an increased production of guidelines and tools on how to integrate gender in evaluation (ECG 2012; UN Women 2015). This report differs from these efforts in that it reflects more than one year of experimentation and learning-by-doing with “real” Independent Evaluation Group (IEG) evaluation work. Conscious that even the perfect (theoretical) approach can fail if the challenges encountered during implementation are not identified and addressed, the IEG gender team has chosen to derive lessons and guidelines from actual experience. The result is guidelines and tools that reflect the limitations of the available information and what can realistically be collected, as well as the constraints related to timelines that are often strict and inflexible, the volume of work that requires engagement on different fronts, and the knowledge and motivations of evaluators that are not gender experts and are exposed to multiple requests.

Some of the tools proposed here (the approach to collect qualitative data on women’s empowerment through focus group discussions in Lao PDR, Nepal, and Burkina Faso; the survey questionnaire to collect quantitative data on women’s empowerment in Nepal and Burkina Faso) have been piloted during 2015 in the field and adjusted based on the results of the pilot. Some other tools (the Implementation Completion Report Review [ICRR] gender flag) have been piloted and rolled out as part of IEG’s regular work program. Lessons have been derived from in-depth portfolio reviews that were part of the preparation of other IEG products (the gender chapter of the Results and Performance of the World Bank Group 2015, the Social Safety Nets and Gender report 2014) or through an analysis of portfolio reviews carried out by IEG teams conducting thematic evaluations (the Investment Climate evaluation, the Financial Access evaluation, the Energy evaluation). Other tools (the approach to integrating gender in country evaluations and private sector validations) are based on analysis carried out by the gender team, but they haven’t been piloted or even discussed internally at this stage. No guidelines are proposed for corporate evaluations, since no tools been

prepared for conducting case studies, as there were no opportunities for experimentation and analysis in these cases.¹

The report represents, therefore, a stage in the process of improving the integration of gender in IEG evaluation work. It is a work-in-progress and a live approach, which will evolve as IEG learns and absorbs these lessons and adopts these tools, in a process of trial and error that will lead to corrections and the introduction of innovations.

Now that a critical mass of knowledge has been achieved and organized, the next step in this process will involve a renewed effort of dissemination, networking, and sharing of information, and additional piloting and experimentation to refine the tools and consolidate adoption and buy-in by evaluators. The next phase will include training for evaluators (ICRRs, country evaluations, International Finance Corporation [IFC] validation products, participatory approaches, and so on), seminars and brainstorming events tailored to specific needs and evaluation products, an updated and improved intranet page for easy retrieval of these tools, and stronger engagement with teams across IEG and the World Bank Group (the Results Measurement and Evidence Stream [RMES] community of practice, the Gender Cross-Cutting Solutions Area [CCSA], the global practices, the Operations Policy and Country Services Vice Presidency [OPCS]), using also the role of the thematic coordinator. The IEG gender team will also engage in activities more closely related to an accountability function (revision of flags, monitoring pipelines, and reviewing concept notes and reports). In addition, the team will establish stronger relationships with other multilateral and bilateral institutions to intensify the exchange of experience and learning and comparison of methods.

¹ That said, the IEG Report on Self-Evaluation Systems conducted a gender analysis that the team will analyze to derive methodological lessons.

I. Introduction

The recent World Bank Group restructuring recognizes gender as a top priority, as highlighted by the creation of the Gender CCSA, and the launch in December 2015 of the new gender strategy, covering the period 2016-2023, which “sets more ambitious targets, establishes a new methodology for measuring progress, and outlines an agenda for new frontier areas in which our impact might be transformational. It moves away from the concept of ‘mainstreaming’ toward focusing on proven interventions that achieve tangible results.”² In its role of independent evaluator of Bank Group activities,³ IEG is tasked with assessing results of projects and programs, including results on closing gender gaps, as well as assessing the effectiveness of Bank Group strategies, including its strategic approach to gender. IEG carries out its evaluation work through a variety of approaches and evaluation products. In terms of products, IEG conducts project-level validations of self-evaluation reports prepared by Bank Group staff; in-depth project evaluations; thematic evaluations of Bank Group programs and strategies; and evaluations of country strategies. IEG also compiles evaluation evidence in “learning products” meant to disseminate lessons on what works. IEG evaluations rely on a variety of approaches, but, in general, evaluations are carried out ex-post and are centered on assessing outcomes against stated objectives, benchmarks, standards, and expectations of the projects or strategies.

In response to the renewed focus on gender in the Bank Group, IEG has adopted a strategic plan to improve the integration of gender in its evaluation work. The main objective of this plan is to identify viable approaches to systematically integrate gender into the evaluation of strategies and operations, so that gender-relevant results can be assessed and documented.

Before presenting and discussing the methods proposed to achieve this, it is worth considering the general rationale behind integrating gender into Bank Group work. There are two interrelated arguments for gender equality – the intrinsic and the instrumentalist approaches (WDR 2012; Cornwall 2014; Duflo 2012; Malhotra et al. 2002). Gender equality and increased women’s empowerment can be considered ends by themselves in the conceptualization of development as a freedom. Along these lines

² Announcement of the new gender strategy, December 17, 2015,

<https://hubs.worldbank.org/news/Announcement/Pages/New-Gender-Strategy-Launched-16122015-173318.aspx>

³ IEG evaluates the activities of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) and International Development Association (IDA)—the World Bank, the work of the International Finance Corporation (IFC) in private sector development, and Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (MIGA) guarantee projects and services, “to provide an objective assessment of the results of the Bank Group’s work and to identify and disseminate lessons learned from experience.” (<http://ieg.worldbankgroup.org>)

women's empowerment is associated with rights, equality, justice, participation and collective action (this is commonly defined as the "rights-based approach" to gender equality).⁴ On the other hand, the instrumental argument focuses on the role of gender equality in achieving higher levels of development. It relates women's empowerment to efficiency, investment returns, and productivity (Cornwall 2014; WDR 2012; FAO 2011; Duflo 2012).

While recognizing that women's empowerment and the process towards higher gender equality are ends in themselves, the World Bank Group places more emphasis on the instrumental role. The 2012 World Development Report discusses evidence of efficiency gains when promoting gender equality, placing the instrumental argument at the center of development efforts. Gender equality is "smart economics,"⁵ that is, it enhances productivity, improves development outcomes for future generations, and makes institutions more representative and inclusive. As such, women's economic empowerment is instrumental in reducing poverty, improving human capital (education and health outcomes) of the next generation, and ensuring a balanced growth path of the economy. This is the spirit that guides gender integration within the institution.⁶

II. What are we evaluating?

IEG and the World Bank Group gender strategy

Over the past 15 years, the Bank Group has made much progress in advancing the gender agenda. Gender has progressively become one of the most prominent corporate objectives. Until the recent Bank Group restructuring (July 2014), the Gender Unit—mapped to the Poverty Reduction and Economic Management (PREM) Network—had been leading the World Bank Gender Strategy since it was first introduced in 2001. At the same time, gender has been recognized as a cross-cutting issue that, based on the 2001 gender strategy and Operations Policy/Bank Policy (OP/BP) 4.20, is to be mainstreamed in all country strategies and across the whole World Bank lending portfolio. In the new Bank Group structure, the cross-cutting nature of gender has been formally recognized through the creation of the Gender CCSA in July 2014, which also includes the Gender Secretariat in IFC.

⁴ The rights-based approach has received increasing emphasis in recent times, and it has been forcefully embraced by the United Nations (UN).

⁵ Gender equality as smart economics was the motto of the World Bank Group Gender Action Plan.

⁶ The new gender strategy also recognizes explicitly the importance of gender equality as an end in itself. However, Bank Group operations and country strategies overwhelmingly interpret gender equality as instrumental to achieve better development outcomes, which is in line with the Bank Group's goals and type of work.

The main steps in the evolution of the World Bank's gender policy over the past 30 to 35 years are summarized in Box 1. In recent times, the corporate focus on gender has intensified with the "gender action plan" (GAP 2007-2011), whose main goal was to improve women's economic opportunities. The GAP focused the Bank's attention on economic sectors, which had been traditionally challenging for gender mainstreaming and therefore had been identified as deserving special strategic support. The four-year plan, *Gender Equality as Smart Economics*, called for investments in the improvement of women's access to jobs, land rights, financial services, agricultural inputs, and infrastructure. The GAP disbursed about US\$ 70.0 million to Bank Group teams (mostly with a "matching fund" modality) to improve gender integration in the Bank's strategies and projects, produce analytical work to inform policies and operations, support impact evaluations to gather evidence of what works in increasing gender equality, gather more gender-disaggregated data, and train more staff in integrating gender into their day-to-day job.

The GAP paved the way for the *World Development Report 2012* on gender equality and development – 10 years after another major analytical piece, the World Bank policy research report, *Engendering Development* (2001). Moreover, the GAP also led to the definition of corporate commitments on gender. Gender equality was selected as a special Theme of the *IDA 16 and IDA 17 replenishments*,⁷ with the aim of intensifying support for the efforts IDA countries are making to promote gender equality, and implementing and reviewing progress on the action plan on gender mainstreaming. Gender mainstreaming efforts in IDA 16 were mostly centered on helping IDA countries towards achieving progress on gender-related Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Addressing gender issues, especially empowering women, was noted as a multisector, long-term effort, critical to make progress on all the MDGs. The IDA 17 replenishment raised the level of ambition and requested a broader commitment from the Bank to incorporate gender through: adding gender considerations into the analysis, content, and results framework of *all* IDA Country Partnership Frameworks; ensuring that all Regions implement and monitor regional gender action plans; renewing the strategy for gender equality – with more ambitious targets; strengthened focus on knowledge, learning and innovation progress measures, and results; and, increasing data availability and statistical capacity in IDA countries. In addition to IDA gender-related commitments, specific gender indicators were selected and included in the IDA results monitoring system (RMS), some of which absorbed in the World Bank corporate scorecard (see Table 1).

⁷ The IDA 16 replenishment covers the period July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2014 (FY12-FY14). The IDA 17 replenishment covers the period July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2017 (FY15-FY17).

While the corporate focus on gender has dramatically intensified over the last 10 to 15 years, progress has not been linear. Gender was the subject of the 2010 IEG evaluation of progress of the effectiveness of the Bank's gender policy.⁸ This evaluation found that the World Bank made progress in gender integration from 2002 to 2008. Progress was initially strong, but weakened in the latter half of the review period. IEG also found that there were two key gaps in the policy. The first was the absence of a clear results framework. The second was a progressive replacement of a generalized gender mainstreaming approach with a more selective country-level approach. IEG recommended (i) institutionalizing the management accountability framework, (ii) developing a monitoring system to assess how well the Bank's work program adequately addresses gender-related concerns, (iii) establishing a results framework to facilitate the adoption of an outcomes approach to gender integration, and (iv) restoring a broader requirement for gender integration at the project level.

Some of the gaps identified by IEG have been addressed, as reflected in the World Bank Management Action Record (MAR) tracking system – reporting mechanisms have been institutionalized; efforts in producing gender-disaggregated data and impact evaluation evidence have intensified; and progress has been made in strengthening the results and accountability mechanisms.

Despite progress at the corporate level,⁹ the relative depth and quality of gender integration in both country strategies and Bank Group operations is problematic, as the upcoming Results and Performance of the World Bank Group 2015 is demonstrating. Corporate commitments have helped broaden attention to gender at the policy level, but the effort has not necessarily translated into meaningful integration in practice. Existing guidelines refer to integrating gender when relevant, but do not define relevance (except in the case of IFC, where relevance is defined at the work program level), and this results in variable practice. Poor measurement persists as the gender flag guidelines are largely process-oriented and do not address more substantive issues, such as results measurement.

⁸ IEG. 2010. *Gender and Development: An Evaluation of World Bank Support, 2002-08*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

⁹ According to the recent report on the “World Bank Group Corporate Scorecards” (September 24, 2015, PowerPoint presentation) attention to gender in the institution resulted in 100 percent gender-informed country strategies. Moreover, in FY14 (before the definition of a “gender-informed” project changed) the share of lending operations that were gender-informed was 95 percent (“Update on the Implementation of the Gender Equality Agenda at the World Bank Group,” October 2014). While the forthcoming Results and Performance of the World Bank Group 2015 questions these numbers as implausibly high, there is no doubt that recent years have seen an increase in the number of projects and country strategies addressing gender issues.

Box 1. The World Bank Gender Policy

In 1977, the World Bank was the first multilateral institution to appoint a **Women in Development (WID) adviser**. In 1984, the Bank issued **Operational Manual Statement (OMS) 2.20**, which called for Bank staff to consider women's issues as part of the social analysis undertaken during the appraisal of an investment project and to assess and address through project design any disadvantageous effects on women. In 1986, a **WID unit** was established, which subsequently influenced many operational policies. In 1990, an operational directive on poverty reduction recommended that women's issues be considered when designing poverty-reduction programs. At its 1994 meeting, the Bank Board discussed a strategy paper, *Enhancing Women's Participation in Economic Development*.

The discussion led to **OP 4.20 on the Gender Dimensions of Development**. OP 4.20 required staff to "reduce gender disparity and increase the participation of women in the economic development of their countries" as part of its mandate to reduce poverty. OP 4.20 acknowledged that to reduce poverty effectively and in a sustainable manner, development assistance needed to be designed to address the differential impact of development interventions on women and men. OP 4.20 marked a shift from the WID approach—focusing exclusively on women, their roles, responsibilities, and needs, without regard to the power relationship between men and women—to a broader integration of gender issues into Bank assistance, which would increase women's participation in economic development. OP 4.20 underscored the importance of country ownership and commitment for Bank support to be effective in helping to reduce gender disparities. Two points of entry—one through the country strategy and the other through project appraisal—provided the means to integrate gender considerations into Bank support for the next several years. OP 4.20 is still operational today.

In 1995, the Bank president participated at the Beijing Fourth World Conference on Women. In 1996, an **External Gender Consultative Group (EGCG)** was established. The group comprised 14 members, including representatives of national women's organizations, nongovernmental institutions, and political organizations from around the world. These members were to assist the Bank in designing and implementing gender policies and help strengthen gender-related dialogue with Bank partners and interested sectors of civil society.

In 1997, a **Gender and Development (GAD) Unit** was created as part of the PREM Network. The GAD Board—with the Gender and Development Unit as its secretariat—was responsible for knowledge management, monitoring and reporting on the status of policy implementation, and building capacity.

In April 2001, the Bank strengthened the country-level approach through a gender strategy paper—*Integrating Gender into the World Bank's Work: A Strategy for Action*—discussed at the Board. This strategy introduced the use of a new diagnostic tool—the Country Gender Assessment (CGA)—and promised that a CGA for every active borrower would be completed by fiscal 2005. CGAs were expected to inform country strategies, which were to include, as relevant, gender-responsive interventions. In sectors and themes that the country strategy identified as priorities for gender sector managers, and task teams were to ensure that gender considerations received appropriate treatment in operations.

In 2007, the Bank launched a four-year **GAP—Gender Equality as Smart Economics**, which closed in 2011. Recognizing shortfalls in gender integration at the operational level in selected sectors, the GAP encouraged gender mainstreaming by providing staff with incentives to integrate gender into predetermined sectors and activities—in particular agriculture, infrastructure, labor market, entrepreneurship, and private sector.

In 2014, the **Gender CCSA** was created as one of the cross-cutting global practices.

In December 2015, a new World Bank Group **gender strategy**, "Gender Equality, Poverty Reduction, and Inclusive Growth," was presented to the Bank Group Board. The new strategy identifies priority areas for engagement and sets up a new methodology to measure results.

Sources: Evaluating a Decade of World Bank Gender Policy: 1990-99, OED, World Bank (2005); Gender and Development: An Evaluation of World Bank Support, 2002-2008, IEG, World Bank (2010); various corporate documents.

Table 1. IDA 16 and IDA 17 Commitments with Respect to Gender (Special Theme)

OBJECTIVES	RECOMMENDATIONS / PROPOSED ACTIONS ^a	IDA RESULTS MEASUREMENT SYSTEM INDICATORS
<p>Deepen integration of gender equality considerations in country strategies and operations, including by focusing on follow-up actions and monitoring and evaluation as well as implementation of regional strategies incorporating specific commitments, milestones, and accountabilities.</p>	<p>- All IDA Country Partnership Frameworks incorporate gender considerations into the analysis, content of the program, and the results framework.</p> <p>- All regions implement and monitor the Regional Gender Action Plans, with plans and corresponding indicators tailored to regional and country gender contexts.</p> <p>- Develop a renewed strategy for gender equality—with more ambitious targets, a new methodology for measuring progress, and an agenda for pushing ahead on new frontiers with transformational impacts.</p>	<p>Tier 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total births) • <i>Ratio of girls to boys in primary education</i> • Ratio of girls to boys in secondary education • <i>Primary completion rate (sex disaggregated)</i> • Maternal mortality ratio • Adolescent fertility rate • Number of IDA countries without any discriminatory laws against women • Employment to population ratio for women (15+)^b (<i>ratio of female to male labor force participation in IDA 16</i>) • Youth employment to population ratio (age 15-24) (gender disaggregated)^b • Employment to population ratio in FCSs (gender-disaggregated)^c • Youth employment in fragile and conflict-affected states (FCSs) (gender disaggregated)^c • Bank account per 1,000 adults (gender disaggregated)^b <p>Tier 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pregnant women receiving antenatal care during a visit to a health provider • <i>Female beneficiaries from agriculture and rural development projects</i> • <i>Female beneficiaries covered by social safety net programs</i> • <i>Active microfinance loan accounts for women</i> <p>Tier 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Proportion of IDA Country Assistance Strategies (CASs) drawing on and discussing the findings of gender assessments.</i> Proportion of IDA Country Partnership Frameworks incorporating gender equality considerations into the analysis, content of the program, and the results framework • <i>Proportion of IDA projects that are gender-informed (%).</i> Percentage of IDA operations that integrate gender into analysis, design, and monitoring • Proportion of IDA operations that integrate gender into analysis, design, and monitoring in FCSs^c • For projects with gender monitoring in project design, the percentage of which report on such indicators during implementation • For projects with gender monitoring in project design, the percentage of which report on such indicators during implementation in FCSs^c • Proportion of IDA operations with Core Sector Indicators that can be gender-disaggregated that report such data^c

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Percentage of safety nets projects designed to mitigate risk and vulnerability for women and girls</i> • <i>Percentage of agriculture and rural development operations that target women</i> • <i>Percentage of health projects that address high fertility and maternal mortality</i>
<p>Strengthen feedback loops and reporting to enhance results and impact on gender equality.</p>	<p>- Introduce a mechanism to strengthen learning and results through an assessment and rating of gender performance at project exit, building on the systematic tracking of Implementation Status and Results Reports (ISRs), enhanced efforts on impact evaluations and emerging architecture associated with learning reviews.</p> <p>- Strengthen knowledge of what does and does not work to close gender gaps in IDA countries through monitoring and evaluation, including impact evaluations on gender-related issues, more systematic tracking of gender results of IDA operations using sex-disaggregated core sector indicators, and the expanded use of beneficiary feedback mechanisms.</p> <p>- Roll out statistical activities to increase sex-disaggregated data and gender statistical capacity in at least 15 IDA countries.</p>	<p>Tier 1 Level of statistical capacity</p> <p>Tier 2 Countries supported on strengthening national statistical systems</p>
<p>Note: Indicators in bold were present in both the IDA 16 and IDA 17 RMS. Indicators in <i>italics</i> were only present in the IDA 16 RMS. Indicators in regular font style were only present in the IDA 17 RSM. ^a Recommendations and actions proposed for IDA 17. Gender mainstreaming efforts in IDA 16 were mostly centered on helping IDA countries towards achieving progress on gender-related MDGs. Addressing gender issues, especially empowering women, was noted as a multisector, long-term, effort critical to make progress on all the MDGs. ^b Indicators selected under the ‘Inclusive Growth’ theme. ^c Indicators selected under the ‘Fragile and Conflict States’ theme. <i>Sources:</i> IEG team based on <i>Additions to IDA Resources: Sixteenth Replenishment IDA16: Delivering Development Results</i>, IDA Report from the Executive Directors of the International Development Association To the Board of Governors, Approved by the Executive Directors of IDA on February 15, 2011 (and modified on March 18, 2011); <i>Additions to IDA Resources: Seventeenth Replenishment IDA17: Maximizing Development Impact</i>, IDA Report from the Executive Directors of the International Development Association to the Board of Governors, Approved by the Executive Directors of IDA on March 25, 2014.</p>		

Measuring *results* of projects and country strategies, as well as the achievements of the Bank Group's gender strategy, is, indeed, one of the main requirements still to be addressed. Currently, the extent of gender mainstreaming in country strategies and operations is only measured at entry, with no follow-up at mid-term and closing. The IDA 17 framework has openly acknowledged this drawback and has introduced as a commitment tracking the percentage of projects that monitor gender indicators during implementation (Table 1).

In IFC, the approach to gender integration is different than in IBRD/IDA, but the emphasis on measuring gender integration at entry rather than results achieved at closing and sustained in the longer term is similar. In 2008, IFC included gender-disaggregated indicators in its development outcome tracking system (DOTS) and, more recently, adopted a gender flag for advisory and investment services.¹⁰ In 2015, a new indicator has been proposed for inclusion into the IFC scorecard for FY16: the percentage all IFC agribusiness, finance, and extractives advisory service projects that have integrated a gender analysis and gender intervention.

The gender strategy that just closed at the end of 2015 had focused exclusively on guidelines and requirements for gender integration at entry in projects and country strategies, to the neglect of reporting on results. However, elements considered important for integration at entry may not be as important for the generation of results.¹¹ Bringing a stronger focus on results—both at the project and country strategy levels—is a major goal of the new Bank Group gender strategy. The new strategy, “Gender Equality, Poverty Reduction, and Inclusive Growth,” presented to the Board in December 2015, reiterates the centrality of a country-based approach, and establishes a strong link between the gender equality agenda and the twin goals of the institution. This sharpens the results focus and makes achieving gender equality a key component of eradicating poverty and achieving shared prosperity and inclusion. This also provides important entry points for IEG to fulfill its mandate to evaluate results.

¹⁰ IFC has promoted several initiatives to integrate gender in its portfolio, such as the Gender Entrepreneurship Markets program, the Global Banking Alliance, the Women in Business Program, WINVest, and SheWorks. The IFC gender flag was introduced in November 2013 for advisory services, and in May 2015 for investments services.

¹¹ For instance, consultations may be critical to identifying relevant gender issues in the local context, but there may not be a strong correlation between consultations and results achieved if the initial consultations did not generate the ‘right’ approach for gender integration in projects and country strategies, and assessment of results or the outcome of those consultations was simply not taken into account.

III. Integrating Gender into IEG Evaluation Work: Challenges and Entry Points

An analysis carried out by IEG in preparation of the MAR 2013 of the 2010 gender evaluation identified a number of challenges that staff across the World Bank Group pointed to in relation to gender mainstreaming:¹²

- **Low value added of gender.** Bank staff – especially in some sectors – does not necessarily see the relevance of gender for their work. There is poor understanding of the added value of gender in the Bank’s work (“Gender is not applicable”)
- **Insufficiently strong commitment.** The momentum for gender mainstreaming may fade as new priorities arise (“Gender is a passing phase”)
- **Low demand by client countries.** Clients do not show enough interest in gender integration (“Gender not seen as a priority by countries”)
- **Data gaps.** Availability of household-level and intra-household data remains a serious gap. There is not enough flexibility and there are not enough incentives to integrate new insights from impact evaluations in monitoring and evaluation (M&E). Poor linkages exist between analytical and operational needs and data requirement (“Not enough information”)
- **Poor know-how.** Operationalization of the WDR is not obvious (WDR does not provide guidelines) – there is not enough support in providing tailored, personalized help within Bank units or at the project level (“Not enough knowledge of how to do it”)
- **Process-oriented approach.** The Bank Group needs to move from lip-service and bean counting (superficial, bureaucratic add-on) to substantial integration (“Very mechanistic emphasis on monitoring gender integration”)
- **Lack of resources.** Lack of time, financial resources (flat budgets, over-reliance on special funding), and human resources to pay attention to gender issues are serious problems. There is no mandate for social and gender analysis and provision of corresponding resources (“Not enough resources”)
- **Gender interpreted as an add-on.** Gender is not sufficiently interconnected with other Bank goals (especially poverty reduction) (“Gender not organically integrated”)

¹² Twenty-three in-depth interviews with select Bank staff (representing different Regions and sectors, and mostly knowledgeable of the Bank strategy on gender) were conducted and formed the basis of a report/background paper to the MAR 2013.

IEG evaluators are not exempt from these problems. A survey conducted among IEG staff and consultants in April 2014 by the IEG gender team indicated that, although most respondents are confident that gender issues are covered in IEG reviews and evaluations *when relevant*,¹³ there is a need for gender evaluation guidelines and the sharing of examples and best practices because it is not always clear how gender should be addressed in evaluation, beyond the (extremely infrequent) situation of gender being a prominent aspect of the project development objectives. In validation products – several respondents noted – gender is addressed when it is a main aspect of the operation or strategy. Yet, an analysis of ICRRs, Country Assistance Strategy Completion Report (CASCR) Reviews, Country Program Evaluations (CPEs), thematic evaluations, and IFC validation products conducted for Results and Performance of the World Bank Group 2015 indicated that the coverage of gender issues is uneven within IEG, possibly reflecting differences in evaluators’ backgrounds, skills, and sensitivities, and to the priorities assigned to different issues. As a positive note, lack of resources did not appear to be an issue for IEG evaluators. The integration of gender experts into evaluation teams is beneficial, especially if it happens at the very early stage.¹⁴ Other strategies that can be adopted are reaching out to experts and Bank Group gender teams in the GPs and country teams for brainstorming meetings, and selecting peer reviewers with gender expertise (see “Tips for Evaluators” in the Thematic Evaluations section).

In addition to the motivation, skills, and knowledge of the IEG evaluators, another challenge for IEG is represented by the availability of information produced and reported by World Bank teams in formal project documents – in particular, information on results included in supervision and completion reports. This aspect is critical as IEG’s approach to evaluation is ex-post and objective driven, which makes IEG particularly dependent on information provided by project and country teams.¹⁵

In what follows, the main challenges for IEG evaluators will be discussed and solutions proposed. The first one concerns the identification of meaningful indicators to measure gender equality and female empowerment to select the most appropriate indicators for evaluations or to provide the correct interpretation of indicators included in M&E frameworks.

¹³ “When relevant” meant, in the view of the respondents, “when gender is part of the project development objectives.”

¹⁴ As with other subjects, the quality of gender consultants is crucial for the quality of gender integration, as well as their timely and full involvement in the evaluation team.

¹⁵ This is especially true for validation reports, which do not allow for the collection of new evaluative material.

Gender Equality: Which Indicators?¹⁶

Measuring empowerment and gender equality¹⁷ presents several challenges for policy makers and development practitioners for a number of reasons. First, the multidimensional nature of “empowerment” and “gender equality” makes it difficult to measure these concepts with simple metrics (for example, being empowered in one dimension does not necessarily imply being empowered in another dimension. See Kabeer 2001 and 2012; Duflo 2012). Second, empowerment and equality are both a process and an outcome. Finding an indicator able to capture the process of empowerment as opposed to a (static) outcome has proven difficult. While outcomes can be easily expressed using quantitative data, measuring processes requires extensive participatory qualitative data collection and analysis. Third, balancing the use of quantitative versus qualitative data in measuring gender equality is challenging (O’Neil, Domingo, and Valters 2014; Kabeer 2001). Fourth, women cannot be treated as a homogenous group as they face different constraints based on age, race, social status, education, and other socio-economic characteristics (Perezniето and Taylor 2014). Thus, comparing males and females requires a deeper analysis than solely looking at averages and sex disaggregated indicators. Both individual-level indicators and relative measures are relevant in capturing the power dynamics within and outside the household. These difficulties explain why thus far, despite the existence of multiple indicators and indices, there are no universally agreed measures or indicators of gender equality and female empowerment.

Different institutions have proposed their own (country-level) measures of gender equality and women’s empowerment, each reflecting their distinct emphasis and perspectives. The United Nations Development Programme’s (UNDP) [Gender Development Index](#), [Gender Empowerment Measures](#), and [Gender Inequality Index](#) capture absolute levels in women’s economic participation, economic opportunity, political empowerment, educational attainment, and health and well-being. The World Economic Forum’s [Global Gender Gap Index](#) measures gender gaps in four dimensions: economic participation and opportunity, educational attainment, overall health, and political empowerment. The Economist Intelligence Unit’s [Women’s Economic Opportunity Index](#) covers five dimensions of women’s empowerment: labor policy and practice; women’s economic opportunity; access to finance, education, and training; women’s legal and social status; and the general business environment. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development’s (OECD) [Social Institutions and Gender Index](#) focuses on social institutions that impact equality between men and

¹⁶ This section synthesizes the main findings of a paper on women’s empowerment commissioned for this report.

¹⁷ “Gender equality” and “women’s empowerment” are connected as traditionally women have been in a subordinate position with respect to men. Goal 5 of the Sustainable Development Goals “(to) achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls” reflects the strict link between the two concepts.

women, and considers the four dimensions of family code, physical integrity, ownership rights, and civil liberties. Sabina Alkire et al. (2013) developed the [Women Empowerment in Agriculture Index](#) (WEAI) to measure the impact of agricultural interventions on women's empowerment in five domains – production, resources, income, leadership, and time. WEAI is designed specifically to measure women's empowerment in agriculture. The World Bank Group's [Women, Business, and the Law](#) database measures how laws, regulations, and institutions differentiate between women and men in seven areas: accessing institutions, using property, getting a job, providing incentives to work, building credit, going to court, and protecting women from violence.

In addition to indices, other measures are derived from household-level data. Sabina Alkire and Solava Ibrahim (2007) propose a shortlist of internationally comparable indicators of individual agency and empowerment. Ruth Alsop and Nina Heinsohn (2005) assess degrees of empowerment within three domains and eight subdomains: state (justice, politics, and service delivery), market (credit, labor, and goods) and society (family and community) at three levels – macro, intermediate, and micro. The recently launched UN Foundation [Roadmap for Promoting Women's Economic Empowerment Initiative](#) (UN 2015) analyzes best practices in measuring women's economic empowerment and recommends outcome measures (direct, intermediate, and final) of women's economic empowerment, classified along increased productivity, income, and well-being. Many researchers and institutions propose single variables and indicators, collected at the community, household, or individual-level, that may be reported disaggregated by sex.

This multiplicity of indicators, reflecting different goals, frameworks of analysis, and data constraints, is problematic when the evaluator's objective is to select the "right" variable to measure a specific result (for a questionnaire, for example) or to determine whether the indicator included in the M&E framework does actually measure what it is supposed to, whether it is an output or an outcome, and what could have been a more appropriate indicator given the objectives of the project.

In what follows, a list of commonly used indicators of empowerment is presented as a "guide" to evaluators in defining the meaning of specific variables. These indicators are grouped into three main categories: (i) women's economic empowerment; (ii) women's social empowerment; and, (iii) women's political empowerment. There is no clear-cut classification of these indicators, however, and overlaps across categories are possible. So, some indicators listed below also can be included under one of the other (or both) categories. The context and goals of the projects should help to define the meaning of these variables more specifically. A more detailed and exhaustive list of variables is presented in the paper "Women's Empowerment: Concepts, Framework, and

Measurement,” commissioned for this report, which also includes a discussion of why a specific variable is a meaningful measure of a specific dimension of empowerment. The “master questionnaire” prepared for this report includes questions that can be used in quantitative questionnaires to collect some of these variables.

Women’s Economic Empowerment

- **Income and Expenditure.** It is important to distinguish between the woman’s own earned income and other income she may receive, identify its source, type, and regularity, and the share of the woman’s contribution to the household income (relative to men). An important dimension of empowerment is manifested by the woman’s control over her own and her household income (whether the woman can decide how to use the income she earns and the household income, whether this decision is made jointly with her husband or other household members or it is her independent decision).
- **Assets.** Identify women’s ownership of housing, land, livestock, and other productive assets, durable goods, or communal resources. As with income it is also important to assess not just the ownership, but also women’s control over these assets (who decides the purchase, sale, use, and transfer of women’s own and shared assets). It is also important to identify women’s access to financial assets, credit, and saving accounts. Formal and informal laws and their enforcement regarding property and inheritance are also relevant dimensions under this category.
- **Employment.** Identify women’s participation in paid and unpaid (or family) employment over time. It is important to recognize the type of employment (for a wage, public or private, formal, vulnerable or casual, self-employment, family farm work, and so on); women’s participation in “good” vs. “bad” jobs; the regularity of employment, amount of hours worked, benefits attached to her job (child care, maternity, and so on); gender segregation in occupations and industries; and wage differentials. It is important to identify time allocated between productive and domestic tasks.
- **Human Capital.** Identify women’s access to education, skills, and training; women’s access to health; and levels and changes over time. Identify any gender gap in key outcomes.
- **Access to Infrastructure.** Identify access to basic services such as water, sanitation, and electricity. Also includes access to markets, information, and technology.

Women’s Social Empowerment

- **Mobility and Freedom of Movement.** Identify places where women are not allowed to go alone, if any. Measure women's visibility and access to social space.
- **Status within the Household.** Several indicators give a sense of women's status within the household such as: assets brought to the marriage and a woman's relative contribution to household income; the relative level of education of the husband and the wife; women's financial assets and labor contribution to the household; the mean spousal age difference; help received from the husband and other relatives in domestic tasks; participation in household decisions (health and education of children, own health, purchase of consumption goods, purchase of durable goods, visits to family and friends, women's right to refuse sex, contraceptive use, family planning) – both actual participation and perceptions of her ability to make or contribute to a decision.
- **Women's Social Status, Social Norms, and Gender Roles.** Existence and shifts in patriarchal norms (such as the preference of sons, discrimination against daughters – in education, nutrition, and health), marriage and kinship systems indicating greater value and autonomy for women (such as later marriages, the self-selection of spouse, reduction in the practice of dowry, and the acceptability of divorce); age at marriage and attitudes towards and prevalence of domestic violence; effective local enforcement of legal rights; symbolic representation of the female in myth and ritual (what is considered possible for women), including positive media images of women, women's roles, and their contribution; and women's sense of inclusion and entitlement.
- **Social Capital.** Kinship structures; participation in extra familial groups and social networks (type of social network groups, roles); and self-perceived exclusion from community activities.

Women's Political Empowerment

- **Knowledge.** Knowledge of government and the political system, and of the means to access it.
- **Participation.** Exercising the right to vote, strength of women as a voting bloc, participation in public protests and political campaigning. Women's involvement or mobilization in the local political system and campaigns, and in village council. The number of women participating in the political process.
- **Decision Making.** Women's representation in local, regional, and national bodies of government and parliaments. The number of women in position of political influence. Representation of women's interest in effective lobbies and interest groups.

- **Institutions.** International instruments and conventions on civil and political rights ratified. Women's ability to use and access public service entitlements, and local formal and informal justice and dispute resolution systems. Prevalence of crimes rooted in living, customary, or religious laws (honor killing, domestic violence, sexual abuse).

Gender indicators: what are they?

Gender indicators are “pointers” that are suitable to express how distant a certain situation is from gender equality. They are gaps, ratios, and generally measures of gender *inequalities*. For example, the “ratios of girls to boys in primary, secondary, and tertiary education,” which was one of the MDG3 indicators is a gender indicator.

Indicators that can be meaningfully collected for a single individual (such as level of education) as opposed to the household (such as housing characteristics) or the community (such as size of the village) and are reported for men and women (or boys and girls) are sex-disaggregated indicators (for example girls' and boys' attendance in primary school). Sex-disaggregated indicators can be used to derive ratios and gaps. Notice that person-level indicators may not be recorded and reported in a sex-disaggregated way (for example, child attendance in primary school), thus missing an opportunity to uncover gender differences.

Female- and male-specific indicators are those that only make sense for either women or men. For example, maternal mortality is a female-specific indicator. The extent of demobilization is a male-specific indicator in countries where women are not allowed in the army.

Gender-blind indicators are those that do not allow the evaluator to uncover gender differences and gender relations in society, either because they are not collected or cannot be collected in a sex-disaggregated way. For example, “community participation” is a gender-blind indicator, but if collected separately for men and women it can become a gender indicator. Poverty, based on “per capita, or per adult equivalent, consumption or income” is a gender-blind indicator because the calculation of the per capita or per adult equivalent household consumption (or income) assumes an equal distribution of resources among household members,¹⁸ and does not take into account the actual level of consumption of each household member. In this case, when sticking to the conventional definition of poverty, the indicator cannot be expressed in a

¹⁸ The use of equivalent scales does not help because, even when equivalent scales differentiate between members with different characteristics (including, in certain cases, sex) they still assign a theoretical (as opposed to actual) level of consumption or income to each of them.

sex-disaggregated way; alternatives such as “poverty of female-headed households” or “female poverty” (calculated by aggregating the poverty rate of all women) are either different indicators (the former), or plainly wrong (the latter). For a poverty indicator to become a “gender indicator,” a totally different route should be pursued – for example, identifying individual-level indicators that can express relevant dimensions of well-being, depending on the context and the goal of the analysis (for example, time spent in unpaid work; food consumed; individual expenditure for certain items; and so on).

Quantitative or qualitative indicators?

Quantitative indicators are indicators that can be expressed as numeric measures (for example, “the wage gap is 78 percent” – that is, on average women earn 78 percent as much as men). Qualitative indicators often refer to perceptions or judgments, and are particularly helpful to understanding processes as opposed to specific and well-defined results (for example, “progress in building networks”). Qualitative/quantitative indicators are perceptions that can be expressed using a quantitative scale (for example, “level of happiness” expressed with a scale from 1 to 5 from “very unhappy” to “very happy”).

As the analysis and measurement of gender inequalities is complex and multidimensional, the use of both quantitative and qualitative indicators is necessary. For example, survey results can be complemented by findings from focus group discussions.

Outcome or output indicators?

As evaluators are called to assess development impacts, they are ultimately interested in outcome indicators. However, output indicators are very useful in understanding how implementation went and how the project or strategy achieved specific outcomes. Output indicators, however, are clearly not sufficient by themselves to document gender results, particularly as the objectives outlined in projects and country strategies are typically expressed as development outcomes.

It is also important to note that outcome indicators in certain projects can be output indicators in others. For example, a public works project can include several measures of employment as outcome indicators (transition into public workfare employment, transition out of public workfare employment into other types of employment). A conditional cash transfer (CCT) project could measure the employment of the woman receiving the transfer not as an outcome indicator, but to understand why, in certain circumstances (for example, in urban areas), the take up is low, or to unveil potential conflicts in the use of women’s time. In this case, given the objectives of the CCT project, the employment of the mother would be an output.

The analysis conducted for IEG’s 2015 Results and Performance Report shows that indicators used in country strategies and projects were generally inadequate to capture gender results. Indicators, when present, were narrow in scope, tended to measure outputs rather than outcomes, were often not well defined, and insufficient to establish attribution.¹⁹ The analysis also shows that few of the project development objective (PDO) indicators captured gender gaps and their evolution, gender inequality measures, or gender biases. Most indicators used were core sector indicators in the area of human development. These drawbacks need to be kept in mind by evaluators, who often face the difficult task of gauging what could have been meaningful (outcome and output) indicators for an exhaustive gender analysis, but were not collected or presented in the project documents.

Who are the female beneficiaries?

Analysis conducted for the 2015 Results and Performance Report shows that projects increasingly report on “female beneficiaries” but this indicator is of limited use when it tends to refer to project recipients or residents of the project area. Similarly, the IEG Review of Social Safety Nets and Gender (2014b) highlighted the challenges of measuring gender impacts in a truly meaningful way. Reporting that “female beneficiaries were 50 percent of the total beneficiaries” is not very meaningful – this is clearly the composition of the population in the project area, but assuming that all the population that happened to live in the project area automatically benefited from the project is very questionable (this type of reporting happens especially when the project adopts a geographical targeting approach – for example, in the case of delivery of infrastructure).

Since June 2009 World Bank projects are required to report the number or percentage of female beneficiaries, and since FY14 the Corporate Scorecard tracks this indicator disaggregated by sex. As a result, there has been an increase in reporting of this indicator for new projects, and a number of projects added the indicator at the time of restructuring²⁰. In many cases this was the only gender indicator. The need to comply with the requirement, however, creates the incentive of reporting beneficiaries in an unsatisfactory way – like, for example, the “recipients” or the “residents in the project area” as discussed previously.

The definition of beneficiaries (and female beneficiaries, specifically) has to be done in context, after deriving the “results chain for gender” and determining what it means to

¹⁹ IEG evaluations have identified these weaknesses in the indicators used as part of M&E frameworks for Bank Group projects and country strategies more generally, but that does not lessen the importance of developing appropriate indicators to meaningfully capture gender results.

²⁰ In half of the instances where PDO gender indicators were added during implementation, the “female beneficiaries” indicator was added.

“benefit” from the project, going beyond the mere concepts of recipients or residents in the project area and measuring both the direct and broader distributional impacts.

Sources of information

IEG validation products rely entirely on information provided by the Bank Group team. In these cases, the ability of assessing gender results is totally dependent on the “right” indicators having been included in the monitoring and evaluation framework. The evaluator can and should report and assess the information provided, comment on the appropriateness of the indicators chosen, and signal the absence of information if appropriate.

In in-depth project evaluations (PPARs), thematic evaluations, and country program evaluations (CPEs), evaluators can and should collect new evidence. In these cases, they can gather information through quantitative surveys, focus group discussions, case studies, portfolio reviews, and interviews with key stakeholders. They can also use existing datasets (for example, the Demographic and Health Surveys [DHS], the Living Standard Measurement Study surveys [LSMS], the Labor Force surveys, and so on) and statistics and indices compiled by other institutions.

Annexes 1 and 2 propose a tool to extract gender information from country strategies. Annex 3 introduces the ICRR gender flag, which can be adapted for the collection of data in project portfolio reviews. Annex 4 introduces the “master questionnaire” on female empowerment, a collection of questions used in household survey questionnaires to collect information on women’s voice and agency, decision-making, and, more generally, manifestations of empowerment. Annex 5 presents scripts for focus group discussions (FGDs) prepared for two IEG evaluations.; Finally, Annex 6 presents the “Gender Resource” database, which includes the description of and the link to external resources (datasets, toolkits, and so on) that can be used for gender analysis.

IV. Integrating Gender in Specific IEG Products

Project Validation

IEG undertakes about 400 project and operations-level *micro-evaluations* per fiscal year. There is currently no explicit requirement to report gender outcomes or discuss gender-relevant features, unless these elements are central to the operation. The gender flag, introduced last year at the corporate level to track gender integration in operations, is a self-reported assessment by the project team focusing on gender coverage at entry with

no similar follow-up to systematically report gender-relevant features and results at project completion. (IEG is not monitoring the gender flag.)

Implementation Completion Results Reports (ICRs) have a dedicated section on “Poverty Impacts, Gender Aspects, and Social Development,” which can be used by project teams to discuss the gender aspects of interventions and report results. This section, however, is not systematically used by project teams, as required, to report on gender results, except for projects that include gender indicators (in which case results are normally reported in other parts of the ICR – the results matrix, the efficacy section, and the annexes, which may provide details on beneficiary assessments or impact evaluations that generated those results). The analysis conducted for the 2015 Results and Performance Report found that only half of the projects with an expected gender result identified at entry (and no corresponding gender indicator) discussed achievements in the “Poverty Impacts, Gender Aspects, and Social Development” section. In most cases, the results reported in this section referred exclusively to the success of the project in reaching women (or girls). Generic statements, and plausible (but not measured) impacts are often included.

ICRR templates do not include a section for reporting on gender results – similar to the one dedicated to safeguards, for example. This obviously does not facilitate the systematic assessment and reporting by the IEG evaluator of any gender finding that the ICR may present. The review conducted for the 2015 Results and Performance Report showed that ICRRs tend to ignore gender-related findings discussed in completion reports, regardless of their relevance, unless the findings are strictly related to project PDOs and their indicators. Moreover, ICRRs very rarely discuss the robustness of the gender evidence or the presence (or not) of gender-relevant lessons in project completion reports. In addition to the absence of a dedicated section in the ICRR template, the underreporting of gender results in ICRRs can also be explained by the prevalence of qualitative (as opposed to quantitative) reporting in ICRs and the absence of robust sources to back up statements about gender impacts.

The underreporting of gender results in ICRRs – either because of poor evidence produced in ICRs or because of the tendency of IEG evaluators to overlook gender results even when they are presented in ICRs – is an issue that the “IEG gender flag” for ICRRs is meant to address (Annex 3). This tool, prepared and piloted in the first half of FY16 and rolled out in November 2015, comes at a time when IEG is debating whether and how to revise the templates and methodology of its desk reviews of ICRs, which is a great opportunity to assess potential options to better integrate gender in these validation reports. ICRRs are the building blocks of a number of other IEG products, so including a more systematic reporting on gender benefits other products as well –

thematic evaluations, learning products, and the annual Results and Performance Report.

The goal of the “IEG gender flag” is to systematically document the presence of gender dimensions in individual projects; and, create incentives for ICRR authors to report on gender in the main body of the ICRR, making the evaluators aware of important dimensions that they may have overlooked. The flag records whether gender is a relevant aspect of the PDO or of one of the project components, whether the ICR reports sex-disaggregated or female- or male-specific indicators, whether there are indicators that could have been sex-disaggregated and were not, and whether the ICR discusses specific gender issues. Some judgment is required from the evaluator in determining whether gender could have been relevant in relation to the PDO and it was not adequately covered at the design/PDO definition stage or in developing some of the project components (for example, an access to finance project may be expected to integrate a specific strategy to reach out to excluded groups, women being one of those). Also, evaluators are asked to determine whether there are indicators that could have been gender-disaggregated, but were not, or relevant indicators that were totally missing.

The gender flag, which will eventually be fully integrated in the new ICRR template, is going to be monitored by the IEG gender team. It will be used for annual reviews and reporting, and for integrating portfolio reviews for thematic evaluations and other products.²¹

Country Evaluations

According to the most recent reporting on the Corporate Scorecard, by FY15 all country strategies integrated gender, meeting the corporate target of 100 percent satisfactory attention to gender two years in advance of the FY17 target.²² The Corporate Scorecard defines “Gender integrated country strategies” as those that incorporate gender into: a) analysis or consultation on gender-related issues; b) specific actions to address the distinct needs of women and girls, or men and boys, or positive impacts on gender gaps; and c) mechanisms to monitor gender impacts.²³ According to the World Bank

²¹ While the IEG gender flag may require validation by IEG teams undertaking thematic or other evaluations—and may need to be supplemented with additional information—it will simplify portfolio reviews by identifying projects that have gender aspects, and will allow for a “robustness test” of relevant elements.

²² “World Bank Group Corporate Scorecard” (September 24, 2015, presentation).

²³ See http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2014/10/09/000456286_20141009104938/Rendored/PDF/913110WP0World00Box385295B00PUBLIC0.pdf, page 24.

operational policy, country strategies should draw on and discuss the findings of a gender diagnostic; from FY16, the requirement is that Systematic Country Diagnostics (SCDs) should incorporate gender into their analytical framework.

An analysis conducted for the 2015 Results and Performance Report showed that most of the 58 country strategies that closed between FY12 and FY14 touched upon gender issues in diagnostics, actions, or pillars. **But only 21 percent had gender present in all three dimensions as required** (analysis, content, and results framework). Furthermore, less than half of the country strategies reviewed included gender at their core (in objectives and pillars), and explicitly stated that gender was addressed in a pillar or in a “cross-cutting” manner. Most country strategies reference and discuss gender-related issues, but most do not present a logical chain that links background analysis, actions, pillars or objectives, and indicators; rather, they say that gender is cross-cutting without further explaining what that means. Finally, our analysis found that in half the cases where gender issues are identified or diagnosed in country strategy documents, are they addressed in objectives, pillars, or actions.

IEG evaluates country strategies in Country Learning and Report Reviews (CLRRs) and Country Program Evaluations (CPEs). CLRRs are validations of country strategy completion reports. They consist of desk reviews with a rather rigid structure and require the evaluator to validate the evidence presented by the country team. CPEs, conducted for a single country or for a cluster of countries, are in-depth evaluations of a country program, involving field missions and the collection and assessment of new evaluation material. In both cases, IEG is faced with the task of evaluating or validating gender results, although in the former case, the evaluator is entirely dependent on the evidence presented, while in the latter case, new evidence can be collected.

The challenges faced by evaluators in assessing gender results in country strategies are: (a) gender is generically identified as a cross-cutting issue, without an adequate explanation of what this definition means. As requirements regarding reporting of gender results are unclear when gender is integrated as a cross-cutting theme, reporting of results tends to be poor; (b) reporting of gender results focuses not on outcomes, but on activities that occurred during the strategy period using output (and sometimes input) indicators already included in Bank Group operations. No link is made between those activities and the overall Country Assistance Strategy (CAS) outcomes; (c) gender is an “add-on” dimension, not convincingly integrated as part of the strategic priorities. As a result, it is difficult to understand the rationale for gender integration and the meaning of results reported (if they are reported); (d) there are inconsistencies between the background analysis (which should provide the motivation or rationale to select and address gender priorities), the type of gender integration (selection of the focus area/objectives, or of gender as cross-cutting), and the choice of indicators – that is, the

three dimensions (analysis, focus area or objective, and indicators) are not logically connected in the strategy – and the meaning of results unclear; (e) there is no mandate for teams to report on gender results. As gender is often perceived as an issue that needs to be “mainstreamed”, but whose relevance is not always obvious to the country strategy team, reporting on results is often scattered. IEG noted in one CAS Completion Report Review: “mainstreaming an issue (for example, youth, gender, and governance) is increasingly used in CAS design to highlight its importance. In reality, however, this often results in diluted attention, weak support, and no accountability for achieving results. It is thus critically important to devote at least as much attention to building a strong results chain for the cross-cutting themes as to any other pillars, and include them in the results framework for proper tracking of progress.”

In reviewing CLRs, there is little the evaluator can do regarding evidence that is not presented, is not clear, is too scattered, or is inconsistent. However, the evaluator can and should highlight these drawbacks in his or her review. A review of 58 CLRs conducted for the 2015 Results and Performance Report showed that evaluators tend to discuss gender results only if relevant indicators are present in country strategy results matrices; CLRs rarely point to inconsistencies between gender priorities identified at the time of diagnostics and the opportunities (often missed) to address them in the country program. Lack of explicit guidance on how to treat cross-cutting issues like gender may explain this finding. Annex 1 provides guidelines to highlight gender findings in CLRs.

While IEG depends to some extent on evidence provided by the country strategy team to evaluate gender results, there is always scope to collect more information, especially for CPEs. A review of the most recent country and thematic evaluations undertaken by IEG indicates that some evaluations include an explicit and substantial attention to gender (like the Afghanistan CPE and the fragile and conflict-affected states evaluation), but others are totally silent about it. At present, gender analysis in CPEs is contingent on evaluator interest, motivation, and willingness to allocate resources to cover gender issues rather than responding to the relevance for gender analysis in that particular context. The review meeting of the approach paper is an important milestone to assess whether the evaluation plans to adequately integrate gender, based on the proposed evaluation framework (this is true also of thematic evaluations, see corresponding section in this report). IEG is now reviewing its CPE guidelines for staff. The existing draft states that gender analysis has to be included in all country evaluations and that cross-cutting objectives, such as gender, should be treated as all other objectives in country strategies. The guidelines mention that the progress assessment of cross-cutting objectives, such as gender, should be based on objective or outcome indicators and not inputs or outputs. In the absence of those, the CPE should attempt, to the extent possible, to come up with relevant indicators to reflect the objectives, and use available evidence to assess their achievement.

In CPEs, the opportunity exists to collect additional evidence on the gender results achieved by the country strategy. The IEG team should (a) discuss relevance for gender integration in country programs through a review and analysis of relevant documents at the desk review stage; (b) assess how gender is reflected in the country portfolio when conducting the portfolio review of Bank Group lending and non-lending operations; (c) collect evidence on gender integration on the ground while on mission, through focus groups, interviews with stakeholders, and other data collection efforts as appropriate. Annex 2 provides guidelines to integrate gender in CPEs.

In a nutshell, the guidelines will assist the evaluator to **conduct gender analysis** at the country-level to assess, among others:²⁴

- (i) **Relevance of Country Partnership Framework (CPF) objectives with regard to gender** which will help to identify if an important gender issue in the country context has been missed. For example, the importance of targeted sexual violence against women in FCS was highlighted by the IEG evaluation on Bank Group assistance to low-income FCS, but it was an issue not addressed in Bank Group strategies or operations during the evaluation period.
- (ii) **Relevance of CPF design with regard to gender** to evaluate if gender entry points were used appropriately to integrate gender issues in programs. For example, did health projects in countries with high maternal mortality or high fertility address maternal health issues?
- (iii) **Appropriate choice of gender indicators in CPF results frameworks**
- (iv) **Efficacy** dimensions will evaluate whether the emphasis on gender issues in country strategies (if any) was translated into operations, and whether analytical work on gender (for example, country gender assessments) fed into country strategies or operations. For example, the Bank's analytical work on gender in Nepal (Bennett, 2006; IEG, 2014a, p. 86) led to quotas for women in Parliament.

²⁴ The OECD-DAC quality standards for evaluations guidelines require evaluations to address gender: "The evaluation questions also address cross-cutting issues, such as gender, environment and human rights." (OECD, 2010, p. 9).

IFC validation products

IFC's approach to integrating gender has been very selective and has been defined around specific business lines. IFC priorities for gender integration center on fostering women's roles in three areas: entrepreneurship, employment, and corporate leadership, which correspond to a limited portion of the IFC portfolio. Gender is virtually absent from business lines or sectors that have not been identified as priorities for gender. For those business lines that are identified as gender priority areas, IFC develops work programs²⁵ that articulate the business case and a gender results chain, as well as specific products to propose to clients.

The approach for gender integration differs between Advisory Services (AS) and Investment Services (IS). For AS, the IFC Road Maps FY14–16 and FY15–17 state that AS will contribute to all IFC priorities with an emphasis on gender, among others. In practice, what is observed in the IFC AS portfolio is that some products have gender objectives, generally derived from or inspired by the gender business lines developed by IFC. This set of projects is very small (the review undertaken for the 2015 Results and Performance Report indicates that 12 percent of AS have gender objectives). However, even in the absence of gender objectives, projects may target women (for example, female entrepreneurs or owners or managers of small and medium enterprises (SMEs)-, women employees, or female contractors in value chains) as recipients of specific activities (for example, recipients of loans or, very commonly, training). Projects may include indicators to measure both the outreach and (very unfrequently) the outcome of those activities.

IS projects do not normally aim to address gender inequalities or improve women's disadvantages, with the exception of Banking on Women projects, which provide women-owned businesses with access to finance. These are virtually the only IS projects with a gender objective (several projects combine IS and AS). However, all IS clients (with the exception of financial institutions) need to provide information on their own employment disaggregated by sex, women in corporate boards, women in senior management positions, and female and male students reached (where applicable). These indicators are part of the Development Outcome Tracking System (DOTS) and provide a profile of IFC clients, but do not track results for end beneficiaries of IFC's IS projects, a general limitation and not specifically related just to gender.

²⁵ One of the earlier work programs was, for example, the Global Banking Alliance for Women, launched in 2007 to promote women's entrepreneurship through building the capacity of financial institutions to serve women customers. The Gender Entrepreneurship Markets program, the Women in Business Program, and more recently WINVest, and SheWorks are programs meant to reduce the gap between men and women as entrepreneurs, employees, and corporate leaders.

Based on the review of IFC project documents conducted for the 2015 Results and Performance Report, and the portfolio reviews of recent thematic evaluations of private sector topics (such as the evaluations covering the topics of investment climate reforms and access to finance), the variables presented in Table 2 are identified as meaningful elements of a portfolio review or worth tracking in a hypothetical “gender flag” for IFC projects. This flag has not been formally proposed and discussed, but it may be considered as a useful tool to systematically track gender features and results of IFC projects.

Table 2 – Gender dimensions of IFC projects

Questions	Notes
IS	
Does the project have a gender objective?	
Are female beneficiaries explicitly targeted?	Currently women beneficiaries are targeted by the Banking on Women Program projects
<i>(If yes to the previous question): How?</i>	
Which gender indicators does the project plan to collect?	IS projects collect DOTS indicators that capture the profile of the client (for example, female employment), not necessarily the outcome (or output) of the project
<i>(If indicators are included in M&E): Are these indicators reported?</i>	
AS	
Does the project have a gender objective?	Distinguish between what was originally planned and what happened at completion
Is gender identified as a focus area?	What does this mean in practice?
Are female beneficiaries explicitly targeted?	
<i>(If yes to the previous question): How?</i>	
Did the project implement gender-relevant activities?	Distinguish between activities that were explicitly designed to reach women (for example, dedicated credit lines) and activities that happened to involve also women (for example, standard training)
<i>(If yes to the previous question): Which ones?</i>	
<i>(If yes to the previous question): Were these activities central to the main activity/goal of the AS?</i>	
Which gender indicators does the project plan to collect?	Please note whether these indicators are outputs or outcomes.
<i>(If indicators are included in M&E): Are these indicators reported?</i>	Are the changes or results attributable to the project?

Another body of gender-relevant information is likely to be collected by IFC in relation to its **Policy and Standards** on Environmental and Social Sustainability (E&S). This could be an interesting source of data, although it is not clear what is actually collected and what the quality of the information is. Performance Standard 1 (PS1) provides for gender standards in projects that trigger preparation of Stakeholder Engagement Plans (SEPs) and are required to prepare an Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA). The ESIA is required to assess the potential differential impact of its operations on men and women, whereby: “IFC expects its clients to minimize gender-related risks ... and unintended gender differentiated impacts. Recognizing ... gender inequity, IFC is committed to creating opportunities for women through its investment and advisory activities.” The Policy and Standards recognize that projects may have different impacts on women and men, due to their differentiated socioeconomic roles and their varying degrees of control over and access to assets, productive resources, and employment opportunities. The policy guidance notes suggest that: “gender-differentiated impacts should be assessed and the risks and impacts identification process should propose measures designed to ensure that one gender is not disadvantaged relative to the other in the context of the project. This may include providing opportunities to enhance full participation and influence in decision-making through separate mechanisms for consultation and grievances, and developing measures that allow both women and men equal access to benefits (such as land titles, compensation, and employment).” Performance Standard 2 on Labor and Working Conditions requires the client not to make employment decisions on the basis of personal characteristics (including gender) which are unrelated to inherent job requirement. Performance Standard 4 on Community Health, Safety and Security addresses the client's responsibility to avoid or minimize the project risks and impacts to community health, safety, and security that may arise from project related activities, with particular attention to vulnerable group. PS4 recognizes that men and women usually have different security needs and experiences; so the impact on local women, men, boys, and girls needs to be considered. Performance Standard 5 on Land Acquisition and Involuntary Resettlement requires the client to ensure that women’s circumstances are not worsened by the project in relation to the pre-project situation and to raise the profile of gender related matters in discussions with government agencies and other relevant groups in the course of resettlement planning, in order to encourage more equitable treatment of affected women. Performance Standard 7 on Indigenous People requires that, when a project has potentially adverse impacts on indigenous people, the client assesses and documents the potential impact. The assessment of land and natural resource use should be gender inclusive and specifically consider women’s role in the management and use of these resources.

There is no data on the implementation of the E&S, and there is no evidence of whether the clients are providing the necessary information as required or the extent to which IFC E&S staff monitor gender issues in relation to the Policy and Standards. The safeguard policy applies chiefly to IS; advisory projects have an E&S risk screening, but most projects do not merit an E&S flag, hence there is no E&S follow-up.

Project Evaluations

IEG annually assesses about 15-20 percent of the Bank's lending operations through field work. In selecting operations for evaluation, preference is given to those that are innovative, large, or complex; those that are relevant to upcoming studies or country evaluations; those for which Executive Directors or Bank management have requested assessments; and those that are likely to generate important lessons.

To prepare a Project Performance Assessment Report (PPAR), IEG staff examine project files and other documents; visit the borrowing country to discuss the operation with the government and other in-country stakeholders, and interview Bank staff and other donor agency staff both at headquarters and in local offices as appropriate. A PPAR is an in-depth evaluation that provides the opportunity to collect original evaluative data to assess the operation development results and their sustainability. A PPAR offers the opportunity to gauge gender inequalities and women's empowerment issues in Bank Group operations through the collection of both qualitative and quantitative data.

Over the past year, IEG developed and piloted quantitative and qualitative tools to assess the impact of Bank Group operations on gender issues in the context of two PPARs of community driven development projects (Lao PDR Poverty Reduction Fund I and Nepal Poverty Alleviation Fund I) and one impact evaluation (Burkina Faso Community Scorecard). While developed for these specific activities, these tools can be further adapted and tailored to assess gender and empowerment impacts in other types of interventions and for products other than PPARs. What follows is a description of the tools prepared by IEG and the approach adopted to prepare them. The FGD scripts are presented in Annex 5.

Methodology

I. Desk review of questions used to measure empowerment

The team reviewed the literature on empowerment and scanned several household questionnaires (LSMSs, DHS, ad-hoc questionnaires used for impact evaluations, and so on) to identify questions used to measure empowerment in different contexts. The team identified questions on community participation and social capital, time use, decision-making (at the community and intra-household levels), agency, and life satisfaction. Relevant questions were extracted and organized by topic. This “master questionnaire” is available online for IEG evaluators (see also Annex 4), as a resource for evaluators to derive the most appropriate questions for their purpose and adapt them to their specific evaluation work.

II. Finalizing and piloting a Household Survey Questionnaire

The team assessed advantages and limitations of alternative questions and discussed their potential use in the context of three project-level evaluations (two PPARs and one impact evaluation).

A survey questionnaire was developed and piloted in Nepal in September 2015 to measure several dimensions of female empowerment for the PPAR on the Poverty Alleviation Fund. The quantitative questionnaire (which was administered to 1,200 households) included a number of modules typically present in household surveys – on education, employment, health, household conditions and physical assets, and income, in addition to a household roster. A module with project-specific questions was also included. Modules aimed at gathering data on gender inequality and women’s empowerment were added to this questionnaire – on social environment and community participation, empowerment and participation, time use, decision-making, agency, and life satisfaction.

The gender equality and women’s empowerment modules were selected from the “master questionnaire” (described previously) and were then discussed with local counterparts to fine-tune and tailor them to the context. Questions on women’s empowerment are very context-specific – for example, freedom of movement, religious practices, or community participation might manifest in different ways in different societies and, in some cases, may not be relevant as measures of empowerment. The local firm hired to implement the data collection helped with the translation and reformulation of questions, and advised on how to frame and ask sensitive questions – as those on gender roles and empowerment often are.

One critical issue to consider is that the necessary information for evaluating gender inequalities and gender roles needs to be collected from both men and women. For this reason, it is important to have a sufficiently large (and representative) sample, including both men and women.

III. Focus Group Discussion

The multidimensional nature of empowerment cannot be fully captured through quantitative information. Qualitative data are essential to probe gender roles and understand some of the nuances of this difficult concept.

The team developed a focus group discussion script that was adapted to the specific circumstances of three project-level evaluations to collect information on the empowerment aspects of women in community-driven development interventions in Burkina Faso, Lao PDR, and Nepal. The FGD script is centered on issues of community participation, networking, decision-making regarding sub-projects, and empowerment at the community and intra-household levels. The main goal of this tool was to understand how the lives of women and men have been impacted by the project, with specific reference to the manifestation of empowerment. In particular, the team goal was to identify perceptions regarding social norms and intra-household relationships and their change over time. As it was the case for the quantitative questionnaire, local consultants were hired to tailor questions to each specific context, translate them into the local language, and conduct the FGDs.

The focus group participants were asked open-ended questions about the topics of interest following the script prepared by the World Bank team. As a general rule,²⁶ each focus group discussion was conducted by two local consultants, one that served the role of facilitator and the other that served the role of note taker. The facilitator led the discussion and the note taker was in charge of transcribing the conversation and helping with the coding of the answers afterwards. The facilitator introduced the topics, posed the questions, and guided the discussion covering the allotted time for each section of the FGD. Each focus group session lasted approximately 2 hours. At the end of each FGD, the participants were asked to complete a short questionnaire with questions on individual characteristics (age, education level, and land ownership). The FGD conversation was run in the local language and recorded to facilitate transcription into English. The IEG team participated in pilot sessions in Lao and Nepal and observed the majority of FGDs in Lao. The local team met at various stages with the IEG team to discuss the results of the FGDs, identify key issues raised during the conversations, evaluate the facilitator's role, discuss FGD notes, and agree on coding strategies. It is advisable to conduct a debrief seminar with the local consultant team to (a) ensure a full understanding of the methodological approach; and (b) resolve logistical issues related to field work.

²⁶ The implementation of FGDs differed slightly by country; what is described here is the general approach.

Piloting the FGD script and methodology was absolutely crucial and so was using local experts to help design and finalize the survey instruments. Piloting provided the opportunity to learn and adjust and finalize the tools, since FGD scripts (as well as survey questionnaires) are highly context and project specific. It also helped to adjust logistical aspects, such as properly allocating time to the various topics, fine-tuning the style of the interviews, and understanding how to use “trigger” questions to ensure ample participation.

FGDs aimed at generating information on gender gaps and perceived and actual gender roles in the community and the household pose very specific challenges, as the issues discussed are often sensitive, and because of the need of “properly” involving female participants. Particularly important is to understand how to deal with sensitive issues related to intra-household dynamics and to identify “off-limits” topics. The involvement of local consultants and the piloting of the tools are essential in this regard. When in doubt, the principle of “not doing harm” should prevail.

Box 2 reports the main lessons learned from running FGDs in three countries, with specific reference to the “gender angle” that characterized this exercise.

Box 2 Focus Group Discussions on Women's Empowerment–Lessons from the field

Planning before field work

1. Arrange a convenient venue (school classroom, bar, or restaurant entirely booked for the occasion, and so on), where participants and team members can be comfortable and sheltered from distractions. Consider places convenient to women (places that women can easily reach without spending too much time or money and are considered “proper” gathering spaces for women). The time and length of the FGD can affect women's participation too.
2. Agree with the local consultants on the criteria and strategy to select and recruit FGD participants well in advance of the actual sessions.
3. Select female facilitators and note takers for women's FGDs to encourage participation and more candid communication.
4. Arrange for refreshments and payment (if necessary) to FGD participants beforehand. As a norm, a small token should suffice, as well as the reimbursement of travel expenses if appropriate. Women may face higher financial constraints than men, and their ability to attend can be particularly sensitive to travel costs.
5. Local consultants may not speak local languages or dialects, especially if a country has many. Women are more likely than men to be illiterate and speak local languages. Translators may be required to ensure full participation, especially of women.
6. Agree with the local consultants on the approach to FGD transcripts, in particular, whether the sessions should or can be recorded, whether one or two note takers are required (two may be required if the session is not recorded), and in which language the notes should be taken. Ensure that the recording of sessions is accepted, as this can intimidate participants, especially women.
7. Ensure the quality of field notes and transcripts. The facilitator and the note taker are jointly responsible for preparing a field note and FGD transcripts. Each FGD transcript should include a field note describing the context of the FGD: the participants' mood, topics or factors that generated interest and active participation, the participants' understanding of the questions, difficulties in explaining the questions or topics, sequencing and order of questions, non-verbal communication among participants, distractions, and so on. Field notes and transcripts are better prepared the evening after the FGD session.
8. Allocate sufficient time between FGDs to wrap up and take notes. Field notes and the FGD transcripts should be kept safe and later submitted to the research team.
9. Ensure informed consent and anonymity.

Designing FGDs

10. Run separate FGDs for women and men to ensure full participation of women, who may not be comfortable in speaking freely (or at all) in the presence of men.

Box 2 Focus Group Discussions on Women's Empowerment—Lessons from the Field (cntd.)

11. Ensure the groups are homogeneous in terms of age, ethnicity, and level of education (or other income proxy). Identify the relevant characteristics to define the groups of interest and run FGD separately. Consider the power dynamics between different types of women, not only based on income level, but also marital status (mother-in-law vs. daughter-in-law), and status in the community (women with official roles vs. more marginalized women).
12. Beware of individuals who could monopolize the discussion (for example, a village head, the head of the union, an elderly person, and so on). Separate out these individuals and gauge their views through separate semi-structured interviews (a great strategy to “recognize their role” without jeopardizing the FGD). Use the opportunity to probe FGD findings.

Running FGDs

13. Ask participants to sit in a sequence. The consultants running the FGD have to remember each participant's sequence number.
14. Set a specific duration for the FGD with time devoted to each question and stick to the plan. To ensure no questions are overlooked, the facilitators should tick each question after asking it. Observe the timeframe specified in each section of the guidelines.
15. If all the participants do not express their views in the discussion, the facilitator should encourage them to speak and give sufficient time to each participant, while still respecting the total time for each section. Note down the sequence number of participants who do not speak. Women may be shyer than men, but the opposite may also be true. Think of strategies that can work for women and for men to encourage participation—these can be different strategies (for example, different trigger questions)
16. The note taker(s) will write down the participants' responses and the sequence number of who provided each statement. If possible and appropriate, the discussions will be recorded using a tape recorder, a phone, or other electronic device. This has to be clearly communicated to the participants and their consent must be received. Make sure the recording device is working properly and is charged sufficiently before starting the FGD. After the FGD, the recording will be used by the facilitator and the note taker to fill in any gap in the notes. It is important to transcribe the information immediately after the FGD (within 24 hours) for higher accuracy.
17. Ensure that participants are not sitting too close to the note taker as this may cause unnecessary distractions (for example, participants could be interested in the notes instead of actively participating).
18. Do not allow any unauthorized individuals into the room while discussions are in progress (for example, do not allow men into the room while conducting the discussions with women and vice versa)
19. During discussions, avoid distractions (for example, children and animals). Allowing very young babies that need to be breastfed may be necessary to ensure the participation of mothers.

Source: IEG, based on field experience

Thematic Evaluations

Because males and females are assigned different roles in the household and the community, face different constraints, and have different incentives and opportunities, interventions generally have a different impact on women and men, and boys and girls, regardless of the original intent. These impacts may be intended or unintended, and can reduce or amplify gender inequalities.

So, what does a “gender-sensitive” (or “gender responsive”) evaluation mean? What does it mean to “address gender” in evaluation? According to UN Women, a gender responsive evaluation is:

“[an evaluation that]... incorporates principles of gender equality, women’s rights, and the empowerment of women. It is a systematic and impartial assessment that provides credible and reliable evidence based information about the extent to which an intervention has resulted in progress (or lack thereof) towards intended results regarding gender equality and the empowerment of women” – UN Women, Independent Evaluation Office, 2015, p. 4.

A gender responsive evaluation is characterized by both the goal and the means. The goal: it evaluates the impact of the project (or work program, or strategy) on gender inequalities, that is, how gender and power relationships have change as a result of the project (or work program, or strategy). This means: it adopts, to the extent possible, participatory methods, that is, methods that allow for the voice, opinions, and point of view of all stakeholders (including women) to be heard and to contribute to the shape of the evaluation questions. Clearly, a gender sensitive evaluation uses sex-disaggregated data on project or program beneficiaries – to assess the outreach and take-up by males and females, and evaluate gender-related impacts.

Notice that outreach to women or girls does not necessarily mean “addressing gender.” Outreach does not mean take-up and take-up does not mean impact. For example, training interventions may reach out to women, but women may not attend. If they attend, they may not necessarily participate, and if they participate they may not necessarily learn. And if they learn, they may not necessarily change their behavior, which may or may not impact the outcome of interest (for example, the profits of their enterprise). This example illustrates that defining the rationale and the result chain (theory of change) of a project or a program is essential to understand which results an intervention can produce that may change the opportunities of women (or men) and the power relationships between the two groups. It also illustrates the importance of defining the group of “female beneficiaries” in relation to the outcome of interest.

It is also important to stress that “gender” does not mean “women or girls” or “men or boys.” Gender is about the gender stereotypes, norms, judgments, and expectations that

implicitly or explicitly define what being female and male is about and, therefore, define the relationships between females and males – which means the range of opportunities, the expected behaviors, the power structures, and the scope of decision-making. Projects and programs have gender impacts when they change these elements (positively or negatively). It is this type of change that the evaluator should reflect on when defining the theory of change. For example, introducing a quota for women’s participation in politics or top management is not “change” per se. It is change if it changes how women in leading roles are perceived or women’s and men’s behaviors in facilitating women’s access to leadership positions. Thematic evaluations – as well as PPARs and country program evaluations – allow for assessing these impacts, even when the original projects or programs did not have gender as an explicit objective or did not pay much attention to gender aspects – provided the correct data are collected.

Gender is not a single dimension of diversity, but it often interacts with other dimensions like ethnicity, religion, class or caste, or poverty. That is, women (or men) are not all the same, but there may be profound differences inside what, based solely on sex, may appear to be a homogeneous group. Sometimes differences based on caste or economic status are stronger than gender differences. If this is the case (depending on the objective of the evaluation), one should consider both gender and the other relevant trait(s).

The integration of gender into evaluation involves the mobilization of resources and the identification of an adequate methodology at an early stage. The approach paper should discuss how relevant gender issues are in the context of the topic being evaluated, develop meaningful gender evaluation questions, and identify an adequate methodology. The selection of peer reviewers with gender expertise should also be considered.

Tips for IEG evaluators

1. Think about gender impacts when defining the theory of change and identifying key stakeholders

What are the impacts on gender relationships that the project(s) or program may have determined, even if these were not explicitly defined at the design stage? To identify these potential impacts, it is important to refer to theoretical models (for example, models that explore the intra-household decision-making process, community dynamics, and so on), and to key stakeholders who can uncover how gender relationships unfold in a specific context, and how they are impacted by the project(s) or program(s). Key stakeholders are not (only) women’s groups, but all those who play a decision-making role or can be impacted by the intervention. Ask: who are key decision-makers and beneficiaries of the intervention(s) or program(s) being evaluated?

Who could they have been? Which groups were left out? Were there constraints to participation, or to full enjoyment of the benefits brought about by the intervention or the program? This is where participatory approaches can be very useful to generate information about the ways in which different groups in the community view their role in the intervention – something the evaluator could not anticipate using just available theories or available data.

2. Pay attention to data collection methods

The data needed for a gender-sensitive evaluation should help determine what the gender inequalities are that can be impacted by the evaluation, and how these inequalities change and in relation to what. The different needs, constraints, opportunities, and behaviors of men (boys) and women (girls) need to be identified, as well as the mechanisms that the project(s) or program(s) triggered to generate change.

Ideally, both quantitative and qualitative data are needed to describe these dynamics. Data collection methods should be sensitive to gender norms in the specific context (how to discuss domestic violence? What is the best approach to solicit the views of disadvantaged women? What is the best time and place to talk to women? Who should and should not be present at the discussion to ensure that the data collected are reliable?) Not all data collection methods are appropriate for all groups – women in certain contexts are not able to express themselves freely, because they may not be allowed to speak, they do not feel comfortable speaking in the presence of women or men with higher social status or with specific family status (the mother-in-law, the husband), they are illiterate, they cannot attend public meetings or community consultations, or it is not proper for them to be in certain locations (a bar, a restaurant). Location, time, language, group composition, and the profiles of the facilitators are elements to carefully consider when carrying out consultations with women, especially with women of low socio-economic status.

3. Use gender-sensitive evaluation questions

Examples may include:

- ✓ Who are the beneficiaries? Women, men, both? Who benefited and who did not? What does “benefiting” mean in the context of the program? Which gender relationships were affected by the intervention or the program?
- ✓ Did women and men take part in defining the issue that the intervention intended to solve? Did both participate in the proposed solution?

- ✓ Were the specific problems and needs of women and men recognized at the design stage?
- ✓ Were there specific activities supported to address the different problems and needs?
- ✓ Was there any strategy or specific goal related to gender equality?
- ✓ Were the different gender roles – reproductive, productive, and community – considered?
- ✓ Was the different power of women and men in decision-making considered?
- ✓ Was an equal participation of women and men promoted?
- ✓ Did the intervention take into account the different use of time by women and men?
- ✓ Did the intervention assume equal access to resources or services for women and men? And equal control over them?
- ✓ How did project beneficiaries, male and female, respond to the intervention?
- ✓ Did the intervention produce the intended benefits for both men and women? What factors accounted for variations in impact?
- ✓ Are both women and men doing things differently as a result of the intervention?

4. Assess gender roles and how these have changed

Carefully consider how gender roles may have changed, including as a result of unintended impacts. For example, in assessing the effect of an income generation initiative or a cash transfer, it is important to determine how this affected the power dynamic at home. Did husbands or male relatives respond positively to women earning more or becoming a breadwinner?

5. Define the activities that the evaluation team can or should undertake to evaluate gender impacts

Very few projects and program are designed explicitly with the intent to impact gender relationships. Much more frequently gender relationships are impacted when trying to achieve other objectives. In some cases, gender aspects may not be very relevant in the evaluation of a certain projects or programs. The evaluation team should therefore define, when designing the evaluation, if gender impacts are or may be relevant and

how to evaluate them. These are the potential activities that the evaluation team may engage in:

- (1) *Brainstorming*. Definition of the theory of change with respect to gender aspects, and how this theory of change interacts with the theory of change of the project or program. Consider which gender gaps may have been impacted, including as a result of unintended impacts. Definition of the evaluation questions with respect to gender. The brainstorming phase can involve:
 - a. consultations with experts;
 - b. consultations with the gender team;
 - c. consultations with stakeholders;
 - d. seminars, workshops, and so on;
 - e. literature reviews;

- (2) *Definition of the methodology to assess gender impacts, and the data needs*. The concept note or approach paper needs to clearly spell out not only the relevance, the theory of change, and the evaluation questions, but also the data needs and evaluation methods. These may consist of one or (ideally) more of the following:
 - a. Participatory methods (semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions, and so on);
 - b. Use of existing quantitative data – including LSMS or DHS surveys, and M&E of the project or program, and so on;
 - c. Portfolio reviews;
 - d. Use of external statistics compiled by various organizations;
 - e. Case studies;
 - f. Interviews with key informants.

- (3) *Engagement with relevant counterparts in the World Bank Group on the gender issues*. Relevant counterparts involved in the GP and the Gender CCSA.

- (4) *Gender analysis and presentation of findings*. Formulation of gender recommendations, if appropriate. The gender analysis does not necessarily need to be presented separately from the “main” analysis, but depending on the type of findings or strategic considerations, it could be placed in a separate chapter. Include gender findings in the summary sections. Consider formulating a gender recommendation, if appropriate (for example, the evaluation of Bank support to low-income fragile and conflict-affected states had a gender recommendation).

(5) *Involve the gender team in the evaluation department early on!* The gender team can brainstorm with the evaluation team and help organize brainstorming meetings with experts; it can point to relevant literature, help identify consultants, provide terms of reference for gender experts, and recommend evaluation methods. It also can provide entry points for gender integration into portfolio reviews, suggestions and tips for data collection, and areas of analysis.

References

- Alkire, Sabina, and Solava Ibrahim. "Agency and Empowerment: A Proposal for Internationally Comparable Indicators." *Oxford Development Studies* 35, no. 4 (2007): 379-403.
- Alkire, Sabina, Ruth Meinzen-Dick, Amber Peterman, Agnes Quisumbing, Greg Seymour, and Ana Vaz. "The women's empowerment in agriculture index." *World Development* 52 (2013): 71-91.
- Alsop, Ruth, and Nina Heinsohn. "Measuring empowerment in practice: structuring analysis and framing indicators." World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 3510 (2005).
- Cornwall, Andrea. (2014) Women's empowerment: What works and why? WIDER Working Paper 104.
- Duflo, Esther. "Women empowerment and economic development." *Journal of Economic Literature* 50, no. 4 (2012):1051-1079.
- Evaluation Cooperation Group (2012), Gender Equality and Development Evaluation Units: Lessons from Evaluations of Development Support of Selected Multilateral and Bilateral Agencies, ECG Paper 5, Rome: Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD (IOE).
- Kabeer, Naila. "Discussing Women's Empowerment: Theory and Practice (Sida Studies 3)" (2001).
- Kabeer, Naila. "Empowerment, Citizenship and Gender Justice: A contribution to Locally Grounded Theories of change in Women's Lives." *Ethics and Social Welfare* 6. No. 3 (2012): 216-232.
- O'Neil, Tam, Pilar Domingo, and Craig Valters. "Progress on women's empowerment." (2014).
- Pereznieto, Paola, and Georgia Taylor. "A review of approaches and methods to measure economic empowerment of women and girls." *Gender & Development* 22, no. 2 (2014): 233-251.
- UN Women, Independent Evaluation Office (2015), How to manage gender-responsive evaluations: Evaluation handbook, New York City: UN Women.
- World Bank (2011),

ANNEXES – Tools and templates

Annex 1. Country Evaluations: Gender Flag Guidelines for CLRs (*draft for discussion*)

Annex 2. Country Evaluations: Gender Guidelines for CPEs (*draft for discussion*)

Annex 3. Gender Section of the ICR Review Template (“ICRR Gender Flag”)

Annex 4. Master questionnaire – Women’s empowerment questions

Annex 5. Focus Groups – Women’s empowerment and gender roles in the household and the community

Annex 6. The “Gender Resource” database for evaluators

Appendix 1. Country Evaluations: Gender Flag Guidelines for CLRs *(draft for discussion)*

Objective: The following Guidelines are meant to accompany IEG’s CLR Review template. This ‘gender flag’ will serve for further tracking and reporting on the quality of gender integration in country strategies and compliance with the corporate indicator. It will support the evaluators to systematically assess gender elements of country strategies.

(1) Were specific gender priorities identified in the CPF? (the first two answers are not mutually exclusive)

- Yes, gender specific priorities were identified for the country
- Yes, gender specific priorities were identified for the CPF
- No, only generic gender issues were discussed, no specific priority outlined
- No, gender issues were not mentioned.

If gender specific priorities were identified for the CPF, please briefly describe them here.

.....

(2) Were gender issues part of any of the CPF Outcomes? (the first two answers are not mutually exclusive)

- Yes, gender was identified as a cross-cutting issue
- Yes, gender was part of (at least) one focus area (pillar)/part of (at least) one objective
- No, gender was not included as cross-cutting or in a focus area (pillar) or objective

If gender was included as a cross-cutting theme, please detail whether gender is cross-cutting across focus areas (pillars)/objectives, or within a specific pillar. Please name the focus area (pillar)/objective and briefly explain how gender was integrated.....

If gender was identified as part of a specific focus area (pillar), please detail which focus area (pillar)/objective and briefly explain how gender was integrated.....

(3) Are there specific gender-relevant lending and/or non-lending operations identified in the Bank Group proposed CPF program? (the first two answers are not mutually exclusive)

- Yes, there was at least one gender-relevant lending operation identified
- Yes, there was at least one gender relevant non-lending operation identified

No, there was no gender relevant lending or non-lending operation identified

If there was any gender-relevant lending or non-lending operation identified in the Bank Group program please describe it here. Was this lending or non-lending operation well-grounded in diagnostic work and supported by indicators to track progress? Is there a results chain for gender?

.....
.....

(4) Does the CPF Results Framework identify outcome indicators to track gender results?

Yes, there is at least one outcome indicator that tracks gender results

No, there is no outcome indicator to track gender results but the CPF discusses the gender results achieved in a qualitative way

No, there is no outcome indicator to track gender results nor the CPF discusses the gender results achieved in a qualitative way

If there is at least one outcome indicator that tracks gender results please name it here. Briefly refer to the appropriateness of the indicator(s) included (do the indicators capture the gender-related CPF objectives, are they measurable, and so on?). If gender results were discussed qualitatively please comment

.....

(5) Alignment with Corporate Goals

Does the CPF link gender issues to the twin goals of ending extreme poverty and boosting shared prosperity? Specify.....

Appendix 2. Country Evaluations: Gender Guidelines for CPEs *(draft for discussion)*

Objective: CPEs provide an opportunity to assess the quality of the gender integration in CPFs in context. Several entry-points were identified following the existing CPE guidelines. The goal of these Gender Guidelines is twofold: (i) to facilitate the assessment of gender impacts of CPEs and (ii) to provide support to evaluators to comply with existing guidelines with regard to treatment of gender and, better integrate gender in their work. Overall, the analysis of gender outcomes in CPEs will contribute to improve IEG assessment of distributional effects, making this work program fully aligned with the World Bank Group's focus on achieving shared prosperity and at the same time help assess results on the ground on gender, one of the objectives of the new gender strategy.

Table A.1: CPE Gender Guidelines

CPE Guidelines ²⁷	Possible Gender entry points	Suggested Sources
<p>RELEVANCE</p> <p>Relevance of program objectives²⁸</p> <p><i>the extent to which program’s objectives are consistent with (a) critical constraints affecting the country’s long-term socio-economic development, and (b) government’s development plans and priorities</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was adequate gender analysis undertaken at the country level (Country Gender Assessments, SCD, other AAA work?) • Are there specific gender priorities identified in the SCD or other Gender analysis that were omitted in the CPF? • Are there specific gender priorities identified in the Government strategy/development plan that were omitted in the CPF? • Did the focus areas discussed any specific gender issues to be addressed? • Did the consultative process identify any gender priority? Was that priority included in the CPF? • How did the government manifest its commitment to specific gender issues? For example, did the country government commit to women’s empowerment through establishing a Ministry of Gender or adopting other policy frameworks, quotas, and so on? • Did gender issues need special focus at national or subnational level during the evaluation timeframe? For example, was there targeted sexual violence or large number of female-headed households in conflict-affected areas, is customary law a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Country Gender Assessment, Poverty Assessments, Poverty and Social Impact Analysis (PSIA), other analytical work including gender dimensions • Country government’s national development plan (or similar documents) • CAS/CPS/CPF “Country Context” section • Women, Business and Law database (http://wbl.worldbank.org/) • Gender-related MDGs and SDGs: http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/ and http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/mdgoverview/post-2015-development-agenda.html

²⁷ Source: “Guidelines for Conducting Country Program Evaluations”, April 2015, IEG

²⁸ Relevance of objectives includes review and assessment of government policies and strategies

	<p>valid source of law (refer to the Women, Business, and Law database), was the country performing poorly on MDGs/ SDGs like an increase in HIV/AIDS with gender disparities relative to the region or other countries at the same income levels – LICs, MICs, and so on, are there socially excluded groups (the Bank’s recent emphasis on Social Inclusion).²⁹</p>	
<p>Relevance of program design</p> <p><i>the extent to which program’s design — its planned activities or policy areas — is consistent with the stated objectives</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were lending and non-lending instruments responsive to gender issues in the country context? • Was there a critical mass of assistance to produce the gender stated results? • Did the gender related objectives remain relevant over the strategy period? • Which sectors did gender-relevant projects³⁰ focus on? For example, health, education, CDD, agriculture, and so on? Was this the right focus? • Was gender AAA or ESW taken into consideration when designing lending operations? • Did gender AAA or ESW influence the policy dialogue? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bank Group Project portfolio during the evaluation timeframe • Country Gender Assessment, Poverty and Social Impact Analysis (PSIA), other thematic or sector-specific analytical work including gender dimensions

²⁹ According to IEG’s CPE guidelines (pp.8) – the critical question is did the WBG do the right thing? When answering this question, it is important to go beyond what was in the CPF and discuss the country.

³⁰ Gender-relevant projects include a gender emphasis in the PDO, or a focus on one of the three dimensions related to gender-based outcomes, that is, human development, economic empowerment, voice and accountability.

<p>RESULTS FRAMEWORK</p> <p><i>represents the underlying logic that explains how the development objectives of a country program are selected and how they are to be achieved</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did outcome indicators adequately measure the CPF objectives with regard to gender? • Were indicators included to measure progress of CPF objectives with regard to gender, with a baseline and a target (and target date)? • What type of indicators did the CPF use? (“Participation” seems to be a catch all indicator, but may not be the right one) • Is there a causal chain for gender objectives? • Is that causal chain coherent with overall CPF objectives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review CPF Results Framework against gender priorities stated in CPF
<p>ALIGNMENT</p> <p><i>the extent to which the CPF program as implemented was focused on assisting the country to reduce poverty and boost shared prosperity in a sustainable manner (the Corporate Goals)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was gender identified as critical for achieving the twin Goals by the Systematic Country Diagnostics (SCD) or other analysis? • How was addressing gender priorities linked with the achievement of the twin goals? 	
<p>SELECTIVITY</p> <p><i>the extent to which the Bank Group had a comparative advantage in engaging in the gender issues identified in the country strategy (note that the comparative advantage maybe on certain gender issues not all)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify “comparative advantage” by scanning work of other bi-laterals and multi-laterals working in the country on gender issues, and assess if the Bank has more “impact” than other partners working on these issues? For example, UNHCR may a comparative advantage during active conflict 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role of the UN, DFID, USAID, others?

	<p>in “war zones” while Bank Group may focus on the post-conflict reconstruction phase rather than during active conflict.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The extent to which the CPF provided sufficient explanation and evidence to justify Bank Group’s choice not to focus on gender in certain areas critical for the poverty reduction and shared prosperity, such as activities by other development agencies, in order to ensure proper division of labor or pooling of resources. 	
<p>EFFICACY</p> <p><i>achievement of the CPF Objectives</i>³¹</p> <p>Gender to be treated as all other objectives if included as a cross-cutting issue. Progress assessment of cross-cutting objectives should be based on objective or outcome indicators and not inputs or outputs. In the absence of those, the CPE should attempt to come up with relevant objective or outcome indicators to reflect the objectives, and use available evidence to assess their achievement.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did interventions address gender issues to generate identified outputs and outcomes in the country program? • Did Bank Group projects and analytical work capture and deliver on gender issues identified in projects? • Extent to which the CPF Objectives related to gender were actually achieved, or progress was made toward stated objectives. • Extent to which sufficient interventions were undertaken to generate gender-relevant outputs and outcomes identified in country program. • Discuss the quality of the reporting on gender results (evidence sources) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follow-up with Bank Group staff through key-informant interviews and project beneficiaries through focus groups (see Annex 5) • Evaluators can broadly categorized the lending and non-lending portfolio under three gender-related dimensions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Strengthened Human Development (Outputs include increased access to services, improved quality, and strengthened institutions) (b) Economic Empowerment of Women (Outputs include access to economic opportunities –

³¹ According to CPE guidelines – Results chain for each objective should be analyzed.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was there an effort to link the gender objectives of the CPF with the overall CPF outcomes? How? 	<p>employment based programs, microfinance; increased capacity through training – vocational trainings or employment based trainings, and improved institutions)</p> <p>(c) Increased Voice and Accountability (Outputs include improved participation in community councils, women’s participation in water projects, strengthened gender aware institutions at local level and national level)</p>
<p>RISK TO DEVELOPMENT OUTCOME</p> <p><i>the risk, at the time of evaluation, that development outcomes will not be maintained. This refers to objectives or outcomes that actually have been achieved</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the gender outcomes or objectives achieved sustainable? Is there ownership by government or other stakeholders for gender issues being addressed? Evidence on continued borrower commitment to program objectives with regard to gender Sociopolitical support for CPF gender objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meetings with relevant government officials, CMUs, and other involved WBG staff
<p>IMPACT AND INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT</p> <p><i>measures (a) the WBG contribution to the attainment of specified development goals; (b) the contribution of the Bank Group’s assistance individually to the country development goals targeted by the WBG program; and (c) the extent to which the</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extent to which the program has improved the government’s or NGO capacity, with regard to gender Level of social capital. Evidence that gender impacts attributable to country program have been, to the extent 	

<p><i>program bolstered the client's ability to make more efficient, equitable, and sustainable use of its human, financial, and natural resources</i></p> <p>One of the criteria listed is "gender equality".</p>	<p>feasible, isolated from those caused by other factors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program's additional contribution to development impacts (for example, delivering relevant knowledge or advice, catalyzing change, and fostering more effective use of external resources). 	
--	---	--

Appendix 3. Gender Section of the ICR Review Template (“ICRR Gender Flag”)

Objective: (1) systematically document the presence of gender dimensions in individual projects; and, (2) create incentives to ICR authors to report on gender.

Two important caveats:

There is currently no rating connected to gender either directly or indirectly. Rarely is gender a prominent aspect of the PDO (for example, increasing gender equality; achieving specific results for women or girls; and so on), which would be the main channel for gender results to influence project rating. More often gender aspects are “secondary” elements that may not be considered (by the evaluator, and/or the project team) as impacting project performance or may go unnoticed;

All projects are expected to alter the distribution of the main outcomes of interest and this impact may well be different by gender (as by other relevant traits, such as poverty, ethnicity, and so on). However, outcomes are often not reported by categories of beneficiaries (including in a sex-disaggregated way), but as general averages. In other words, what may be relevant in a project about gender is its absence. Documenting gaps is, however, particularly challenging.

A drop-down menu includes five main questions (note: some accept multiple answers):

Is gender a relevant aspect of the PDO or of one of the project components? (Multiple options possible)

(a *relevant aspect* is defined as the intent or the potential of the project to impact gender equality, or gender relationships, or women or men — or boys or girls — as specific beneficiaries of the project activities; or — in the case of project components — as the inclusion of specific activities meant to achieve gender relevant outcomes, such as capacity building targeting women or men or focused on gender issues, or other activities facilitating participation of women/men, or their access to and use of services, and so on)

- a. Yes, it is an explicit part of the PDO
- b. Yes, it is part of (at least) one of its components
- c. No, it is not part of the PDO or the components, but it could be (missed opportunity)
- d. No, it is not part of the PDO or the components, and it does not appear to be relevant

Specify

If there has been changes between the PAD and the ICR, please refer to the “PAD” in the response above and explain below what changed in the “ICR”:

What is different in the ICR

Note: The two “yes” answers (option a and b) capture the explicit mention of gender in the ICR. If gender is not explicitly mentioned, you are invited to reflect on the PDO and the project design and determine whether the project could have meaningfully included gender. For example, you can ask the following questions: does the project have the potential to positively impact existing gaps or facilitate participation of or access by women/girls (if they are the disadvantaged group – in some cases it can be men/boys)? Can the project have potential negative consequences for gender equality, for example negative consequences for women, should it have discussed them and, if possible, have included measures to alleviate them? (Think for example a pension reform that changes the system from defined benefit to defined contribution.) Could men and women respond differently to the project activities and should this different behavior have been taken into account in order to maximize the results of the project?

Does the ICR report sex-disaggregated or female- or male-specific indicators? (Multiple options possible)

(sex-disaggregated are person-level indicators that can be reported separately by sex — such as participation in public work projects, enrollment in school, and so on; female- or male-specific indicators are indicators that apply specifically to one sex such as maternal mortality, prenatal care, and so on. Reported indicators may be derived from the results framework, or from impact evaluation, or other assessments).

- a. Yes (PDO-level indicators)
- b. Yes (output-level or other indicators)
- c. The share or % of female beneficiaries is one of the indicators
- d. No

Specify and comment on adequacy and comprehensiveness (whether all the right indicators are or not included).....

Note: Mark “yes” based on the presence in the ICR of sex-disaggregated and/or female- or male-specific indicators at either the PDO-level or output level or both. If yes, please specify whether one of the indicators is the share or % of female beneficiaries (sometimes also expressed as “the project intends to reach XX beneficiaries, of which YY (or ZZ%) women”)

Are there indicators that could have been sex-disaggregated and were not? (Multiple options possible)

- a. Yes (PDO-level indicators)
- b. Yes (output-level or other indicators)
- c. No, all person-level indicators were sex-disaggregated
- d. No, not relevant or not possible

Specify and comment on adequacy and comprehensiveness (whether all the right indicators are or not included).....

Note: If, at the PDO- and/or output-level, there are person-level indicators that could have been sex-disaggregated, but were not, please mark the corresponding options a or b. Mark d “not relevant or not possible” if in the project you are evaluating gender indicators do not apply (think of, for example, a privatization of a Bank, or the introduction of computers in a Ministry, and so on) or if there are no person-level indicators. In your comments, you can note whether in your view important indicators are missing – for example, if the PDO has an explicit reference to gender, but there is no corresponding indicator (for example, if the goal of the project is “to empower women” but there is no indicator to measure it).

Does the ICR discuss specific gender issues?

(for example, in the sections “Poverty, Gender, and Social Development Impacts”, “Efficacy”, “Unintended Impacts”, or other sections of the ICR)

- a. Yes, in a comprehensive way
- b. Yes, but only superficially
- c. No (potential missed opportunity)
- d. No, not relevant.

If yes, specify and note section.....

If potential missed opportunity specify which issue is potentially missing.....

Note: Mark “no (potential missed opportunity)” if the document does not discuss any gender issues, but in your view – based on the PDO, the components, what was originally stated in the PAD (and was not revised) and more generally the type of project – there are aspects related to gender that could have been discussed. Mark b (“yes, but superficially”) if the ICR includes a discussion of a specific gender issue, but this discussion is very generic, not comprehensive and there are still issues that are not discussed when one would have expected to find some comment. Mark d “no (not relevant)” if in the project you are evaluating gender is not expected to be an issue (think of, for example, a privatization of a Bank, or the introduction of computers in a Ministry, and so on).

Please comment on any other issue regarding gender features in this ICR

For example, you may comment about project design or one of its components that lacked attention to specific gender aspects; or refer to a similar project you happen to know that dealt with gender issues in a different way; or praise the project for its unusual attention to gender; and so on.

.....
.....
.....

Appendix 4. Master questionnaire – Women’s empowerment questions

A survey questionnaire was developed and piloted in Burkina Faso and Nepal to measure women’s empowerment along several dimensions. The two questionnaires were developed for impact evaluation analysis as part of the evaluation of a Citizen Scorecard project (Burkina Faso) and the Poverty Alleviation Fund (Nepal). The questionnaire of Nepal (the one with more gender questions) included the following sections: (i) household roster, (ii) education, (iii) employment, (iv) household conditions and physical assets, (v) income, (vi) project specific questions in relation to implementation, (vii) health, (viii) social environment and community participation, (ix) empowerment and participation, (x) time use, (xi) decision-making, (xii) agency and life satisfaction, (xiii) disaster coping strategies (to gauge the community’s response to the 2015 earthquake). Sections viii to xii were especially designed with the purpose of analyzing gender roles, gender inequalities and women’s empowerment, but all sections included gender-relevant and sex-disaggregated information.

It is important to stress that to evaluate gender inequalities it is crucial to have a representative sample of *both* men and women, and ideally (depending on the context and the evaluation question) women with different position in the household (for example wives of different ranks, wives and mothers-in-law, and so on). Power calculations to determine the minimum sample size should take this into account (samples need to be large enough to allow for a separate analysis by sex and still retain significance).

The choice of questions and categories provided has to be tailored to the context. Questions on mobility, religious practices, or community participation might not be relevant in some countries or areas. Working closely with local counterparts to select and formulate the correct question and careful piloting of the survey tools are key in preparing a good questionnaire. Local experts play also a crucial role in advising on how to approach issues that could be particularly sensitive – which is often the case when investigating gender roles and empowerment.

The individual questionnaires piloted in Burkina Faso and Nepal have been extracted from a larger “master questionnaire” that has been created in the process. This master questionnaire assembles modules and gender questions compiled from multiple sources (the DHS, LSMS and other household budget surveys, surveys used for specific impact evaluations, and so on). It is available on the IEG intranet page for evaluators to identify and select relevant questions for their specific evaluation projects.

Appendix 5. Focus Groups – Women’s empowerment and gender roles in the household and the community

FGD script developed for the evaluation of the Lao PDR Poverty Reduction Fund (PRF)

The focus groups discussions took place in 26 selected villages in the three provinces (Huaphanh, Savannakhet and Luang Namtha). Each focus group included between 10 to 15 participants selected by the village authority.³² In total, 157 women and 94 men participated in the focus group discussions. The focus groups were composed by only women and only men, to encourage full participation. The ethnic composition was internally homogeneous (within each focus group), but varied depending on the village. Each focus group discussion lasted about 2 hours.

Running of the focus groups

Welcome and instructions

“Hello everybody, my name is _____ and this is _____, we come from _____ “research group”. You have been selected to participate in this discussion given your involvement with the PRF. We are conducting a study on community participation and empowerment connected to the Poverty Reduction Fund. Your personal opinions and views are very important for our study, they will help us better understand how this project has impacted the lives of people in the community, especially of women.

I will ask you several open questions, for which there are no right or wrong answers, and there is no need to reach consensus or make decisions. Please express your opinions freely during the meeting.

I will moderate the discussion and Y will take notes. This conversation will be recorded on tape. This is only for purpose of the study, only Y and I will listen to the tape. No names or personal information will be used in the study.

Practical issues: the discussion will last between an hour and a half and two hours. We ask you to please switch off your mobile phones. No smoking is allowed during the session. Please allow everyone time to express their opinion during our conversation, and talk one at a time.

³² As a rule, focus group participants should be selected by the evaluators using the most appropriate method given the evaluation questions (for example, randomly across villagers or beneficiaries, or non-randomly, but using a criterion that avoids biases in the type of responses). In Lao PDR, however, because of political constraints, it was not possible for the team to select focus group participants. While this was not an ideal situation, the script was not shared with the project team; so the selection could not be based on the ‘desired answers’ to be provided during the discussion.

You can address each other when expressing your opinion, we are only here to assist in the discussion. If you need to use the restrooms feel free to do so now (point to restrooms).

Do you have any questions?

Introductions and warm up:

- Please introduce yourself, and tell us briefly why you decided to participate in our focus group today?
- Let's begin our discussions today by talking a little bit about your community. In general, do you think this community is a good place for a woman/man to live? Why? [This question is designed simply to warm up the group. Please do not spend more than 5 minutes discussing]

Exploring main topics:

Themes and questions: Description of the sub-project and how the group relates to it	Notes: (all throughout the discussion dig in particular into reasons/issues related to gender roles)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did the specific sub-project happen? What happened, are you familiar with it? 	Reference to the project, connect the group with the activity. [Need specific information on the type of project in that village]
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was the infrastructure built the village priority? • Was it your priority? 	Intent is to understand whether the sub-project implemented meets the need of the participants
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did you participate in the decision about what to do? Who participated? How were/are priorities being set? Change over time? (to be defined better) 	<p>Try to understand if the group had a say in deciding on the sub-project, if they actively concur in making the decision (irrespective of whether they are happy with it).</p> <p>Also try to understand whether there was a change over time (that is, whether participation has increased over time)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How did you participate in making the decision? In which capacity? How organized? Why? 	Did the individual participate in her/his own capacity? Or as a member of another association? Or representing the household or a

	category of individual? Did they participate because they felt obliged/compelled to do it, as this was an expectation or requirement?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why not? 	Reasons for not participating (no time, no interest, not allowed, not useful, gender norms, interest already represented by somebody else, discouraged, belief they are uninfluential, and so on)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you wish you could be more involved? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you think that participation helps you in any way? Do you participate in other community organizations? Can you influence the decisions that are made? 	Try to tease out whether they feel participation is good or bad (positives and negatives)
Community and intra household decisions	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there specific people that generally participate in the selection of this type of projects (or not, if participation in these groups is generally low)? 	Dig into reasons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In general, how are decisions being made in this village? Who participates? Can women decide as much as the others? [excluded groups] • Was there a change over time? 	Tease out whether the exclusion is explicit (by written rules or instructions) or implicit (because of what happens in practice, for example, only men gather traditionally)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What about decisions in the households? 	Try to understand women's role in decision making within the households. Is this different than in the community? Why? Why not?
How community groups operate	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there any type of association, group or club which holds regular meetings in your village? By association or group we mean things like: a. self-help group, non-credit related, b. rosca, sacco, or upatu, c. micro-finance group, d. 	This question should help to also have a sense of the existence of community organizations and the level of participation of the community. [Please name only relevant community organizations]

<p>school/education committee, e. women's organization, f. drama, music, dance, or sport club, g. cooperative, h. burial group, i. religious group, j. ward or village committee, k. political party or other political group, l. NGO (volunteer), m. labor union, n. community mobilizer.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the rules of participation and what is expected of the members in these groups? 	<p>Try to understand what is the expected role of members, and specific norms around participation?</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do people like you have opportunities to assume a leadership roles? Of making their voice heard? 	<p>Try to understand also to what extent individuals would engage more</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you think there is some explicit or implicit exclusion of specific groups of people (such as women, second/ third wives, minorities, and so on)? By exclusion we mean that someone is not welcomed or does not feel welcomed in the group 	<p>Tease out whether the exclusion is explicit (by written rules or instructions) or implicit (because of what happens in practice, for example, only men gather traditionally)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In your opinion, what are the reasons that could explain this exclusion? • What happens with these excluded groups, are they worse off? (Any change over time?) 	<p>Examples: written rules, social rules, lack of information; mobilization of social groups; leadership; exchange within social groups; and so on</p>
<p>Efficacy of community action</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Think about your community's experience with trying to improve the infrastructure and community services. What factors contributed to its success or failure? Give some examples. 	<p>For example: ease of communication within the group / communication between group and the institution / conflicting or productive personalities, personal interactions / resources, including time and finances / level of interest, engagement, effort / scope for change allowed by the government "structures"</p>
<p>Externalities of community action</p>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you think that participating in these types of groups, impact your life in a positive or negative way? Why? How? 	Socialization / sense of contributing and adding value / personal benefit / self-confidence / social duty and so on.
---	--

Closure, wrap up questions:

- Identify key themes that emerged from the discussion and give participants an opportunity to refine (What are the key lessons we should take away from this discussion?)
- Summarize and test with the group the relative weight of certain categories of response
- Identify differences of perspective, contrasting opinions, and areas of agreement
- Signal that the group discussion will end soon and allow a round of final comments
- Give thanks and request them to answer a few questions as they leave. The moderator or note-taker write down the answer to the questions below just before the participants leave the room. (Many thanks for being so generous with your time today and for sharing your views and experiences with us. Just before you exit the room, we will need one more minute for each of you to answer 3 questions for us, thanks!)

Final questions to be recorded in writing in a participation sheet:

- Do you own land?
- What is the highest level of education you completed?
- Age
- Subjective poverty ranking question. From 1 to 5, where do you rank your household? (1 being the poorest of your community and 5 those better off).

FGD script developed for the evaluation of the Nepal Poverty Alleviation Fund (PAF)

Similarly to the FGDs conducted for the evaluation of the Lao PRF, the main goal of the FGDs in Nepal is to understand how the lives of women and men had been impacted by the project, with

the specific objective of assessing the impacts on women's empowerment.³³ The goal is to identify changes in social norms and intra-household relationships, as well as other observable development impacts. Additionally, the discussion will gather information on the impact of the recent earthquake and on the coping strategies of the communities in the aftermath. Both men and women (in separate FGDs) were encouraged to discuss their views and opinions of women's empowerment, social norms and intra household relationships.

The focus group discussions will center on the issues of community participation, networking, decision-making regarding community infrastructure, empowerment, and disaster coping mechanisms. Focus group participants will be asked open-ended questions on these topics following a script prepared by the World Bank team and piloted in the field by the Centre for Economic Development and Administration (CEDA). Each focus group session should last approximately for 2 hours.

Selection of participants

FGD will be conducted in five districts – Ramechhap, Rasuwa, Mahottari, Rolpa and Dailekh. FGDs will be conducted only in project (treatment) areas, where PAF has been present for more than 4 years. Participants will be selected according to the following criteria:

1. The participants must be members of the community organizations (COs) created by the PAF.
2. The groups have to be homogeneous in terms of age (18-45 years), and ethnicity. FGDs need to be conducted with specific cast/ethnic minorities (Dalit and Janajatis)
3. Exclude from FGDs individuals that could monopolize the discussion (for example, village head, head of the union, elderly, and so on)
4. If the same individual is selected as a respondent for the household questionnaire and also as FGD participant, the FGD and the survey should not be conducted in the same day.
5. The field team should meet key individuals of selected community organizations (COs), prepare a list of CO members using screening forms, identify eligible participants, convene them in a suitable space (like school, club, VDC office, and so on), and conduct FGDs.

Running of the focus groups

Welcome and instructions

“Hello everybody, my name is “.....” and this is “.....”, we are researchers from the Centre for Economic Development and Administration (CEDA). We are conducting a study on

³³ The FGDs had been planned for September 2015. Unfortunately, due to the difficulties related to the recovery from the earthquake, it was not possible to field either the FGDs or the quantitative survey. In September 2015, however, the FGD tools were piloted in the field.

community participation and empowerment connected to the Poverty Alleviation Fund. You have been selected to participate in a discussion about PAF in your community. Your personal opinions and views are very important for our study, they will help us better understand how this project has impacted the lives of people in the community, especially women. Additionally we will try to understand how the community has been able to cope with the recent earthquake and its aftermath.

I will ask you several open questions, for which there are no right or wrong answers, and there is no need to reach consensus or make any decisions. Please express your opinions freely during the meeting.

I will moderate the discussion and “.....” will take notes. This conversation will be recorded, only for purpose of the study, only “.....” and I will listen to the tape. No names or personal information will be used in the study and all records will be kept strictly confidential.

Practical issues: the discussion will last between an hour and a half to two hours. We ask you to please switch off your mobile phones. No smoking is allowed during the session. Please allow everyone time to express their opinion during our conversation, and talk one at a time. You can address each other when expressing your opinion. We are only here to assist in the discussion. If you need to use the restrooms feel free to do so now (point to restrooms).

Do you have any questions?

Beginning of the discussion

Please introduce yourself, and tell us briefly your involvement with PAF? Let’s begin our discussions today by talking a little bit about your community. In general, do you think this community is a good place for a woman/man to live? Why? [This question is designed simply to warm up the group. Please do not spend more than 5 minutes discussing]

Exploring main topics

Section 1: Community and intra household decisions	Notes (all throughout the discussion dig in particular information reasons/issues related to gender roles)
[Attention: Discuss the kind of community related works such as (creating an association or institution, development related work, income generating activities, cultural and religious and so on) have been performed in the village. Discuss with the participants in a nutshell and try to dig out the points.	Dig into reasons. Look into possible discrimination against some groups and why?

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In general, how are decisions regarding what kind of community work and how to do it, being made in this village? (If the participants do not understand the question probe that is there an option for calling everybody to a meeting for making decision or not? Is there any practice to follow the decision made by the influential specific person in the meeting or not? Whether the decisions are made through mutual dialogues and consensus or not? In case of conflict in decision making, are decisions made by voting or not?) • Who are the community people generally called upon to participate in the meeting at the village? (Please Probe: Like rich/poor, male/female, lower caste/upper caste, indigenous nationalities, Muslims, and so on) • Are people belonging to very poor and weak section of the society able to take part in the discussion and decision making as much as the people of the upper section of the society or not?(Please compare between the rich and poor, women and men, upper and lower caste, upper caste with indigenous nationality and Muslim). If not why? • Are there special groups of people in your village that decide on what kind of income generating activities (give example) and infrastructure development work (give example) have to be carried out. To which group or community do they belong to? Is there any group of people who are not called to participate in meetings? To which groups or community do they belong to? • Why do you think there are individuals who are frequently called for participation and others that are seldom called for participation? Why is this happening? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How are decisions relating to the households matters often made? (If the participants do not tell anything or do not understand the term “how decisions are made”, probe by asking: whether obeying the decisions made by the elder family member of the household, or taking decision through the discussion among the family members and between whom male and female, and so on) 	<p>Try to understand women’s role in decision making within the households. Is this different than in the community? Why? Why not?</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In which cases do women or men alone make decisions in your family? In which cases they need mutual discussions with their counterparts for making decision • Is the decision making process in your family different than in other families in the community? If so how? If not why? • In your opinion, why some family members are more involved in decision making than the others? (Please Probe: between male and female who makes more decisions and who makes less. Ask reasons for being so, or why there are differences between male and female members in decision making) <p>10. Do you think that it is okay to make fewer decisions by [if male in Q9, "male". If female in Q9 "female" some people and more by others [if male in Q9, "male". If female in Q9 "female"]? If it is okay tell us why? If it is not okay, tell us why?</p>	
Section 2: How community groups operate	
<p>11. Is there any type of association, group or club which holds regular meetings in your village?</p> <p>(By association or group we mean things like: non-governmental organizations (NGOs), community, women's group, political, occupational, traditional, ethnic, religious and local clubs, cooperatives, sports and music club, credit and non-credit organizations, education and health related institutions, labor unions, and so on).</p> <p>Note: write down the names of all associations, institutions and the groups in which participants are members and holding regular meeting.</p>	<p>This question should help to also have a sense of the existence of community organizations and the level of participation of the community. [Please name only relevant community organizations]</p>
<p>12. What are the established rules and the regulations for being members' or to participate in those associations, institutions or groups?</p> <p>Probe it:</p>	<p>Try to understand what is the expected role of members, and specific norms around participation?</p>

<p>1. What kind of households or individual - poor, rich, educated, female, male and so on.</p> <p>2. Membership fees are mandatory or not. How much should be paid?</p> <p>3. Who will recommend and who will accept the membership.</p> <p>4. Ask any other points in details.</p> <p>13. What are the duties, responsibilities and the rights/ privileges of the members involved in these associations, institutions, and groups?</p>	
<p>14. Do people like you have opportunities to assume a leadership role or occupy key positions? Have you ever taken a leadership role regarding any important issues or problems in your community? (Note: leadership position means: chairman, vice-chairman, secretary, undersecretary, treasurer and so on)Are you interested in assuming major posts? If you don't intent to take responsibility, then tell us why?(Probe it: What types of additional work do you have to do and what kind of problems do you expect if taken major posts)</p> <p>15. Do these organizations, institutions, groups provide you opportunity to articulate your voice (tell your problems)? Do they hear your voice/problems? Or whether decision is made reflecting your opinion/problems?</p> <p>16. When was the last time you participated in a community meeting?</p> <p>(Ask before how many years..... months..... and days)</p>	<p>Try to understand also to what extent individuals would engage more. What could be the difficulties? Ask why did they participate or why not.</p>
<p>17. In your opinion have specific groups of people (such as women, indigenous, Dalit, ethnic minorities) not been included in the group participation (gathering, meeting and leadership and so on)? Is this due to written rules and act or due to the prevailing social norms? If they are excluded by making written rules and act, then explain explicitly what kind of rules and the act?</p>	<p>Tease out whether the exclusion is explicit (by written rules or instructions) or implicit (because of what happens in practice, for example, only men gather traditionally)</p>

<p>18. Do you think that the practice of not including any specific group of people participating in gathering, meeting and leadership, and so on, is alright for you? In your opinion, what are the reasons that could explain this exclusion?</p> <p>Probe: written rules, social rules, lack of information; lack of mobilization of social groups; lack of leadership; lack of interaction within social groups; and so on.</p> <p>19. In your opinion, how is the socio-economic status of relatively weaker section of the society like women, indigenous people, Dalit, ethnic minorities? Is it improving or deteriorating over time?</p> <p>Probe: living standard, social relations/ties, income, women participation, collective decision making, skill development, children education, food and nutrition, household ownership on assets, and so on.</p>	<p>Examples: written rules, social rules, lack of information; mobilization of social groups; leadership; exchange within social groups; and so on.</p>
<p>Section 3: Description of the PAF project and how the group relates to them</p>	
<p>(Attention: Briefly discuss about what kind of income generating and infrastructure related activities were conducted in the past / is being conducting at the present with the financial support by the community organization of the participants? Then ask the following questions)</p> <p>20. How decision regarding the PAF supported income generating and infrastructure related works were finalized?</p> <p>Probe:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is it through group meeting or community decision? 2. As per the advice of other members of the groups? 3. As told by the partner organization (PO)? 4. As told by the influential person of the village? 5. As per the interest of the male CO members, without having a group meeting? 6. As per the interest of the female CO members, without having a group meeting? 7. As told by the female member in the household? 8. As told by the male member in the household? 9. Discuss if any other 	<p>Intent is to understand the way projects have been selected (via participatory approached, top down approach from the PO, the village authority making decisions, Men making decisions, Women making decisions)</p> <p>Try to understand if the group had a say in deciding on the projects, if they actively concur in making the decision (irrespective of whether they are happy with it).</p>

21. Have you participated or attended in the meeting organized to decide income generating and infrastructure development related work carried out by the community organization? How did you participate?

(Probe: If the participants do not understand the question “How did you participate?” then ask them questions like have you taken a leadership role during the discussion or put an idea in the floor or gave approval in the point raised by others? Or any other ways? Ask if they just went to the meeting but did not speak?

22. [There are various types of income generating and infrastructure development activities that community organization can do for the betterment of households and community.] Now tell us on what basis CO generally decide which income generating and infrastructure development work should be done first, which should be done at second time, at the last or not to do at all? (Or how do you prioritize the activities?)

23. Were your suggestions regarding prioritization of income generating or infrastructure development activities well taken by the all members of the community organization and final decision were also made on the basis of your suggestions or not? (Please state the example)

24. In community organization (group), is there any practice of hearing the voice of some people and neglecting the voice of others or not? If some people are neglected, then whose voices are heard most and who’s left behind?

(Probe: Male or female- more/less, upper or lower caste, indigenous nationalities, Muslim, more/less)

Attention: Explain the participants about the meaning of “Voice of the group”. It means putting any type of problems in the group, trying to solve it through discussions, making the decision and helping to find a solution to some problems.

25. You have mentioned that (mention this and that group as per Q24) groups are unable to express their voice in community organization or the group. Therefore, tell us why they are unable to express their voice?

<p>26. Did you participate in the gathering/meeting organized to discuss/ finalize the types of income generating and infrastructure development activities and applied for? Who were the other participants?</p> <p>27. How did you participate in that gathering or meeting? In which capacity?</p> <p>Probe:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Self-participation or as a member of own community organization. 2. As a representative of other organization. 3. As a household representative. 4. Due to obligation to obey others or rules. 5. Due to being part of the targeted group (women, indigenous nationality, Dalit and Muslim, being beneficiary) <p>28. In the gathering/meeting, what types of opinion did the CO members expressed regarding what types of activities to be carried out and applied for? Did the meeting decided as per the views expressed by the CO members? If yes, what types of activities were decided to carry out and applied for? If not, why?</p>	<p>Did the individual participate in her/his own capacity? Or as a member of another association? Or representing the household or a category of individual? Did they participate because they felt obliged/compelled to do it, as this was an expectation or requirement? Maybe because they are part of the targeted groups (Women, Janajati and Dalit)</p>
<p>29. In the meeting, how did the gathering/meeting reached to the decision about the activities to applied for [mention activities identified in Q28]</p> <p>Probe: 1. How many attended meeting, gathering?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Did they get time to speak turn by turn? 3. Did all had same or differing opinion 4. If differing opinion, was decided through voting? 5. If not through voting, how was decision taken? <p>30. Why did you attend the gathering, meeting?</p>	<p>Reasons for not participating (no time, no interest, not allowed, not useful, gender norms, interest already represented by somebody else, discouraged, belief they are uninfluential, and so on)</p>
<p>31. (For those who did not participate) If you did not participate, why didn't you participate in the meeting, gathering?</p>	
<p>32. Do you want to be more involved or participate more in organization, institutions and the community work? Why? In</p>	<p>Try to tease out whether they feel participation is good or</p>

<p>which way do you want to be more involved? If you do not want to be more involved, tell us why?</p> <p>33. What kind of advantages and disadvantages did you experienced while involved in the organizations, institutions or in the community work?</p> <p>34. Have you been involved or participated in any other community organizations/institutions, and so on? (Probe it: Get information about the name and the functions of the organization)</p> <p>35. Are there any instances that the groups, community organizations/institutions in which you are affiliated hear your voice and make decision accordingly? (influence of the participants on decision) If yes, how? (Take examples)</p> <p>36. What kind of changes did poverty alleviation programs bring in you, your family and the society?</p> <p>(Probe: In life style, social relations, income level, women's participation, collective decision making, skill development, children's education, food and nutrition status, and the ownership in the income of the household and so on)</p>	<p>bad (positives and negatives)</p>
<p>Attention: Based on the participants views in previous questions, briefly remind that CO is involved in implementing various types of income generating and infrastructure development projects and the ways they take decisions and conduct the projects.</p> <p>37. Now tell us, was there a similar approach for making decisions and conducting these programs before PAF came to your village. If not, was the decision making process of the programs of poverty alleviation new to the villagers? After PAF's approach to work, have other associations and institutions and community work change their approach for making decisions. If yes, how? And why do you think this happened? Can PAF's approach be used in any other work? How so?</p> <p>38. In the present time, has participation increased when in making decisions about the community? If yes, do you think it is due to the Poverty Alleviation Fund work done in the village?</p> <p>39. After involving in the PAF programs have you witness any changes in the household decision making process? (Decision about</p>	<p>Try to understand whether there was a change over time (and what changed) Did participation and/or decision making (at the community or intra-household level) changed over time? Could we attribute this to PAF CDD approach? Probe whether PAF introduced some rules of participation that did not exist before and you like - or perhaps some that you do not like and are not part of how your community traditionally does things? Is there anything that PAF</p>

<p>the children, selling of goods and property, work and expenditure and so on)</p> <p>Probe:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase or decrease in the ability of the female member to make decisions. 2. Increase or decrease in the ability of both male and female to make decisions through mutual discussion. 3. Increase or decrease in the ability of the male member to make decisions. <p>40. If there is a change, then how? If not why?</p>	<p>introduced that you think should be used for other programs as well?</p>
<p>Section 4. Earthquake aftermath questions</p>	
<p>(Now I want to ask you about the recent earthquake and the type of impact it had on your village, community and family)</p> <p>41. How was your village affected? What were the main problems in your community as a consequence of the earthquake?</p> <p>42. In your community were some specific people or groups more affected by the earthquake? Why were they more affected?</p>	<p>Ask about what kind of problems did they face after the earthquake. Dwelling issues, death or injury in the family, loss of business, and so on...Dig into the reality of minorities, women, elderly, sick, children, or those with specific livelihoods...</p>
<p>43. In the aftermath of the disaster, how was the recovery period in your community? How did the community react? What were the positive and negative reactions after the earthquake? Can you think of any examples?</p> <p>44. In which dimensions do you think your community was unprepared for this natural disaster.</p> <p>45. Did you provide any kind of aid to those affected by the disaster? What kind of help did you or your family provide?</p>	<p>This set of questions aim to understand the way the community response to the earthquake. We would like to know, what are the weakness that became apparent after the earthquake? Was it a problem of the infrastructure, lack of cohesion, and leadership, lack of planning?</p>

<p>46. What kind of help did you or your household receives from the community? What kind of help did you receive from any organization or government agency?</p> <p>47. Did PAF help the earthquake victims? What kind of help did PAF extend to you and your community?</p> <p>48. Do you think the help from the government was adequate and timely?</p> <p>49. What kind of problems are the earthquake victims still facing?</p> <p>50. What are the main challenges to solve the problem of the earthquake victim?</p>	<p>This set of questions aim to understand the institutional response after the earthquake.</p> <p>We want to understand whether the network created by PAF has helped with the response and recovery and in which ways?</p>
--	--

Closure, wrap up questions:

- Identify key themes that emerged from the discussion and give participants an opportunity to refine (What are the key lessons we should take away from this discussion?)
- Summarize and test with the group the relative weight of certain categories of response
- Identify differences of perspective, contrasting opinions, and areas of agreement
- Signal that the group discussion will end soon and allow a round of final comments
- Give thanks and request them to answer a few questions as they leave. The moderator or note-taker writes down the answer to the questions below just before the participants leave the room. (Many thanks for being so generous with your time today and for sharing your views and experiences with us. Just before you exit the room, we will need one more minute for each of you to answer the following questions for us, thanks!)

Ask each participant to fill out the following table.

Participants' record form:

S.N.	Full name of the participant	Age	Education level (class completed)	Caste/ethnicity	Do your family own land or not?	Self-assessment of poverty status (very poor, poor, moderate, rich, and very rich)
1						

2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						
11						
12						
13						
14						
15						

Appendix 6. The “Gender Resource” database for evaluators

The “Gender Resource” database is an online database that allows evaluators to identify and retrieve gender relevant datasets, data tools, and toolkits. These resources can be used to access data needed for thematic evaluations or to validate data provided by WBG teams, or to identify tools that can support data analysis or provide guidelines for specific evaluation approaches. The search can be conducted using keywords (see below and example of search for “education” – only the first two entries appear in the screenshot).

The IEG gender team has screened and classified each entry and provided a description and a link to the original source. The database will grow as evaluators will use it and new material will be identified; it will be kept up-to-date by the gender team.

The database is the result of a collaboration between the gender team, IEGCS, and the IT team. The link to the database (currently in Spark) is

<http://globalpractices.worldbank.org/teamsites/vpu/ieg/iegenderresource/Pages/Home.aspx>

The screenshot shows a web browser displaying the IEG Gender Resource Database search results. The search term "education" is entered in the search bar. The results are filtered by "Topic" (Education) and "Type" (Tool). Two results are visible:

- Left Behind -- Girls' Education in Africa**
Left Behind, Girls' Education in Africa, UNESCO, girls education, education, Africa, data tool, reports, global initiative ...
globalpractices.worldbank.org/teamsites/vpu/.../DispForm.aspx?ID=15
- Gender Checklist: Education**
Gender Checklist Education, ADB, Africa, checklist, initial social assessment, ISA ... main gender issues in the education sector and in designing appropriate gender-sensitive ...
globalpractices.worldbank.org/teamsites/vpu/.../DispForm.aspx?ID=16

A context menu is open over the first result, showing "Left Behind -- Girls' Education in Africa" and "Changed by Nik Andre Han". The menu also includes "OPEN" and "SEND" options.

