

Independent Evaluation Group

Evaluation of Bank Support for Gender

Approach Paper

Background

1. The World Bank was first among the multilateral institutions to make gender issues an explicit item of attention. In 1977, the Bank appointed a Women in Development Advisor, and in 1984, it issued an Operational Manual Statement (OMS) 2.20, “Project Appraisal,” which recommended that issues related to women be included in social analyses prepared for projects, when women were an important group affected by the project.¹ Then, in 1993, after the 1990 *World Development Report, Poverty*, the Bank’s first gender strategy, *Enhancing Women’s Participation in Economic Development*, was presented to the Board as part of the overall poverty reduction initiative and led to the issuance of Operational Policy (OP) 4.20, “The Gender Dimension of Development.” This complemented the project-level approach of OMS 2.20, adding a strategic country-level approach, which supported reduction of gender disparities and increased economic participation of women. It required gender analysis and integration of gender considerations in Country Assistance Strategies (CASs), as well as supporting client countries to collect gender-disaggregated data.

2. IEG’s 2000/2001 evaluation of Bank support for gender, conducted in two phases and published together in 2005 as *Evaluating a Decade of World Bank Gender Policy, 1990-1999*, assessed gender mainstreaming into Bank support between 1990 and 1999.² It concluded that 63 percent of all CASs reviewed after the 1993 gender policy had satisfactorily addressed gender considerations. While more than 80 percent of Health, Nutrition, and Population (HNP) projects integrated gender considerations at the design stage, integration was weaker in sectors that influenced the economic participation of women.³ At an institutional level, the evaluation found that there was no consensus on the scope of the Bank’s policy and strategy;⁴ and that operational staff were unaware of even those policy elements on which there was a broad consensus. It concluded that the Bank had not established processes to institutionalize and operationalize its policy and that monitoring of gender issues was weak. The evaluations recommended that the Bank clarify its gender policy, require the integration of gender considerations into CASs based on comprehensive diagnoses and relevant activities, strengthen client institutions to support the implementation of national gender policies, and establish monitoring and evaluation systems to measure progress in achievement of policy objectives.

¹ OMS 2.20 required consideration when women were an “important group of project participants or beneficiaries.”

² IEG has previously evaluated the Bank’s engagement on gender in 1994 and 1997. The 1994 study traced how the concept of women in development, and later the broader concept of gender, came to be reflected in Bank policies and lending. The 1997 evaluation assessed 185 projects (mainly in the social and agricultural sectors) and found that approximately 71 percent of them meaningfully integrated gender considerations into overall project objectives.

³ These included: (i) increased access to economic opportunities; (ii) increased access to credit facilities; and (iii) increased access to training and skills upgrade.

⁴ See IEG’s 2001 evaluation “Integrating Gender in World Bank Assistance” paragraphs 1.3-1.5.

3. Simultaneously, a Bank Policy Research report (*Engendering Development through Gender Equality in Rights, Resources, and Voices*) brought together a large body of evidence to demonstrate that gender discrimination contributes to higher poverty and lower quality of life, slower economic growth and development, and weaker governance. The report concluded that poverty reduction contributes to reducing harmful gender disparities, but neither gender disparities nor poverty can be eliminated without directly addressing gender issues. Poverty and gender inequality are intertwined, the report noted, and this recognition can help in formulating more effective development strategies. It recommended a three-pronged strategy that would help to: (i) reform institutions to provide equal rights and equal opportunities for women and men; (ii) foster economic development to strengthen incentives for more equal resources and participation; and (iii) take active measures to redress persistent disparities in command of resources and political voice.

4. An updated Bank strategy, *Integrating Gender into the World Bank's Work: A Strategy for Action*, was discussed by the Board in FY2002. It strengthened the country-level approach and clarified areas of confusion. The strategy covered both male and female issues and recommended that gender be mainstreamed in sectors where it was a barrier to poverty reduction and growth, including economic, financial, and infrastructure sectors. Subsequently, an Operational Policy/Bank Procedure, OP/BP 4.20, "Gender and Development" was issued in 2003 (see Box 1), clarifying processes, responsibilities, and accountabilities for the implementation of the Gender Strategy. The Bank clarified that the OP/BP did not apply to Development Policy Loans (DPLs), and that it replaced the provisions related to women in OMS 2.20. Thus, the Bank policy framework took on a country-level approach to gender, requiring gender issues to be integrated in strategic sectors and thematic areas where the CAS identifies the need for gender-responsive interventions.⁵ In 2006, the Bank's Gender and Development Group issued a *Gender Action Plan* as part of the implementation of the Gender Strategy, which supports the increased participation of women in economic, infrastructure, financial, and labor markets.

Box 1. Gender and Development: What Do World Bank Policies Require?

The Bank's current policies require the following:

- An assessment in each active client country to identify gender constraints to development effectiveness (as a separate assessment or as part of other economic and sector work (ESW) or an assessment undertaken by other donors or governments)
- CASs draw on and discuss the findings of gender assessments identifying gender-responsive actions that are proposed as part of Bank support
- Integration of gender issues into projects/activities in sectors or themes identified in the CAS as needing priority attention
- Integration of gender issues in resettlement plans and Indigenous People's Development Plans.

⁵ A few other operational policies require consideration of gender issues in projects that involve involuntary resettlement or affect indigenous peoples.

Rationale and Purpose for Evaluation

5. During the Board discussion of the *Gender Action Plan*, some members expressed a need to understand how the Bank had implemented its 2001 Gender Strategy. IEG now plans to undertake an evaluation to assess the Bank's implementation of its strategy between FY2002 and FY2009 (Q2), and the results it obtained through its lending and non-lending activities.

6. The purpose of the evaluation will primarily be to foster learning based on the Bank Group's (IBRD and IDA) experience with the aim of improving and enhancing the development effectiveness of future Bank interventions, and to better understand the approach of the International Finance Corporation (IFC) to gender integration. The evaluation will also serve an accountability purpose.

Evaluation Scope, Objectives, Questions, and Framework

7. The evaluation will cover all Bank lending and non-lending activities for the period between FY02 (the year after the 2001 Strategy was discussed at the Board) and FY09 (Q1 and Q2). It will focus only on the design of the 2006 *Gender Action Plan* because it is premature to focus on its results. IFC has been paying increasing attention to gender issues in its investment and advisory operations. Most IFC activities in this area are, however, recent and too early to be evaluated. The evaluation will provide a preliminary overview and analysis of IFC's gender-related initiatives.

8. The three main evaluation questions are (sub-questions are provided in Annex 2):

- **Relevance of the Bank's gender strategy:** To what extent is the Bank's strategy resulting in the "right" gender issues (issues relevant for poverty reduction and economic growth as noted in BP 4.20) being adequately addressed at the country level?
- **Integration of gender into Bank support:**⁶ To what extent did the Bank implement its 2001 Strategy?
- **Results of strategy:** To what extent has the Bank contributed to any documented results in reducing gender disparity and enhancing women's empowerment in selected countries?⁷ To what extent did the Bank support the development of gender-disaggregated data in client countries in these areas? What worked well? What needs to be strengthened?

Methodology

9. The evaluation will consist of two distinct assessments: (i) **a broader Country Gender Evaluation** in all countries that have a population of more than a million, received more than

⁶ The sub-questions are derived from BP 4.20.

⁷ The evaluation will not assess whether the Bank support contributed to gender equality. The last evaluation found this a difficult question. For example, field assessments in Bangladesh found that women receded into their homes as their incomes grew. They were entitled to greater respect within their households, paid better dowries, and were married off to economically better households. In that context, women interviewed expressed satisfaction, but it does not seem to have been a shift toward gender equality. Thus, the evaluation will focus on reduction of gender disparities and enhanced women's empowerment.

one investment project, and prepared a CAS/ISN between FY02 and FY07 (See Annex 1 for the list of 93 countries and the excluded countries); and (ii) **an in-depth Results Evaluation** of Bank support for gender and development, with focus on economic participation of women and social empowerment, in 12 countries selected randomly from the above set of 93.

10. **Country Gender Evaluation:** In the set of 93 countries, the evaluation will primarily answer the first two evaluation questions. It will assess the relevance of Bank support in each country, understand how the Bank has integrated gender into its support, and whether there were any missed opportunities in countries or sectors where gender integration has not taken place. In short, it will aim to understand how the Bank has implemented its FY02 gender and development strategy. To do this, the evaluation will review about 300 pieces of ESW,⁸ 130 CASs,⁹ and all (about 1,200) investment projects approved between FY02 and before FY09 (Q2). The data from the analysis will also be used to examine the above questions. The analysis will also examine the patterns of the Bank's lending support for gender—over CAS periods, by region, by sector, and by type of borrower. In assessing the first two evaluation questions, IEG will also undertake a survey of Bank staff and managers. (See Annex II for additional information on proposed methodologies).

11. **Results Evaluation:** This outcome assessment of Bank support will examine all Bank programs and projects in 12 countries. This assessment will focus on results of Bank projects and programs that have closed between FY2004 and FY2008.¹⁰ It will examine all relevant ESW to understand how these influenced gender integration in country or sector activities. The evaluation will aim to glean lessons from this review of results and will examine whether Bank support benefitted both men and women. It will examine the strengths and weaknesses of the Bank's strategy in these countries, understand what worked well, and what needs to be strengthened. It will also examine whether there were any missed opportunities or unanticipated results that were not envisaged in the CAS or subsequent operations. (See Annex II for additional information on proposed methodologies).

12. The 12 countries will be selected using transparent criteria to reduce bias in the selection.¹¹ The evaluation will use a variety of methods in these selected countries, including

⁸ See Annex I for the types of ESW that will be analyzed. In reviewing ESW, the evaluation will use the following indicators: (i) whether consideration of gender issues was mainstreamed (as opposed to a few references); (ii) whether the analysis was backed by data, (iii) whether the ESW integrated gender issues into the recommendations or solutions; and (iv) whether the ESW provided guidance on possible indicators for systematic monitoring

⁹ In countries with a CPIA sub-rating of 4.5 or above for gender equality as of 2002, the lack of analysis or specific discussion in CASs will not be considered as less than satisfactory unless the GDI rating or other analysis indicates that gender is an issue.

¹⁰ Many investment projects would have been designed in the late nineties, when the 1994 OP 4.20 on Gender Dimensions of Development was in effect.

¹¹ The selection stratification procedure will be based on the GDI/HDI score and IEG's rating of the CAS or ISN (whether it includes a gender agenda or not). Based on these ratings, the 93 countries will be divided into four mutually exclusive groups: (i) Group 1 – Low with a GDI/HDI score of 0.98 or below and a CAS gender rating “yes”; (ii) Group 2 – Low with a GDI score of 0.98 or below and a CAS gender rating “no”; (iii) Group 3 – High with a GDI/HDI score of above 0.98 and a CAS gender rating “yes”; and (iv) Group 4 – High with a GDI/HDI score of above 0.98 and a CAS gender rating “no”. The evaluation will examine countries from groups 1 and 3, which will be stratified based on the share of countries that fall in each group. A special smaller analysis will look at all countries in the selection frame in Group 2. For countries in the fourth group, the evaluation concludes that

desk reviews and structured interviews. Field visits and beneficiary assessments are planned in 2 countries as part of this second assessment to understand the views of stakeholders. In addition, video-conferencing will be arranged with stakeholders in the other 10 countries. Wherever possible, these video-conferencing sessions will be followed up with some structured interviews.

13. Assessing the results of Bank support will be a complex issue. Metrics for assessment are not universally accepted; consistent data are not available in several sectors; methodologies to collect data are expensive, and project ICRs do not typically include gender-disaggregated data. The evaluation framework will inevitably have to simplify the complex circumstances existing in each country and identify some dimensions that will reasonably capture results, based on the nature and type of Bank assistance. An indicative results framework is provided in Annex 4, based on the Bank's 2001 Strategy and its 2006 *Gender Action Plan*, which the evaluation will use flexibly in assessing the outcome of Bank support.¹² The detailed indicators for assessing results will need to be developed consistent with the objectives of Bank support in each country. These will not be the same for all countries (since the objectives and priority sectors differ across countries), and may not all be outcome indicators, but may include proxy indicators to assess the contribution of Bank assistance to outcomes that are likely to enable women (or men where relevant) to empower themselves or maximize their welfare.

14. Attribution of results to Bank support will be challenging, for there are a large number of determinants beyond Bank support that can influence the gender status in a country. Results of Bank support, to the extent they can be assessed, will be aggregated from the project and program levels to the sector and country levels in the 12 countries. In addition, interviews with a variety of stakeholders (policy makers, project implementing staff, nongovernmental beneficiaries, and beneficiaries) in the 12 countries and analyses of in-country policy and planning documents will be used to triangulate results and ensure that such attribution to Bank support is reasonable.

Budget and Timeline

15. The evaluation will be undertaken by IEG staff and consultants under the guidance of Ali M. Khadr (Senior Manager, IEGCR). The evaluation will be managed by Gita Gopal (Lead Evaluation Officer, IEGCR) and the team will include James Sackey (IEGCR), Louise Victoria Gunnarsson (IEGWB), and other consultants. Peer reviewers (Ximena Vanessa Del Carpio, Klaus W. Deininger, Ravi Kanbur, and Kenichi Ohashi) will provide guidance and comments on draft reports. The Swiss Agency for Development Cooperation will undertake participatory assessments in two evaluation countries and organize the videoconference sessions in ten.

improving gender performance is not a priority in the country and the Bank's input does not need to be studied in depth by the evaluation.

¹² The Bank's 2001 strategy does not include a results framework, while the 2006 Gender Action Plan does. IEG's literature review for the previous gender evaluation is also being updated to better understand the relevance of the Bank's 2002 Gender Strategy and will contribute as necessary to strengthening the results framework.

Table 1: Schedule for Evaluation

| <i>Activity</i> | <i>Date</i> |
|------------------------|--------------------|
| Approach paper to CODE | November 21, 2008 |
| Draft report to OPCS | July 1, 2009 |
| Final Report to CODE | September 15, 2009 |

Annex 1: List of 93 Countries for Country Implementation Review

| Country | Region | Gender-related development index (GDI 2001) | CPIA closest 2000 | Country | Region | Gender-related development index (GDI) | CPIA closest 2000 |
|--------------------------|--------|---|-------------------|------------------|--------|--|-------------------|
| Angola | AFR | 0.439 | 3.5 | Albania | ECA | 0.732 | 3.5 |
| Benin | AFR | 0.395 | 3.5 | Armenia | ECA | 0.727 | 4.5 |
| Burkina Faso | AFR | 0.317 | 3.5 | Azerbaijan | ECA | 0.743 | 4.0 |
| Burundi | AFR | 0.331 | 3.5 | Belarus | ECA | 0.803 | 4.5 |
| Cameroon | AFR | 0.488 | 3.5 | Bulgaria | ECA | 0.794 | 4.5 |
| Central African Republic | AFR | 0.352 | 2.5 | Bosnia & Herzeg. | ECA | ... | 3.5 |
| Chad | AFR | 0.366 | 2.5 | Croatia | ECA | 0.814 | 4.0 |
| Congo | AFR | 0.496 | 3.0 | Georgia | ECA | ... | 3.5 |
| Congo (DR) | AFR | 0.353 | 3.0 | Kazakhstan | ECA | 0.763 | 3.5 |
| Coted'Ivoire | AFR | 0.413 | 3.0 | Kyrgyzstan | ECA | 0.692 | 4.0 |
| Eritrea | AFR | 0.434 | 4.0 | Latvia | ECA | 0.810 | 4.5 |
| Ethiopia | AFR | 0.347 | 3.0 | Lithuania | ECA | 0.823 | 4.5 |
| Gambia | AFR | 0.457 | 3.0 | Macedonia | ECA | 0.795 | 4.0 |
| Ghana | AFR | 0.564 | 3.5 | Moldova | ECA | 0.697 | 3.5 |
| Guinea | AFR | 0.446 | 3.5 | Poland | ECA | 0.839 | 4.5 |
| Kenya | AFR | 0.488 | 3.0 | Romania | ECA | 0.771 | 3.5 |
| Lesotho | AFR | 0.497 | 3.5 | Russian Fed | ECA | 0.774 | 4.0 |
| Madagascar | AFR | 0.467 | 3.5 | Slovakia | ECA | 0.834 | 4.5 |
| Malawi | AFR | 0.378 | 3.5 | Tajikistan | ECA | 0.673 | 3.5 |
| Mali | AFR | 0.327 | 3.5 | Turkey | ECA | 0.726 | 3.5 |
| Mauritania | AFR | 0.445 | 3.5 | Ukraine | ECA | 0.761 | 4.0 |
| Mauritius | AFR | 0.770 | 4.0 | Uzbekistan | ECA | 0.727 | 4.0 |
| Mozambique | AFR | 0.341 | 3.5 | Argentina | LCR | 0.839 | 4.5 |
| Niger | AFR | 0.279 | 3.0 | Bolivia | LCR | 0.663 | 3.5 |
| Nigeria | AFR | 0.457 | 3.0 | Brazil | LCR | 0.770 | 3.5 |
| Rwanda | AFR | 0.416 | 4.0 | Chile | LCR | 0.821 | 4.0 |
| Senegal | AFR | 0.420 | 4.0 | Colombia | LCR | 0.774 | 4.0 |
| Sierra Leone | AFR | 0.320 | 3.0 | Costa Rica | LCR | 0.824 | 5.0 |
| Tanzania | AFR | 0.396 | 4.0 | Dominican Rep | LCR | 0.727 | 4.0 |
| Uganda | AFR | 0.483 | 4.0 | Ecuador | LCR | 0.716 | 3.0 |
| Zambia | AFR | 0.376 | 3.5 | El Salvador | LCR | 0.707 | 3.5 |
| Cambodia | EAP | 0.551 | 3.0 | Guatemala | LCR | 0.638 | 2.5 |
| China | EAP | 0.718 | 4.0 | Haiti | LCR | 0.462 | 2.0 |
| Indonesia | EAP | 0.677 | 3.5 | Honduras | LCR | 0.656 | 3.5 |
| Lao People's DR | EAP | 0.518 | 2.5 | Jamaica | LCR | 0.750 | 4.0 |
| Mongolia | EAP | 0.659 | 4.0 | Mexico | LCR | 0.790 | 3.0 |
| Viet Nam | EAP | 0.687 | 4.0 | Nicaragua | LCR | 0.636 | 3.5 |
| | | | | Panama | LCR | 0.781 | 3.5 |
| Papua New Guinea | EAP | 0.544 | 2.5 | Lebanon | MNA | 0.737 | 3.5 |

| Country | Region | Gender-related development index (GDI 2001) | CPIA closest 2000 | Country | Region | Gender-related development index (GDI) | CPIA closest 2000 |
|-------------|--------|---|-------------------|------------|--------|--|-------------------|
| Philippines | EAP | 0.748 | 4.0 | Morocco | MNA | 0.590 | 2.5 |
| Paraguay | LCR | 0.739 | 3.0 | Tunisia | MNA | 0.727 | 5.0 |
| Peru | LCR | 0.734 | 3.5 | Yemen | MNA | 0.424 | 2.0 |
| Uruguay | LCR | 0.830 | 4.5 | Bangladesh | SAR | 0.495 | 3.0 |
| Venezuela | LCR | 0.787 | 3.0 | India | SAR | 0.574 | 2.5 |
| Algeria | MNA | 0.687 | 3.0 | Nepal | SAR | 0.479 | 2.5 |
| Egypt | MNA | 0.634 | 3.0 | Pakistan | SAR | 0.469 | 2.5 |
| Jordan | MNA | 0.729 | 2.5 | Sri Lanka | SAR | 0.726 | 4.0 |

| Excluded Countries |
|---------------------------|
| Czech Republic |
| Equatorial Guinea |
| Fiji |
| Korea (Republic of) |
| Malaysia |
| Namibia |
| Seychelles |
| Sudan |
| Swaziland |
| Syrian Arab Republic |
| Togo |
| Turkmenistan |
| Afghanistan |
| Estonia |
| Gabon |
| Hungary |
| South Africa |
| Slovenia |
| Thailand |
| Zimbabwe |
| Serbia |
| Montenegro |

Annex 2: Evaluation Questions and Summary Methodology

| Evaluation Questions & Sub-Questions | Methodology | Data Sources |
|--|---|---|
| <i>To what extent is the Bank's GD strategy relevant? (Did the Bank do the right things?)</i> | | |
| <p>Is the strategy adaptable to different country conditions? **Has the Bank shifted from a project level to a more strategic focus in the different countries? Has Bank support been appropriate to client countries, given the levels of gender disparity?</p> | <p>**Desk Review of integration into CASs and operational level documents in 93 countries **Structured Interviews with Client Stakeholders ** Survey of Bank operational staff and Country Directors **Updated Literature Review</p> | <p>**Review of ESW and CGAs, CASs and CASCR, and PADs ** Feedback from client stakeholders in the 12 evaluation countries **Country Director and Staff Survey</p> |
| <p>Is the strategy clear? **Extent to which staff reflect a clear understanding of the policy framework; and implementation of IEG recommendations of the 2000 evaluations that were endorsed by CODE</p> | <p>**Survey of Bank staff and Managers **Follow-up on IEG recommendations agreed to by Management in the MAR **Other donor evaluations</p> | <p>*CD and Staff Survey *Consultation with Gender Board and OPCS</p> |
| <p>To what extent is the strategy results-oriented? **Monitoring of Policy implementation; and mechanisms for ensuring accountability of Bank management and staff</p> | <p>**Desk review of Bank strategy and its implementation</p> | <p>**Results Framework for Strategy **Review of operational documents to understand how Bank is monitoring results **Review of Institutional Monitoring Reports</p> |
| <p>Is the Bank's policy consistent with other multi-lateral donor approaches? *Consistency of Bank objectives and that of other agencies; consistency of Bank approaches with that of other agencies; and comparable levels of monitoring by Agencies.</p> | <p>**Desk Review of strategies of other multilateral donors **Interviews with other donor representatives</p> | <p>IDB/AfDB/ADB/OECD/UN gender policies</p> |

| Evaluation Questions & Sub-Questions | Methodology | Data Sources |
|---|---|--|
| | | |
| <p><i>To what extent did the Bank effectively implement its gender and development strategy? (Did the Bank do the right things right?)</i></p> | | |
| <p>To what extent did the Bank periodically assess the gender dimensions of development within and across sectors in countries in which it has an active assistance program? <i>*In answering this question in the 93 countries, the focus will be on the extent to which the Bank diagnosed gender issues with focus on (i) scope of diagnosis (BP 4.20 Para 1); (ii) quality of diagnosis as a whole for the country (not individual ESW); (iii) periodicity of such diagnosis; and (iv) reasonableness of overall recommendations given gender disparity status (as assessed by a country-level indicators such as GDI or specific health, education, and labor market indicators).</i></p> <p><i>* In the smaller set of 12 countries, the focus will be on the quality of individual and relevant ESWs. (i) consideration of relevant gender issues; (ii) backed by quantitative data to the extent available; (iii) logical link between analysis and recommendations; and (iv) identification of gender-related monitoring indicators.</i></p> | <p><i>**Desk Review of ESW **External Peer Review of Selected and Seminal Pieces</i></p> | <p><i>**All Country Gender Assessments (CGAs) **Poverty assessments, country economic memorandums, public expenditure reviews, development policy reviews, poverty impact assessments or institutional analysis **Other assessments that the CAS indicates that the Bank relied on (carried out by the country or other organizations). **Other donor assessments **Selected regional and global ESW</i></p> |
| <p>To what extent did CASs draw on and discuss the findings of the gender assessments? (See BP 4.20 Paras 2, 4, and 5) <i>**In answering the question in the 93 countries, the evaluation will assess to what extent there is a (i) link between the gender-related discussion in CAS with diagnosis; (ii) clarity in the identification of sectors and themes as relevant; (iii) integration of gender issues into results framework in countries with significant gender issues</i></p> | <p><i>**Desk Review of all CASs</i></p> | <p><i>*All CASs approved during the evaluation period in 93 countries</i></p> |
| <p>To what extent were Bank-financed projects and Bank activities gender responsive in sectors and thematic areas where the CAS has identified the need for priority gender-responsive actions? <i>**In answering the question in the 93 countries, the evaluation will assess to what extent there (i) is sound analysis of differential implications of project activity on men and women in the PAD or an annex thereof, (ii) is consultation with men and women in design of</i></p> | <p><i>Desk review of PADs Interviews with task teams in 12 countries</i></p> | <p><i>All PADs approved since FY2002 and before FY2009 (Q2), Implementation Status Reports, Mid-term Reviews, ICRs</i></p> |

| Evaluation Questions & Sub-Questions | Methodology | Data Sources |
|--|---|---|
| <p>project; (iii) activities or component are linked to stated gender-related objective or issues; and (iv) is a gender-informed Results Framework for monitoring and evaluation.</p> | | |
| <p>To what extent were institutional arrangements (staff skills, internal organization, incentives, and budget) well-aligned for effective support to the country? In answering this question, the evaluation will seek information on: ** (i) budget allocation for gender integration region-wise and in the selected set of smaller countries as compared to discussion of needs in the 2001 strategy; (ii) adequacy of internal processes for ensuring accountability of Bank management and staff for policy implementation compared with other cross-cutting issues such as environment; and (iii) gender equality in HR policy of the Bank and its results as monitored by the gender of the CD and TTL for each CAS and gender of Sector Manager and TTL for each project activity.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review • Staff and Management Survey • Structured Interviews with 6 Regional Focal Points and gender country focal persons in 12 countries | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of Internal Documents, • Budget reports as provided by regional or country focal points • HR Policies • Regional reports, |
| <p>To what extent did regions monitor the implementation of the gender policy? ** Through what processes did the regions monitor implementation of gender policies? To what extent did such monitoring result in reports that provided a clear understanding of the status of policy implementation? To what extent did the regions provide the MD with periodical reports on the implementation of the policy?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Desk Review ○ Structured interviews with all Regional Gender Focal Points | <p>All monitoring reports prepared by the region and the GAD Board</p> |
| <p>To what extent has the Bank collaborated with donors in undertaking its gender work? ** Donor collaboration in undertaking gender analysis ** Donor collaboration in the set of 12 countries</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Review of Bank Documents ○ Interviews with donor staff ○ Staff Survey | <p>Donor and Bank documents</p> |

| Evaluation Questions & Sub-Questions | Methodology | Data Sources |
|--|--|--|
| <p>To what extent did the Bank achieve its stated objectives and contribute to country-level outcomes?</p> | | |
| <p>To what extent have countries reduced gender disparity and enhanced women’s empowerment, and what has been the Bank’s contribution to any documented results? **Indicators to be developed based upon country objectives and data availability but would include both objectives - reduced gender disparities and increased women's empowerment</p> | <p>In the 12 countries: **Desk review of documentation of closed projects **Participatory Assessments in 12 countries to validate findings of desk review - in 2 countries this will involve field assessments; in 10 such consultation will be through video conferencing ** Interviews with Bank Staff</p> | <p>**IEG evaluations, ICRs, Supervision reports and Implementation Status Reports of substantially completed interventions **Views of Stakeholders (including policy makers, NGOs, beneficiaries, project managers, Government officials) **Views of Bank Staff **Other donor evaluations</p> |
| <p>To what extent did the Bank assist clients to develop and implement their gender strategies?</p> | <p>In the 12 countries: ** (i) Desk review; and (ii) consultation with client stakeholders.</p> | <p>Bank, country, and other donor documents</p> |
| <p>To what extent did the Bank support the development of gender-disaggregated data and gender-relevant knowledge?</p> | <p>In the 12 countries: **Desk review of availability of gender-disaggregated data ** Consultation with client stakeholders</p> | <p>**ESW including country, regional, and global ESW; **Review of Household surveys, LSMSs, and other similar surveys supported by the Bank in the 12 countries</p> |

Annex 3: Draft Report Outline

- Chapter 1: Evaluation Background and Objectives
- Chapter 2: Relevance of Bank Support for Gender
- Chapter 3: Quality of Gender Strategy Implementation (will include a section from the global analysis)
- Chapter 4: Results of Bank Support
- Chapter 5: Summary Findings and Recommendations

Annex 4: Indicative Framework for Results Assessment

| <i>Inputs from the Bank</i> | <i>Selected country-level outputs/intermediate outcomes (illustrative)</i> | <i>Gender outcomes</i> |
|--|--|---|
| <p>Lending and nonlending products</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Country Gender Assessments (CGAs), ESW,^a analytic and advisory activities (AAA), Institutional Development Funds (IDFs) • Policy dialogue • Investment loans and technical assistance <p>Implementation resources and support by Bank management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gender-aware strategies • Sufficient budget and improved tools for gender integration • Trained Bank staff • Improved incentives for gender integration for managers and staff • Improved monitoring and evaluation of gender integration and results of Bank support | <p>Policy and institutional strengthening</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved availability and use of sex-disaggregated data • Gender-aware policies and laws (such as equal access to property, joint property titling, reduction of discrimination against women in labor markets, reforming financial institutions in a manner that both poor men and women have access to services) • Improved systems and processes for gender mainstreaming in design and implementation of development activities • Improved gender-aware monitoring of development outcomes <p>Increased access to quality services and economic markets</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved access to quality education and health services • Reduction of burden of unpaid domestic labor through improvement in access to water, energy • Improved access to markets through transport and other economic infrastructure <p>Improved Capacity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved participation of women as decision makers in the planning, and as beneficiaries, of development activities • Improved access to economic assets (including labor market participation and increased capacity to establish businesses) • Equal decision making powers in natural resource management • Increased access to relevant training and capacity enhancement programs | <p>Improved human development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction of gender disparities in education access and performance • Reduced gender disparity in health indicators showing improved well-being of women <p>Equal economic opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equal wages for equal work • Equal opportunities to productive assets, services, and remunerative work • Improved skills and capacity <p>Empowerment of women</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhanced accountability of governments to implement gender-responsive policies and activities • Removal of institutional barriers and the enhancement of incentives to increase the access of men or women to development opportunities • Effective participation of women as decision makers in development planning in their own communities |

a. Gender Strategy, 2001, p. 32: "These estimates assume that Country Gender Assessments for all active borrowers will be completed by the end of fiscal year 2005 and that other analytical work will be performed on a selective basis."

b. Gender Strategy 2001, p. 32 states: "The estimated incremental costs of implementing the strategy will be about \$2 million in the current fiscal year, about \$3 million per year in the three subsequent years, and approximately \$2.5 million per year thereafter. Corporate incentive funding of \$0.6 million has been set aside for the current year, and the regions have committed more than twice this amount as matching Bank budget."

