WB Independent Evaluation Group Gender Program: Advancing the integration of gender in evaluation

Gisela Garcia

Evaluation Week – Abidjan, September 5, 2018

IDEV, African Development Bank

Overview

1. Rationale
2. Challenges
3. IEG Approach to assess gender
    a. Gender flag for project validation
    b. Assessing gender in CPEs
    c. Project, sector/thematic evaluations
4. Priorities going forward

1. Rationale

- Gender is more than ever a top priority of the **World Bank Group**:
  - World Bank Group Gender Strategy 2016-2022
  - IDA 18 Theme
  - Corporate commitments (WBG scorecards): integration in projects and country strategies.
  - Capital increase
- **IEG commitment:**
  - 4+ years of work on gender;
  - strengthening attention to gender in the work program
- **ECG** Gender Practitioners community of practice

2. Challenges

- **PDO** (Project Development Objective)**-driven** evaluation approach (especially for project-level evaluations)
- Availability of **information** in formal project documents and limitations on additional data collection
- Availability of the right **expertise** at the right **time**, **evaluators' skills and motivation**
- **Sustained commitment** of the unit/group
- **Financial resources**

2. Challenges: Identifying Gender Results

1. Relevance and results chain poorly defined or missing

2. Gender indicators are increasingly frequent, but ‘weak’

3. Gender results increasingly reported, but quality uneven

2. Challenges: Existing Gender Indicators

- **Outcome** indicators less frequent than **output** indicators
- Limited **sex-disaggregation**: only 17% of projects have PDO-level gender indicators but 51% could have them just by sex-disaggregating existing ones
- Overall majority of indicators relate to **women or girls** only, much more rarely to **men or boys**' issues
- Use of **female beneficiaries** indicator is becoming more frequent, but indicator is not always meaningfully defined
- When gender-relevant outcomes indicators are **present**, these are often reported
- **Country** strategies use MDG or project level indicators

2. Challenges: Rationale for gender relevance varies by project

- A. Gender equality as the goal
- B. Potential to positively impact existing gaps
- C. Acknowledging trade-offs
- D. Leveraging behavioral differences
- E. With no immediate and direct impacts

3. IEG Approach

- Management commitment and leadership
- In-house expertise and learning by doing
- Development of specific products
  - Validation: IEG gender flag
  - Evaluation: gender integration in a variety of evaluation products
- Creation of tools and resources for evaluators
  - Guidelines for integrating gender in evaluation
  - IEG Academy course (forthcoming)

3a. The gender flag

Validation (**ICRRs**): “IEG gender flag” was introduced in 2015. It is filled in for every project completion report validated by IEG.

It focuses on:

- Gender in PDO or components + missed opportunities
- Sex-disaggregated and female- or male-specific indicators + missed opportunities
- Other discussion on gender in project documents

3a. Gender flag, deriving information from ICRs

1. If gender-related outcomes in the **statement of objectives:**

- sex-disaggregated, gender-relevant indicators are expected and evidence should be provided on outcomes achieved;
- the ICR should comment on gender aspects not only in terms of efficacy (achievement of outcomes), but also relevance of objectives, relevance of design, bank performance, borrower performance, and M&E quality.

2. No gender-related objective, but gender-related project **component**, and/or women specifically identified as a **beneficiary** group:

- The ICR is likely to include comments on gender issues, and probably gender-disaggregated input/output/outcomes.

3. No gender-related objectives/components and women were not identified as beneficiary group:

- Discussion on gender is likely to be lacking.

3a. Experience with the gender flag so far

- “Not relevant” as per evaluator judgement may mean missed opportunity;
- Large percentage of missing information (*not clear if due to quality of ICR, evaluator attention/ knowledge, or lack of accountability mechanism*);
- Need to rely on evaluators’ subjectivity
- Evaluators reluctant to make a judgment call (for example, on the adequacy and comprehensiveness of indicators)
- Evaluators seem to equate project benefits for women or vulnerable groups to gender

3b. Assessing gender in country strategies

Despite specific corporates requirements for gender integration AND strong ambitions of the 2015 WBG Gender Strategy

CPF guidance says "*can*" (not "must" or "should") which may confuse teams; AND there is no reference as to *how to do it*

Guidance on gender to SCD teams were recently updated,

CPF guidance has yet to be updated.

3b. Assessing gender in country strategies

- **Assess actual treatment of gender in country strategies** (RAP 2015, SCD/CPF and CE eval)**, CLRs, and CPEs**
- **Derive guidance to teams based on evaluative findings, WBG commitments AND Gender Strategy expectations**
- **Pilot-test guidelines in Rwanda CPE**
- **Revise guidance to teams based on experience**

3b. How is gender captured in CPEs?

ALL reviewed CPEs assessed gender in some way, yet…

- ✓ CPEs did not pay more attention when gender was identified as a cross-cutting issue or in IDA countries.
- ✓ Moreover, not all CPEs in countries with the most obvious gender issues address gender (*maybe a flag to teams is needed?*)
- ✓ When analysis was more detailed (i.e. Afghanistan, Liberia), findings contributed to inform a major evaluation–leading to a recommendation to pay more attention to gender in FCV

3b. IEG Approach: Integration of gender in country validations and evaluations – tips

1. *Were specific gender priorities identified in the country strategy? Which ones?*

2. *Were gender issues discussed in the country strategy outcomes? (how? cross-cutting; focus area/pillar; objective);*

3. *Is there any reference to gender data or knowledge gaps?*

4. *Are there specific gender relevant lending and non-lending operations identified in the country program? Any concrete actions to address data or knowledge gaps?*

5. *Does the country strategy results frameworks identify outcome indicators to track gender results? Are those indicators aligned with the actions identified through question #4?*

6. *Does the country strategy link gender issues to the twin goals of ending extreme poverty and boosting shared prosperity?*

3b. IEG Approach: Entry points for CPEs

Relevance of program objectives

Gender analysis, priorities, focus areas, consultations

Relevance of program design

Focus on gender of the portfolio - composition, changes over time;

Policy dialogue

Results Frameworks

Causal chain, outcome indicators

Efficacy

Results achieved

3c. IEG Approach: project, and sector/thematic evaluations

Discussion of the gender approach at the onset (**concept note/approach paper**): IEG quality standards

Ad-hoc flexible approach, but common features:

- Definition of the theory of change – inclusion of gender-sensitive evaluation questions
- Assessment of gender roles, gender gaps, and changes over time
- Definition of the activities that the evaluation team can/should undertake to evaluate gender impacts (brainstorming and consultations with experts, definition of the methodology and data needs, identification of and engagement with relevant counterparts and key stakeholders within the WBG and in countries, involvement of the IEG gender team)
- Presentation of findings. Consider formulation of gender recommendations.

4. Priorities going forward

- Increase quality at the level of validation products, based on an analysis of the IEG gender flag for ICRR
- Streamline gender integration in thematic and corporate evaluations, as well as in the Annual IEG Report on the Results and Performance of the World Bank Group
- Scale up the approach in country program evaluations
- Roll out approach for assessing gender results in private sector investments and advisory

IEG Independent Evaluation Group | WORLD BANK GROUP World Bank • IFC • MIGA

evaluations that matter

WHAT WORKS

Thank You!

Questions? Reach out!

Gisela Garcia
ggarcia3@worldbank.org

Improvements of the gender flag

- Fine tune the ICRR flag and provide continuous training to provide more clarity to evaluators and minimize subjective interpretation;
- Carry out periodic analysis of the gender flag (e.g. by sector) and identify good examples;
- Work on minimizing '***subjectivity***' BUT, at the same time, support more '***evaluative judgment***' among evaluators
- Work with ICRR coordinators and panel reviewers to address sector and accountability issues
- Ensure alignment with how gender group is tracking results

Is gender integrated in country strategies?

- ✓ There has been some progress in integrating gender in CPFs compared to previous CASs
- ✓ Gender issues that are highlighted in SCDs tend to be echoed in CPFs (economic empowerment issues -related to labor force participation, skills development, and jobs are often discussed)
- ✓ CPFs are better than previous CASs at articulating WBG actions to address specific gender inequalities
- ✓ CPFs include many more gender-disaggregated indicators

Yet, we are not up to commitments or ambitions

- ✓ Consultations around gender issues are often not followed with concrete actions in the CPF program
- ✓ Alignment between actions and indicators proposed in CPFs results frameworks is still often weak
- ✓ CPF gender-relevant indicators are way too often just output indicators or percentage project beneficiaries (indicators do not aim to measure gender gaps)
- ✓ Gender dimensions of priorities commonly identified in SCDs (i.e. skills, school-to-work transition, employment) are often not clearly spelled out
- ✓ Data and knowledge gaps with regard to gender are often not highlighted in SCDs neither are actions proposed in CPFs to address those gaps

3b. How is gender integration captured in CLR and CLRRs?

We reviewed the treatment of gender in all country strategies completion reports completed since FY12 (58 in total) – assessing how both the Bank and IEG treated gender and comparing that to what was outlined in the country strategies

- ✓ Discussion of gender is much less frequent in completion reports than in country strategies (this is valid for both management completion reports and for IEGs!)
- ✓ Gender-relevant indicators are rarely reported on
- ✓ When gender is a cross-cutting issue, the discussion is even less common!
- ✓ Lessons learned from country strategies rarely capture gender results
- ✓ Only one third of the completion report reviews discussed gender
- ✓ **Very few CASCR reviews pointed to inconsistencies** on gender between the promises in the country strategies, its results frameworks, and what is outlined in the completion reports