



Gender and Development
– a review of evaluation reports
1997-2004



Gender and Development

– a review of evaluation reports
1997-2004

Oslo, July 2005

by

Nordic Consulting Group A.S.
Janne Lexow and Stein Hansen

Table of Contents

List of Tables	4
List of Acronyms	5
Summary of Conclusions and Recommendations	7
Conclusions	7
Recommendations	9
1 Introduction	10
1.1 Background	10
1.2 Purpose and Scope of the Review	10
1.2.1 The Gender Perspective Reflected in the Design of Evaluations	11
1.2.2 The Gender Perspective Reflected in the Findings of Selected Evaluations	11
1.3 Limitations of Findings	11
2 The Gender Perspective Reflected in the Design and Implementation of Evaluations during the 1997 – 2004 Period	13
2.1 Integration of Gender Perspective in the ToR	13
2.2 The Gender Perspective in the Design of the Evaluations	13
2.3 The Gender Perspective and Evaluation Methodology	13
2.4 Gender as an Issue in Composing the Evaluation Team	14
2.5 Gender Awareness when Selecting Interviewees	14
3 Conclusions Based on all 63 Reports	15
4 The Gender Perspective Reflected in the Findings of 24 Selected Evaluations	17
4.1 Review Approach	17
4.1.1 The Evaluation Reports	17
4.2 Findings	17
4.2.1 Women as a Target Group	17
4.2.2 Gender-Specific Analysis	18
4.2.3 Evidence of Targets Set for Women's Participation	19
4.2.4 Gender Equality as a Development Objective	20
4.2.5 Gender-Relevant Results	20
4.2.6 Gender-Relevant Recommendations	22
5 Tentative Assessment	25
6 Conclusions and Recommendations	27
6.1 Conclusions	27
6.2 Recommendations	29
Annex 1: Terms of Reference	30
Annex 2: Tables	35

List of Tables

Table 1	Evaluation reports where it was considered reasonable to expect an explicit gender perspective	16
Table 2	Evaluation reports where it was NOT considered reasonable to expect an explicit gender perspective	16
Table 3	Thematic linkage of selected evaluation reports to priority areas	17
Table 4	Overview of the 24 evaluation reports according to review criteria	23
Table 5	Overall rating of gender perspective in the 24 selected evaluations according to strategy themes	25

List of Acronyms

CESAR	Centre for Environmental Studies and Resource Management
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
IPS	The International Press Service
MCH	Mother and Child Health
MFA	The Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
Norad	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation
NUFU	Norwegian Council of Universities' Programme for Development Research and Education
ToR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
WB	The World Bank
WHO	The World Health Organization
WID	Women in Development

Summary of Conclusions and Recommendations

This report presents the outcome of a review of the gender perspectives in 63 evaluation reports produced during the years 1997-2004. 24 of these were pre-selected by Norad for in-depth review.

All the evaluation reports were reviewed by a set of questions designed to verify gender mainstreaming in evaluation design and implementation:

- How has the gender perspective been reflected with reference to designs of evaluations?
- To what extent has a gender perspective been integrated into the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the evaluations?
- Regarding the evaluation methodology chosen, has the gender perspective been reflected?
- To what extent has there been attention to gender when interviewees have been selected?
- To what extent has gender been an issue regarding the composition of the evaluation teams?

The selected sample of 24 reports was reviewed based on the following criteria:

- How and to what extent has a gender perspective been included within the selected areas?
- To what extent have programmes and projects taken women's needs and interests as their starting point?
- In connection with the formulation and planning of projects and programmes, to what extent have women been chosen as the target group?
- To what extent do the evaluation reports emphasise gender equality as a development objective?
- Have gender issues been included in the various steps of the implementation and evaluation of programmes and projects?
- To what extent are the chosen activities relevant to women?
- Have the programmes and projects included targets for participation by women and to what extent have the results benefited women?

Conclusions

Gender equality is closely linked to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals. The importance of gender equality in poverty reduction and the promotion of human rights and democracy is pivotal. There is hardly any other policy issue that has been so much profiled in policy frameworks guiding Norwegian development assistance over the years, and internationally Norway has a strong image as a country in which gender equality is highly valued.

Despite the emphasis on gender equality in policies guiding development assistance, gender has not been a key issue in evaluations conducted in the period 1997-2004.

This conclusion is based on the following findings:

- Of the total number of 63 evaluations conducted, 48 scored in the range of 1-3 (on a 1-5 scale) on the question of whether the gender perspective has been reflected with reference to the design of the evaluations. 36 of these evaluations received score 1, which means that there is no reflection of this point at all. In general, the average score was markedly higher for those evaluation reports where one would expect an explicit gender focus in accordance with the Strategy for Women and Gender Equality in Development Cooperation (1997-2005).

- 52 evaluations of the total of 63 scored in the range of 1-3 on the question of whether a gender perspective had been included in the ToR. Of these 52, as many as 38 of the ToRs did not include the gender perspective at all. In those ToRs where the gender perspective is fully mainstreamed and at the same time explicitly addressed, the evaluators have followed the ToR. The average score for those evaluations where it was considered reasonable to expect a gender perspective to be made explicit was 2.27 and 1 in those where it was not reasonable to expect such a perspective.¹
- Several evaluation teams were well balanced from a gender composition point of view, but the review of 63 reports points out that this is quite uncorrelated to the degree of gender perspective incorporated in the evaluation topic and the ToR.
- Among the 24 evaluation reports which were considered from a thematic point of view, the connection between gender issues and the policy or intervention being evaluated was made explicit in only thirteen of the cases. Women are specifically mentioned as one of the target groups in ten of the 24 evaluation reports. Only twelve reports contain some information about women's needs and interests. There is no example of an explicit reference to gender equality as an overarching objective of the programme.
- Eighteen of the 24 reports contained no information about specific efforts or approaches taken to investigate how the gender perspective had been included.
- In eleven of the evaluations no reference was made to gender-related achievements. In this connection it is important to note that even the briefest statement or description of what had been accomplished was taken as positive in this review.
- 21 of the 24 evaluation reports did not include any specific future action to be taken with regard to the gender perspective.
- Evaluations of initiatives related to social sectors were found to highlight gender issues to some extent; this performance was better than evaluations in other sectors but overall the review of the selected sample did not find a consistent pattern or trend regarding this point.
- The review did not find that female representation in the teams necessarily made a difference with regard to how the evaluation was conducted or how findings are presented in evaluations. It is not known how much weight has been put on incorporating gender specialists into evaluation teams.

In conclusion, results with reference to the inclusion of the gender perspective in both design and findings are not impressive, but the review team did not find an intentional pattern of deliberate exclusion of a gender perspective on the part of the individual evaluation teams.

Rather the results may be related to some “intangible” or “informal” aspects of an evaluation culture which tends to render women and gender equality invisible at many stages of the evaluation process ranging from design to reporting of findings.

More seriously, however, is the concern arising from the observation that gender mainstreaming was not a focal issue in the projects and programmes when these were originally designed. That being the case, one could hardly expect it to be a prominent feature in the evaluations of the very same projects.

This observation also points to the fundamental generic weakness of not designing projects, and their monitoring indicators with subsequent evaluations in mind.

¹ It should be noted that when the expression “reasonable to expect” is used, this is on the basis that issues/themes under consideration are highlighted in the “Strategy for Women and Gender Equality in Development Cooperation (1997-2005)”.

Recommendations

In terms of recommendations, there is probably no single sweeping measure that can secure gender-sensitive evaluations. This has to be addressed in a broad sense at several levels. It requires a pragmatic technical approach to the manner in which evaluations are conducted. Furthermore, it requires accountability of the development assistance system to ensure that emphasis is put on this issue. At the same time, it requires a careful understanding of the influencing mechanisms by which women can become marginalised in development assistance unless specific efforts are made to ensure the opposite effects.

The fundamental weakness that has led to the above findings and conclusions is to be found in the project- and programme cycle process as practiced. What is needed is a profound attitudinal change and associated awareness-raising regarding the incorporation (or mainstreaming) of the evaluation activity as an integral component of project- and programme designs. This must be established routinely in terms of explicit formulation of baselines (ideally; counterfactual development paths) with a set of carefully chosen project-specific monitoring indicators. This must be accompanied by agreed procedures and capacity for data collection throughout the project cycle. This will pave the way for the conducting of appropriate and timely evaluations. It is at this early stage in the project cycle that quality assured inclusion of the strategic gender dimensions in development cooperation must be secured.

What is possible, however, is to make recommendations about how evaluations are managed, designed and implemented:

- The ToR should clarify what Norad expects in terms of gender focus for each evaluation exercise. Connections between the project, policy or intervention in question and the women and men it directly affects should be made clear from the start whenever gender relevance is considered to be high.
- Gender equality experts should be involved in developing the ToR.
- In the cases where an explicit gender focus is to be given weight in the evaluation, and this is mutually agreed upon from the start, the Evaluation Department must ensure that this is properly reflected throughout the evaluation process cycle.

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

Norway has been committed to promoting the rights of women through its development cooperation since the mid-1970s. Much of the work done by Norway involving women and gender equality is directed at strengthening women's rights and their participation at the political arena, but also at major programmes particularly in the health and education sectors. The share of the Norwegian development assistance budget that particularly targets women and gender equality amounts to around one third of bilateral assistance (Norad's Annual Report 2003).

Norway recognises that special initiatives may focus on women, but the goal must be to integrate gender equality into all development cooperation efforts. In 1997 "A Strategy for Women and Gender Equality in Development Cooperation"² was launched by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA). The Strategy advocates a dual approach which involves integrating gender perspectives in all activities and at all levels of development cooperation (*mainstreaming*) on the one hand, and on the other promoting gender equality by targeting women or men.

The Strategy leading up to 2005 outlines six priority areas for supporting women and gender equality:

- rights, including issues of formal gender equality, legislation, human rights in the multi-lateral context, and international monitoring of national commitments, violence against women in- and outside home, and in armed conflicts;
- participation in decision-making processes, including every aspect of the development process, democratisation, conflict prevention, and peace processes;
- economic participation, from the international economic framework, to economic reforms and research, to industrial development and agriculture;
- education, from basic education to higher education and education for adult women;
- health, including primary and reproductive health care; and
- management of natural resources and the environment, particularly regarding management of natural resources, food production, agriculture, nutrition and health, and women's traditional knowledge.

Throughout the Strategy, there is an emphasis on monitoring, quality assurance, and reporting both quantitatively and qualitatively.

This study is a desk review which involves an examination of how the various aspects of the Strategy have been reflected in evaluation reports commissioned by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs during the period 1997-2004, with reference to both the design and the findings of the evaluations in question.

1.2 Purpose and Scope of the Review

This Review presents an overview of how the gender perspective has been integrated into the various aspects of conducting evaluations, and how the gender perspective has been reflected in some selected projects and programmes which have been evaluated. The Review consists of the following two main components and addresses these by means of corresponding sets of underlying questions:

² Henceforth referred to as the Strategy.

1.2.1 The Gender Perspective Reflected in the Design of Evaluations

Based on a review of all evaluation reports that have been issued by the MFA in the period 1997-2004 (see Annex 1 and 2), the first of set of questions answered in this Review is as follows:

- How has the gender perspective been reflected with reference to the design of the evaluations?
- To what extent has a gender perspective been integrated into the ToR for the evaluations?
- Regarding the methodology chosen for the evaluations, has the gender perspective been reflected?
- To what extent has there been attention to gender when interviewees have been selected?
- To what extent has gender been an issue in determining the composition of evaluation teams?

1.2.2 The Gender Perspective Reflected in the Findings of Selected Evaluations

Based on a selection of evaluation reports (see Annex 1) issued by the MFA during the period 1997-2004, and which focus to a greater or lesser extent on the six priority areas of the Strategy (see above), the subsequent set of questions are assessed in the second part of this Review:

- How and to what extent has a gender perspective been included in evaluations concerning the six priority areas?
- To what extent have programmes and projects taken women's needs and interests as their starting point?
- In connection with the formulation and planning of projects and programmes, to what extent have women been chosen as the target group?
- To what extent do the evaluation reports emphasise gender equality as a development objective?
- Have gender issues been included in the various steps of the implementation and evaluation of programmes and projects?
- To what extent are the chosen activities relevant to women?
- Have the programmes and projects included targets for participation by women and to what extent have the results benefited women?

This Review will also assess the extent to which any particular channels, areas or sectors of development cooperation have a more explicit approach to addressing the gender perspective, and it aims at establishing to what extent there have been changes over time during the 1997-2004 period with reference to both evaluation design and findings.

1.3 Limitations of Findings

Findings from this Review cannot necessarily be generalised to the entire Norwegian development cooperation portfolio. The reviewed evaluation reports cover a wide range of topics, but the overall picture is that Norwegian development cooperation is even more wide-reaching. The review team has no background information that can confirm whether the findings of this Review are representative for other programmes and other sectors than those that have actually been evaluated.

It is also important to note that not all the reports were comprehensive evaluation reports.³

Furthermore, it is important to note that the assessments made in this report are entirely focused on how the evaluation reports address gender relevance in the programmes. This review does not look at other aspects of the evaluation reports or the programme or project in question.

³ Three reports were summaries or synthesis reports of larger evaluation exercises. (12.97 *Cooperation for Health Development. WHO's support to programmes at country level*, 2.99 *International Planned Parenthood Federation and*, 1.04 *Towards a Strategic Framework for Peace-building*). Several reports are not conventional evaluations of specific projects and programmes, but are desk studies of overall policy and strategic issues (5.97 *Aid to Basic Education in Africa*, 7.97 *Aid as a tool for promotion of human rights and democracy: What can Norway do?*, 1.00 *Norwegian Support to the Health Sector and* 2.00 *Norwegian Support to the Education Sector*). One report (6.01 *Can Democratization Prevent Conflicts?*) is a seminar report.

Addressing the gender aspects in the evaluation reports has largely been carried out according to predetermined questions raised in the ToR. To some extent these questions presuppose that the evaluation process unveils information about target groups, implementation processes and results of a gender-relevant nature which can be analysed on the basis of access to the reports alone. In reality, several evaluation reports do not provide comprehensive information on such issues, and in order to get a full picture, comparison with relevant programme documents produced at the initial stages of the programme in question would have been required.

2 The Gender Perspective Reflected in the Design and Implementation of Evaluations during the 1997–2004 Period

The part of the Review concerned with the design of evaluations will be addressed by way of a scale where 1 signifies a total absence of the gender perspective, and 5 represents “good practice” incorporation of the gender perspective in the various phases of the evaluation. Obviously, the relevance of each of the evaluation questions varies between the topics being evaluated, and this is also reflected in the score tables.

2.1 Integration of Gender Perspective in the ToR

Unsurprisingly, one observes that the gender perspective is carefully integrated into the ToR of those evaluations that explicitly deal with gender as the core issue.⁴ Furthermore, mainstreaming of gender issues in the ToR is also undertaken to some extent in the country programme evaluations (Nicaragua, Tanzania, and Bangladesh).

At the same time, with reference to the key evaluation questions in section 1.2. above, it is observed that the gender dimension is not included or only included as an add-on in the large majority of evaluations, even in several cases where one would have thought analysis and assessment would be key evaluation issues.⁵ 52 evaluations of the total 63 evaluations scored in the range of 1-3, meaning that these ToRs are vague or that no statement is given with regard to the gender perspective at all. Of the 52 in the 1-3 range, 38 of these scored 1. This means that there is absolutely no reference to gender or women’s issues in the ToR.

2.2 The Gender Perspective in the Design of the Evaluations

By and large, it appears that the evaluators have taken initiatives to address gender perspectives beyond what the ToRs tend to indicate as regards the design of the evaluations. In those ToRs where the gender perspective is fully mainstreamed and at the same time explicitly addressed, the evaluators have adhered to the ToRs.

However, in the majority of the evaluations, gender has not been identified as an explicit or key issue. This is either due to omission, or because gender is assumed to be mainstreamed into the more general and overarching development cooperation goals being addressed by the activity being evaluated. However, as is also the case for several of the 63 evaluation reports examined, a gender perspective has not been found relevant by those who have commissioned the evaluation or by the evaluation teams.

2.3 The Gender Perspective and Evaluation Methodology

Since the majority of evaluation reports reviewed have not included gender as a key issue, the chosen evaluation methodology has generally not explicitly addressed the gender perspective in a systematic way throughout the evaluation. If included at all, it is often in the form of gender-disaggregated statistics which are not further analysed.

⁴ E.g. evaluation numbers 1.97, 1.99, 2.99, 3.99, 2.00, 3.01, 3.02, and 2.03. These evaluation reports are listed with full report title and year in Appendix 1.

⁵ This is seen from Annex 2 tables 1-8 for those evaluation reports described with a “yes” and which at the same time has received a 1 or 2 score for “integration of gender perspective in the ToR”.

2.4 Gender as an Issue in Composing the Evaluation Team

34 of the 63 evaluation teams are well balanced from a gender composition perspective, and this is uncorrelated to the degree of gender perspective incorporated into the evaluation topic and the ToR. However, one cannot from the ToRs and the available documentation regarding evaluator selection criteria determine whether the team compositions are based solely on professional competence and availability, or whether gender has been a decisive factor in the composition of evaluation teams. However, when comparing the scores for each evaluation report along the ToR, design and methodology criteria, and that of team composition, one would tend to conclude that the generally well balanced gender composition of evaluation teams is not due to gender being an issue when composing evaluation teams, but rather a result of the tendering organisation's efforts at putting together highly competent evaluation teams with relevant experience and background.

A gender-balanced team composition does not always mean that gender issues become more focused during the evaluation process or in the evaluation reports. There are several examples that there are females in the team, but where a gender perspective remains relatively poorly dealt with in the reports.⁶ There are also examples of high female representation in evaluations that do mainstream a gender perspective throughout the report.⁷ It is worth noting, however, that there are no examples of evaluations which include gender relevance on all the six dimensions and which have no females on the team.

2.5 Gender Awareness when Selecting Interviewees

It would appear from the scores in Tables 1 and 2 below that the gender mix of interviewees in part reflects the topic being evaluated. In those cases where the topic is gender sensitive according to priority areas in the Strategy, the ratio of female to male interviewees is higher than in those cases where the gender issue is not explicitly addressed.

However, one has to be careful in drawing conclusions based on the lists of interviewed persons and institutions. The selection of interviewees is partly determined on the basis of the ToR and the evaluation design and methodology. The evaluator may have limited ability to secure a gender-balanced set of interviewees irrespective of how aware they are of the gender perspective. In several cases, it is observed that interviewees from donor organisations are well balanced from a gender perspective, whereas the interviewees in recipient country governments, NGOs and the private sector tend to be men.

The review team has also observed that in several evaluation reports the overview of interviewees (if listed) is such that one cannot identify their gender. Initials only may be given instead of a first name, and no "Mr" or "Ms" was indicated.

⁶ 3.99 *Decentralisation and Development*, 7.97 *Aid as a Tool for Promotion of Human Rights and Democracy: What can Norway do?*, 12.97 *Cooperation for Health Development. WHO's support to Programmes at Country level (synthesis report)*, 8.98 *The Norwegian Program for Indigenous Peoples*, 5.00 *Evaluation of the NUFU Programme*, 6.00 *Making Governments Smaller and More Efficient*.

⁷ 2.99 *International Planned Parenthood Federation*, 3.99 *Evaluation of Support to Psycho-Social Projects in Bosnia-Herzegovina and the Caucasus*.

3 Conclusions Based on all 63 Reports

Applying the study methodology described above, score points on a 1 – 5 scale have been established for each of the five gender perspective questions (see Section 1.2.1) for each year of evaluation reports. In order to reduce the many pitfalls associated with interpretation when treating various evaluations as one homogenous group with regard to how reasonable and relevant it would be to expect an explicit gender perspective in the evaluation ToR, design and methodology, evaluation reports/topics have been divided into two distinct groups. The first is a ‘positive’ group and the other a ‘negative’ group, the latter including those evaluations where it would appear reasonable not to expect an explicit inclusion of a gender perspective.

The detailed results are presented in Annex 2. For an overview of the findings, see Tables 1 and 2 below. Table 1 shows the average annual scores for each of the 5 gender perspective questions addressed to the examined evaluation reports.

Unsurprisingly, one finds that the average scores for the whole 1997-2004 period of evaluation reports is markedly higher for all five evaluation design and process related questions for those evaluations where one would have expected such questions to be addressed (Table 1), compared to the scores in those evaluations where one would not expect such questions to be a key issue (those summarised in Table 2).

While this review has found some “good practice” evaluations when applying a gender mainstreaming criterion, the scores as regards ToR, design and methodology are generally not impressive. However, the scores have been gradually improving over time. The sample of evaluation reports in each of the two categories (“positive” and “negative”) is, however, far too small for any statistically reliable conclusions to be drawn.

As for those evaluations where one would have expected some attention to gender perspectives in the ToR, design and methodology, Table 1 clearly shows that indeed the outcome is as one would have expected. At the same time, one observes roughly the same scores for both categories of evaluation reports as regards the gender composition of evaluation teams and interviewees. This clearly suggests that mainstreaming of gender considerations has been implemented when composing evaluation teams and selecting interviewees, and that this applies universally irrespective of a gender perspective being an explicit part of the topic being evaluated.

Table 1. Average annual point score (1-5 scale) for evaluation reports where it was considered reasonable to expect⁸ an explicit gender perspective in the evaluation task

Gender perspective question	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	Average
How has the gender perspective been reflected with reference to design of the evaluations?	2.00	2.38	3.11	2.86	3.25	3.00	5.00	-	3.09
To what extent has a gender perspective been integrated into the ToR for the evaluations?	1.29	1.46	2.78	1.86	2.50	3.00	3.00	-	2.27
Regarding the evaluation methodology chosen, has the gender perspective been reflected?	2.33	2.54	3.11	2.71	3.25	3.00	5.00	-	3.13
To what extent has there been attention to gender when interviewees have been selected?	2.67	3.75	4.20	4.67	4.00	5.00	3.00	-	3.90
To what extent has gender been an issue regarding the composition of evaluation teams?	3.25	4.08	3.56	3.71	4.75	5.00	2.00	-	3.76

Table 2. Average annual point score (1-5 scale) for evaluation reports where it was NOT considered reasonable to expect an explicit gender perspective in the evaluation task

Gender perspective question	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	Average
How has the gender perspective been reflected with reference to design of the evaluations?	1.67	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.08
To what extent has a gender perspective been integrated into the ToR for the evaluations?	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Regarding the evaluation methodology chosen, has the gender perspective been reflected?	1.67	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.08
To what extent has there been attention to gender when interviewees have been selected?	3.00	n.a.	2.00	3.50	3.00	4.50	4.00	4.00	3.29
To what extent has gender been an issue regarding the composition of evaluation teams?	4.33	5.00	5.00	3.67	1.00	2.50	2.50	4.00	3.50

8 Defined according to priority areas highlighted in the Strategy.

4 The Gender Perspective Reflected in the Findings of 24 Selected Evaluations

4.1 Review Approach

4.1.1 The Evaluation Reports

The second part of this review focuses on the substantive content of the evaluation reports examined. In this regard one has to take into account the wide heterogeneity of actions, sectors, projects and programmes that these evaluations cover, which makes a direct quantitative comparison of the evaluation reports difficult, if not impossible.

A total of 24 evaluation reports produced between 1997-2004 were pre-selected by Norad for this part of the review on the basis of their thematic linkage to the priority areas set out in the Strategy (see section 1.1). In other words, there was an *a priori* assumption of a strong gender focus in the projects and programmes subject to evaluation.

Table 3: Thematic linkage of selected evaluation reports (issue/volume) to priority areas in the Norwegian Strategy for Women and Gender Equality

Rights	Decision-making processes	Economic participation	Education	Health	Management of natural resources, environment	Other
7.97	3.97	1.03	5.97	1.97	10.00	10.97
8.98	6.00		2.98	12.97	3.04	3.03
3.99	6.01		2.00	2.99		
1.01	1.04		5.00	1.00		
4.02	2.04		2.03			

The evaluation reports above are categorised according to their predominant focus but may in practice cover several priority areas.⁹

4.2 Findings

4.2.1 Women as a Target Group

Women are specifically mentioned as one or one of several target groups in ten of the 24 evaluation reports. The remaining reports have no specific reference to women, but may be directed to groups of professionals, e.g. journalists, to strengthening research collaboration in general or to government institutions. There are examples of programmes in which the overall programme strategy makes clear that targeting of women is a goal, but where the programme appears to have followed this up only to a limited extent.¹⁰

⁹ First of all, the priority areas are broadly defined in the Strategy itself, and there is no clear-cut distinction between the different themes. The distinction between "rights" and "decision-making" are particularly blurred, as human rights and democracy are often dealt with in the same evaluation report. Programmes may include sub-components that are strongly geared toward e.g. economic participation of women through credit schemes or income generating activities but still become categorised under the "rights" heading because this is the main focus of the programme under scrutiny. Promotion of female education may be an integral part of sub-components under programmes addressing health issues. Programmes addressing peace-building and post-war conflict resolution may furthermore include components which may be justified under several of the six thematic priority areas.

¹⁰ See 1.97 Norwegian Assistance to Prevent and Control HIV/AIDS, and 5.00 The NUFU programme.

Generally speaking, specific targeting of women may be needed as an initial step to enhance gender equality in some contexts and situations. Female war victims may for example have very specific needs which can often only be dealt with through specific projects for women. Support to credit or income-generating schemes may be other cases where specific targeting is relevant. One evaluation, *1.97 Norwegian Assistance to Prevent and Control HIV/AIDS*, brings to the forefront a concern that moving from targeted approaches to more general community approaches may dilute attention to the specific needs of women, but the evaluation team is nevertheless in favour of a move towards a less targeted approach.

A main observation is, however, that the evaluation reports provide no clear indications that targeting women has been followed through in the main strategies of the programmes. The programme development objectives and measures only rarely include a gender equality perspective and with a few exceptions, limited resources appear to be used for small, targeted interventions for women. The potential advantage that specific targeting may give in terms of offering an opportunity for a separate budget line may be outweighed by the limited financial support allocated through such budget lines. This is illustrated for example in the evaluation of *2.03 The Norwegian Education Trust Fund for Africa (NETF)* in the World Bank where it is stated that girls' education is one of the goals of the NETF. Yet, in 2002 the overall disbursement for girls' education was only one percent of the total for activities related to this goal.

4.2.2 Gender-Specific Analysis

Key questions related to how women's needs and interests have informed initial decisions on programme design are:

- Are the problems /conditions for women and men described?
- Are there gender disaggregated statistics?
- Do the objectives affect men/women?
- Are the activities addressed to men/women?
- Are the expected results different for men/women?
- Whose demands are met?

The extent to which the projects/programmes have been based on such analysis is unclear. The review has to be based entirely on what the evaluation reports say in this regard. Only twelve of the 24 evaluation reports contain some information about women's needs and interests. In *2.98 Institutional Cooperation between Sokoine and the Norwegian Agricultural University*, the evaluation team raised a concern that women's needs for higher education programmes in the field of agriculture are not met within the programme to the extent expected given their vital role in Tanzania's agricultural sector. In *5.97 Aid to Basic Education in Africa* the rationale for addressing female education is associated with the benefits of reduced fertility and mortality among children and improved family welfare. Women's own rights to education are not addressed.

Although a few references to the situation of women are made in about half of the evaluation reports, these do not appear to be the result of deliberate analyses at the onset of the project. Absence of appropriate information at the starting point is likely to have influenced programme policy frameworks, strategies and choice of activities, and resulted in less gender-responsive approaches. One cannot, of course, rule out the possibility that it is the evaluation teams that have overlooked gender-responsive mainstream activities, but such cases are probably rare as most evaluation teams are likely to take advantage whenever gender-relevant baseline data exist and highlight these in the report.

There are examples that women's needs and interests have been successfully added on at later stages of a programme's development. In the *8.98 Programme for Indigenous Peoples*, women in Peru had started to complain that only men reaped programme benefits. Thorough

consultations with the concerned women resulted in a project on health education and awareness-raising with regard to reproductive rights. Despite being reported as a success, there is no indication that similar projects were replicated elsewhere in the programme areas or that a gender perspective became a cross-cutting issue in the programme at large. In general, the evaluation reports contain too little information to enable an assessment of the prospects of other projects which are added on to an ongoing programme becoming entry points for gender mainstreaming in the entire programme.

In one report (*3.99 Norwegian Support to Psycho-Social Projects in Bosnia-Herzegovina and the Caucasus*) consultation with women as part of the evaluation process revealed that unless a profound analysis of women's needs and interests is carried out before projects are designed, strategies and activities may not be designed to address women's real needs. The evaluation team points out that probably as a result of a strong focus on women as victims of rape during the conflict, the international donor community faced strong pressure to start up projects to heal the wounds of violated women. The problem was, however, that in some of these projects, women did not report that such violations had taken place, and that they indeed had other needs which ought to be met such as income generating activities and education. Regardless of new evidence being brought into the picture, the evaluation team reported that project staff continued to treat women as rape victims and that it was difficult to change the initial approaches to other areas which better corresponded to the need for women to overcome the traumas of war. Indeed, the evaluation report concluded that women tend to be unnecessarily treated as clients or "beneficiaries" instead of active participants and contributors to the rebuilding of a war-torn society.

4.2.3 Evidence of Targets Set for Women's Participation

Two issues may be relevant here:

- (i) The degree to which women are included in project activities
- (ii) The degree to which there is a gender balance among staff in implementing organisations

In those programmes and projects which have established separate components, e.g. income generating schemes, advocacy and awareness, for women, there is obviously a high degree of participation. One evaluation report points out that women do use the services provided and participate in various aspects of the project. The evaluation criticises the programme for failing to take men's needs into consideration and for not addressing different age groups. The evaluation points out that young men for example need different programmes from young women and married men.

Gender balance and active participation of women in all decision-making bodies is a pre-requisite for successful gender mainstreaming. None of the evaluation reports provides information about targets for women's participation in such bodies or in general project and programme activities. Such targets could for example be in the form of affirmative action to recruit females to positions which have been dominated by men, or specific targets for enhancing gender capacity and competence in policy-making and management structures through training and capacity building efforts.

Numerical balance between men and women staff in an organisation is important, but not the only essential point in gender mainstreaming. Access to decision-making bodies is another point to take into consideration. This is highlighted in evaluation report *1.01 The Norwegian Human Rights Fund* where most implementing organisations appear to have reached a numerical balance between men and women among staff, but where men have the most important jobs in terms of influence and decision-making. In some cases, in particular for the projects addressing education and health, there are references to global and Norwegian development goals of gender equality and gender parity in access and participation, but in general this aspect appears to be largely overlooked.

There is evidence that some programmes have tried to address the fact that women are not participating to the same degree as men. The NUFU programme organised a seminar with the purpose of identifying strategies to improve its performance in this regard. The evaluation states that this seminar was important, but does not specify what strategies and recommendations came out of it. At the time of the evaluation, no efforts had been made as part of the programme to follow up the outcome of the seminar.

It appears that women are often perceived as weak and vulnerable. Women's strengths and resources are seldom mentioned. The tendency to group women together with children as a target group (HIV/AIDS) or lump them into a category as "vulnerable" beneficiaries (Human Rights) without any further diversification may negatively affect women's participation rates both in programmes and in decision-making bodies, which in turn may lead to marginalisation and exclusion.

4.2.4 Gender Equality as a Development Objective

There is no example among the 24 reports where it is explicitly mentioned that the achievement of gender equality is an overarching objective of the programme.

Several evaluations (e.g. 1.97, 7.97, 2.99) mention that general development objectives would not be achieved unless women are empowered and men get involved in all activities. Such references however are fragmented with no accompanying analysis with regard to how empowerment and involvement could reduce gender inequality and positively influence overall programme goals, efficiency of implementation strategies, effectiveness, sustainability and impact.

Two evaluations relate to governance, a highly profiled Norwegian policy area (3.97 *Evaluation of decentralisation and development* and 6.00 *Making Government Smaller and more Efficient*). Both reports highlight the need for more efficient and decentralised governance as a means for reaching overall development objectives. None of them, however, reflects on the importance of bringing a gender perspective into this. The issue of decentralisation is one of the aspects which are particularly important in terms of gender mainstreaming. Decentralisation will bring resources and decision-making power closer to the communities and the local government. This highlights the need for a gender-balanced representation in local government structures, and also the need for participatory mechanisms that involve both men and women from a wider community in decision-making and policy-making contexts.

4.2.5 Gender-Relevant Results

There are two levels of emphasis in this context:

(i) The implementation process

The Review Team looked for evidence in the evaluation reports that the implementation process itself had been gender-sensitive. This may allow for an identification of hindrances and obstacles as well as adjustment of existing and future activities. In order to monitor whether the implementation process is gender-sensitive, one should establish how and to what extent projects and programmes highlight gender issues in their ongoing reporting systems during the process of implementation. Few, if any, of the evaluation reports provide enough information on this point to reach any conclusion. Information in relation to reporting systems is written in gender-neutral terms.

Several programmes have offered opportunities for policy dialogue between the Norwegian aid administration, programme managers, coordinators, implementing partners, researchers and others through board meetings and other policy forums. No reference is made to whether the gender profile of programmes has been subject to debate during such meetings.

(ii) *Progress and results*

The other level of emphasis focuses on whether there is evidence of progress towards substantive goals. An assessment of results requires that indicators must have been developed at an earlier stage of project development and that it is possible to track the delivery of specific gender-relevant outputs (activities) and outcomes (results) and demonstrate that these have the intended effects.

It should be noted that in eleven of the 24 evaluation reports there is no reference to progress towards substantive gender relevant goals at all. Unsurprisingly, all of these reflect projects and programmes in which no reference is made to women as a specific focus or as one of several targets groups in the programme. In ten of the 24 evaluation reports there is furthermore no information about how women's and men's needs and interests have been analysed. On this basis one may draw the conclusion that when there is no emphasis on women as a target group and no gender analysis has been conducted to inform development of programme objectives, strategies and activities at the initial stage of the project, the likelihood that there will be any gender-relevant results in the project or programme is very small. It should be noted that nine of the eleven reports which do not contain any information on gender-relevant results also lack emphasis on gender in the ToR for the evaluation team.

The evaluation reports suffer from the recurrent weakness that there is little or no baseline information or indicators developed that can be used to track whether the outputs and outcomes have been delivered as originally intended. Even when some results are reported, these are mostly kept at output level, while there is hardly any reference to outcomes and even less to effects or impact.

Several examples illustrate this point. Information can be vague and descriptive as is the case in report *1.97 Norwegian Assistance to Prevent and Control HIV/AIDS* where references are made to the fact that a programme on family planning and health education has been established in Uganda without following this point through with further information about the quality of these services, how women and men have received the services differently and whether this has strengthened the position of women and men to make informed decisions with regard to risky sexual behaviour. Several sub-components aim towards generating income for women, but there is no information about whether income has actually been generated or not, nor is there any comparison to a counterfactual scenario or baseline that should have been established at the start-up of the project/programme.

References to the gender perspectives in the report *7.97 Aid as a Tool for Human Rights and Democracy: What can Norway do?* are entirely descriptive. It is pointed out that there is a lack of evaluation of the human rights and democratisation portfolio (p. 73) but that such support to projects and programmes is generally perceived as fairly successful. It is unclear whether this perception includes an assessment of the gender perspective, but some specific projects are mentioned as positive e.g. "Women and Law in Southern Africa". There is no follow up of what the positive outcomes of this highly profiled project are or were intended to be. There are plenty of issues that potentially could have been brought forward in a discussion of what Norway can do and to some extent is already doing in promoting a gender sensitive approach to human rights and democracy. Rights to access to land, property and social justice, security issues such as trafficking of women, how to ensure political inclusion in decision-making bodies, incorporation of CEDAW (Convention to Eliminate All forms of Discrimination Against Women) into policy dialogues and so forth. Many of these issues are highlighted in the Strategy and would be obvious candidates for further scrutiny.

The Norwegian policy objective of introducing gender-sensitive approaches to peace building and at all stages of conflict-resolution appears to have met with limited success according to two evaluation reports on the subject¹¹.

The first report does not bring women or gender issues into the discussion and analysis at all. The second report gives an overview of Norwegian policies and experiences with peace-building efforts. It is quite clear that the need for mainstreaming gender issues and making these a cross-cutting theme in all interventions is highlighted as central in Norwegian policy guidelines. Nonetheless, projects or interventions that have followed this through appear to be few and far between. The report makes a brief reference to a couple of projects designed specifically for women (e.g. in Guatemala), but there is no further reference to how these projects are strategically linked to activities for building peace and democracy in the country or how the participating women benefit from the project. This evaluation too points to the lack of clearly defined goals and means to verify effects as a general problem for many of the projects in the socio-economic category.

In general, gender relevant results are reported with reference to specific projects for women. These projects are often minor, isolated sub-components with weak linkages to the main project activities, and outcomes and effects of these projects on women's lives are seldom analysed. To the extent that effects are referred to these are often in the form of statements such as "good" or "positive" and not based on qualitative or quantitative measurements.

The use of statistical categories which are explicitly broken down by gender are required for assessment of clearly quantifiable targets. One of the evaluation teams (*5.00 The NUFU programme*) points out that it is not possible to evaluate whether the results of 30% female trainees are good or not as long as there is no data on the percentage of female staff in the institutions in the South or the participation rate in various disciplines.

4.2.6 Gender-Relevant Recommendations

To the extent that the evaluation team makes any recommendations with regard to gender mainstreaming, there is a tendency to insert these in the text in more or less arbitrary ways. Very few evaluations bring such recommendations through to the main section of the report where lessons learned, recommendations and ways forward are highlighted. Thus in 22 of the 24 evaluation reports there is no recommendation with relevance to gender. Only two reports contain brief references to gender¹². Also in these two reports fairly vague statements are made such as the "need to reinforce gender awareness" and "girls' education needs to be consolidated", without any information on what this would imply in terms of programme strategies, actions or change of direction in the programme.

Table 4 below provides an overview of the 24 evaluation reports according to the above-mentioned review criteria.

11 1.04 *Towards a Strategic Framework for Peacebuilding: Getting Their Act Together* and 2.04 *Norwegian Peacebuilding Policies: Lessons Learnt and Challenges Ahead*.

12 See 2.99 *International Planned Parenthood Federation* and 2.03 *The Norwegian Education Trust Fund for Africa*.

Table 4. Overview of the 24 evaluation reports according to review criteria

Report	Women as a target group	Specific gender needs analysis	Evidence of targets set for women's participation	Gender-relevant results	Mainstreaming of gender-relevant recommendations
1.97 Norwegian Assistance to Prevent and Control HIV/AIDS	Overall programme strategy: Yes Tanzania: Few interventions directed towards women Zambia: Initially commercial sex workers - later general community Uganda: Women targeted for income generation NGO	Women headed households, poverty, work-load and over-representation in statistics mentioned. Empowerment of women and men's involvement mentioned	No specific target for programme per se. Women's participation is implicit in several sub-components e.g in women's groups	Credit schemes for women's groups. No demonstration of effects.	None
3.97 Decentralization and Development	Not mentioned specifically	No reference	No	No information	None
5.97 Aid to Basic Education in Africa	Not mentioned specifically	Poor. Primary school attendance is prerequisite for reducing fertility, mortality etc.	Unclear information	No information	None
7.97 Aid as a Tool for Promotion of Human Rights and Democracy	Partly. Women mentioned as a possible target group for assistance to vulnerable groups	No reference. Brief mentioning of women's rights as human rights	No	One projects on women's rights in Zambia. No demonstration of effects	None
12.97 Cooperation for Health Development. WHO's support to programmes at country level	Not mentioned specifically	No reference	No	No information	None
10.97 Norwegian Assistance to IPS	Not mentioned specifically	No reference	No	No information	None
2.98 Institutional Cooperation between Sokoine and the Norwegian Agricultural University	Not mentioned specifically	Ref to women's critical roles in agriculture and absence of relevant data in the programme	No	Gender issues have not received particular attention. Reference to women being only a fraction of candidates produced. No information beyond number of female students, staffs and fellows	None
8.98 The Norwegian Program for Indigenous Peoples	Overall programme: No A few projects e.g. in Peru has women as specific target group	No analysis in programme at large. One project in Peru on reproductive health has evidence of being based on analysis of women's needs	No	Peru Case has successfully highlighted women as independent actors in reproductive health matters. Beyond this "the programme has missed emphasis on gender equality"	None
2.99 International Planned Parenthood Federation	Yes. Women target group in most projects	Reference to inadequate analysis of women's problems and needs. Women perceived as rape victims despite poor evidence	Clientisation of women as beneficiaries and not as participants is highlighted as negative	Services are generally good. The report emphasises that little observation of gender aspects in practice in some projects	Need to reinforce gender awareness
3.99 The Norwegian Support to Psycho-Social Projects in Bosnia-Herz. and Caucasus	Yes. Women as main target group in most projects	Focus on safe motherhood, reproductive health, MCH through different channels of aid	No	Focus on integration and social networks good. Sustainability is questioned.	None
1.00 Norwegian Health Related Development 1988-97	Yes. Norwegian policy statements on e.g women's reproductive health rights, safe motherhood. Strengthening of women's rights and primary health care			Allocations to MCH and family planning the largest sub-sector in bilateral and multilateral aid and constitute 72% of multi-bi budgets.	None

Report	Women as a target group	Specific gender needs analysis	Evidence of targets set for women's participation	Gender-relevant results	Mainstreaming of gender-relevant recommendations
2.00 Norwegian Support to the Education Sector 1988-98	Yes. Highlighting Norwegian policies for targeting women. All sub-sectors target women specifically	Trends and policies for both mainstreaming and specific projects for women. Ref to UN Beijing PoA and N. Women's Strategy	DAC WID statistics	Projects promoting female education have been supported through all channels and all levels of education. Statistical reporting shows absence of gender dimension in 753 projects out of 1038 projects	None
5.00 The NUFU programme	Yes. Commitment towards women's perspective and gender integration in NUFU Agreement	Reference to NUFU seminar in how to deal with gender issues. The report does not refer to specific outcomes of this seminar	Discussion of lack of relevant data on percentage of female staff in institutions in the South or on the participation rate for women in various disciplines	Evaluation states that the programme is not strong on gender. 30% of trainees are female-most at the level of technicians	None
6.00 Making Governments Smaller and More Efficient	Not mentioned specifically	No analysis	No specific approach	No information	None
10.00 Taken for Granted. The Norwegian Special Grant for Environment	Not mentioned specifically	No analysis	No specific approach	Gender is relevant in 11% of projects but not commented further	None
1.01 The Norwegian Human Rights Fund	Yes. Women's rights are targeted. India: Women are most important Nigeria and Liberia less clear	Ref. to severe violations of women's rights, sexual discrimination, domestic violence, access to services	Little information about targets for participation of women. Gender balance in staff composition in most NGOs, but men have the most important jobs	13% of the fund for women's rights. In training of rights, advocacy, alternative income in India	None
6.01 Can Democratization Prevent Conflict? The Bergen Seminar	No specific information	No analysis	No specific approach	No information	None
4.02 Legal Aid Against All Odds	No specific information	No analysis	No specific approach	No information	None
1.03 The Norwegian Investment Fund for Developing Countries (Norfund)	No specific information	No analysis	No specific approach	No information	None
2.03 The Norwegian Education Trust Fund for Africa in the World Bank	Yes. Girls' education is one of the sub-component. Special measures for girls' education are included in all sector programmes	Reference to strategies for removing barriers for girls' education. Appear to be implicitly assumed that these correspond to problems women face	Different country strategies, workshops, seminars	3% of disbursement have been for girls' education. The amount spent on girls' education has fallen from 4% in 1998-99 to 1% in 2002. In 8 of 13 participating countries there was no disbursement in 2002	Girls' education needs to be consolidated, but no further information about implications
3.03 Bistandstorgets evaluerings-nettverk	No specific information	No analysis	No specific approach	No information	None
1.04 Towards a Strategic Framework for Peacebuilding: the Joint Utstein Study	No specific information	No analysis	No specific approach	No information	None
2.04 Norwegian Peacebuilding policies. Lessons learnt challenges ahead	Yes. Norwegian policies underline the focus on women's rights and participation	No analysis	No specific approach	Ref. to projects in Afghanistan and Guatemala and to women's rights issues	None
3.04 CESAR's Activities in the Middle East	No specific information	No analysis	No specific approach	No information	None

5 Tentative Assessment

As evidenced by this Review, the gender perspective has not been satisfactorily addressed in evaluation reports during the period 1997-2004. The extent to which gender has been addressed does not seem to be related to any specific year or channel of aid distribution. The lack of focus on gender is evenly spread across all channels.

There is also no clear consistency with regard to the sub-sector or type of programme that has been evaluated. Despite being thematically linked to the priority areas set forth in the Norwegian Strategy for Women and Gender Equality, few of the 24 evaluations established specific gender relevance in the various aspects of the evaluation research itself.

Table 5. Overall rating of gender perspective in the 24 selected evaluations according to strategy themes (Rating: Poor: *; Fair: **; Good:***)

Rights	Decision-making processes	Economic participation	Education	Health	Natural resources, environment	Other
7.97*	3.97*	1.03*	5.97*	1.97*	10.00*	10.97*
8.98*	6.00*		2.98**	12.97*	3.04*	3.03*
3.99*	6.01*		2.00***	2.99***		
1.01*	1.04*		5.00**	1.00**		
4.02*	2.04*		2.03*			

The overall rating of the 24 selected evaluation reports shown in Table 5 is based on the analysis in Chapter 4 above, as presented in Table 4. Table 5 shows that among the 24 evaluations in the sample, nineteen are rated as "poor". In practice this means that these evaluations hardly pay any attention to gender at all. As with nearly all such ratings they are not meant as an accurate measure or score, but serve as illustrations of the general impression based on a fairly thorough review of the reports. The poor ratings are spread across all the sectors, although some better scores can be observed within the social sectors as compared to sectors such as human rights and democracy and projects that are related to overall institutional performance.

In terms of channels of assistance, it appears that Norwegian NGOs and local NGOs which are contracted to implement parts of a larger programme address women and gender issues fairly consistently both in terms of targeted project components and in the evaluation approach. It appears that NGOs have most contact with women and women's organisations in the field. One of the programmes¹³ under the NGO umbrella reflects fairly new partnership models in which all the individual members flag gender equality as an organisational priority, but the following up of this in practical operations remains patchy and uneven.

13 E.g. 1.01 The Norwegian Human Rights Fund is a network of 7 Norwegian NGOs.

Bilateral development assistance remains important as a source for funding for gender mainstreaming and in principle the scope for translating Norwegian policy issues related to mainstreaming gender issues in project direction and implementation is high. Country-to-country assistance is usually based on well-established relationships that provide a solid basis for dialogue and cooperation. Long term relationships enhance possibilities for generating knowledge and experience about local conditions on the Norwegian side which in turn could be translated into appropriate practical mainstreaming initiatives. Unfortunately none of the evaluation reports discusses how gender issues have been brought to the fore in direct policy dialogue, annual meetings or in the follow-up progress reports during implementation. It should be noted that over the years there have been major changes in the way development cooperation works. One of these changes is the shift from individual projects to sector-wide approaches, but none of the evaluation reports in the sample addressed such initiatives.

Some of the evaluation reports¹⁴ cover multilateral assistance, but they are synthesis reports of larger evaluations. Whereas multilateral funding priorities by definition reflect the consensus of multiple actors and resources are spread across a broad geographic scale, the review of these evaluations provides too little information on mainstreaming efforts to make any conclusions about the effectiveness of multilateral organisations in this regard.

This immediately points to an overall concern that gender mainstreaming policies have not successfully been understood or followed up in many evaluations. Instead of bringing a gender perspective into discussions, analysis and presentations, it appears that even in the reports concerning highly relevant priority areas, women's issues and a broader gender perspective have become more or less invisible.

More seriously, however, is the concern arising from the observation that gender mainstreaming was not a focal issue in the projects and programmes when these were originally designed. That being the case, one could hardly expect it to be a prominent feature in the evaluations of the very same projects.

This observation also points to the serious generic weakness of not designing projects, and their monitoring indicators with subsequent evaluations in mind.

¹⁴ E.g. 12.97 *Cooperation for Health Development. WHO's support to the programmes at country level* and 2.99 *International Planned Parenthood Federation*.

6 Conclusions and Recommendations

6.1 Conclusions

The question of addressing gender equality in evaluations is closely linked to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals. Furthermore, there is hardly any other policy issue that has been so much profiled in policy frameworks to guide Norwegian development assistance over the years, and internationally Norway has a strong image as a country in which gender equality is highly valued.

Despite the emphasis on gender equality in policies guiding development assistance, gender has not been a key issue in evaluations conducted in the period 1997-2004.

This conclusion is based on the following findings:

- Of the total number of 63 evaluations conducted, 48 scored in the range of 1-3 (on a 1-5 scale) on the question of whether the gender perspective has been reflected with reference to the design of the evaluations. 36 of these evaluations received score 1, which means that there is no reflection of this perspective at all. In general, the average score was markedly higher for those evaluation reports where one would expect an explicit gender focus in accordance with the Strategy.
- 52 evaluations of the total of 63 scored in the range of 1-3 on the question of whether a gender perspective had been included in the ToR. Of these 52, as many as 38 of the ToRs did not include the gender perspective at all. In those ToRs where the gender perspective is fully mainstreamed and at the same time explicitly addressed, the evaluators have followed the ToR. The average score for those evaluations where it was considered reasonable to expect a gender perspective to be made explicit was 2.27 and 1 in those where it was not reasonable to expect such a perspective.¹⁵
- Several evaluation teams were well balanced from a gender composition perspective, but the review of 63 reports points out that this is quite uncorrelated to the degree of gender perspective incorporated in the evaluation topic and the ToR. This is confirmed in the second part of the Review, where ten evaluations included women in a minority on the teams, but thirteen evaluations scored high on this point.
- Among the 24 evaluation reports which were considered from a thematic point of view, the connection between gender issues and the policy or intervention being evaluated had been made explicit in only thirteen of the cases.
- In eighteen of the 24 reports there was no information about specific efforts or approaches taken to investigate how the gender perspective had been included. Gender impact assessments to examine the impact of policies on women and men have been little used in the evaluation approaches.
- In eleven of the evaluations no reference was made to gender-related achievements. In this connection it is important to note that even the briefest statement or description of what had been accomplished was taken as positive in this review.
- Ten of the 24 evaluations had no visibility of gender issues. Eight of the evaluations had sentences or some paragraphs, statements and a few figures that contained some gender-specific information. It appears that few of the projects and programmes evaluated had gender disaggregated research information and statistics, as well as monitoring systems, in place. The remaining eight reports had made efforts to mainstream gender issues throughout the report.

¹⁵ It should be noted that when the expression "reasonable to expect" is used, this is on the basis that issues/themes under consideration are highlighted in the "Strategy for Women and Gender Equality in Development Cooperation (1997-2005)".

- 21 of the 24 evaluation reports did not include any specific future action to be taken with regard to the gender perspective.
- Evaluations of initiatives related to social sectors are to some extent highlighting gender issues better than evaluations in other sectors but overall the Review of the selected sample did not find a consistent pattern or trend regarding this point.
- The Review did not find that female representation in the team necessarily makes a difference with regards to how the evaluation is conducted or how findings are presented in evaluations. It is not known how much weight has been put on incorporating gender specialists in the evaluation teams.

Mainstreaming gender issues means making gender issues explicit as a cross-cutting theme across all interventions, including in monitoring and evaluations. In principle all evaluation teams should be encouraged to highlight gender issues in all major studies and analyses that constitute the evaluation process, regardless of whether this is mentioned in the ToR or not. The development cooperation system should also ensure that the evaluation team is made accountable for this task through making such expectations clear from the very start of the process.

The question of why gender has not been included in evaluation reports has not been investigated in this Review, but some comments should nevertheless be made:

- One reason may be that those who commission an evaluation make some *a priori* assumptions with regard to the relevance of gender issues in the case of a particular evaluation. This may be justified in some cases. It is difficult, however, to reconcile the absence of a gender perspective in the majority of evaluation reports, with the backing of Norwegian development cooperation policy.
- Perception of relevance may be one issue. Gender issues are not the only issues that should be given emphasis in an evaluation. There might even be cases where it is justifiable to leave those issues out of the ToR. It is, however, highly unlikely that it can be justified to leave them out completely in 38 of the ToRs and give only a vague statement of the matter in 14 others.
- Another reason may be found in the general complexity of evaluation tasks. Most evaluations are overloaded with tasks to be investigated and assessed and ToRs are usually full of competing demands. Gender issues are not the only policy that evaluation teams have to respond to. How to balance competing demands should, however, be the concern of the evaluation team and not be pre-emptively assessed so that gender-relevant expectations are left out of the ToR in cases where these issues are relevant.

In conclusion, results with reference to both design and findings are not impressive, but the Review team does not infer an intentional pattern of deliberate exclusion of a gender perspective on the part of the individual evaluation teams as such.

Rather the results may be related to some “intangible” or “informal” aspects of an evaluation culture which tends to make women and gender equality invisible at many stages of the evaluation process ranging from design to reporting of findings.

More seriously, however, is the concern arising from this observation that gender mainstreaming was not a focal issue in the projects and programmes when these were originally designed. That being the case, one could hardly expect it to be a prominent feature in the evaluations of the very same projects.

This observation also points to the fundamental generic weakness of not designing projects, and their monitoring indicators with subsequent evaluations in mind.

6.2 Recommendations

In terms of recommendations, there is probably not one sweeping measure that can secure the problem of gender-sensitive evaluations. This has to be addressed in a broad sense at several levels. It requires a pragmatic technical approach to the manner in which evaluations are conducted. Furthermore, it requires accountability of the development assistance system to ensure that emphasis is put on this issue. At the same time, it requires a careful understanding of the influencing mechanisms by which women can become marginalised in development assistance unless specific efforts are made to ensure the opposite effects.

The fundamental weakness that has led to the above findings and conclusions is to be found in the project- and programme cycle process as practiced. What is needed is a profound attitudinal change and associated awareness-raising regarding the incorporation (or mainstreaming) of the evaluation activity as an integral component of project and programme designs. This must be established routinely in terms of explicit formulation of baselines (ideally; counterfactual development paths) with a set of carefully chosen project-specific monitoring indicators. This must be accompanied by agreed procedures and capacity for data collection throughout the project cycle. This will pave the way for the conduction of appropriate and timely evaluations if and when it is decided that the programme/project in question is selected for evaluation or periodic review. It is at this early stage in the project cycle that inclusion of the strategic gender dimensions in development cooperation must be secured.

What is possible, however, is to make recommendations about how evaluations are managed, designed and implemented:

- The ToR should clarify what Norad expects in terms of gender focus for each evaluation exercise. Connections between the project, policy or intervention in question and the women and men it directly affects should be made clear from the start whenever gender relevance is considered to be high.
- Gender equality experts or representatives should be involved in developing the ToR.
- In the cases where an explicit gender focus is to be given weight in the evaluation, and this is mutually agreed upon from the start, the Evaluation Department must ensure that this is properly reflected throughout the evaluation process cycle.

Annex 1: Terms of Reference

Gender and Development: A Review of Evaluations 1997-2004

1. Background

Norway has been committed to promoting the rights of women through its development cooperation since the mid-1970s. Much of the work done by Norway involving women and gender equality is directed at strengthening women's rights and their participation at the political arena, but also at major programmes particularly in the health and education sectors. The share of the Norwegian development assistance budget that particularly targets women and gender equality amounts to around one third of bilateral assistance (Norad's Annual Report 2003). In 1997 "A Strategy for Women and Gender Equality in Development Cooperation"¹⁶ was launched by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA). The Strategy advocates a dual approach which involves integrating gender perspectives in all activities and at all levels of development cooperation (*mainstreaming*) on the one hand, and on the other promoting gender equality by targeting women or men.

The Strategy outlines six priority areas for supporting women and gender equality:

- Rights
- Participation in decision-making processes
- Economic participation
- Education
- Health
- Management of natural resources and the environment

This review involves an examination of how the various aspects of the Strategy have been reflected in evaluation reports commissioned by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs during the period 1997-2004, with reference to both the design and the findings of the evaluations in question.

2. Purpose and Scope of the Review

The proposed review of evaluation reports is not envisaged to establish the effects of Norwegian development cooperation on the lives of women in developing countries. Rather, the review will only be able to present an overview of how the gender perspective has been integrated into the various aspects of conducting evaluations, and how the gender perspective has been reflected in some selected projects and programmes which have been evaluated. The review shall consist of the following main components and underlying questions:

2.1. The Gender Perspective Reflected in the Design of Evaluations

Based on a review of all evaluation reports that have been issued by the MFA in the period 1997-2004 (see Appendix I), how has the gender perspective been reflected with reference to the design of the evaluations? To what extent has a gender perspective been integrated into the ToR for the evaluations? Regarding the methodology chosen for the evaluations, has the gender perspective been reflected? To what extent has there been attention to gender when interviewees have been selected? To what extent has gender been an issue regarding the composition of evaluation teams?

¹⁶ Henceforth referred to as the Strategy.

2.2 The Gender Perspective Reflected in the Findings of Selected Evaluations

Based on a selection of evaluation reports (see Appendix II) issued by the MFA during the period 1997-2004 which focus to a larger or smaller extent on the six priority areas of the Strategy (see above), how and to what extent has a gender perspective been included within those areas? To the extent possible, establish through a desk review of the selected evaluation reports, the degree to which programmes and projects take women's needs and interests as their starting point. In connection with the formulation and planning of projects and programmes, to what extent have women been chosen as the target group?¹⁷ To what extent do the evaluation reports emphasise gender equality as a development objective?

Have gender issues been included in the various steps of the implementation and evaluation of programmes and projects? To what extent are the chosen activities relevant to women?

Have the programmes and projects included targets for participation by women and to what extent have the results benefited women?

2.3 Tentative Assessment

In view of the analysis above, is it possible to point to any particular characteristics pertaining to the evaluations that have been found to include the gender perspective, such as particular channels of cooperation, areas, sectors or other? Are there any indications that there have been changes over time during the period under review? This should be assessed with reference to both the design (section 2.1) and the findings of evaluations (section 2.2).

3. Methodology

The study will entail a desk review based on an analysis of selected evaluation reports from the period 1997-2004.

4. Report

The consultant is to present a draft report, and based on factual comments by the Evaluation Department, a final report will be submitted. The report should be written in English, and should not exceed 30 pages.

¹⁷ This part should include, in addition to instances where women has been the sole target group, also projects and programmes where women have been one amongst several targets groups.

Appendix I

Evaluation reports 1997-2004

- 1.97 Evaluation of Norwegian Assistance to Prevent and Control HIV/AIDS
- 2.97 «Kultursjokk og Korrektiv» – Evaluering av UD/Norads Studiereiser for Lærere
- 3.97 Evaluation of Decentralisation and Development
- 4.97 Evaluation of Norwegian Assistance to Peace, Reconciliation and Rehabilitation in Mozambique
- 5.97 Aid to Basic Education in Africa – Opportunities and Constraints
- 6.97 Norwegian Church Aid’s Humanitarian and Peace-Making Work in Mali
- 7.97 Aid as a Tool for Promotion of Human Rights and Democracy: What can Norway do?
- 8.97 Evaluation of the Nordic Africa Institute, Uppsala
- 9.97 Evaluation of Norwegian Assistance to Worldview International Foundation
- 10.97 Review of Norwegian Assistance to IPS
- 11.97 Evaluation of Norwegian Humanitarian Assistance to the Sudan
- 12.97 Cooperation for Health Development. WHO’s Support to Programmes at Country Level
- 1.98 “Twinning for Development”. Institutional Cooperation between Public Institutions in Norway and the South
- 2.98 Institutional Cooperation between Sokoine and Norwegian Agricultural Universities
- 3.98 Development through Institutions? Institutional Development Promoted by Norwegian Private Companies and Consulting Firms
- 4.98 Development through Institutions? Institutional Development Promoted by Norwegian Non-Governmental Organisations
- 5.98 Development through Institutions? Institutional Development in Norwegian Bilateral Assistance. Synthesis Report
- 6.98 Managing Good Fortune – Macroeconomic Management and the Role of Aid in Botswana
- 7.98 The World Bank and Poverty in Africa
- 8.98 Evaluation of the Norwegian Program for Indigenous Peoples
- 9.98 Evaluering av Informasjonsstøtten til RORGene
- 10.98 Strategy for Assistance to Children in Norwegian Development Cooperation
- 11.98 Norwegian Assistance to Countries in Conflict
- 12.98 Evaluation of the Development Cooperation between Norway and Nicaragua
- 13.98 UNICEF-komiteen i Norge
- 14.98 Relief Work in Complex Emergencies
- 1.99 WID/Gender Units and the Experience of Gender Mainstreaming in Multilateral Organisations
- 2.99 International Planned Parenthood Federation – Policy and Effectiveness at Country and Regional Levels
- 3.99 Evaluation of Norwegian Support to Psycho-Social Projects in Bosnia-Herzegovina and the Caucasus
- 4.99 Evaluation of the Tanzania-Norway Development Cooperation 1994–1997
- 5.99 Building African Consulting Capacity
- 6.99 Aid and Conditionality
- 7.99 Policies and Strategies for Poverty Reduction in Norwegian Development Aid
- 8.99 Aid Coordination and Aid Effectiveness
- 9.99 Evaluation of the United Nations Capital Development Fund (UNCDF)
- 10.99 Evaluation of AWEPA, The Association of European Parliamentarians for Africa, and AEI, The African European Institute

- 1.00 Review of Norwegian Health-related Development Cooperation 1988–1997
- 2.00 Norwegian Support to the Education Sector. Overview of Policies and Trends 1988–1998
- 3.00 The Project “Training for Peace in Southern Africa”
- 4.00 En kartlegging av erfaringer med norsk bistand gjennom frivillige organisasjoner 1987–1999
- 5.00 Evaluation of the NUFU programme
- 6.00 Making Government Smaller and More Efficient. The Botswana Case
- 7.00 Evaluation of the Norwegian Plan of Action for Nuclear Safety Priorities, Organisation, Implementation
- 8.00 Evaluation of the Norwegian Mixed Credits Programme
- 9.00 “Norwegians? Who needs Norwegians?” Explaining the Oslo Back Channel: Norway’s Political Past in the Middle East
- 10.00 Taken for Granted? An Evaluation of Norway’s Special Grant for the Environment
- 1.01 Evaluation of the Norwegian Human Rights Fund
- 2.01 Economic Impacts on the Least Developed Countries of the Elimination of Import Tariffs on their Products
- 3.01 Evaluation of the Public Support to the Norwegian NGOs Working in Nicaragua 1994–1999
- 4.01 The International Monetary Fund and the World Bank Cooperation on Poverty Reduction
- 5.01 Evaluation of Development Co-operation between Bangladesh and Norway, 1995–2000
- 6.01 Can democratisation prevent conflicts? Lessons from sub-Saharan Africa
- 7.01 Reconciliation Among Young People in the Balkans. An Evaluation of the Post Pessimist Network
- 1.02 Evaluation of the Norwegian Resource Bank for Democracy and Human Rights (NORDEM)
- 2.02 Evaluation of the International Humanitarian Assistance of the Norwegian Red Cross
- 3.02 Evaluation of ACOPAM. An ILO program for “Cooperative and Organizational Support to Grassroots Initiatives” in Western Africa 1978 – 1999
- 4.02 Legal Aid Against the Odds: Evaluation of the Civil Rights Project (CRP) of the Norwegian Refugee Council in former Yugoslavia
- 1.03 Evaluation of the Norwegian Investment Fund for Developing Countries (Norfund)
- 2.03 Evaluation of the Norwegian Education Trust Fund for Africa in the World Bank
- 3.03 Evaluering av Bistandstorgets Evalueringnettverk
- 1.04 Towards a Strategic Framework for Peacebuilding: Getting Their Act Together. Overview report of the Joint Utstein Study of Peacebuilding
- 2.04 Norwegian Peacebuilding Policies: Lessons Learnt and Challenges Ahead
- 3.04 Evaluation of CESARs Activities in the Middle East Funded by Norway

Appendix II

Evaluation reports 1997-2004

- 1.97 Evaluation of Norwegian Assistance to Prevent and Control HIV/AIDS
- 3.97 Evaluation of Decentralisation and Development
- 5.97 Aid to Basic Education in Africa – Opportunities and Constraints
- 7.97 Aid as a Tool for Promotion of Human Rights and Democracy: What can Norway do?
- 10.97 Review of Norwegian Assistance to IPS
- 12.97 Cooperation for Health Development. WHO's Support to Programmes at Country Level
- 2.98 Institutional Cooperation between Sokoine and Norwegian Agricultural Universities
- 8.98 Evaluation of the Norwegian Program for Indigenous Peoples
- 2.99 International Planned Parenthood Federation – Policy and Effectiveness at Country and Regional Levels
- 3.99 Evaluation of Norwegian Support to Psycho-Social Projects in Bosnia-Herzegovina and the Caucasus
- 1.00 Review of Norwegian Health-related Development Cooperation 1988–1997
- 2.00 Norwegian Support to the Education Sector. Overview of Policies and Trends 1988–1998
- 5.00 Evaluation of the NUFU programme
- 6.00 Making Government Smaller and More Efficient. The Botswana Case
- 10.00 Taken for Granted? An Evaluation of Norway's Special Grant for the Environment
- 1.01 Evaluation of the Norwegian Human Rights Fund
- 6.01 Can democratisation prevent conflicts? Lessons from sub-Saharan Africa
- 4.02 Legal Aid Against the Odds: Evaluation of the Civil Rights Project (CRP) of the Norwegian Refugee Council in former Yugoslavia
- 2.03 Evaluation of the Norwegian Education Trust Fund for Africa in the World Bank

Annex 2: Tables

Table A1: Evaluation Reports 1997; Gender and Development Priority Area Scores

Evaluation report no. and name	Reasonable to expect an explicit gender perspective in the evaluation	How has the gender perspective been reflected with reference to design of the evaluations?	To what extent has a gender perspective been integrated into the ToR for the evaluations?	Regarding the evaluation methodology chosen, has the gender perspective been reflected?	To what extent has there been attention to gender when interviewees have been selected?	To what extent has gender been an issue regarding the composition of evaluation teams?
1.97 Evaluation of Norwegian Assistance to Prevent and Control HIV/AIDS	yes	4	3	4	3	3
2.97 «Kultursjokk og Korrektiv» – Evaluering av UD/Norads Studiereiser for Lærere	yes	1	1	2	n.a.	3
3.97 Evaluation of Decentralisation and Development	no	1	n.a.	1	n.a.	3
4.97 Evaluation of Norwegian Assistance to Peace, Reconciliation and Rehabilitation in Mozambique	no	2	1	2	4	5
5.97 Aid to Basic Education in Africa – Opportunities and Constraints	yes	2	n.a.	2	n.a.	2
6.97 Norwegian Church Aid's Humanitarian and Peace-Making Work in Mali	no	2	n.a.	2	2	5
7.97 Aid as a Tool for Promotion of Human Rights and Democracy: What can Norway do?	yes	2	1	3	3	5
8.97 Evaluation of the Nordic Africa Institute, Uppsala	yes	1	1	1	4	5
9.97 Evaluation of Norwegian Assistance to Worldview International Foundation	yes	1	1	1	1	2
10.97 Review of Norwegian Assistance to IPS	yes	3	1	4	3	1
11.97 Evaluation of Norwegian Humanitarian Assistance to the Sudan	yes	3	1	3	2	n.a.
12.97 Cooperation for Health Development						
WHO's Support to Programmes at Country Level	yes	1	n.a.	1	n.a.	5
Average point score for "yes" evaluations*	2.00	1.29	2.33	2.67	3.25	
Average point score for "no" evaluations*	1.67	1.00	1.67	3.00	4.33	

n.a. = Information not available in the Evaluation Report (No ToR, no list of persons interviewed, no listing of evaluation team composition).

* = Average point score based only on those evaluations where scores are available for the column in question.

Table A2: Evaluation Reports 1998; Gender and Development Priority Area Scores

Evaluation report no. and name	Reasonable to expect an explicit gender perspective in the evaluation	How has the gender perspective been reflected with reference to design of the evaluations?	To what extent has a gender perspective been integrated into the ToR for the evaluations?	Regarding the evaluation methodology chosen, has the gender perspective been reflected?	To what extent has there been attention to gender when interviewees have been selected?	To what extent has gender been an issue regarding the composition of evaluation teams?
1.98 "Twinning for Development". Institutional Cooperation between Public Institutions in Norway and the South	yes	1**	1	1**	2	2
2.98 Institutional Cooperation between Sokoine and Norwegian Agricultural Universities	yes	2	1	3	3	4
3.98 Development through Institutions? Institutional Development Promoted by Norwegian Private Companies and Consulting Firms	yes	4	1	4	3	3
4.98 Development through Institutions? Institutional Development Promoted by Norwegian Non-Governmental Organisations	yes	3	2	3	4	5
5.98 Development through Institutions? Institutional Development in Norwegian Bilateral Assistance. Synthesis Report	yes	3	1	3	***	1
6.98 Managing Good Fortune – Macroeconomic Management and the Role of Aid in Botswana	no	1	1	1	n.a.	5
7.98 The World Bank and Poverty in Africa	yes	2	1	3	4	3
8.98 Evaluation of the Norwegian Program for Indigenous Peoples	yes	1	3	2	3	4
9.98 Evaluering av Informasjonsstøtten til RORGene	yes	4	1	3	2	2
10.98 Strategy for Assistance to Children in Norwegian Development Cooperation	yes	4	2	4	5	5
11.98 Norwegian Assistance to Countries in Conflict	yes	1	1	1	4	5
12.98 Evaluation of the Development Cooperation between Norway and Nicaragua	yes	3	2	3	5	5
13.98 UNICEF-komiteen i Norge	yes	1	2	1	5	4
14.98 Relief Work in Complex Emergencies	yes	2	1	2	5	5
Average point score for "yes" evaluations*		2.38	1.46	2.54	3.75	4.08
Average point score for "no" evaluations*		1.00	1.00	1.00	n.a.	5.00

n.a. = Information not available in the Evaluation Report (No ToR, no list of persons interviewed, no listing of evaluation team composition).

* = Average point score based only on those evaluations where scores are available for the column in question.

** = The annexed detailed questionnaire sent to interviewees contain no gender specific questions.

*** = Not relevant for this case.

Table A3: Evaluation Reports 1999; Gender and Development Priority Area Scores

Evaluation report no. and name	Reasonable to expect an explicit gender perspective in the evaluation	How has the gender perspective been reflected with reference to design of the evaluations?	To what extent has a gender perspective been integrated into the ToR for the evaluations?	Regarding the evaluation methodology chosen, has the gender perspective been reflected?	To what extent has there been attention to gender when interviewees have been selected?	To what extent has gender been an issue regarding the composition of evaluation teams?
1.99 WID/Gender Units and the Experience of Gender Mainstreaming in Multilateral Organisations	yes	5	5	5	5	5
2.99 International Planned Parenthood Federation – Policy and Effectiveness at Country and Regional Levels	yes	5	5	5	***	5
3.99 Evaluation of Norwegian Support to Psycho-Social Projects in Bosnia-Herzegovina and the Caucasus	yes	5	5	5	5	5
4.99 Evaluation of the Tanzania-Norway Development Cooperation 1994–1997	yes	5	3	5	3	3
5.99 Building African Consulting Capacity	yes	1	1	1	3	4
6.99 Aid and Conditionality	no	1	1	1	2	5
7.99 Policies and Strategies for Poverty Reduction in Norwegian Development Aid		3	1	3	5	1
8.99 Aid Coordination and Aid Effectiveness		1	1	1	n.a.	3
9.99 Evaluation of the United Nations Capital Development Fund (UNCDF)		2	3	2	n.a.	3
10.99 Evaluation of AWEPA, The Association of European Parliamentarians for Africa, and AEI, The African European Institute		1	1	1	n.a.	3
Average score point for “yes” evaluations*	3.11	3.11	2.78	3.11	4.20	3.56
Average point score for “no” evaluations*	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	5.00

n.a. = information not available in the Evaluation Report (No ToR, no list of persons interviewed, no listing of evaluation team composition).

* = Average point score based only on those evaluations where scores are available for the column in question.

** = The annexed detailed questionnaire sent to interviewees contain no gender specific questions.

*** = Not relevant for this case.

Table A 4: Evaluation Reports 2000; Gender and Development Priority Area Scores

Evaluation report no. and name	Reasonable to expect an explicit gender perspective in the evaluation	How has the gender perspective been reflected with reference to design of the evaluations?	To what extent has a gender perspective been integrated into the ToR for the evaluations?	Regarding the evaluation methodology chosen, has the gender perspective been reflected?	To what extent has there been attention to gender when interviewees have been selected?	To what extent has gender been an issue regarding the composition of evaluation teams?
1.00 Review of Norwegian Health-related Development Cooperation 1988–1997	yes	2	2	2	n.a.	4
2.00 Norwegian Support to the Education Sector.	yes	5	3	5	5	5
3.00 The Project "Training for Peace in Southern Africa"	yes	2	3	2	4	5
4.00 En kartlegging av erfaringer med norsk bistand gjennom frivillige organisasjoner 1987–1999	yes	1	1	1	n.a.	5
5.00 Evaluation of the NUFU programme	yes	2	2	2	n.a.	5
6.00 Making Government Smaller and More Efficient. The Botswana Case	no	1	1	1	n.a.	5
7.00 Evaluation of the Norwegian Plan of Action for Nuclear Safety Priorities, Organisation, Implementation	no	1	1	1	4	1
8.00 Evaluation of the Norwegian Mixed Credits Programme "Norwegians? Who needs Norwegians?"	yes	4	1	4	n.a.*	1
9.00 Explaining the Oslo Back Channel: Norway's Political Past in the Middle East	no	1	1	1	3	5
10.00 Taken for Granted? An Evaluation of Norway's Special Grant for the Environment	yes	4	1	3	5	1
Average score point for "yes" evaluation*		2.86	1.86	2.71	4.67	3.71
Average point score for "no" evaluations*		1.00	1.00	1.00	3.50	3.67

n.a. = Information not available in the Evaluation Report (No ToR, no list of persons interviewed, no listing of evaluation team composition).

* = Average point score based only on those evaluations where scores are available for the column in question.

** = The annexed detailed questionnaire sent to interviewees contain no gender specific questions.

*** = Not relevant for this case.

n.a.* = Comprehensive name list available, but first names are only by initial and thus no gender information is available.

Table A5: Evaluation Reports 2001; Gender and Development Priority Area Scores

Evaluation report no. and name	Reasonable to expect an explicit gender perspective in the evaluation	How has the gender perspective been reflected with reference to design of the evaluations?	To what extent has a gender perspective been integrated into the ToR for the evaluations?	In the evaluation methodology chosen, has the gender perspective been reflected?	To what extent has there been attention to gender when interviewees have been selected?	To what extent has gender been an issue regarding the composition of evaluation teams?
1.01 Evaluation of the Norwegian Human Rights Fund	yes	3	2	3	4	5
2.01 Economic Impacts on the Least Developed Countries of the Elimination of Import Tariffs on their Products	no	1	1	1	3	1
3.01 Evaluation of the Public Support to the Norwegian NGOs Working in Nicaragua 1994–1999	yes	4	4	4	5	5
4.01 The International Monetary Fund and the World Bank Cooperation on Poverty Reduction	no	1	1	1	n.a.	1
5.01 Evaluation of Development Co-operation between Bangladesh and Norway, 1995–2000	yes	5	2	5	3	4
6.01 Can democratisation prevent conflicts? Lessons from sub-Saharan Africa	no	1	1	1	3	n.a.
7.01 Reconciliation Among Young People in the Balkans An Evaluation of the Post Pessimist Network	yes	12	1	4	5	
Average score point for "yes" evaluations*		3.25	2.50	3.25	4.00	4.75
Average point score for "no" evaluations*		1.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	1.00

n.a. = Information not available in the Evaluation Report (No ToR, no list of persons interviewed, no listing of evaluation team composition).

* = Average point score based only on those evaluations where scores are available for the column in question.

** = The annexed detailed questionnaire sent to interviewees contain no gender specific questions.

*** = Not relevant for this case.

Table A6: Evaluation Reports 2002; Gender and Development Priority Area Scores

Evaluation report no. and name	Reasonable to expect an explicit gender perspective in the evaluation	How has the gender perspective been reflected with reference to design of the evaluations?	To what extent has a gender perspective been integrated into the ToR for the evaluations?	Regarding the evaluation methodology chosen, has the gender perspective been reflected?	To what extent has there been attention to gender when interviewees have been selected?	To what extent has gender been an issue regarding the composition of evaluation teams?
1.02 Evaluation of the Norwegian Resource Bank for Democracy and Human Rights (NORDEM)	yes	1	2	1	5	5
2.02 Evaluation of the International Humanitarian Assistance of the Norwegian Red Cross	no	1	1	1	4	3
3.02 Evaluation of ACPAM An ILO program for "Cooperative and Organizational Support to Grassroots Initiatives" in Western Africa 1978-99	yes	5	4	5	5	5
4.02 Legal Aid Against the Odds: Evaluation of the Civil Rights Project (CRP) of the Norwegian Refugee Council in former Yugoslavia	no	1	1	1	5	2
Average score point for "yes" evaluations*	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	5.00	5.00
Average point score for "no" evaluations*	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	4.50	2.50

n.a. = Information not available in the Evaluation Report (No ToR, no list of persons interviewed, no listing of evaluation team composition).

* = Average point score based only on those evaluations where scores are available for the column in question.

** = The annexed detailed questionnaire sent to interviewees contain no gender specific questions.

*** = Not relevant for this case.

Table A7: Evaluation Reports 2003; Gender and Development Priority Area Scores

Evaluation report no. and name	Reasonable to expect an explicit gender perspective in the evaluation	How has the gender perspective been reflected with reference to design of the evaluations?	To what extent has a gender perspective been integrated into the ToR for the evaluations?	Regarding the evaluation methodology chosen, has the gender perspective been reflected?	To what extent has there been attention to gender when interviewees have been selected?	To what extent has gender been an issue regarding the composition of evaluation teams?
1.03 Evaluation of the Norwegian Investment Fund for Developing Countries (Norfund)	no	1	1	1	3	3
2.03 Evaluation of the Norwegian Education Trust Fund for Africa in the World Bank	yes	5	3	5	3	2
3.03 Evaluering av Bistandstorgets Evalueringsnettverk	no	1	1	1	5	2
Average score point for "yes" evaluations*		5.00	3.00	5.00	3.00	2.00
Average point score for "no" evaluations*		1.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	2.50

Table A8: Evaluation Reports 2004; Gender and Development Priority Area Scores

Evaluation report no. and name	Reasonable to expect an explicit gender perspective in the evaluation	How has the gender perspective been reflected with reference to design of the evaluations?	To what extent has a gender perspective been integrated into the ToR for the evaluations?	Regarding the evaluation methodology chosen, has the gender perspective been reflected?	To what extent has there been attention to gender when interviewees have been selected?	To what extent has gender been an issue regarding the composition of evaluation teams?
1.04 Towards a Strategic Framework for Peacebuilding: Getting Their Act Together. Overview report of the Joint Utstein Study of Peacebuilding	no	1	1	1	3	3
2.04 Norwegian Peacebuilding Policies: Lessons Learnt and Challenges Ahead	no	1	1	1	5	5
3.04 Evaluation of CESARs Activities in the Middle East Funded by Norway	no	1	1	1	n.a.	4
Average score point for "yes" evaluations*		1.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	4.00
Average point score for "no" evaluations*						

n.a. = Information not available in the Evaluation Report (No ToR, no list of persons interviewed, no listing of evaluation team composition).

* = Average point score based only on those evaluations where scores are available for the column in question.

** = The annexed detailed questionnaire sent to interviewees contain no gender specific questions.

*** = Not relevant for this case.

EVALUATION REPORTS

- 1.92 NGOs as Partners in Health Care, Zambia
2.92 The Sahel-Sudan-Ethiopia Programme
3.92 De Private Organisasjonene som Kanal for Norsk Bistand, Fase I
- 1.93 Internal Learning from Evaluations and Reviews
2.93 Macroeconomic Impacts of Import Support to Tanzania
3.93 Garantiordning for Investeringer i og Eksport til Utviklingsland
4.93 Capacity-Building in Development Cooperation Towards Integration and Recipient Responsibility
- 1.94 Evaluation of World Food Programme
2.94 Evaluation of the Norwegian Junior Expert Programme with UN Organisations
- 1.95 Technical Cooperation in Transition
2.95 Evaluering av FN-sambandet i Norge
3.95 NGOs as a Channel in Development aid
3A.95 Rapport fra Presentasjonsmøte av «Evalueringen av de Frivillige Organisasjoner»
4.95 Rural Development and Local Government in Tanzania
5.95 Integration of Environmental Concerns into Norwegian Bilateral Development Assistance: Policies and Performance
- 1.96 NORAD's Support of the Remote Area Development Programme (RADP) in Botswana
2.96 Norwegian Development Aid Experiences. A Review of Evaluation Studies 1986-92
3.96 The Norwegian People's Aid Mine Clearance Project in Cambodia
4.96 Democratic Global Civil Governance Report of the 1995 Benchmark Survey of NGOs
5.96 Evaluation of the Yearbook "Human Rights in Developing Countries"
- 1.97 Evaluation of Norwegian Assistance to Prevent and Control HIV/AIDS
2.97 «Kultursjokk og Korrektiv» – Evaluering av UD/NORADs Studiereiser for Lærere
3.97 Evaluation of Decentralisation and Development
4.97 Evaluation of Norwegian Assistance to Peace, Reconciliation and Rehabilitation in Mozambique
5.97 Aid to Basic Education in Africa – Opportunities and Constraints
6.97 Norwegian Church Aid's Humanitarian and Peace-Making Work in Mali
7.97 Aid as a Tool for Promotion of Human Rights and Democracy: What can Norway do?
8.97 Evaluation of the Nordic Africa Institute, Uppsala
9.97 Evaluation of Norwegian Assistance to Worldview International Foundation
10.97 Review of Norwegian Assistance to IPS
11.97 Evaluation of Norwegian Humanitarian Assistance to the Sudan
12.97 Cooperation for Health Development
WHO's Support to Programmes at Country Level
- 1.98 "Twinning for Development". Institutional Cooperation between Public Institutions in Norway and the South
2.98 Institutional Cooperation between Sokoine and Norwegian Agricultural Universities
3.98 Development through Institutions? Institutional Development Promoted by Norwegian Private Companies and Consulting Firms
4.98 Development through Institutions? Institutional Development Promoted by Norwegian Non-Governmental Organisations
5.98 Development through Institutions? Institutional Development in Norwegian Bilateral Assistance. Synthesis Report
6.98 Managing Good Fortune – Macroeconomic Management and the Role of Aid in Botswana
7.98 The World Bank and Poverty in Africa
8.98 Evaluation of the Norwegian Program for Indigenous Peoples
9.98 Evaluering av Informasjonsstøtten til RORGene
10.98 Strategy for Assistance to Children in Norwegian Development Cooperation
11.98 Norwegian Assistance to Countries in Conflict
12.98 Evaluation of the Development Cooperation between Norway and Nicaragua
13.98 UNICEF-komiteen i Norge
14.98 Relief Work in Complex Emergencies
- 1.99 WID/Gender Units and the Experience of Gender Mainstreaming in Multilateral Organisations
2.99 International Planned Parenthood Federation – Policy and Effectiveness at Country and Regional Levels
3.99 Evaluation of Norwegian Support to Psycho-Social Projects in Bosnia-Herzegovina and the Caucasus
4.99 Evaluation of the Tanzania-Norway Development Cooperation 1994-1997
- 5.99 Building African Consulting Capacity
6.99 Aid and Conditionality
7.99 Policies and Strategies for Poverty Reduction in Norwegian Development Aid
8.99 Aid Coordination and Aid Effectiveness
9.99 Evaluation of the United Nations Capital Development Fund (UNCDF)
10.99 Evaluation of AWEPA, The Association of European Parliamentarians for Africa, and AEI, The African European Institute
1.00 Review of Norwegian Health-related Development Cooperation 1988-1997
2.00 Norwegian Support to the Education Sector. Overview of Policies and Trends 1988-1998
3.00 The Project "Training for Peace in Southern Africa"
4.00 En kartlegging av erfaringer med norsk bistand gjennom frivillige organisasjoner 1987-1999
5.00 Evaluation of the NUFU programme
6.00 Making Government Smaller and More Efficient. The Botswana Case
7.00 Evaluation of the Norwegian Plan of Action for Nuclear Safety Priorities, Organisation, Implementation
8.00 Evaluation of the Norwegian Mixed Credits Programme
9.00 "Norwegians? Who needs Norwegians?" Explaining the Oslo Back Channel: Norway's Political Past in the Middle East
10.00 Taken for Granted? An Evaluation of Norway's Special Grant for the Environment
- 1.01 Evaluation of the Norwegian Human Rights Fund
2.01 Economic Impacts on the Least Developed Countries of the Elimination of Import Tariffs on their Products
3.01 Evaluation of the Public Support to the Norwegian NGOs Working in Nicaragua 1994-1999
3A.01 Evaluación del Apoyo Público a las ONGs Noruegas que Trabajan en Nicaragua 1994-1999
4.01 The International Monetary Fund and the World Bank Cooperation on Poverty Reduction
5.01 Evaluation of Development Co-operation between Bangladesh and Norway, 1995-2000
6.01 Can democratisation prevent conflicts? Lessons from sub-Saharan Africa
7.01 Reconciliation Among Young People in the Balkans An Evaluation of the Post Pessimist Network
- 1.02 Evaluation of the Norwegian Resource Bank for Democracy and Human Rights (NORDEM)
2.02 Evaluation of the International Humanitarian Assistance of the Norwegian Red Cross
3.02 Evaluation of ACOPAM
An ILO program for "Cooperative and Organizational Support to Grassroots Initiatives" in Western Africa 1978 - 1999
3A.02 Évaluation du programme ACOPAM
Un programme du BIT sur l'« Appui associatif et coopératif aux Initiatives de Développement à la Base » en Afrique de l'Ouest de 1978 à 1999
4.02 Legal Aid Against the Odds
Evaluation of the Civil Rights Project (CRP) of the Norwegian Refugee Council in former Yugoslavia
- 1.03 Evaluation of the Norwegian Investment Fund for Developing Countries (Norfund)
2.03 Evaluation of the Norwegian Education Trust Fund for Africa in the World Bank
3.03 Evaluering av Bistandstorgets Evalueringsnettverk
- 1.04 Towards Strategic Framework for Peacebuilding: Getting Their Act Together.
Overview Report of the Joint Utstein Study of the Peacebuilding.
2.04 Norwegian peacebuilding policies: Lessons Learnt and Challenges Ahead
3.04 Evaluation of CESAR's activities in the Middle East Funded by Norway
4.04 Evaluering av ordningen med støtte gjennom paraplyorganisasjoner. Eksemplifisert ved støtte til Norsk Misjons Bistandsnemda og Atlas-alliansen
5.04 Study of the impact of the work of FORUT in Sri Lanka: Building Civil Society
6.04 Study of the impact of the work of Save the Children Norway in Ethiopia: Building Civil Society
- 1.05 – Study: Study of the impact of the work of FORUT in Sri Lanka and Save the Children Norway in Ethiopia: Building Civil Society
1.05 – Evaluation: Evaluation of the Norad Fellowship Programme
2.05 – Evaluation: Women Can Do It – an evaluation of the WCDI programme in the Western Balkans

Norad

Norwegian Agency for
Development Cooperation

P.O. Box 8034 Dep, NO-0030 OSLO
Visiting adress:
Ruseløkkveien 26, Oslo, Norway

Telephone: +47 22 24 20 30
Fax: +47 22 24 20 31
postmottak@norad.no
www.norad.no

No of copies: 500
October 2005
ISBN 82-7548-160-0