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<tr>
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<td>GSB</td>
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<tr>
<td>IADB</td>
<td>Inter-American Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDA</td>
<td>International Development Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMF</td>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCRFW</td>
<td>National Commission on the Role of Filipino Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEDA</td>
<td>National Economic Development Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
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<td>OED</td>
<td>Operations Evaluation Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP</td>
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<td>PREM</td>
<td>Poverty Reduction and Economic Management</td>
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<td>SIDA</td>
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<tr>
<td>TESDA</td>
<td>Technical Education and Skills Development Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.N.</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIFEM</td>
<td>United Nations Development Fund for Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>United States Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WID</td>
<td>Women in Development</td>
</tr>
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The Operations Evaluation Department (OED) is proposing to evaluate the effectiveness of the gender dimensions of the World Bank's development assistance. The evaluation will seek to answer the following questions:

- Is the Bank's gender strategy relevant at the country and global levels? Is the strategy effective in meeting the development objectives of client countries?
- Has the Bank effectively integrated gender into its country assistance strategies?
- How effective has the Bank's assistance been in producing sustainable outcomes, impacts, and institutional strengthening in the area of gender?

OED proposes to conduct this evaluation in a participatory manner, consulting with critical stakeholders in client countries, donor representatives, and Bank staff. Financed by the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, two consultative activities were organized as a prelude to OED's gender evaluation.

The first activity, an Entry Workshop organized by OED, brought together specialists interested in gender and evaluation. They deliberated on the Bank's gender strategy, the proposed OED evaluation and its intended thrust, and approaches to measuring the effectiveness of the gender dimensions of the Bank's development assistance. The second activity, a Roundtable on Gender, jointly organized by OED and the Gender Sector Board (GSB), provided the opportunity to listen to and understand the views of client and donor representatives on the Bank's gender strategy. The panel included the vice president of the Philippines and the deputy prime minister of Jordan as well as several other high-level policymakers. The rich experiences and varied backgrounds of the
participants made the workshop and roundtable discussions invaluable, and the
interchanges have influenced both the GSB in its work on rethinking the Bank’s
gender strategy and OED in refining its approach and methodology for the
gender evaluation.

It is very important to document the process of consultation so that the
thoughts and ideas that have emerged from these and other such activities can
go far beyond OED and the GSB. I am, therefore, especially delighted that the
proceedings are being published. They can—and should—help enrich the
debate that will need to precede OED’s gender evaluation.

Since the late 1970s, the Bank has emphasized the need to seek and inte-
grate information on the roles of women, their opportunities, and constraints in
policy formulation and project design, as well as to define benchmarks for
monitoring the effects of the Bank’s assistance. Yet today, almost three decades
later, these proceedings indicate that the questions and issues raised at these
sessions seem to be little or no different from those that were previously raised.
This is certainly a matter for introspection.

The OED evaluation, therefore, comes at an opportune time, as we move
into the new millennium. It should not only help feed into the preparation of
the Bank’s gender policy and implementation strategy but also seek to answer
why some of the teething problems in this area have never disappeared. What
has the Bank done right? How can the Bank seek to improve the effectiveness
of its assistance in this area?

I wish the OED Gender Team all the best in this evaluation and look
forward to receiving its report.

Matthias Meyer
Executive Director, Switzerland
The World Bank
Gender Strategies

Elizabeth McAllister, Director of the Bank’s Operations Evaluation Department, opened the workshop by introducing OED’s Gender Evaluation Team and the Gender Strategies Panel: Oey Astra Meesook, Country Director for Eritrea, Ethiopia, Somalia, and Sudan in the Bank’s Africa Region; Andres Rigo, Acting General Counsel; and Karen Mason, Director of Gender and Development, Poverty Reduction and Economic Management (PREM).

Ms. McAllister paid tribute to the U.N. Decade for Women (1975–85), which launched an unprecedented global movement for change in the status of women. It led to the recognition of women’s pivotal role in development effectiveness and women’s rights as human rights. It laid the foundation for and created a better understanding of the issues regarding the status of women in developed and developing nations alike.

In 1983, the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development promulgated “Guiding Principles to Aid Agencies for Supporting the Role of Women in Development.” DAC’s principles led to commitments by its members (including the Bank, which has observer status) to design development strategies to “give women in developing countries their full role in the planning and execution of development programmes and the more equitable enjoyment of their benefits.” The DAC guidelines established that it was the professional responsibility of each development official to make this a reality. The Bank was influential in this process, particularly in the development with Harvard University of a series of case studies that were used throughout the development system to train development officials and developing country decisionmakers in analytical techniques for measuring the impact of development projects on women.

Over the past decade, donors and the Bank have increasingly recognized that to achieve equity for women, development interventions cannot focus solely on women’s issues. Rather, a better understanding of gender—of the relationships between women and men—is fundamental to the effective design of equitable development programs.
Gender
Rhetoric and Reality

Robert Picciotto

The majority of the world's poor are women and children. Women provide most of the child care. Women produce half of the food in many poor countries; they make up one-fourth of the work force in industry and one-third in services. The income that women control is more likely to be spent on basic welfare than is the income men control. It seems self-evident that reducing gender disparities and enhancing women's participation in the development process is critical to the Bank's mandate. After all, the Bank's mission is to fight poverty with passion and professionalism for lasting results.

Despite these well-known facts, there remains a great deal of cynicism among development professionals (not always expressed aloud) regarding the desirability, feasibility, and priority of gender concerns in operational work. The greatest obstacle to progress lies in the denial that gender matters. Some exponents of what Albert Hirschman calls the futility thesis argue that precisely because gender and development are intricately connected, gender needs no specific focus. They hold the view that risk development will automatically improve the lot of women. Thus, of the 4.4 billion people in developing countries, almost one-third have no access to clean water, three-fifths are not connected to basic sanitation, one-quarter have inadequate shelter, one-fifth are out of the reach of modern health services, and one-fifth suffer from malnutrition. Meeting these needs directly and efficiently helps women. Hence, concentrating on filling this public goods gap is the best way to help women. In reality, of course, gender does matter since considerable gain stems from involving women in the design of such programs. Evidence is overwhelming.
that participation influences development outcomes and has a distinct gender
dimension.

A variant of the same thesis holds that human development in general, rather
than gender, is the issue. The argument goes as follows: the key to gender equity is
investment in education and health, and work is going relatively well on this front.
Female life expectancy has increased 20 percent faster than male life expectancy
over the past two decades. Gender gaps in education and health have narrowed
fairly rapidly over the past 30 years. Education levels have been steadily rising.
The gaps between women and men in school enrollment and adult literacy were
halved between 1970 and 1990. In primary schools, the enrollment of girls, which
was once 75 percent that of boys, is now close to 90 percent. This argument glosses
over the huge gender gaps that remain unaddressed. The United Nations (U.N.)
Gender Development Index is lower than the overall Human Development Index in
every country the U.N. surveys. And there are huge differences in gender equity
from country to country.

Another reactionary argument is the jeopardy thesis. It holds that any effort
the Bank makes to improve gender policies will worsen women’s situation by
creating a backlash. The argument is grounded in the notion that a lack of
Bank knowledge about local customs inevitably leads to well-mean but flat-
footed recommendations with unintended results that penalize the very reforms
the Bank tries to support. In effect, the argument rests on the notion that we do
not know what we are doing with respect to gender, and therefore it is best to
do nothing. It is surprising that many of the people who advance such argu-
ments do not hesitate to recommend adjustment measures that can have very
serious—yet poorly understood—social consequences.

Finally, there is the even more subtle perversity thesis, which acknowledges
that gender equity is very desirable but argues that the Bank’s pursuit of
reforms may have indirect negative consequences that will undermine their
benefits. For example, the power structure may resent the Bank’s meddling, and
country relations will inevitably suffer from it, making projects that help
women, such as improving water supply, difficult to do. It also argues that
focusing on gender diverts resources from areas where the Bank is more effec-
tive and, thus, is not in the corporate interest.

Ultimately these kinds of arguments may be linked to policy constructs that
reflect parsimonious and archaic concepts of development. According to such
concepts, women’s participation in development is simply one way of enhanc-
ing labor-intensive growth, while reducing gender inequities is equivalent to improving access to education, health, nutrition, and credit. This places a heavy burden on gender specialists—to prove that opening up development opportunities to women is a better way to achieve poverty reduction than employing alternative policy measures. While they have proved this, again and again it has been at the expense of a more productive use of analytical skills within a more realistic conception of development as social learning. According to Douglas North, the new development theory:

*Draws its inspiration from physics . . . (and) derives its inspiration from evolutionary biology. But in contrast to Darwinian theory, in which selection mechanisms are not informed by beliefs about the eventual consequences, human evolution is guided by the perceptions of the players who make choices (decisions) in light of these perceptions in order to produce outcomes downstream that will reduce the uncertainty of organizations—political, economic and social—in pursuit of their goals. Institutional change, therefore, is a deliberate process shaped by the perceptions of the actors about the consequence of their actions.*

This concept reflects the true obstacles to gender equity. It argues for a social policy that is adapted to a rapidly changing world far better than the static theories and linear input-output models that have held sway over development economics for decades. Conceived of as a social learning process, this institutional perspective gives a special role to cultural factors. It integrates institutional development, political participation, and social transformation. It gives pride of place to policy experimentation and objective evaluation of what does and does not work. This is the direction toward which gender policy must evolve (see figure 1).

Mental constructs screen information about the real world and are therefore critical to the creation and adaptation of social institutions—that is, their rules, norms, conventions, and organizations. Advocacy and opinionmaking and good public policy advice are fundamental. Incentives, organizations, and policies are shaped from ideas about what is taking place in the real world. These are the rules of the game, and ultimately they shape human interactions and determine aggregate economic performance.

Organizations and norms help minimize transaction costs by increasing the predictability of human behavior and by generating trust. At the same time,
they induce stability in social protocols. Customs and rules can become dysfunctional, however, when changes in the natural, technological, or demographic environment are frequent or large.

From this perspective, eliminating gender discrimination is part of the institutional adjustment process needed for poverty reduction. The bad news is that societal beliefs and values may take generations to change. The adequacy of the cultural context with respect to existing factor endowments and evolving technological resources is a powerful determinant of gender customs. But even if the culture is flexible enough to accommodate adjustment, the policy response may not match the transformation of the external environment. Difficult initial conditions, a lack of public understanding, inadequate leadership, or the inability to resolve divergent interests can lead to inadequate policy responses. In addition, since inadequate social structures and misdirected institutional change often come into play, institutional redesign and related capacity building must be continuous over the long term.

The Bank’s emerging poverty reduction strategy to increase women’s opportunity to participate in development—the most important aspect of its current gender policy—is only part of the story. The rest is about empowerment and security. From this perspective, gender work has to do with ideas, culture, and social capital, and these are the areas that gender work has neglected. The balance of this volume captures a wide range of experience, vision, and warnings. This should open the way to a new policy that deals with the realities rather than the rhetoric of gender in development.
Mainstreaming Gender
The Ethiopian Experience

Oey Astra Meesook

The Ethiopia country team has worked to mainstream gender into the Bank's country assistance program. Although the team did not single out gender in the country assistance strategy document, it has made significant strides in integrating gender into the country portfolio. This was initiated when resources were set aside for gender activities and the country team was encouraged to address women's issues in Ethiopia.

Socioeconomic indicators in Ethiopia had signaled the low socioeconomic status of women. Women's access to education and services was lower than that enjoyed by men. Women bore a disproportionate burden of poverty, and in some areas they typically worked 15 to 18 hours a day, while men worked about 3 hours. The division of labor showed women devoting most of their time to collecting wood for fuel and water, supporting agriculture and livestock production, preparing food, and looking after children. Women were also frequently subjected to harmful traditional practices. Men worked primarily in agriculture and livestock production but also held the positions of decisionmakers, judges, police, and security in the community. Employment opportunities in the formal sector were not an option for the majority of women in Ethiopia. The team realized that for development to be

The key . . . was raising the awareness of the country team, getting it on board . . . [taking] the time to really listen to the client.
The government of Ethiopia asked the Bank to work more on women’s issues, but the key to mainstreaming gender was raising the awareness of the country team, getting it on board, and launching some exploratory work. This work dates back to 1993–94, when the Bank approached the Ethiopian Minister for Women’s Affairs. Her reaction was that the government was aware of the problems and just needed grant financing. The Bank, however, felt that there was a need for a better understanding of the issues, because its projects were not having the expected impact on women. Moreover, an ambitious program of decentralization had just been launched. It was important to understand the new institutional arrangements for the implementation of development interventions before providing financing.

Consultations with critical stakeholders in the country kick-started the work. At the same time, the country team facilitated an institutional development grant to enable the Women’s Affairs Office to build capacity, since it was clear that it needed to be better equipped to deal with gender issues. The country team took the time to really listen to the client. In order to include the voices of grassroots women, participatory rural analyses were carried out in most of the regions, background studies and research on decentralization and its impact on women were undertaken, and focus group discussions and participatory workshops with women were arranged. The team also focused on larger issues of governance and gender rights. A team from Ethiopia representing government, the civil service, and academia was encouraged to participate in the Bank-funded regional initiative on gender and law, which includes countries from eastern and southern Africa. The Institutional Development Fund grant also facilitated participatory discussions on gender and law and revision of the civil code, which had a number of gender-biased provisions. All this work resulted in a report on the institutional and regulatory constraints to equitable development in Ethiopia. The government and the Bank published this report jointly, to the credit of the consultation process.

Once the context had been analyzed, the government was ready to seek a loan to address some of the key issues identified in the sector report. The Women in Development (WID) project in Ethiopia is currently the only project in the Africa Region focusing on women. The project is to accomplish four things: facilitate the formation of self-help women’s groups, fund women’s
groups, train women and other stakeholders, and increase education and awareness of women's rights.

An ongoing part of this work is to collect gender-disaggregated data and to raise gender awareness. There have been good policy exchanges at all levels, and the team is striving to ensure that gender issues are studied in its macroeconomic work. Activities to monitor gender and welfare are also being undertaken, and the Bank’s small grant program is funding gender activities in collaboration with nongovernmental organizations (NGOs).

Eight projects in addition to WID are actively integrating gender into the portfolio. They include projects on health, water supply, education, agriculture, and power distribution. The country director's budget allocation ensures the support of gender issues. The team has learned several lessons:

- Implementing goals is complicated and needs attention. A consultant has been hired in the Resident Mission to help enhance and measure the impact of Bank-financed projects for women.
- Gender-disaggregated data need to be collected.
- Country ownership is very important. Workers have to be prepared to change their views and approaches where necessary, particularly when dealing with such sensitive issues.
- Establishing a focal point for gender in the country team has been crucial in executing the work effectively and in a timely fashion.
- Resource allocation signals commitment.
- Participatory approaches enhance gender analysis.
Gender and the World Bank Mandate

Andres Rigo

The word gender did not appear in the Bank’s Articles of Agreement when they were drafted in the 1940s. The Bank’s charter was a product of the time in which it was negotiated and drafted. During that time, the Bank’s membership was less than a third of what it is today, and it consisted mostly of European, American, and a few Commonwealth countries. Every wave of new members to the Bank since has created new challenges. For example, the arrival of International Development Association (IDA) members generated more emphasis on social issues. How are the Articles of Agreement relevant to a world that is now very different from when they were drafted?

The policy of the Bank’s legal department is to be flexible in interpreting the articles in response to changing needs. Today, the thinking about what contributes to development has been expanded to include work on nutrition, gender, and education, with a greater focus on the individual. For example, flexibility can be seen in legal opinions written by the general counsel, endorsed by the Bank’s Board, and reflected in the Bank’s mandate. The articles have proven to be so flexible that the purpose of the Bank is now defined in very broad terms that go beyond facilitating investments and into the arena of human development. The articles also speak of raising living standards in

The Bank’s Operational Policy on Gender has the broad aim of reducing gender disparities . . . It is not a stand-alone policy but is linked to other operational policies on poverty reduction . . . The Bank’s mandate on gender should be carried out through leadership.
the member countries as well as improving labor conditions. Raising women’s productivity could improve key development goals everywhere and directly reduce poverty. Failure to address this aspect of development work could lead to inefficiency and could exacerbate inequities between men and women.

OP 4.20, approved by the Bank’s Board, sends instructions from a legal point of view to staff through the manager, based on the Board’s acceptance of the legal department’s opinions. OP 4.20 has the broad aim of reducing gender disparities. It resulted directly from a strategy paper on gender issues. Women need to be considered when poverty programs are designed, and women’s issues ought to be taken into account when we look to mitigate a project’s adverse effects. OP 4.20 is not a stand-alone policy but is linked to other operational policies on poverty reduction, indigenous people, and voluntary resettlement. The Bank ought not to be seen as a social engineering machine that can achieve social change by itself. Rather, its mandate on gender should be carried out through leadership, as in Ethiopia, where the government was consulted in achieving change.

The degree of importance accorded to OP 4.20 is not part of the Bank’s safeguard policies. Nevertheless, from a legal perspective, all its policies are binding on the Bank, regardless of their category. U.N. resolutions are not, however, binding on the Bank; the Bank’s own governing bodies make their own decisions. The Bank’s gender policy is more one of strategy and exists within other, more specific policies that look at project design. In certain instances, the Bank has adopted policies lightly and has not then been able to apply them, because the machinery and commitment necessary to follow them up had not been put in place.

Because development and politics are related, most of what the Bank does has political consequences, and this should not be ignored. The charter, however, requires the Bank to make its decisions while taking into account economic considerations, not political ones. In the area of human rights, for instance, the Bank can help countries become more aware of the importance of borrowing money to help educate the populace. The Bank should certainly be aware, however, of the political realities facing client countries when it makes its decisions.
The Future Direction of Bank Strategy

Karen Mason

The Bank is a very complicated organization, which renders mainstreaming gender in the institution complex. Achieving development requires fundamental shifts in society, not just economic changes. Gender is key in this respect. There are three possible kinds of gender mainstreaming. The first is investing in special programs for women, such as the Bank's investment in girls' schooling. The second kind is designing projects so that they meet existing gender conditions and account for the different needs of men and women. The third—and most revolutionary—is designing policies, programs, and projects to transform the existing gender system. An example would be a program to ensure that parents voluntarily invest in girls' education. The OED evaluation may tell us how well the Bank is doing with regard to each of these approaches. Generally, there is little accountability in the organization for ensuring that OP 4.20 is followed.

The GSB is working on a revised strategy for mainstreaming. It has agreed that the revised strategy has three main elements. The first is more analytical work that demonstrates the relevance of gender equality in alleviating poverty, achieving sustainable economic development, and bringing this work to the attention of Bank staff in operations. In this regard, a policy research report on gender and development is

Gender mainstreaming is difficult to observe and measure because it involves incorporating new features into projects in all sectors rather than creating gender-specific, stand-alone projects.
forthcoming. Analysis of the gender situation in individual countries is also needed to help operational staff better understand the implications for their work. The second element is further work on tools and information that Bank staff need in order to incorporate gender into their work. The third element is providing assistance to in-country agents who work to change gender relations.

If the revised strategy is to be effective, better systems to monitor and evaluate what is happening in the Bank will also be needed. The GSB is looking to OED to be its partner in this effort. To sum up, we should be aware that gender mainstreaming is difficult to observe and measure because much of it involves incorporating new features into projects in all sectors rather than creating gender-specific, stand-alone projects. Although the Bank has a good gender policy in place, follow-through has been inconsistent, and the institutionalization of gender mainstreaming remains incomplete. This is a problem that needs to be addressed as the Bank’s gender strategy is rethought.
Joanne Salop, the Bank's Vice President of Operations Policy and Strategy, was Interim Director for Gender and Development during 1998. She opened the session by introducing its three speakers. Their topic was learning from other organizations that have had long experience in the field of gender. The first to speak was Noeleen Heyzer, Executive Director of the United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM). She was followed first by Cecilia Lopez, a former minister of environment, agriculture, and planning in the government of Colombia, and then by Mayra Buvinic, Chief of the Social Development Division of the Inter-American Development Bank (IADB).
One of the outcomes of a major UNIFEM evaluation in 1996 was the realization that UNIFEM had to transform itself into a more strategic and empowering organization, one that promoted evaluation as a learning culture within UNIFEM itself. In addition, the importance of promoting a results-based organization emerged from that evaluation—that is, finding how to incorporate empowerment with the kind of results the organization wanted to achieve. UNIFEM has used the empowerment and rights-based approach to human development to demonstrate its advocacy, partnership building, and operational capacities in implementing programs and initiatives in almost 90 countries. I helped develop the guiding vision and strategy for UNIFEM’s participation in Beijing, and I continue to help build its role as a provider of strategic and technical know-how to the U.N. system in the area of women’s empowerment and gender equality.

UNIFEM was instituted to be a catalyst and an innovative fund within the U.N. system, piloting and mainstreaming gender issues. It works closely with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). One of the key questions posed by its fieldwork is: How do we ensure that the policies or commitments that are adopted do not evaporate? That is, how do we promote accountability? UNIFEM has three focal areas of action:
(a) looking at women’s economic security in the context of globalization and the emergence of new technologies, (b) looking at governance and leadership

Women’s government offices and ministries can generate power for themselves by developing alliances with other offices and ministries to engage in larger policymaking processes and to contribute toward engendering macroeconomic policies and national budgets.
and how we ensure that the leadership we promote has accountability and a constituency that creates that accountability, and (c) looking at human rights, especially with respect to violence against women. (On the growing problem of trafficking in girls, for example, UNIFEM has noticed in the significant amount of work it has done that the growth is in areas of economic and social breakdown. In the Asian region, a U.N. interagency program has dealt specifically with trafficking in the Mekong and other regions.) Taking these three focal areas as a mandate, UNIFEM conceived of itself as a seamless organization with core values that would fuel its strategies, which can be summarized as accountability and advocacy, brokering and building partnerships, and building capacity and developing constituencies.

Generally, women's government offices and ministries have been weak for reasons that include lack of financial support and political will, as well as an absence of expertise. Some, however, are strong, and those are the ones that are able to develop effective partnerships with women's constituencies. The way in which these offices can generate power for themselves within governments is by reaching out and developing alliances with other ministries, including the Ministry of Finance, to actively engage in the larger policymaking processes and to contribute toward engendering macroeconomic policies, national budgets, and data gathering.

UNIFEM also supports a policy of and the legal framework for equality, rooting it in the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, which UNIFEM regards as the Women's Bill of Rights. Equally important is educating the population to hold government accountable to its commitments. It is necessary to remember that all development involves cultural change; even the introduction of schooling makes for a big cultural shift. UNIFEM has also worked on getting women more access to new and emerging markets, especially in agriculture, the informal sector, and other small-scale enterprises. UNIFEM uses its status as a U.N. organization to its full potential in building common ground and partnerships of government, civil society, and international organizations. There is room for greater partnership between UNIFEM and the Bank.
Mainstreaming Gender in Colombia

Cecilia Lopez

In Colombia, gender issues have been a part of government policies for a long time. The country took a big step during the presidential campaign of 1993-94, when gender equity was made a major part of the campaign. The result was a real political commitment to promote gender at the highest levels. In practice, however, issues of gender follow the minister who commits to them, which shows both the weakness in the system and the power of a strong will.

While I was the minister in charge of the environment, the government looked to promote women’s access to higher positions, but the goal of having a high-level official responsible for gender issues in each ministry failed. To be successful, one needed a boss who would make staff recognize the importance of gender considerations. Women’s offices and ministries did not work because they isolated women and then tried to promote them. It was better and easier to get women into the mainstream, where men held the power and could respect women for their expertise, than to try to appeal to a male sense of gender equity. The government also looked at justice, education, and health in relation to women and the need to increase their participation in these areas.

When I moved to the Ministry of Agriculture, a “rural social contract” strategy was initiated between peasants and Starting gender equity with social equity turned out to be successful... The solution is to tackle gender from the perspective of women’s economic contributions, thereby opening doors to mainstreaming gender in a country’s development.
organizational producers. This approach also failed, and the ministry abandoned it, because the powerful producers did not welcome it.

Finally, as a minister of planning, which is Colombia’s think tank, I spearheaded the creation of an institution to strategize on gender. The approach was to begin with women’s production and then move into social and political areas. The goals were to diagnose the social and productive realities that allow gender equity to emerge and then identify areas for action. It was also important to have an international body committed to supporting these goals. The approach to starting gender equity with social equity turned out to be successful. Research in the planning department that looked at poverty, the quality of life, education, and health yielded two big lessons: (a) macro programs endure and (b) without a consciousness of gender issues, one will fall back to dealing only with women’s issues.

In summary, the experience of a country such as Colombia shows that gender issues are fragile at the institutional and political levels and that they are coupled with a weak women’s movement and strong dependence on personal and political will. The solution is to tackle gender from the perspective of women’s economic contributions, thereby opening doors to mainstreaming gender in the country’s development. In looking for strategies, the macroeconomists in Colombia responded to approaches that used production, labor problems (which showed a waste of resources), and the value of women’s work as a way of increasing the gross national product (GNP). When the economists saw that women were becoming an important part of the future, they became interested in gender issues.

The status of women has made crucial advances in this century. Women’s issues have moved along better than poverty issues. But 20 million small women’s projects are not the answer. We need a big jump in conceptual frameworks, resources, and strategies at the macro level. The women’s movement is moving faster than the institutions are.
One can distinguish three modalities of mainstreaming gender issues into loan portfolios such as IADB’s: (a) mainstreaming gender in the traditional lending portfolio; (b) mainstreaming gender in new areas that expand IADB’s portfolio, such as the control of violence and early childhood development; and (c) mainstreaming gender in the reimbursable modalities of the institution rather than the nonreimbursable ones. The third modality is where one finds the real challenge, since it implies changing the attitude that banks should assist women to one that they should invest in women. Mainstreaming works best in a learning context, as in new or emerging fields such as microenterprise or violence reduction, where there is often an openness to new ideas.

IADB’s loans in the social sector are much smaller than those available for infrastructure, and loans for women’s projects have additional limitations in institutional capacity. Small institutions are in a position to do work in the area, but care has to be taken not to overburden them with too much money. Further, high transaction costs have to be looked at insofar as they hinder borrowers from borrowing for gender issues. Integrating gender issues in IADB’s program exercises is also important, as is establishing dialogue with people from the borrowing countries who have expertise in this area. IADB has also looked at women’s leadership in order to change the way in which countries come to IADB. Clearly there is a world trend toward placing women in positions of leadership, with or
without IADB's help, but institutions that are in a position to facilitate the trend would be well served to move it forward.

IADB has made two new loans to promote peaceful societies and to combat domestic violence in Colombia and Uruguay. IADB made the link between domestic and social violence by bringing together the actors in both spheres of violence to talk to one another and identify their commonalities. Drawing a connection between domestic violence and social violence, research had shown that violence is largely learned. IADB's study in Chile and Nicaragua showed that women lose substantial earnings from domestic violence.

IADB mainstreamed microenterprise factors into the microenterprise portfolio. Asking how it could push mainstreaming in the traditional portfolio, IADB found two important factors: (a) providing information and incentives for staff to integrate gender issues and (b) including incentives in borrowers' loans to increase their demand for loans.

A shortcoming of the traditional approach to gender in many organizations is the overemphasis on relative differences with men. More relevant and useful is the absolute measure that compares women over time or compares women with other women. Current research and policy overemphasize "gender versus women," using men as the standard of comparison for women, but this often obscures the real issues of poverty and exclusion. In the health sector, for example, the relevant comparison is women with other women, not women with men. Gender approaches, as distinct from approaches that look at women in particular, could divert scarce resources to benefit men, which in itself may be fine, but we need to recognize the scarcity of resources for addressing issues related to women.
Gender Mainstreaming

The session’s chair, Gita Gopal, opened by stating that mainstreaming has become the key instrument through which many multilateral agencies are trying to address gender in their work. She noted that the present panel was very knowledgeable on the topic and then introduced the discussants. Maria Correia, who has led a team of gender specialists in the Bank’s Latin America and Caribbean Region for PREM, is now Sector Manager for Gender in the Latin America and Caribbean Region. Achola Pala Okeyo is a senior policy adviser on gender in UNDP’s Africa bureau and a well-known pioneer in rural development research and advocate for gender equality. Aruna Rao, independent consultant, is a gender and institutional change specialist who has worked on gender issues in Bangladesh and Bangkok.
Recent Experience in Latin America and the Caribbean

Maria Correia

Work on gender in the Latin America and Caribbean Region began in 1994 in the agriculture and natural resources sector in Central America and Mexico. Among the several different models that the Bank uses for mainstreaming, the one being used in the Latin America and Caribbean Region is not definitive but has yielded some positive results.

Gender is the quintessential implementation issue. Sovereign governments, not the Bank, implement projects, but the executing agencies in client countries tend to be weak, overextended, and at times dysfunctional. They often have difficulty providing even the most basic services. Moreover, the Bank places little emphasis on implementation, as reflected in the meager resources it dedicates to project supervision. Task managers are overworked, and gender is just one of many issues that they have to deal with. Enforcing staff and senior manager accountability for gender does not work because the Bank simply does not have the resources. Because gender is an inherently complex subject, gender sensitization is not sufficient to mainstream gender in projects through either Bank staff or country clients. Thus, the Latin America and Caribbean gender team has begun to question whether mainstreaming is a viable

The paradox of mainstreaming is that the success of gender efforts often renders the issues less visible.
goal or whether the team should focus instead on specifically targeted activities that can show clear results. Staff in the region are now experimenting with both mainstreaming techniques and gender-specific activities.

The region’s experience teaches that mainstreaming gender requires (a) showing public value, (b) ensuring an authorizing environment for gender work, and (c) establishing operational capacity to carry out gender goals. Often communities that work with gender issues have focused on public value and the authorizing environment and have overlooked the critical operational capacity questions. The region, however, has emphasized establishing operational capacity to help task managers and country clients. The gender team is set up as a service-oriented group to provide operational support to staff and country clients.

Rather than lobbying for support and mandates from the top, gender work in the Latin American and Caribbean Region has been a bottom-up effort, focusing on establishing credibility with task and sector managers. In an organization such as the Bank, demonstrating the value of gender through solid empirical research has also been a key success factor. Another lesson is that resources are limited: in the current operating environment, gender has had to compete for resources and employ techniques from the social marketing literature, such as identifying different target groups and appealing to their interests. Another feature of the region’s work has been to include male gender issues such as alcoholism, drug abuse, gang violence, and unemployment in the work program.

To find entry points for gender work, the region’s staff have piloted an instrument known as the country gender review, which maps out gender issues in a particular country and reviews the Bank’s portfolio for its treatment of gender. Reviews allow gender staff to establish dialogue with country clients and country department staff, which in turn has induced demand for gender work. The country gender reviews have also been useful documents for preparing country assistance strategies, poverty studies, and social assessments. The first gender review was paid for by the Bank department because it was a pilot, but the country units paid for the subsequent reviews.

The appointment of a sector manager on gender, with direct access to country directors, and a team of 12 staff and consultants reflect progress in the region’s commitment to gender work. Moreover, country Bank budgets that reflect demand for gender work from the country departments more than doubled from fiscal 1999 to fiscal 2000.

In summary, mainstreaming is tough, but this can be said of more than
gender. It is important to understand the institutional constraints—both within and outside the Bank—as well as the paradox of mainstreaming, which is that the success of gender efforts often renders the issues less visible. While country-based institutional constraints to gender mainstreaming can be intractable, the Latin America and Caribbean response has been to understand the operating limitations, accept them, and attempt to put in place the technical assistance structures that will overcome them.
UNDP and Gender
in the Africa Bureau

Achola Pala Okeyo

UNDP works within a developed corporate framework with regional bureaus to contextualize issues within the regions. The success of UNIFEM in some ways has to do with its history and with its partnerships with women constituents who work in, and have had close links to, the real world. This approach is useful for understanding how other organizations work to achieve mainstreaming. Some of the questions to ask are: Where has the organization put the money? What types of groups have advocated gender equality? How do you tell how the money that has been disbursed is being used?

In trying to mainstream gender, organizations tend to start from the premise that women are disadvantaged and need special assistance, and they bring a prescription to women in the hope that it will help. But realizing that women themselves can recognize their disadvantages and can articulate areas for change is what brings the prospect of success in addressing their issues. Speaking of Africa specifically, mainstreaming is a problem at the macro or national sectoral level, because many of the institutions at this level do not function at their full capacity. It is therefore sensible to take a two-pronged approach: certain things work better if they are addressed as projects outside the main institutions while change takes place gradually at the macro level, and other matters can be pursued through the existing framework. This approach can

Realizing that women themselves can recognize their disadvantages and can articulate areas for change is what brings the prospect of success in addressing their issues.
work anywhere except in countries where the split between work and family has not been as clearly demarcated, such as Australia, Canada, and the Scandinavian countries. It works best, too, if it starts with an activity that gives encouragement, not with the most difficult activities first. It is also necessary to identify the key change agents and to support and develop them.

To gain better information about gender issues, we need to focus more on measurement. In addition, methods of providing support and building people’s leadership capacities have to be devised. The specific elements of leadership to develop are those that enable people to bring in the largest constituencies. It is also important that organizations build data on mainstreaming to show how much progress is being made. In Africa, realistic statistics are needed on ethnicity, culture, HIV, and the like.
Barriers to Mainstreaming

Aruna Rao

We cannot escape the institutional *black box*—structures and practices that translate policies into action—regardless of whether we pursue a WID approach to gender issues or a gender and development approach to change the values that sustain unequal relations. This is true whether the point of entry is gender parity or gender analysis in project planning and whether it is neutral and rational or built on values and assumptions that hinder change and equality.

This organizational *deep structure* is often hidden and unquestioned, but it shapes the work and the outcomes in the field of gender. An examination of organizational deep structures suggests that most organizations are structurally biased toward men’s interests or are exclusionary along other critical dimensions that perpetuate gender inequality. One of the exclusionary rules is the separation of work and family, or the split between paid work and family life. That work has the first claim on workers is an assumption that often does not fit women, who are mainly responsible for family and community work. It devalues women’s interests within the organizations that could support their family roles and the restructuring of family responsibilities. The assumption is perpetuated in management and control processes in organizations such as job evaluations. In speaking about work practices, I refer to the decision choices of staff, not so much to their tools and procedures. What kinds of issues do managers

---

*An evaluation of deep structures in the Bank would look at the values and work practices within the organization that hinder the consideration of gender issues.*
choose to raise when evaluating staff? Who do staff choose to speak to? What issues are raised in project reviews? What incentives do staff have to address gender issues? Exclusionary power is another barrier. Exercising this kind of power blocks organizational learning and devalues participation. Heroic individualism—valuing individualism and competition over cooperation and teamwork—is another aspect of deep structure that celebrates heroes, usually men, and end products and usually sidelines the client.

Another aspect of deep structure that inhibits gender equality is narrow instrumentality. This places the focus of work on quantitative goals, such as input delivery, rather than on an overall mission, such as social change. Subcultures within the organization that may be generally friendly to gender work are also aspects to consider.

How do we uncover deep structure? Giving voice to those who are silent in an organization and examining work practices are two promising ways. Do we hear the voices of the Bank’s clients? Do we know the bits and pieces that have made a policy effective on the ground? An evaluation of deep structures in the Bank would look at the values and work practices within the organization that hinder the consideration of gender issues. It should also highlight best practices within the organization that take gender issues into account, making it possible to see how the Bank’s structures and practices have changed or shaped gender concerns.

Power is one of the aspects of deep structure that is not necessarily gendered but nevertheless hinders gender equality. When we try to uncover such aspects, the dysfunctions of hierarchy often emerge, and gender analysis becomes a lightning rod for many other kinds of abuse of power and forms of exclusion. In some organizations where this kind of work has been done, gender activists have unexpectedly faced the problem of trying to hold on to gender while interest in looking at power and management practices is overwhelming. That deep structure in the Bank refers to hierarchy, lack of risk-taking, and lack of openness to partnerships, and this, not only with regard to gender, calls for a change in the culture, principles, and goals on which the Bank was built: the Bank needs to share a culture with its clients that accepts innovation.
The chair of this session, Ruben Lamdany, Manager of OED’s Country Evaluations and Regional Relations, the unit responsible for the gender evaluation report, opened by stating that over the past decade, the Bank has consistently moved its assistance to focus on the country level and that therefore the focus of evaluation needs to begin at the country level. Once moved to the country level, however, evaluation becomes more challenging: it is more difficult to find counterfactuals, to rate the Bank’s assistance, and to find what to attribute to the Bank. This is especially true for issues such as gender, which is not a principal focus of the Bank’s work. By and large, all that the Bank does has an impact on gender. Therefore, in its evaluation, OED has to look at the implicit effects of the Bank’s country assistance on gender as well as the explicit intended effects.

The Bank needs to develop counterfactuals that are rich enough to capture the implicit effects. In addition, it has to examine the interactions between gender and the Bank’s other objectives—principally, poverty reduction. The Bank needs to assess the complementarity between reducing gender disparity and reducing poverty. In this session and in the workshop and roundtable as a whole, OED is seeking suggestions on how to model these effects and how to measure them.

Mr. Lamdany introduced the session’s presenters. Laurie Effron, who recently completed a countrywide evaluation of Yemen that was notable for its attention to gender, is Principal Evaluation Officer of Country Evaluations and Regional Relations in OED. Lyn Squire serves as Director of the Global Development Network, an emerging association of research and policy institutes formed to generate and share development knowledge. Ravi Kanbur, on leave from Cornell University as T. H. Lee Professor of World Affairs and Professor of Economics, is Director of the Bank’s World Development Report on Poverty and Development, forthcoming in September 2000.
Country evaluations take a country as the unit of account and examine the Bank’s lending and nonlending assistance over a period of time, typically about ten years. What is thus known about Yemen is that, even by comparison with other poor countries, its gender gaps have historically been and continue to be quite wide. In school enrollment, literacy, life expectancy, and child mortality, differences between girls and boys and between women and men are unacceptably large. Tribal traditions, giving greater rights and authority to men, dominate in Yemen, and laws providing rights to women are largely unenforced.

Until 1996, IDA’s assistance to Yemen was modest, and dialogue was limited. With political stability in 1996, this changed. Reforms were supported by adjustment lending, lending increased dramatically, and a resident mission was established. As early as the 1980s, however, gender objectives had been incorporated into projects, long before gender concerns were mainstreamed into the Bank’s operations. These included focusing on increasing girls’ school enrollment, improving maternal health, and providing better extension services to women farmers. But the design of the projects was not backed up by diagnoses of the underlying causes of the gender discrepancies and men’s and women’s differing needs, and only some of the projects had gender-sensitive objectives. In education, health,
and agriculture, the ad hoc approach to gender issues lacked coherence.

Little information has been available on how specific project outcomes have met their gender-related objectives, such as increasing girls' primary school enrollment. At the country level, overall health indicators have improved, and it is likely that women have benefited as much as, or at least not much less than, men, but IDA's assistance cannot be credited with the improvements. IDA's involvement in health was extremely limited, and health project outcomes have been disappointing. In education, in contrast, the gap between female and male illiteracy in 1996 was much larger than it had been 25 years earlier. Ironically, IDA has had a larger involvement in this sector than in health and has focused more on girls there than in any of the other sectors.

The main conclusions from the country evaluation of Yemen are as follows:

- Taking a country as the unit of account is an extremely useful way to analyze the Bank's approach to gender, because it allows an evaluation of the consistency of the assistance strategy over time and across sectors.
- A country-level review highlights the importance of underpinning project interventions with diagnoses of the needs of the target population.
- Project objectives should be defined in a way that makes it possible to monitor them, and project achievements should be monitored and linked to outcomes.
Evaluating the Gender Impact of Adjustment Policies

Lyn Squire

While it is important for the Bank to look at the political and social constraints that limit women's productivity, because the Bank is a development agency, we also need to understand how households and firms respond to adjustment policies. Considerable analysis has been done on the impact of adjustment policies on some aspects of women's behavior rather than on their overall welfare. Measuring impact through behavior rather than well-being needs to be carefully looked at, since changes in behavior do not necessarily improve women's livelihoods. For example, we need to understand how households make decisions about the allocation of women's time before we can conclude that a change in time allocation is a benefit or a loss to women.

It is extremely difficult to look below the household when carrying out analysis and evaluation, and it would be very interesting to see what data do exist on what goes on below the household level. The Bank has to be careful not to use partial measures of behavioral response to judge impact; rather, it has to look at overall well-being. Moreover, many studies

Policy and legal constraints that disable women from taking advantage of new economic opportunities that adjustment might create limit their capacity to benefit from and contribute to long-run development and should therefore be high on the Bank's agenda.
have focused on women rather than on the welfare of society in general. It is also important to know, therefore, whether the assessments incorporated men and women or only women, because the results could differ significantly. We need to take an interest in the relative status of gender equality, in addition to the absolute status that we obviously care about.

Much of the literature has looked at the impact of individual interventions rather than at the impact of an adjustment package. Taking a country perspective could be a valuable complement to examining individual policies. In this way, some measure of net welfare, in which the positive and negative impacts of policies were taken into account, could be usefully obtained.

Certain sorts of short-term effects of adjustment are not very deleterious to women, but we need to be particularly concerned about other, long-term effects. For example, raising school fees might not do much damage to household budgets in the short run but could marginalize a whole generation of girls in their ability to get into school.

Because of policy and legal constraints in their own countries, women might not be able to take advantage of the new economic opportunities that adjustment might create. These constraints also limit women's capacity to benefit from and contribute to long-run development and should therefore be high on the Bank's agenda.
Evaluating Impact and Outcome
Issues of Attribution and Counterfactual

Ravi Kanbur

Seemingly general policies such as exchange rates can have disaggregated gender impacts, and seemingly directed policies can have general consequences. How do we attribute the gender-specific consequences of seemingly general policies, and vice versa, to the Bank's intervention? Do we know whether to assign them to know-how or to financial intermediation, either through Wall Street or through management of a trust fund? Take a hypothetical case in India, where a group of women are trying to scale up the insurance aspect of their initiative. In doing so, they run into constraints from policy and regulation, which in India are geared toward big insurance companies, not small groups. In such a situation, one of the most important things the Bank could do, in addition to providing its $5 million to help the women obtain insurance, would be to engage the government in negotiations that would lead to a reform of the regulations that prevent the women from getting insurance.

Policy dialogue is what...
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the Bank should get involved in, and this is an area in which the Bank has a comparative advantage. Successful policy dialogue can lead to real results and can be a catalyst for genuine change. The Bank should give priority to this rather than focusing on intervening at the micro level, where other institutions normally have the advantage.

It is futile to draw conclusions on attribution or to actually infer a path that would link any change (good or bad) to the Bank’s funds. In the hypothetical India case, where the Bank’s credit of $5 million, advanced for the women’s project, goes into the general coffers of the central government, the money may or may not be a reason for change. Money is fungible and could have come from anywhere else in the government pot. Despite the difficulty in tracing it, however, the connection between the money advanced for the women’s group and the government’s response is actually too close. My advice is to reduce the focus on attribution.

The detailed conditionality of the type that the Bank has been involved in—tying specific bits of money to specific institutional and process changes—is deeply corrosive to national institutions and domestic processes. Governments often accept the conditions only because they are tied to funds. The great challenge is to divorce funds from conditionality. The Bank should try to systematically develop an arm’s-length relationship between specific conditions and specific money. The connection between advice and money is problematic, not only in the Bank but also in the aid business generally. A little bit of distancing would be beneficial. One could begin with some pragmatic acts such as building walls between functions, not having the same officer involved with a given loan at all levels. This would lead to greater government ownership and commitment to conditions and would damage internal processes and institutions less.
Karen Mason, who spoke on the future direction of Bank strategy in the first session, introduced the four speakers for this session. Sharon Benoliel is a social scientist with the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). Michael Bamberger is a gender specialist with the Gender Anchor Unit in the Bank's PREM network. He is coordinating a study on the approaches to gender impact evaluation that different U.N. agencies use and is evaluating the gender impacts of social funds in Angola and Eritrea. Meera Shah is a participatory rural appraisal specialist. Valerie Young is an evaluation manager with the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), where she managed CIDA's WID and gender review.

Mark Blackden highlighted key areas of the topic. For one, both intended and unintended effects of our work are important. In a project in Mali, for example, rice production raised aggregate household income and output but changed power relations and resource allocation within the household, resulting in negative effects on health and nutrition indicators. The challenge of gendered evaluation, therefore, was that looking narrowly at one sector was not a sufficient basis for evaluation work; the approach should have been broader and more holistic.

Another highlight is that it is difficult to evaluate the gender impact of projects when they are not designed with gendered objectives in mind. Evaluations should therefore strengthen their feedback to the design of new projects in order to raise their quality.

Finally, incentives for staff to evaluate gender impact are a key issue, and so are the mechanisms required to support them. Staff should generally be put on the spot for the impact of Bank-supported projects, but adding gender to their responsibilities greatly complicates this task. It brings us back to the implicit assumptions and institutional norms within the “deep structure” of the organization.
Evaluating Education Projects

Sharon Benoliel

USAID evaluates education projects in the field and carries out multicountry impact evaluations at its offices in Washington, D.C. The organization began evaluating girls' education in 1997 because of a growing debate within USAID on how best to use resources for basic education. A new policy paper on education based on best practices was needed. Half a million dollars was spent on this activity, which an education specialist led. The first phase developed the concept paper, in which the key questions to be answered were identified and a methodology was selected and described. The evaluation was designed around several questions:

- What is the best way to get girls into school?
- How can the quality of girls' education be improved?
- What are the best ways to help girls complete a basic education?
- How are boys affected by efforts to improve girls' education?
- What are the critical features of approaches that lead to sustainable outcomes?

The countries selected for evaluation were Egypt, Guatemala, Guinea, Malawi, Nepal, and Pakistan. (Only a desk study could be carried out in Egypt.)

In mainstreaming, particular attention should be paid to staff who have been unable to incorporate gender because they do not know how to do so rather than because they do not want to.
countries where they could see programs that were focused on girls and other programs that needed strengthening, in order to get a sense of what was working. In each of the regions, there were countries that were known within the organization to have an interesting story, and they selected from these. Each team had to write a report on the country it evaluated. The teams examined the extent to which the intended and unintended results had been achieved. They also looked at what other donors were doing that could have contributed to the results, as well as the role of government and any other variables that emerged.

In Washington, the teams prepared the desk study, reviewed statistical data, and talked to other donors. In the field, they read data that they had been unable to obtain in Washington; they interviewed country staff, donors, contractors, parents, and students; and in some cases they reviewed records. They also administered simple mathematics and reading tests to a small sample of children in the countries.

In the field, they also collected data with the help of education specialists, gender specialists, education economists, general evaluation specialists, and local education researchers. The latter were very important in collecting the data and in helping with the interpretation of the results and other information that was obtained.

The many challenges in this work included trying to make a link between intervention and impact, examining other contributing variables, dealing with intervening variables, drawing comparisons with nonprogram areas, and making attributions. Real attribution is impossible, especially in development assistance, where the field is crowded. When they asked to what extent they could attribute the impacts to USAID's intervention, they concluded that USAID's activities appeared to contribute to the educational outcomes.

After the teams completed the evaluation, synthesized the data, and issued their reports, their next challenge was to have the information used and to get the policy guidance staff involved in considering what the results might mean for organizational policy. Specific policies have been suggested to USAID as a result of the evaluation, but the evaluation department's indicators change every year, because funding levels have dropped, necessitating a change in objectives. How gender has been mainstreamed is currently being assessed in USAID. Particular attention should be paid to staff who have been unable to incorporate gender because they do not know how to do so rather than because they do not want to.
Designing Monitoring and Evaluation Indicators

Michael Bamberger

The Bank's Gender Anchor Unit believes that a number of questions about gender need to be addressed in project evaluation. These questions include the following:

- Are there gender issues in project monitoring and evaluation?
- Can we construct a gender-sensitive monitoring and evaluation system?
- Can we construct and use a gender evaluation checklist?
- What information is available from the ongoing PREM network gender indicators project?

Development projects tend to have differing impacts on women and men. Women have multiple roles that they must manage simultaneously, while men tend to have fewer and more distinct roles that they can manage sequentially. Women's roles typically include reproduction, household maintenance, production of goods and services, and community management. Donors and governments frequently overlook gender differences in women's and men's roles and their implications for project design and implementation.

Finding gender-disaggregated data at the national, sectoral, and project levels is difficult. Most evaluation systems do not produce them.
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gated data at the national, sectoral, and project levels is often difficult. Unless
projects are specifically designed to respond to women’s needs, constraints, and
resources, women often benefit less than men, and some groups of women might
even be negatively affected. While there clearly are gender issues in project design,
most evaluation systems do not produce gender-disaggregated data.

One gender indicators checklist that has proved useful in many project
contexts asks:

- Were women involved in selecting the project?
- Were women involved in designing and implementing the project?
- Did women have access to the resources and benefits that the project
  produced?

We need to include gender indicators in project selection, design, and
implementation and in impact evaluation.

The Gender Anchor Unit is conducting a gender indicators project to look at
how gender is integrated into the Bank’s lending operations and at the gender
performance indicators that the Bank and other agencies use. The project also
involves a study of the gender evaluation methodologies of U.N. agencies. Another
project is developing a gender-sensitive monitoring system for transportation
projects (a report is planned for June 2000). The Gender Anchor Unit is also
launching a website on gender and transportation that will display examples and
guidelines for gender-responsive monitoring and evaluation.

Many gender consultants do not have experience in project management
and thus are not always able to present gender-related evaluation findings in a
way that is helpful to project managers, most of whom are not gender special-
ists. Surprisingly, many social assessments do not adequately treat gender
issues. In the Bank, links between sectors are not as good as they should be,
largely because staff are fully occupied with their own sectoral responsibilities.
Some progress has been made with monitoring, but very little has been done in
impact evaluation, because the Bank does not focus much on impact at the end
of a project. In recent years, a number of projects have incorporated beneficiary
impact assessments at the end.
Getting Qualitative Assessments Right

Meera Shah

In a participatory impact assessment, groups of men and women within a community are given the space to identify what impact means and then to ask how values have changed and to ascribe value to the changes. Gender impact is about trying to understand very complex multidimensional social relationships that even the evaluators of the impact have not easily understood. In a study just concluded on consultations with the poor in 23 countries that used participatory methods and processes, the study team focused on violence in gender relations at the community level. When groups of men and women were asked to define what violence meant to them, an amazingly long list of definitions emerged. It was very important to the study to understand the origins of their perceptions of impact and how they defined the impact for that analysis.

Attribution is difficult if it has to rely on proxy indicators, but if the people themselves are doing the analysis, finding causalities and linkages is not that difficult. Of course, not everything is always clear. That quantitative does not mean qualitative is a fictitious constraint. Whether or not qualitative and quantitative indicators can be combined is a false debate. Not everything needs to be or can be quantified, and whatever can be quantified can be quantified in a participatory manner.

Similarly, with aggregation, the question is whether everything has to be aggregated.
gated. Is it not enough to know the direction of change? It is possible to aggregate at a certain level, however, and issues of comparability and representativeness must be addressed if aggregation at sector and country levels is desired. The beauty of a participatory rural analysis is the diversity of views it yields.

It is important to establish why we are performing any given evaluation and how it will be used. Participatory impact assessments work best where project design and implementation are also participatory. Impact assessments should reflect the diversity and multiple realities and perceptions within communities. Numbers are important but not for everything—aggregation can be done without numbers.

It is easy to not disagree with participatory processes, but then capacity becomes an issue, raising the question of whether we have the resources to build capacity before we undertake a participatory process. We also have to ask whether we have the flexibility to carry out the necessary follow-up. Because participatory processes can be frustrating, we should use them only when we have the means to respond to some of their problems. For example, they can raise new expectations or heighten existing ones within communities. It is therefore important to understand what people’s perceptions are and to use these perceptions in designing our quantitative data.
Gender in Infrastructure Projects

Valerie Young

Gender findings in CIDA’s reviews have included evidence of positive results, mostly at the micro, community, or individual level, as well as confirmation that some of CIDA’s gender-sensitive indicators do measure women’s empowerment and participation. Participatory approaches enhance gender findings. Targeting women remains a challenge, and CIDA’s evaluation methodology, Framework of Results and Key Success Factors, should be improved to highlight gender and provide how-to advice.

More recent gender results at CIDA stem from program branch measurement activities (such as institutional and project assessments), annual project progress reports, annual branch performance reports, a special 1999 study for DAC on gender and evaluations, and performance reviews of CIDA’s six Official Development Assistance programming priorities. The performance reviews focused on development results in the form of sustainable impact, but the impact evaluations that were included examined several decades of sector programming.

CIDA’s 1995 Women in Development and Gender Evaluation review included six special studies. Its 1998 review included 9 evaluations, five desk studies, and six case studies of food aid plus 21 evaluations (one impact evaluation) and nine desk studies on basic human needs. The ongoing infrastructure services review includes 17 evaluations (nine impact) and nine desk studies.

These newer gender findings are preliminary and unofficial. They confirm that

One of the critical components for effective project design is gender analysis, preferably analysis that uses local professional resources.
effective project design is a precondition for success. One of the critical components is gender analysis, preferably analysis that uses local professional resources. There is evidence of positive results, notwithstanding the absence in many cases of gender-specific results statements. Many results are thus unintended. Previous findings regarding the absence of baseline and sex-disaggregated data seem to be confirmed. There is some evidence that systematic monitoring and evaluation are not carried out, and when they are, they may be too focused on technical matters. An examination of CIDA’s nonproject activities, such as policy dialogue, suggests the need to increase strategic attention to gender. Trends in CIDA’s approvals and disbursements in infrastructure are unclear.

The reviews also suggest that CIDA may be making assumptions about the gender neutrality of infrastructure programming and about impacts, particularly for women. We need to do more research—including project-related research in the field, poverty assessments at the country level, and gender analysis—to understand these larger questions better.

It should be noted that the sample for CIDA’s reviews is not random: in most cases, CIDA’s program branches recommend the specific projects, institutions, or development initiatives to be evaluated. It is difficult to develop a sample that represents CIDA’s different programming mechanisms and its four geographic regions. In the new year, we will undertake a follow-up exercise to determine what has happened to the recommendations from the basic human needs and food aid reviews. Are we learning? How is the feedback loop working? CIDA continues to struggle with how to use participatory approaches at all levels of project design, implementation, and evaluation. To facilitate the participation of people from the South in our corporate reviews, we have experimented with entry workshops like this one and virtual conferencing. Access to the Internet is an issue. We have also used a reference panel for each review of not more than four or five experts in the area, with at least one from the South.

In 1998 CIDA approved an accountability framework that states that it is responsible for operational results and that it shares accountability with its partners for development results. The framework contains neither incentives nor enforcement procedures. Some branches have peer review and project review committees to screen projects before they are approved and to offer guidance on how to incorporate gender, but these are not standard throughout the agency.
Gender, Culture, and Some Dilemmas of Economic Policy

Osvaldo N. Feinstein, Manager of OED's Partnerships of Knowledge Programs, introduced Susan Moller Okin, Stanford University Professor in Political Science, as the speaker on this topic.
A Cautionary Note on Gender and Culture

Susan Moller Okin

By culture, I refer to a simple definition of the ways in which things are done in society and the beliefs that exist in the scheme of things. As a young girl growing up, I experienced the gender disparities between my parents and observed those I saw in the home of my grandparents. Both showed a very patriarchal family structure that brought home to me the power dimension in culture.

In numerous cultures around the world, a married woman can be unilaterally divorced, regardless of how long she has been married, and she can end up penniless, on the street. In numerous contexts, women experience cultural norms that demand that they live in seclusion and not go outside their families. The only women I have found who defend polygamy are Western academic feminists, who would not dream of living in such a situation.

Women the world over are more likely to be poor—or become poor—than men, even without the impact of Bank policies. We cannot begin to address issues of economic development without addressing gender. There is no such thing as a gender-neutral economic policy. Policy either takes gender into account or it is gender blind, in that it can easily contribute to sexist outcomes. I am not sure that I completely understand the concept of gender mainstreaming, but it seems to me that if one were going to mainstream a set of issues, one would first have to have a stream in which to mainstream. The Bank’s
attention to gender is presently so small that things are not at the stage where they can be mainstreamed.

It is clear that the "trickle-down" effect upheld in neoclassical economics is a myth, rarely in accord with the facts. Unless work is paid work, there is no product in terms of GNP, and this is a large part of the problem: a lot of women's work is not seen as productive. The Bank has a serious obligation to turn its attention to the impact of its policies on women and children, an obligation that stems from the ethical principle of "first, do no harm." The harm the Bank has done in the past must be undone as soon as possible. In 1989, the industrialized countries were spending 28 percent as much on their militaries as they were spending on education and health, while the developing countries were spending 67 percent as much on their militaries as they were spending on education and health. Subsequent structural adjustment cuts had more negative impact on women's education and health than on the circumstances of men. By putting in place adjustment policies without taking gender into account, the Bank has done harm, and it has a duty to fix it.

Some people observe that there is no evidence of actual spending cut differences in adjustment and nonadjustment countries and that adjustment has become a scapegoat for the tough decisions governments have had to make. Some agree that the Bank should pay attention to gender but do not agree that this is because it has done wrong in the area of adjustment. Some believe instead that we need more balance in the roles of internal and external agencies in looking at results within countries. All this makes for considerable discussion. With regard to the counterfactuals, I brought up military spending because it has struck me that if many of the governments had been strongly advised not to spend so much on their militaries and to spend more on the social sector, some of them would have paid attention. This does not, however, excuse or exempt the governments. There are other questions that project planners should be aware of, such as aspects of cultures and religion that have a specific impact on women, but they add up to what I already said: the Bank must pay more attention to gender.
Donor and Partner Experiences in Evaluation

Mathias Meyer stated that he was happy to represent Switzerland, which was involved in the funding of the workshop through the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation. He then invited the session’s four participants to make their presentations. The first was Gisela Geisler, a research fellow at Norway’s Christian Michelsen Institute. The next was Eva Lovgren, an evaluating officer with the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA). Following her, Josephine Ouedraogo spoke as head of the African Center for Women (ACW), under the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA). The fourth speaker was Mary B. Anderson, president of the Collaborative for Development Action in Cambridge, Massachusetts.
Evaluating Gender Mainstreaming

Gisela Geisler

My colleagues and I evaluated gender mainstreaming in the Bank, the U.N., and the U.N. Food and Agriculture Association (FAO) for a study commissioned by the Norwegian Foreign Ministry. We looked at Bangladesh, Malawi, and Uganda. The idea of gender mainstreaming had been around for only a few years. Often, gender mainstreaming policies, if present in an organization, were not integrated into the whole institutional setting but existed merely as an additional dimension. Among the problems we found with gender mainstreaming was that institutional policies did not carry enough weight because they were not sufficiently operational. The strongest gender mandate we found was at UNDP, the weakest at the Bank. The institutional status of WID in gender units was also low in the organizations, but this had just changed in the Bank.

We found that since gender focal points had very low status, no one wanted to hold this position. We found institutional resistance in the attitudes of staff, particularly among staff who did not have a “fit” with the gender concept, such as economists. Resistance among male staff was apparent in men’s discourse and old boy networks. In addition, men feared the impact of affirmative action and of gender mainstreaming in their own personal lives, and this made it difficult for them to

At the regional and country levels, gender focal points should be mandatory; otherwise, gender may be forgotten altogether... Having gender focal points means segregation, but if focal points do not exist, then nothing at all gets done.
take on these issues. Gender policies and professional mixes in organizations that were not dominated by social scientists, such as the Bank, made the social scientists feel like an endangered species.

Staff usually needed gender tools and guidelines before they could begin to mainstream. In all three organizations, gender work was being undertaken helter-skelter. FAO, however, had tried hard to develop tools for its staff. None of the three organizations enforced internal accountability measures. In my experience, accountability measures have not worked in any international organization except at Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit, where they seem to have raised the level of projects and all the staff like them.

When gender mainstreaming was weak at the institutional level, it was even weaker at the country level. FAO had particular problems with this, the Bank and UNDP less so. Targeting money for mainstreaming runs contrary to the idea of gender mainstreaming, and this is one of the methodological problems that has to be thought through. In the Bank, priorities should center on making policies operational and on the accountability of senior management. At the regional and country levels, gender focal points should be mandatory; otherwise, gender may be forgotten altogether. We raised the question of whether gender competes with so many other issues that task managers feel they cannot fund it. The new Bank should look at how the structure of the GSB is working. Does it get requests from other departments for gender expertise?

The key issue in gender mainstreaming is the confusion between policy, mandate, and recommendation. This confusion should be cleared up before evaluators begin gender mainstreaming, so that they know what they are looking for and what they can and cannot expect to find. Having indicators in this work goes without saying, and so does finding the indicators that work. The idea of moving back to address women’s issues rather than those of gender is premature, since women cannot be mainstreamed but gender can be.

In order to measure gender mainstreaming, we have to look across the whole Bank. Having gender focal points means segregation, but if focal points do not exist, then nothing at all gets done. At the Bank, many people do a lot of analysis on gender, but they do not seem to be connected to the rest of the institution. We could build on the successes of the Bank—such as the education and microcredit work—as possible models for achieving gender mainstreaming.
Evaluating Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment

Eva Lovgren

Sweden has had input in the broad study of the DAC Working Party on Aid Evaluation. Promoting equality between women and men has been an important goal for Swedish bilateral development cooperation since the 1960s. In evaluating gender equality policies and practices in 42 evaluation reports, SIDA found the following:

- There has been a slight quantitative increase in mentioning gender issues in the terms of reference, but gender issues were mentioned more frequently in the reports than in the terms of reference. This says nothing about the quality of the discussion.
- The link between gender issues and target group discussions is weak.
- Only one-third of the reports presented sex-disaggregated statistics.
- Gender issues were often discussed as side effects in the reports.
- The reports confused women and gender as terminology, and some of the reports were completely gender blind.
SIDA departments that originated the reports appeared to have a weak demand for gender issues and did not allocate enough time and resources to adequately analyze them. Many of the problems the evaluation highlighted were not particular to gender issues but were present in many evaluations.

After Ms. Lovgren’s presentation, Ms. Okeyo, who had been the speaker at session 18, stated that the greatest difficulty is the choice of the focal point. Capacity issues are strong, and hierarchy is a problem. In UNDP, if the gender focal point were low in the organizational hierarchy, not much would be accomplished. Most of the people who work on gender have had years of experience that exceed the age of the institutions that employ them. Many staff can be defensive when asked about implementing gender mainstreaming, because they cannot admit that they do not know how to do it. An organization needs money and time in this work. It cannot mainstream gender with no money, because certain activities that have to be undertaken are necessary for mainstreaming but are neither program nor policy activities. An example comes from the Southern African Development Community, which has a good gender policy that requires every country to look at all its programs and incorporate gender within them. It has also added a very strong human rights agenda to its mainstreaming. At the country level, however, capacity and funding remain issues. As for the need for time, each sector should have the opportunity to spend time with a gender specialist on a consultative basis in order to begin to work toward mainstreaming.
Evaluating Compliance with International Covenants
The ECA Experience

Josephine Ouedraogo

ECA provides advisory services and tools in capacity building and other areas. It is composed of the ministers in charge of planning, finance, and economic development. Its clients are not governments alone but include civil society as well. ACW is the gender unit within ECA.

ECA’s perspective on gender came to a turning point in 1996, when ACW’s status was raised to be on a par with that of the other divisions in the organization that affect policy. ACW is charged with mainstreaming gender within ECA’s policies and programs. One of ACW’s goals is to train ECA staff in gender analysis, and this is proving to be very difficult. The reason is that many of the staff are men who have been with the organization for a long time. The training program is still being formulated and will run for a period of three to five years.

A second task of ACW is to mainstream gender into ECA’s Conference of Ministers and into the issue papers that

One of the tasks of the African Center for Women is to implement the Beijing Platform for Action by providing support to member states. It has formulated a monitoring platform and guidelines that the member states can apply.
are presented regularly in that conference. This means mainstreaming the Africa economic report that is published every two years, and it means that the depart-
ment that writes this report must use gender indicators. It would like to call on a partnership with the Bank in this effort.

A third task of ACW is to implement the Beijing Platform for Action (Africa Platform for Action) by providing support to member states. ACW has formulated a monitoring platform and has established guidelines that the member states can apply. The guidelines require every country to come up with a national action plan on gender. ACW recognizes the lack of technical skills among the ministries in charge of women’s issues. There is also a lack of gender-disaggregated data that could justify the identification of priorities for action, and a distinction between a gender approach and a WID approach is needed. ACW has found that at the policy level, a gender approach is appropriate.

In tackling the problem of the lack of gender-disaggregated data for evalua-
tion, ACW has developed an information booklet, but its data have not been updated and its sources are not easily found. ACW plans to organize a meeting of African statisticians to discuss the issue of obtaining gender-disaggregated data, during which an agreement would be reached on indicators and the importance of producing them. The constraint ACW faces in this work is its very small budget and staff. Nevertheless, the scale of responsibility the staff feel demands high output.
Mainstreaming
Experience and Overview

Mary B. Anderson

Why is gender mainstreaming so difficult? Are we making it harder than it should be? One of the reasons evaluating gender is so difficult is that gender is not a technical issue. It is a political issue that touches people in a personal, sensitive way. The idea of mainstreaming is fundamentally about equality, politics, and power.

Development assistance is just one tool for addressing equality issues; it is not the only one. Other actors and factors mean that development assistance cannot achieve equality by itself. Would we know gender mainstreaming if we saw it? Yes. Gender is mainstreamed when gender analysis is fully integrated and when the attention to gender equality within an organization is so routine that it does not provoke conflict or comment. Here are three examples of mainstreaming in the United States: the computerization of office work; the application of street addresses, area codes, tax identifiers, and other numbers to many aspects of our lives; and sending six-year-old children to school. In each case, the practice has become so thoroughly accepted that not to do it is to be outside the norm. If gender equality were mainstreamed, we would know it, although it manifests itself differently in different countries.

In evaluation planning, the Bank ought to ask the following questions: What is within its power to bring about gender equality? Is the Bank doing everything it could do to understand what fundamental equality looks like. Because equality is manifested in different ways in different societies, it is difficult to standardize indicators. With good consultation and care, we could begin to understand what fundamental equality looks like.
can? If not, why not? If yes, with what results? Evaluation should be kept simple and straightforward. One should examine belief and attitude on the one hand and action on the other. The two are not sequential; they are mutually interactive. The insider-outsider relationship should also be considered in evaluation, because the outsider can make a real contribution.

Resistance to mainstreaming does not always mean hostility. Sometimes it comes from ignorance, lack of understanding, or habit. Because equality is manifested in different ways in different societies, it is difficult to standardize indicators. With good consultation and care, we could begin to understand what fundamental equality looks like. We could then identify localized indicators within the fundamental, and universal, principle of gender equality.
The Effectiveness of the Gender Dimensions of the Bank’s Development

Robert Picciotto opened the roundtable with a dilemma: women’s contribution to development is fundamental yet women are not proportionately represented among development’s beneficiaries, and discrimination prevents their full involvement in the economic and social life of their countries. Twenty years after gender was identified as an issue in the development community, why does it remain a missing link in many development programs? Mr. Picciotto invited the presenters to explore this question. He welcomed Jan Piercy, Chair of the Board Committee on Development Effectiveness, as the first speaker on the Bank’s gender policy. He then introduced Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo, Vice President of the Philippines; Rima Khalaf Huneidi, Jordan’s Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Planning; Bimal Jalan, Governor of the Reserve Bank of India; Cecilia Lopez, former minister of environment, agriculture, and planning of the government of Colombia, who had made a presentation in session 5; Karsten Hinrichs, Chief of Division, Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, Germany; Anne Kristen Hermansen, Head of Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Norway; and Gerard Steeghs, Senior Desk Officer, Multilateral Development Cooperation, the Netherlands.
Let me begin by drawing attention to three examples of a new awareness of the power of gender. First, there is now an understanding of the primacy of gender issues in the Bank that did not exist when I joined its board five years ago. Second, a meeting of high-level women in finance discussing finance, national economies, and development for one and a half days has demonstrated the importance and power of networks to support and reinforce women who have reached influential positions in their countries. Third, Mr. James D. Wolfensohn has referred to the study on the consultations with the poor as indicating a tremendous disconnect between the poor and those who seek to represent them, in that the poor have the capacity to organize and articulate their needs with great clarity. In presenting that study, he focused on its demonstration that gender inequities persist and that violence against women has not abated.

The powerlessness of women has deepened the crisis in the many societies where culturally only women can reach other women with messages about family planning and related needs. Women must be helped to benefit from the Bank’s capacity building investments and their economic activities. Women must help shape the development agenda. We need to give women a seat at the table.

The global context for discussing gender has improved but is still grim. It now receives a priority that it has never before attained on the Bank’s agenda, but...
policies are only as good as the people who implement them. Joanne Salop succeeded in repositioning gender in the Bank’s group while the Bank launched an international search for a specialist to lead the Bank in this area. The Bank hired Karen Mason, who is not only a gender specialist but is also skilled in one of the Bank’s core competencies and a peer among the Bank’s economists and other specialists. With this leadership in place, I feel confident that the Bank will respond well.

OP 4.20 (adopted in 1994) aimed to reduce gender disparity and increase women’s participation in the economic activities of their countries. It required the Bank to integrate gender considerations, based on sound gender analysis, into its country assistance and programming. It is important to understand how this policy fits in with the Bank’s drive toward client focus and the Comprehensive Development Framework (CDF).

The results of the gender policy are rather weak, however. Some progress has been made over the past few years in the Latin America and Caribbean Region. It is clear that if the participants here are not seeing gender figure in the Bank’s dialogue with their countries or in project implementation, then either the policy is not right or its implementation is not right. This leaves us with three questions:

- Is the Bank’s policy on gender appropriate?
- If not, why not?
- What guidance do you have for the Bank?
Is the Bank’s Policy Appropriate—and If Not, Why Not?

Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo

The Bank’s gender policy is appropriate for a variety of reasons. First, the Bank supports mainstreaming, indicating that it is committed to analyzing the likely effects of all aspects of its assistance on both men and women rather than addressing women’s issues through women-only projects. Second, its strategy incorporates a sectoral focus on expanding girls’ education, improving women’s health, increasing women’s participation in the labor force, enlarging women’s options in agriculture, and opening up women’s access to financial services. Third, the policy focuses on countries where gender disparity is high, although it does not consider my country, the Philippines, as one of these countries. And fourth, the Bank’s plans for addressing gender issues are incorporated into its country assistance strategy.

Any evaluation of the Bank’s progress, however, should be undertaken in the context of the Beijing Platform for Action. At Beijing, the Bank and other multilateral agencies were called to mobilize new and additional resources with a view to targeting women living in poverty. The Bank was urged to promote the participation of grassroots women in the formulation of economic policies, to institutionalize a gender perspective in the design and implementation of its projects, to increase the Bank’s lending to basic education and other sectors that benefit women, and to add senior management at the Bank.
The Bank’s documents suggest that it has made progress in all these areas. Moreover, the Bank’s 1999 Annual Report reiterated the Bank’s commitment to gender-inclusive and gender-equitable development.

Thus, on the whole, the Bank’s policy is appropriate, with some exceptions:

- Contrary to its commitment to analyze gender in all its assistance, the majority of the projects the Bank approves do not contain any gender analysis in the documents it presents to the Board. The 1999 Annual Report made no reference to any prominent report on gender or the participation of women in the economic development of their countries. The country assistance strategy for the Philippines did not refer to any gender reports or analysis.
- Contrary to the Beijing Declaration, which pressed the Bank to raise new resources to target women, the Bank seems hesitant to address gender issues through women-only projects.
- Although the Bank’s lending in education, health, and population has increased in accordance with its commitment in Beijing, the Bank has not consistently increased lending for credit for women.
- The Bank has added women in senior management but still has a long way to go to reach its targets.

Inappropriate implementation of appropriate policy may be the problem. If so, the following guidance may help:

- Comply with the Bank’s policy by analyzing the likely effects on men and women in project and analytical work.
- Comply with the Beijing Declaration and mobilize new resources to target women living in poverty, even if only through women-only projects. The Bank should mainstream women-only projects. Apart from other traditional sectors, the Bank’s development strategy should integrate a capacity building component for women and make concerted efforts to strengthen women’s leadership skills.
- The Bank should increase credit for women because it will enhance the participation of the poorest women in economic activities. A law in the Philippines, for example, requires preferential credit for women in microenterprises. If the Bank could provide budgetary support for implement-
ing this law, women's participation in economic development would increase.

- In increasing women in senior management, the Bank should emphasize their program management skills.

The indications of progress are clear, but there is room for improvement if the Bank is to systematically address gender issues.
How the Bank Can Help

Rima Khalaf Huneidi

Being more constrained than men, women cannot fully participate in their countries' socioeconomic development, a fact that is now universally recognized. Moreover, countries where gender inequality is pronounced are facing serious problems, and their structural adjustment programs further heighten the challenge of these problems.

In view of the magnitude of such problems, gender is not considered a primary issue in many countries. It is not seen as irrelevant, but it is accorded low priority. This is relevant to the Bank's policy because the Bank will ultimately negotiate with these countries the issues to be addressed in projects and policies. In addition, cultural prejudices and the absence of women at the top decisionmaking levels limit their voice. Calls for gender equality are therefore not as powerful as complaints about other issues.

What can the governments and the Bank do? They have to work together to identify gender imbalances and their root causes, which differ from country to country. Then they need to use all their available tools to eliminate the disparities in the short term and eliminate the root causes in the medium term.

One element of the Bank's policy is that it is required to help governments design policies and programs to ensure that all assistance generates an equitable impact for men and women. Has this actually taken place in Bank assistance? The Bank seems to have had the objective of incorporating gender considerations in project and program design, doing damage control rather than supporting gender equality.

Equal access to benefits is the Bank and the countries should target "equality of results." We should look for less inequality overall rather than for equal benefits to men and women.
not necessarily equitable. Women are less privileged, a problem that can be solved only by targeting additional resources to them. The idea that you target more resources to disadvantaged regions is not outlandish in the development literature, and it applies equally to gender. The Bank and the countries should target "equality of results," looking at end results to see that project benefits lead to less inequality overall rather than equal benefits to men and women.

A second element of the Bank’s policy requires it to implement legal changes, modifying and amending its legal framework to ensure that men and women have equal rights. This is necessary—but not adequate by itself. The key lies in ensuring the effective implementation of laws and identifying and addressing factors that prevent women’s equal participation in development activities. The burden is not on the Bank alone, but it can provide technical assistance to empower national institutions to deal with the issues, to develop the capacity to identify impediments, and to devise national strategies for removing them.

A third element of the Bank’s policy is the requirement that it strengthen the database for gender analysis. This is critical. Not all developing countries have the culture to be sensitive to the need for national data and to incorporate them in the collection of disaggregated data. Therefore, the Bank needs to support country institutions in collecting, analyzing, and using data so that they will become the basis for policy analysis and formulation.

Bank financing is expensive. Given that gender issues are not the top priority, many countries will not be willing to borrow funds for them. Therefore, the Bank should make funds for gender issues more appealing. For example, the European Investment Bank is blending environment loans with grants from the European Union, providing an incentive for countries to borrow. Gender issues are as important as environmental issues, and the Bank should therefore establish a fund for pooling grants and loans to make borrowing for gender more attractive.

One last comment. Policy-based operations are another area in which the Bank can incorporate gender issues. I have never seen a policy-based operation that requires constructive policies to enhance the situation of women or one that requires a change in the policy framework related to women as a condition for generating funds.
Reflections on Gender Policy

Bimal Jalan

Reflecting on a few random thoughts, I feel that the Bank’s policy is appropriate, but I cannot say anything else, given that I was a signatory to it in my former position at the Bank. The Bank’s gender policy has raised considerable awareness and generated a lot of analytical work and research. Nevertheless, five years is too short a period for an evaluation of its impact. Therefore, I suggest adopting a different measure: ask whether the Bank has shifted its development assistance to sectors that involve women, help women, empower women, and generate results for women. Literacy, health, population, and microcredit are key areas to measure. A shift has probably not taken place, even after the Bank established its gender policy.

Gender is a complex issue. It is a cultural issue, a historical issue, a social issue; it is not just a poverty issue. The Bank should not characterize it as a “man versus woman” issue. The Bank should also remember that universal approaches to this complex subject are not possible. The Bank can—at best—arrive at some universally valid conclusions. For example, in a country where female literacy is high, you can say that the country is likely to develop faster. The Bank has to arrive at some conclusions about what is effective and then build strategy in the country context.

Not all projects need to consider gender issues. I caution against converting gender issues into a mandatory paragraph in project

Enough evidence demonstrates that where women have been permitted to participate in development activities, development assistance has been more effective.
documents. Gender analysis should be undertaken only in projects that contribute to women's empowerment. The test should be not whether or not there is a paragraph but whether or not the Bank has made the shift to supporting activities that assist women's empowerment. I favor women's-only projects in many cases. Focus on water, for example. When communities have access to water, women's lives are changed. Asking communities to participate in development activities enhances the drive for women's equality. The Bank should identify activities and programs that generate women's power and then shift its resources to them. Microcredit, for example, can transform women's lives, as shown by the significant contribution that the Self-Employed Women's Association, an NGO in India, has made.

We have to regard women's issues both as an end (because 50 percent of us are women) and as a means. There is enough evidence to demonstrate that where women have been given a seat at the table and have been permitted to participate in development activities, development assistance has been more effective. These assertions can be made without any possibility of disagreement.
Gender as a Problem of Development, and a Framework for Its Solution

Cecilia Lopez

I can be frank because I have the privilege of being unassociated with any government. I believe in the Bank’s commitment to gender issues, but in my opinion, its gender policy is not appropriate, for three main reasons. First, its policy is behind the policies of the rest of the world. Second, when the country assistance strategy for Colombia was discussed, gender was not even mentioned. And third, gender is not an issue in many of the Bank’s important discussions, and the Bank has failed to assign adequate resources to gender. Gender is not in the mainstream in the Bank—it is still more talk than action.

The Bank should clarify a confusion that is apparent in its policy. Is it focusing on women as a specific group of people to whom it can target specific resources, or is it talking about gender and development? The latter is about differences between men and women—not men versus women but differences in their access to resources and their impact on interventions. We will not get to the point of equality through women in development activities, but we may get

The economy is not just a productive activity. It is also a reproductive activity. If you do not consider both aspects, you will come to the wrong conclusions.
there through gender and development. So make up your mind: if you want to stay behind, stay with women in development.

Gender is not a poverty issue. It is not a social issue. It is a problem of development. There are important differences between men and women, and both can make important contributions. Women's projects are like women: poor, without resources, and a mess. We should take a more holistic approach to development. Gender is not an NGO issue but a public policy issue. NGOs may play an important role in specific areas, such as women's projects, where there is a focus on specific activities, but it is the governments that are responsible for gender.

Gender is not used in its proper meaning in the Bank's policy. Paradoxically, it has been clearly defined in many Bank documents but has not been internalized within the Bank. Romanticism about women is good for love but not for development.

An even more fundamental problem is the lack of a new and updated macro conceptual framework for gender. The Bank is many years behind current thinking here. It is not offering new and solid arguments for including gender in development discussions.

There are at least three dimensions where we need to move ahead: gender and macroeconomics, gender and politics, and gender and power. Given the Bank's mandate, the first area is key. The Bank should help countries get their macroeconomic policies right so that the macroeconomic framework is right.

The Bank should be a leader in supporting gender equality throughout the world. In the United States, men and women have still to achieve gender equality. In Colombia, where there could be two or three women presidential candidates, one cannot say that there is gender equality. There are about 140 important women in Colombia, and 18 million women suffer from inequity. The Bank should worry about the whole world. The Bank must build a solid conceptual framework on gender and development. If it does not, gender will remain like an appendix—to be added or discarded on a whim.

Women and men are affected in different ways by macroeconomic variables. Women have a different consumption pattern, a different savings pattern, and a different way of spending their money. These differences vary from country to country and must be identified. Moreover, economic and political policies do not have the same impact on men and women, and the differences should be recognized. The economy is not just a productive activity. It is also a reproductive
activity. If you do not consider both aspects, you will come to the wrong conclud-
sions. For example, take structural adjustment. Governments constrain the budget,
they achieve equilibrium, and things seem good. But what is the impact in the
reproductive area? Women are assuming roles not undertaken by the government
anymore. One must not forget that savings in the productive sector imply more
work in the reproductive sector, where women are overrepresented.

Market forces modify gender relations, and gender relations modify market
forces. Macroeconomics is not neutral to gender; it is blind. There is a clear
gender bias in law in property and in inheritance. These are the basic organiza-
tional elements of a society. If you ignore them, you are blind.

There are many macroeconomic models with gender dimensions, models
that are absolutely essential for policy assessment and formulation, despite all
their limitations. Four types of models are being developed in Europe:

- One disaggregates by gender the impact of macroeconomic or other
  variables in order to identify gender differences.
- One introduces gender dimensions in selected macroeconomic variables,
  such as savings and expenditures.
- One divides the economy between sectors of production (the traditional
  macroeconomic variables) and reproduction (nonpaid work; noncash goods
  and services; and, most important, social networks).
- One combines all three.

The time has come to speak about the economics of gender, and the World
Bank should lead the way.
German policy on gender equality has two key sentences. One: both women and men must participate if gender-specific inequalities are to be overcome, since their rights and duties are closely related. Even if we promote projects and programs with all good intentions, they will not be successful unless we negotiate with men.

Two: the Bank's direction has been driven by a number of donors and NGOs. The Bank seems ashamed to talk of economics, but economic arguments can be very persuasive in convincing people of the need to do something for gender equality. The Bank previously emphasized the education of girls and women as a key sector but seems to have reduced this emphasis recently. German experience indicates a number of fields that make economic sense to gender equality.

Development assistance should address the short-term needs of both women and men but should also focus on strategic achievements. For example, in some countries, the minority status of women that inhibits their access to land is an important constraint on their active participation in development activities. The consensus arrived at in Beijing, which was that women's rights are human rights, should be strengthened.

While much attention tends to be paid to women's practical needs, guidelines on their strategic issues—their access to resources and decisionmaking powers—
tend to remain vague and without consequence. Thus, the Germans have welcomed the reference in the Bank's gender policy to the need to address such strategic issues by assisting governments to review and modify legal and regulatory frameworks relating to women's access to assets and resources. The Germans also appreciate the mainstreaming efforts of the policy, including the proposed OED evaluation, as the first step to revision. The 1998 DAC guidelines are a useful reference. The second step is to ensure that these guidelines are rendered binding. But the third and most important—and most difficult—step for donors is successful implementation of the guidelines.
Lessons for the Bank from Norway’s Experience

Anne Kristen Hermansen

Norway has been a firm supporter of gender in the Bank, working at two levels: influencing gender policy through the governing bodies (the Bank’s Board) and through earmarked funds for gender. In 1992 the Norwegians worked through change agents within the Bank system—people who were committed to the issue and were trying to change systems. Norway provided funds to document the importance of considering gender issues in designing and implementing development interventions, and it financed a number of studies to understand how macroeconomic policies impact gender. This work fed into the formulation of the 1994 gender policy and the Bank’s report at Beijing in 1995.

The Norwegians considered the 1994 policy a breakthrough for the Bank. Larry Summers, then the Bank’s chief economist, had stated at a 1993 conference that the most important area for investment for growth was girls’ education. Mr. Wolfensohn’s statement at Beijing had equal significance. The Bank clearly has a vocabulary it did not have in 1992.

Nevertheless, the Norwegians are disappointed. Since the adoption of the Bank’s policy, implementation has stood still. The issues raised today are the same issues raised five years ago. The challenge is still
the lack of mechanisms for implementing policy.

One key concern is the skills mix between social scientists, who know something about these issues, and economists. Another is that the Bank is still not recruiting enough women. Another is the Bank's allocation of resources to gender. The demand from country directors and task team leaders to seek the participation of social scientists in designing programs and projects is greater, but the supply is so low that capacity is totally stressed. This diminishes the quality of the work. With reference to Ms. Piercy's statement that the Latin America gender program may be the only one that is being funded, it would be interesting to know what has been funded by the Bank's budget and other donor funds. In addition, it is evident from Bank documents that gender issues have not been properly addressed in the country assistance strategies.

I agree that the question is perhaps not whether the policy is appropriate but whether its implementation is being meaningfully evaluated. In any case, it makes sense to revise policy periodically, particularly in view of recent developments in the overall environment: the CDF and the joint World Bank-International Monetary Fund (IMF) paper on poverty reduction strategies. I would reiterate Mr. Wolfensohn's plea that it is time not for review but for action. Evaluation is important and new policy is important, but the starting point for doing evaluation is to find mechanisms for implementation that will ensure action for change. This calls for a different kind of evaluation. Significant analytical and research work has been undertaken in the past few years. The charge is now to build on this knowledge in order to reduce the gap between knowledge and what is happening in the field.

Evaluation is being undertaken in a participatory manner, and it is important to bring people on board as evaluation proceeds. Evaluation should also document how a poor skills mix and lack of resources hinder the work. People should be brought on board who are spearheading the CDF and the Bank-IMF strategy on poverty reduction. The Bank should work with donors, because it is extremely important to get gender back on the Board's agenda.
For the Netherlands, women are central to development policy. Within the Bank, there seems to be a disconnect between poverty reduction policies and gender policies. Bank documents give clear evidence that investment in women leads to better results. I wonder why the highly qualified economists in the Bank have not yet caught on to this viewpoint.

Mainstreaming poverty reduction measures was for some time paid only lip service, but Highly Indebted Poor Countries Initiative, the Enhanced Structural Adjustment Facility, and other major initiatives have changed this. In the same vein, poverty reduction needs to make gender a central issue. What is poverty reduction if you do not put gender at the center? That is what mainstreaming is all about. Although it is patently clear from the research that gender issues are of predominant importance, economists at the Bank obviously seem to need further evidence. Bank staff need to be told that if they are not considering gender issues in their work, then they are not doing their work very well.

One other small comment. The Bank has a tendency to make “beautiful” country recommendations. However, countries are not always able to implement the Bank’s recommendations. It is important to evaluate a country’s ability to implement Bank recommendations within the country’s context. I hope that the Bank will listen and move ahead.

Economists at the Bank seem to need further evidence that gender issues are of predominant importance. Bank staff need to be told that if they are not considering gender issues in their work, then they are not doing their work very well.
Comments from the Floor

The Ambassador from the Philippines: It would help if the Bank could find ways to persuade governments to nominate more women to the Board. We also need to get more women into national parliaments. In my experience, it is difficult to find women to run for political office once they are successful in their fields. The Philippines, for example, is searching for women for the post of Internal Revenue Commissioner. The best candidate, the head of a successful accounting firm, has refused the offer from three presidents. What can the Bank do to convince women to run for political office? The longevity of women means that there are more women voters, yet the proportion of women who do not vote is larger. Voter education is important.

The Bank has retired about 400 from the Philippines. Can the Bank factor into early retirement plans that for the past two years, people receive only about a third of their remuneration but that they can be seconded to institutions in the country? Countries could use this good resource effectively.

Barbara Herz (former head of the WID unit in the Bank): Bank-financed projects that considered gender issues rose from 10 percent to 40 percent between 1982 and 1992. It fizzled a little after that. I want to suggest three things that the Bank can do internally to revive this activity.

1. The most effective task the Bank’s gender team accomplished was to demonstrate to Larry Summers that addressing gender issues can make a difference. He was bowled over by the evidence and became its strongest supporter. I would like to see Joseph Stiglitz become transformed in a similar way, not about women’s education but about women and the
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economy or about women, men, and the economy. I would like to see the Bank zero in on key messages econometrically that women do not spend their money on beer and other women. Get somebody who is not seen as a key pleader for gender to make the case. In addition, Mr. Wolfensohn needs to give an indication of whether gender is number 19 on the list of Bank priorities or higher.

2. Train staff, starting with the vice presidents. A workshop whose participants were the representatives of developing countries, starting with the vice presidents, would be of enormous benefit. It could also aim at country directors, who still see gender as an issue to giggle about. It is good to explain to people from developing countries why expanding opportunities for both men and women can help them reach their objectives and to enable them to take them on.

3. Don’t just look at levels of expenditures in sectors like health and education. Look at what is happening there. Have they hired women teachers in countries where girls have to be taught by men? Have they done what it takes to get girls into school? Have they provided quality education because parents are on the fence when it comes to girls’ education? In some areas of Baluchistan, girls’ enrollment is less than 10 percent, but in other areas there where new practices are being introduced, the enrollment rates are more than 80 percent. There are always leaders in a country who fight to make these changes, and if the Bank staff have at their fingertips the knowledge to support them, and are willing to include gender in Bank dialogue on policy, then change can happen. There are not many precedents for policy dialogue based on gender, but there are some. We need the courage to put our knowledge into action.

Eduardo Doriyan (recently appointed the Bank’s vice president for human development): Listening to Cecilia Lopez in her presentation on “Gender as a Problem of Development and a Framework for Its Solution” was like experiencing a major conceptual earthquake. Bringing these issues to the core of development policy and bringing them to human development have the same challenge. How do you link human development, growth, poverty, and long-term strategic development to the core of development policy? Where do we want to be in 2020? What do gender and competitiveness, gender and growth, and gender and poverty imply? Mainstreaming gender seems to be a weak link
in the countries and in the Bank. This workshop and roundtable are useful reminders of the challenges in getting gender and development on the front burner. They are also timely from a global perspective, given the Bank's response to the new and challenging issue about polity and the Highly Indebted Poor Countries Initiative. It may help us think of answers.
Closing Remarks

We introduced these sessions by looking back at the U.N. Decade for Women. It created broad acceptance that recognizing women’s vital contributions and distinctive needs is essential to development effectiveness. Throughout the sessions, we have benefited from a rich mosaic of research findings, legal advice, experience on the ground, in development institutions and in the highest political offices in developing countries. We have seen evidence of enormous efforts to develop techniques (a) to understand the differing roles of women from the household to the government cabinet, (b) to evaluate the impact of development interventions on the social and economic conditions of women, and (c) to change the deeply ingrained resistance to these efforts within public agencies. Strategies and programs have been launched at the global, regional, national, and local levels. Despite impressive efforts, the goals of the 1970s remain only partially attained. The challenge now is to understand why progress has been so elusive.

OED’s evaluation will seek to understand the Bank’s role in enhancing global public policy relating to gender and its progress in mainstreaming gender and in achieving results for women. Mary Anderson suggested that we look at the “power” the Bank has and at how it has used that power to implement economic and other policies. This leads to her salient question of whether the Bank has done everything in its power to meet its gender policy goals. Robert Picciotto and Noeleen Heyzer made the case that development is social transformation and that culture is no more a barrier than development itself. This combined with Susan Moller Okin’s assurance that the Bank has a mandate to “do no harm” and to mitigate the effects of inequality suggests that the evaluation must indeed look at whether the Bank has done everything in its power to meet its equity goals.

Yet we have seen here different points of view as to what constitutes the effective implementation of gender policies and a consensus that the disaggre-
gated data still do not exist to measure the effects of development interventions on gender. For example, Maria Correia argued that a paradox exists: mainstreaming gender often leads to its disappearance yet specific projects aimed at the gender issues lead to marginalization. Her region in the Bank champions project-level work. In contrast, Cecilia Lopez argued that only macro, transformational policies grounded in concrete strategies will have sustainable impact. Perhaps the answer lies in Oey Astra Meesook's experience with starting small in order to build confidence and sequencing interventions to larger-scale macro instruments as understanding and confidence grow.

It has become evident from the presentations that comparative analysis is needed to determine the critical success factors of effective gender interventions. Consensus was firm on the need for better gender-disaggregated data to allow country comparison and to undergird a results orientation that UNIFEM argues is indispensable in preventing the evaporation of commitments. The undeveloped research base on the comparative analysis of effective gender interventions and the continuing lack of data to measure impact create significant challenges for OED's Gender Team.

What are the next steps? The emphasis by the participants on the importance of the institutional environment in which gender policies are developed and implemented (or not) suggests that the evaluation needs to be constructed in the context of what constitutes effective public administration. We could draw on the model that frames good public administration in terms of an institution's having a clear mandate supported by its authorizing environment and by an alignment of its organizational capacity.

On mandate. Does the Bank have a relevant policy in the context of a strong global public policy environment led by the U.N.? What policies has it brought to bear on country and sector strategies and, thus, projects? How has the Bank exercised its mandate to be neutral or do no harm, to reduce inequalities, and to empower women in the countries where it operates? How does the Bank's policy measure up against the policies of other multilaterals and international financial institutions whose memberships parallel that of the Bank?

On authorizing environment. How has the Bank worked with its Board on gender issues? With its borrowers? With civil society? Has it implemented its IDA commitments to improve its gender programming? The Bank has had numerous opportunities to work in partnership with the U.N. organizations and bilaterals. How well has it done?
On organizational capacity. Has the GSB created a supply of gender expertise to advocate gender or has it created a demand for gender expertise through careful alignment of the incentive system with the gender policy? What is the accountability framework? Are monitoring and evaluation systems in place to measure results? Have OED and the Quality Assurance Group included gender in their analyses? Do Bank staff have the support they need through training and access to data, analytical frameworks, and available expertise? Do the personnel reward system and the Operational Policy and Operational Directive frameworks confirm management's support for its gender policy?

The gender evaluation's approach paper has set the stage for OED to seek answers to most of these questions. The sessions have also called for OED to take the evaluation a step beyond our initial thinking, to ask not only if the Bank has been effective but also why or why not? Answering why or why not is the more complex task, but it certainly will yield the answer that will create most value for the development community.

Elizabeth McAllister
Director
Operations Evaluation Department