

**IMPLEMENTING THE BANK'S GENDER MAINSTREAMING STRATEGY:  
ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT, FY08**

**METHODOLOGICAL ANNEX**

**Gender and Development Group, PREM**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

<b>ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS</b> .....	iii
<b>ANNEX 1. METHODOLOGIES USED IN THE REVIEWS</b> .....	1
1. Methodology for Rating Country Strategies and Diagnostics .....	1
Country Gender Assessments.....	1
Poverty Assessments .....	1
Other Core Economic and Sector Work (ESW).....	3
Country Assistance Strategy .....	4
2. Quality Assurance Group (QAG) Quality-at-Entry (QEA) and Quality of Supervision (QSA) .....	5
Quality at Entry .....	5
Quality at Supervision .....	6
QAG Weighting Explanation .....	6
Quality Assessment of the Lending Portfolio .....	7
3. FY06 AND FY08 Review of Projects by PRMGE.....	7
 <b>Tables</b>	
Table A1. Country Gender Assessments Completed in FY06.....	1
Table A2. Poverty Assessments Reviewed .....	1
Table A3. Gender and Development Poverty Assessment Rating Sheet .....	2
Table A4. Core ESW Reviewed.....	3
Table A5. Country Assistance Strategy Documents .....	5

## ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

---

AAA	Analytical and Advisory Assistance
AAP	Africa Action Plan
ACGD	Africa Country Database
ADB	Asian Development Bank
AFR	Sub-Saharan Africa Region
AFTPM	AFR PREM Front Office
ARGP	Africa Regional Gender Program
AWID	Association for Women's Rights in Development
BB	Bank Budget
BCD	Business Competitiveness and Development Program – WBI
BNPP	Bank Netherlands Partnership Program
CAFTA-COMMCA	Central American Free Trade Agreement / Comité de Ministerios de la Mujer en Centro América
CAS	Country Assistance Strategy
CCT	Conditional Cash Transfer
CDD	Community Driven Development
CEDAW	UN Convention for the Elimination of Discrimination against Women
CEM	Country Economic Memorandum
CGA	Country Gender Assessment
CGAP	Consultative Group to Assist the Poorest
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CPIA	Country Policy and Institutional Assessment
CPR	Conflict Prevention and Post-Conflict Reconstruction Network
DANIDA	Danish Consultant Trust Fund
DDR	Demilitarization, Demobilizations and Reintegration
DFID	United Kingdom's Division for International Development
DPL	Development Policy Loan
DPR	Development Policy Review
EAP	East Asia and Pacific Region
ECA	Europe and Central Asia Region
ESW	Economic and Sector Work
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organization
FIPSI	Finance, Private Sector, and Infrastructure Network
G&L	Gender and Law Program
GDLN	Global Distance Learning Network
GEM	Gender Entrepreneurship Markets unit – IFC
GENFUND	Norwegian/Dutch Trust Fund for Gender Mainstreaming
GENRD	Gender and Rural Development Thematic Group
GGA	Gender and Growth Assessment
GICT	Global Information and Communication Technologies Department
GLIA	Great Lakes Initiative on HIV/AIDS
HIV/AIDS	Human Immunodeficiency Virus/Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
ICRW	International Center for Research of Women
IDB	Inter-American Development Bank
IDF	Institutional Development Fund
IFC	International Finance Corporation
ILO	International Labor Organization
ISGIF	Informatics Program
JLOS	Justice Law and Order Sector
JSDF	Japanese Social Development Fund
LCR	Latin America and the Caribbean Region
LCSP	Poverty Sector – Latin America and the Caribbean Region

LCSPS	Public Sector – Latin America and the Caribbean Region
LEG VPU	Legal Vice Presidential Unit
LIL	Learning and Innovation Loan
LSA	Living Standards Assessment
LSSP	Land Sector Strategic Plan
MAP	Multi-Country HIV/AIDS Program
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MDRP	Multi-Country Demobilization and Reintegration Program
MDTF	Multi-Donor Trust Fund
MNA	Middle East and North Africa Region
NIW	National Institute for Women
OECS	Organization of Eastern Caribbean States
OED	Operations Evaluation Department
OPCS	Operations Policy and Country Services
PA	Poverty Assessment
PAHO	Pan American Health Organization
PEAP	Poverty Eradication Action Plan
PER	Public Expenditure Review
PGP	Poverty and Growth Activities
PREM	Poverty Reduction and Economic Management Network
PRMGE	PREM Gender and Development Group
PRODEM	Demographic Project – AFR
PRSC	Poverty Reduction Support Credit
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Support Paper
PSIA	Poverty and Social Impact Analysis
QAG	Quality Assurance Group
SAR	South Asia Region
SCGA	Strategic Country Gender Assessment
SDV	Social Development Sector
TAL	Technical Assistance Loan
TFESSD	Trust Fund for Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Development
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNECA	United Nations Economic Commission for Africa
UNECE	United Nations Economic Commission for Europe
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNIFEM	United Nations Development Fund for Women
WBI	World Bank Institute
WHO	World Health Organization
WILDAF	Women in Law and Development in Africa

## 1. Methodology for Rating Country Strategies and Diagnostics

### *Country Gender Assessments*

1. “Active” client countries completed four Country Gender Assessments (CGA) in FY06, increasing the total completion rate to 51.7 % ( see table A1).<sup>1</sup> In total, CGAs have been completed for 46 “active” client countries indicating that the target completion year of FY05 established in the Gender Mainstreaming Strategy has not been met. The majority of the CGAs still to be completed are in the Sub-Saharan Africa Region (AFR), followed closely by the Europe and Central Asia Region (ECA).

Table A1. Country Gender Assessments Completed in FY06		
AFR*	Ethiopia	Strategic Country Gender Assessment
	Senegal	Strategic Country Gender Assessment
	Mali	Strategic Country Gender Assessment
LCR	Chile	Country Gender Assessment

\*AFR call its CGAs, SCGAs

### *Poverty Assessments*

2. A total of 6 Poverty Assessments (PA) were considered in the review (see table A2). The rating system that was used in the desk review of the PAs was based on the multi-dimensional approach towards poverty laid out in the *World Development Report 2000/01* which analyzed poverty in terms of opportunities, capabilities, security and empowerment. Gender-differentiated aspects of poverty can be found within each of these four dimensions, and therefore a consideration of how gender should be integrated into poverty assessments can be viewed within these four broad areas.<sup>2</sup>

Table A2. Poverty Assessments Reviewed		
AFR	Kenya	Poverty and Inequality Assessment
	Senegal	Poverty Assessment
ECA	Georgia	Poverty Assessment
LCR	Guatemala	Poverty Assessment
	Guyana	Poverty Assessment
SAR	Bangladesh	Poverty Assessment

3. The review looked at the integration of gender issues in four key PA components, these being: (i) assessment of the poverty situation – **gender profile**, (ii) analysis of the impact on poverty and growth and public actions – **gender analysis of poverty**, (iii) suggestions or recommendations for policies or

---

<sup>1</sup> OPCS defines “active” countries as clients for which the Bank’s Regional Management Teams have indicated that a full set of core diagnostic ESW is essential for carrying out the Bank’s operations in those countries, including gender analysis. Countries engaged in civil war/conflict, or emerging from conflict are usually classified as “inactive” due either to a lack of readily available data or to client capacity constraints. The LCR Region completed a CGA for Honduras which was included as a chapter on “Gender and Child Issues in Labor” in the Poverty Assessment that was prepared for FY06; for counting purposes, this CGA is only counted once, in FY02 where a CGA for Honduras was prepared as part of a greater analysis of gender issues in Central American countries. The EAP region completed a CGA for Indonesia, but for counting purposes, this CGA is only counted once in FY02.

<sup>2</sup> See K. Saito, *The Integration of Gender Concerns into Poverty Assessments*, PRMGE, October 2003. These two papers were prepared simultaneously and share the same analytical framework.

actions – **gender-responsive policies**, and (iv) considerations of gender issues and indicators in the monitoring and evaluation plans and systems – **monitoring and evaluation**.

4. The rating methodology shown in table A3, consisted of following three steps:

- First, a number of sub-questions were included under the four review dimensions (gender profile, gender analysis of poverty, gender-responsive policies, and monitoring and evaluation), and each sub-question was given a score on a four-point scale with a score of: *1 indicating detailed coverage, 2 indicating moderate coverage, 3 indicating minimal coverage and 4 indicating no coverage* of gender issues.
- Second, each sub-question was scored and then given a standard relative weight. Each section had a relative weight, which depended on the number of sub-questions in the each section. The relative weights for each section are the following: *Gender Profile – 35%<sup>3</sup>; Gender Analysis – 35%; Gender-responsive Policies – 20%; and Monitoring and Evaluation – 10%*.
- Lastly, the total scores of each section were tallied and ranked on a range of equal intervals were a range: 1.00-1.75 meant that the report was *Highly Satisfactory*; 1.76-2.50 meant that the report was *Satisfactory*; 2.51-3.25 meant that the report was *Marginally Satisfactory*; and a score of 3.26-4.00 meant that the report was *Unsatisfactory*.

<b>Table A3. Gender and Development Poverty Assessment Rating Sheet</b>	
1 = detailed; 2 = moderate; 3 = minimal coverage; 4 = no coverage	<b>Average Total      Weights</b>
<b>1. Gender Profile</b>	
<i>Does the poverty profile address opportunities, capabilities, security and empowerment of women and men?</i>	
1.1 Are sex-disaggregated data and/or qualitative information presented? (male and female literacy, mortality rates, nutrition status, income levels, etc.)	0.35
<b>1.2 Are gender disparities identified in any of the following areas?</b>	
1.2a Differences in total work hours (including all household and non-household tasks); and/or differences in the composition of time use of men, women and children.	0.04
1.2b Gender gaps in labor force participation, wage earnings, length of working hours.	0.04
1.2c Access to and control of productive resources (land, agriculture, credit, savings, etc.)	0.04
1.2d Are distinctions between the critical infrastructure needs of women and men identified? (water, roads, transport, domestic energy, etc.)	0.04
1.2e Gender gaps in human development (education, health, etc.)	0.04
1.2f Participation by women and men in decision-making at the household, community and/or national levels.	0.04
1.2g Inequalities between men and women in rights and protection under the law.	0.04
1.2h Are gender-specific risks and vulnerabilities identified? (domestic violence, conflict-related risks and violence, crime-related violence, HIV/AIDS, refugees/IDPs, migrant workers, risks imposed by cultural norms, etc.)	0.04
<b><i>Average score for Gender Profile</i></b>	
<b>2. Gender Analysis of Poverty</b>	
<i>Were the gender dimensions of poverty analyzed?</i>	
2.1 Is household survey data analyzed in terms of gender and/or does it cover the differences in intra-household distribution of resources and opportunities among different categories of household members?	0.35
2.2 Is qualitative data analyzed in terms of gender?	0.35
2.3 Are the findings of quantitative and qualitative research compared?	0.35
2.4 Are specific sectors that are addressed by the PA, analyzed in terms of gender?	0.35
2.5 Are cross-sectoral linkages identified and/or analyzed?	0.35
2.6 Have the distributional impacts on women and men of existing or past policies and programs been assessed?	0.35
2.7 Has any new analysis been done for the report to address gender gaps?	0.35
<b><i>Average score for Gender Analysis</i></b>	

<sup>3</sup> One of the two main questions in this section contained eight sub-questions (see table A3), these eight sub-questions have each been given a relative weight of 0.04 (0.35/8).

**Table A3. Gender and Development Poverty Assessment Rating Sheet****3. Gender-responsive Policies***To what extent do policy issues discussed promote gender inclusion and equality?*

3.1 Does the report's gender analytical information influence recommended areas of action? 0.20

3.2 Does the poverty assessment discuss government policies and/or programs for promoting gender inclusion and equality? 0.20

**Average score for Gender-Responsive Policies****4. Monitoring and Evaluation***Are there adequate mechanisms to monitor the gender impacts of policies and programs?*

4.1 Gender-Sensitive Design: Do data collection methods capture the differences in impact of public policy and action on males and females? 0.10

4.2 Sex-disaggregated data: Does the monitoring and evaluation system include sex-disaggregated baseline data and/or progress indicators? 0.10

**Average Score for Monitoring & Evaluation****Report Score (Total Average Weighted Score)****Ranking****Other Core Economic and Sector Work (ESW)**

5. Aside from the Country Gender Assessments and the Poverty Assessments, the review also looked at the integration of gender issues in Country Economic Memorandums (CEM), Development Policy Reviews (DPR) and Public Expenditure Reviews (PER). Through random sampling, 26 core ESW pieces were selected for this review.

**Table A4. Core ESW Reviewed**

CEM	AFR	Benin	Constraints to Growth and Potential for Diversification and Innovation		
		Ghana	Meeting the Challenge of Accelerated Shared Growth		
		Senegal	Looking for Work – The Road to Prosperity		
DPR	ECA	Russia	Regional Development and Growth Agglomerations		
		Turkey	Sustaining High Growth – Selected Issues		
		Panama	Country Economic Memorandum 2007		
DPR	EAP	China	Mid-term Evaluation of the 11 <sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan		
		Vietnam	Vietnam Development Report 2008		
		Egypt	Transforming Egypt – A Development Policy Review		
PER	AFR	Africa	Public Expenditure Review – Rural Water and Sanitation Review		
		Burundi	Public Expenditure Management and Financial Accountability Review		
		Cape Verde	Enhancing Planning to Increase Efficiency of Public Spending		
		DR Congo	Public Expenditure Review		
		Ethiopia	Review of Public Finances		
		Cote d'Ivoire	Review of Public Financial Management		
		Madagascar	Review of Public Financial Management		
		Ghana	External Review of Public Financial Management		
		Nigeria	Agriculture Public Expenditure Review		
		Tanzania	Public Expenditure Review		
		ECA	Armenia	Programmatic Public Expenditure	
			Georgia	Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability Joint WB-EC Public Financial Management Assessment	
			Tajikistan	Second Programmatic Public Expenditure	
		LCR	MNA	Ukraine	Improving Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations and Public Health and Education Policy: Selected Issues
				Costa Rica	Public Expenditure Review – Enhancing the Efficiency of Expenditures
		MNA	MNA	Iraq	Public Expenditure and Institutional Assessment

6. The criteria for reviewing core ESW was the same as the ones used in prior gender mainstreaming reports. Reports were rated as Unsatisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, Satisfactory, or Highly Satisfactory according to the following criteria:

- **Unsatisfactory:** Little or no mention of gender differences with respect to poverty.
- **Marginally Satisfactory:** Addresses few gender differences, but does not provide data to support the existence of the differences or how these are relevant in a poverty analysis.
- **Satisfactory:** Addresses gender differences in one or two sectors and provides data that supports the existences of these differences and how they are relevant in a poverty analysis.
- **Highly Satisfactory:** Addresses gender differences in more than two sectors and provides data that supports the existence of these differences and how they are relevant in a poverty analysis.

7. The sectors included in the core ESW review were: education, health, labor market, political participation/decision-making, law/legal reform and protection, infrastructure, agriculture, water, credit/land, and insurance/pensions. It is important to note that the criteria used for this review have significant limitations: they can only evaluate reports in terms of broad sectoral coverage; they do not sufficiently reflect the qualitative standards of the reports, and they do not take account of the differences in the objectives of each ESW product type.

### *Country Assistance Strategy*

8. In order to analyze the mainstreaming of gender in policy dialogue, the review also looked at attention to gender issues in the Country Assistance Strategy (CAS) documents. A total of 30 CAS reports were included in the review (see table A5).

9. The CASs were rated based on the type and number of gender-responsive actions by sector of theme. The sectors included in the CAS review were the following: education, health, private sector development, infrastructure, agriculture, governance/law, and the category “other.” The scores for the CASs – Unsatisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, Satisfactory, and Highly Satisfactory/Good Practice – were given according to the following criteria:

- **Unsatisfactory:** No mention of gender issues – or mention of gender issues, but no discussion of the relevance of those issues for the country assistance program.
- **Marginally Satisfactory:** Analysis of gender issues, but no action proposed and no explanation of why actions are not needed.
- **Satisfactory:** Analysis of gender issues and subsequent action proposed in at least one sector (with 1 to 5 good practices) or explanations as to why action is not needed (for example, where there are actions undertaken by a donor partner, Bank-supported action may not be warranted).
- **Highly Satisfactory:** Analysis of gender issues and subsequent actions in several sectors (with 6 or more good practices).

10. The good practices that determine whether a CAS could be ranked as Satisfactory or Highly Satisfactory were the following:

- Recognizing male and female gender issues.
- Designing the consultative process in a way that ensures the incorporation of gender issues.
- Raising gender issues consistently throughout the CAS.
- Integrating gender issues into the poverty analysis.
- Conducting gender diagnoses across sectors.
- Identifying the most relevant gender issues and selecting high pay-off gender-responsive actions.
- Including gender-specific actions in the program matrix.
- Including sex-disaggregated data.
- Including gender-specific progress indicators.
- Including or referring to country gender analysis.

**Table A5. Country Assistance Strategy Documents**

<b>AFR</b>	<b>MNA</b>
Burundi	Morocco
DR Congo	
Ethiopia	<b>EAP</b>
The Gambia	Indonesia
Mali	Papua New Guinea
Mauritania	
Niger	<b>LCR</b>
Rwanda	Brazil
South Africa	Colombia
Zambia	Costa Rica
	Guatemala
<b>ECA</b>	Mexico
Bosnia Herzegovina	Nicaragua
Belarus	Panama
Croatia	
Georgia	<b>SAR</b>
Serbia	Sri Lanka
Turkey	Maldives
Ukraine	
Uzbekistan	

## 2. Quality Assurance Group (QAG) Quality-at-Entry (QEA) and Quality of Supervision (QSA)

### *Quality at Entry*

Beginning with the assessment of Quality at Entry for FY97 (QEA1), QAG has carried out eight such assessments, the most recent, QEA8 for FY06-FY07 (See Table A6). The purpose of the QEA is to provide real-time feedback to operational teams to improve the quality of the Bank's output in the broad context of alleviating poverty and achieving development impacts. QAG assesses attention to gender issues under Section 3 of the *Guidance Questionnaire* that addresses 'Poverty, Gender, and Social Assessment'. Question 3.2 is "attention to gender issues". Since 2001, PRMGE has tracked the attention to gender issues in project design.

The QEA 4-6 were based on a 4-point scale (1: Highly Satisfactory, 2: Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Satisfactory, 4: Unsatisfactory). In a 4-point scale, a rating of either 1 or 2 is considered above the line and a rating of 3 or 4 is considered below the line. The ratings for QEA 7-8 are based on a 6-point scale (1: Highly Satisfactory, 2: Satisfactory, 3: Moderately Satisfactory, 4: Moderately Unsatisfactory, 5: Unsatisfactory, 6: Highly Unsatisfactory). In a 6-point scale, a rating of either 1 or 2 or 3 is considered above the line and a rating of 4 or 5 or 6 is considered below the line. In addition, each lending project received a weight, which is "the inverse of the ratio of the sample size in the respective stratum for Region and Global & Regional, Additional Financing and Multi-Sector to the portion of the universe from which it is drawn (see below QAG Weighting Explanation).

## *Quality at Supervision*

From FY98-FY06, the QAG conducted Quality of Supervision Assessment (QSA) to provide senior management with real-time feedback on the overall effectiveness and efficiency of the Bank's supervision work at the Regional and Network levels; and to evaluate the Bank's experience in identifying and resolving problems in the portfolio, and draw conclusions for learning in key areas of supervision quality and processes. QAG stopped conducting QEA and QSA in FY08 after a review revealed that QAG assessments focused excessively on Bank performance and not sufficiently on results on the ground.

To address these shortcomings, QAG has replaced QEA and QSA with a single instrument, Quality Assessment of the Lending Portfolio (QALP).

<b>Table A6. Quality at Entry and Supervision Assessment, Years</b>	
Quality at Entry (QEA)	Quality at Supervision (QSA)
FY98=QEA1	FY98=QSA1
FY99=QEA2	FY99=QSA2
FY00=QEA3	FY00=QSA3
FY01= QEA4	FY01=QSA4
FY02= QEA5	FY02= QSA5
FY03= QEA6	FY03-04= QSA6
FY04-FY05= QEA7	FY05-06= QSA7
FY06-FY07= QEA8	

## *QAG Weighting Explanation*

Each operation in the sample is assigned a weight which is the inverse of the ratio of the sample size in the respective stratum for Region and Global & Regional, Additional Financing and Multi-Sector to the portion of the universe from which it is drawn. Weighting each operation in the sample makes it possible to scale up the results of the assessment to the universe of operations from which the sample are drawn, in a proportional manner which adjusts for the different sampling rates. Using the weights and the scores, the percent of satisfactory projects are determined by adding up all the weights of the satisfactory projects and dividing it by the total of all the weights in the entire portfolio for that fiscal year.

For example about 13 "Global & Regional" projects are expected to be approved for AFR, of which 7 would be drawn in the sample. This provides a ratio of 7/13 or a reciprocal of 13/7, i.e., 1.857. Each operation in this sub-sample of 13 would therefore be assigned a weight of 1.857, as it represents 1.857 operations in the sub-universe from which it is drawn.

It is worth mentioning that between 10 and 20 percent of projects from the sample were not rated for attention to gender issues because they were considered 'not applicable'. These projects were included in the calculations and coded as 'unsatisfactory' attention to gender.

### ***Quality Assessment of the Lending Portfolio***

Quality Assessment of the Lending Portfolio (QALP) shifts the focus from quality of Bank performance to results, by identifying risks and shortcomings mid-way during implementation and making recommendations to task teams on how to improve outcomes. This new instrument does not assess gender concerns in lending. For this reason, PRMGE decided to conduct a quality-at-entry assessment for the universe of projects approved in FY06 and FY08. PRMGE plans to conduct a quality of supervision assessment in the near future.

### **3. FY06 AND FY08 Review of Projects by PRMGE**

In light of the QAG decision to discontinue its gender assessment, PRMGE decided to conduct a review of quality-at-entry for *all projects* with IBRD and/or IDA commitments approved in FY06 and FY08. The review was based on information available in Project Appraisal Documents, Program Documents, and Technical Annexes (referred to as *project documents*). Individual reviews conducted by each of the 6 regions, the Agriculture and Rural Development department (ARD), and the Sustainable Development Network (SDN)<sup>4</sup> along with the database that Bank Independent Evaluation Group used for the Gender Strategy evaluation were used for consistency checks<sup>5</sup>.

Project documents were searched to determine the level of coverage of gender-issues. Project documents were initially searched for keywords: Gender, Women/Woman, Female, and Girl. Additional keywords used to search for further gender-related content included: Wife, Widow, Spouse, and Joint. Project documents were assessed to determine the level of coverage on a four-point scale:

- 1: No coverage.
- 2: Minimal coverage: Gender issues are mentioned but no specific quantitative data are provided.
- 3: Moderate coverage: Gender issues are included with specific quantitative data. An allowance is also made for projects where the discussion of gender issues is substantial even if no specific quantitative data are provided.
- 4: Detailed coverage: Gender issues are discussed and presented with quantitative data and extensive background information.

---

<sup>4</sup> Although all regions and networks in principle received similar terms of reference to conduct the review, the outputs received were not necessarily comparable, this entailed exhaustive work of standardizing the data.

<sup>5</sup> The following assumptions are made to utilize data from all the original reviews in an attempt to standardize the information received from the regions and networks:

- Assume no false positives in overlapping data. Where one project has been analyzed in several of the original reviews, it is assumed that there are no false positives. For example, if one review determines that there is minimal gender content and another review indicates that there is no gender content, the former result is adopted. Project documents are consulted when the discrepancy between multiple reviews is considerable.
- Incomplete data from original reviews are either approximated from notes and comments made in those reviews or the actual project documents are consulted.

The IEG database was used to double-check results to ensure that projects with many (few) gender-related keywords also are coded to have more (less) detailed gender-content. The comparison between the IEG database and the current review resulted in similar ratings in 84% of the cases. Typically, discrepancies were found in electronic documents where key pages such as the Results Framework had not been subject to Optical Character Recognition. In these cases a new search was performed to identify the actual number of gender-related keywords and to decide on a rating scale.