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Executive summary

The purpose of this evaluation study is twofold: Firstly, to compile lessons learned from Danida evaluations, evaluation studies and other evaluation publications, and secondly, to distil a set of recommendations relevant to the roll-out of *The Right to a Better Life* (2012), more particularly the planned update of Danida's strategy, *Gender Equality in Danish Development Cooperation* (2004). The evaluation study was carried out between June and September 2013.

The methodology is based on a desk review of Danida evaluation publications carried out between 2004 and 2013, and comprises three interconnected phases:

1. Screening of a long list of 104 evaluation publications
2. Analysis of 26 shortlisted evaluations
3. Reporting findings and recommendations

The study identifies **four overall findings**: (i) Uneven levels of integration of gender equality, (ii) Tendency to use multiple interpretations of gender-related concepts, (iii) Gender equality often treated as a women's issue and limited to participation, and (iv) Insufficient monitoring of programming experiences and lack of smart indicators.

The evaluation study further identifies **eleven findings in strategic priority areas**:

1. **Human rights and democracy** – findings focus on non-discrimination and inclusion:
   - Civil society key to sustained gender policy dialogue
   - New aid modalities can contribute to building dialogue frameworks on gender policy
   - Silence on LGBT rights

2. **Green growth** – findings mainly concern economic empowerment:
   - Targeted economic interventions can be an effective empowerment tool
   - Mobility is key to economic empowerment
   - Microfinance can be a vehicle for economic empowerment

3. **Social progress** – findings concern gender aspects of health and education:
   - Links between gender balance, child health and development
   - Increased overall education enrolment promotes gender equality
   - Incentive structures can improve gender balance in school and training attendance

4. **Stability and protection** – findings focus on gender equality perspectives on conflict
   - Links between gender equality and conflict insufficiently considered
   - Community development can promote gender equality results

The evaluation study puts findings into perspective by drawing on relevant documentation of international evaluations of gender equality experience and other studies, notably syntheses reports by the African Development Bank (2011) and Evaluation Cooperation Group (2012).

Drawing on key findings, recommendations highlighting best practice and addressing central challenges observed are presented. Recommendations are for operational purposes organised according to three levels of policy, programming and organisation.
1. Introduction

Denmark has supported gender equality and women’s rights for more than three decades with varying foci, instruments and methodologies. With the recent adoption of a Human Rights Based Approach (HRBA), gender equality, rights and diversity are poised to play an even more significant role in the Danish development framework in future.

The purpose of this evaluation study (from now on referred to as 'study') is, firstly, to compile lessons learned from Danida evaluations, evaluation studies and other evaluation publications conducted between 2004 and 2013, and, secondly, to distil a set of recommendations of relevance to the planned update of Danida’s gender equality strategy. A ten-year study period has been selected to capture evaluation findings since Danida developed its current strategy framework, Gender Equality in Danish Development Cooperation (2004).

This study comes at a time when government is desirous to roll out its strategy for Denmark’s development cooperation, The Right To A Better Life (2012). HRBA has significant strategy implications for development cooperation and calls for an update of policies and methodologies, including efforts to promote gender equality, rights and diversity. Examples of gender equality pledges relating to the four overall Danida priority areas include:

- **Human rights and democracy**
  Denmark will continue to work actively for gender equality and for the human rights of women and girls. Gender equality is about ensuring equal rights and opportunities for women and men (Ibid., p. 14)

- **Green growth**
  We will promote the inclusion of women and their equal access to buy and own land and to technology and financial services (Ibid., p. 22)

- **Social progress**
  Denmark will place distribution and human rights in social sectors higher on the agenda, both in multilateral forums and in developing countries, and in this regard place particular emphasis on women and gender equality (Ibid., p. 24)

- **Stability and protection**
  We will advocate for women’s rights and for ensuring their political, economic and social inclusion in subsequent state-building and peace-building processes. The special needs of women and girls during and after an armed conflict must be met, just as women and girls must be protected against violence, including gender-based violence (Ibid., p. 29)

The four priority areas and the implications of the overall Human Rights Based Approach give overall guidance to this study, undertaken by development advisors Verner Kristiansen ApS with quality assurance inputs from Dr Sarah Forti of Critical Rights and Gender Consult between June and September 2013 for the Evaluation Department of Danida.

Verner Kristiansen ApS would like to thank the Evaluation Department and the Department for Development Policy and Global Cooperation for constructive oversight of the study process. However, full responsibility for the contents and any shortcomings rests with the authors.
1.1 Study methodology

The methodology of this study is divided into three consecutive phases:

1. Screening of long list of evaluations
2. Analysis of shortlisted evaluations
3. Reporting findings and recommendations

Analytical framework model:

In June 2013, Danida’s Evaluation Department provided a long list of 104 Danida evaluations, evaluation studies and other evaluation publications covering the period between 2004 and 2013 to serve as empirical basis for the study.

The evaluations vary significantly in level of operation, geographic focus, aid modalities and sectors. Examples include The Macroeconomic Impact of HIV/AIDS and HIV/AIDS Interventions (Danida evaluation study: 2012/10), Evaluation of Danida’s ‘Women in Africa’ Regional Support Initiative (Danida evaluation: 2011.03) and Evaluation of the Access to Justice Programme in Zambia 2006-11 (Danida evaluation: 2012.06). The different foci of the studied evaluations affect this study, as it inevitably also refers to findings at varying levels of operation and focus.

Shortlisting of documents for further scrutiny commenced with screening of all publications provided applying an electronic search for selected gender-relevant search words. In total, 12 search words were applied:

- ‘Gender’
- ‘Women’
- ‘Men’
- ‘Boy’
- ‘Girl’
- ‘Male’
- ‘Female’
- ‘LGBT’
- ‘Homosexual’
- ‘Minority’
- ‘Rights’
- ‘Mainstreaming’

A word screening obviously does not provide a complete picture of the extent to which the evaluations deal with gender equality. However, it does provide a significant first overview of relevance and gender equality focus during the decade under scrutiny.
Documents were shortlisted according to an assessment based on three overall criteria:

1. **Quantity of gender equality focus**
   Evaluations were examined to determine if they target gender equality, women’s empowerment or male roles as a principal objective, a significant objective or not significantly.

2. **Innovative approaches**
   Evaluations were also assessed on whether they bring out new gender equality perspectives or shed light on innovative ways of working with gender equality.

3. **Strategic relevance**
   Evaluations were finally assessed on their relevance to the priority areas of *The Right to a Better Life* and HRBA efforts to strengthen capacity of duty-bearers to meet their obligations and rights holders to claim their rights at all levels.

The assessment of the long list yielded a shortlist of 26 publications. To structure analysis and increase comparability between findings, three further questions were asked:

1. What are (implicit and explicit) gender equality objectives of the intervention?
2. What are the observed gender equality outputs/outcomes of the intervention?
3. What are key factors of success and main challenges to be learnt from?

Study findings are derived from desk review. The study is limited to information provided in the publications and therefore unable to determine the factual accuracy of findings or if shortcomings reflect limitations in the evaluated programmes or in the documents themselves. The study puts findings into perspective by drawing on international studies including two particularly relevant syntheses of international evaluations of gender equality programming:


**1.2 How to read this report**
Following this introductory section on context and methodology:

- **Chapter 2** presents four overall findings from the screening of the long list of evaluations and scrutiny of shortlisted evaluations
- **Chapter 3** outlines a total of 11 findings within the four strategy priority areas of *The Right to a Better Life*, before
- **Chapter 4** concludes on evaluation evidence by presenting recommendations, intended to inform the planned strategy update. For easy reference, recommendations are organised according to three levels of policy, programming and organisation
Annexed to this report please find (A) Terms of Reference for the study, (B) Selected bibliography and (C) Overview of screening results.

2 Overall findings
This chapter presents overall findings from the screening exercise and desk review of shortlisted evaluations, evaluation studies and other evaluation publications. The presentation focuses on four findings:

1. Uneven levels of integration of gender equality
2. Tendency to use multiple interpretations of gender-related concepts
3. Gender equality often treated as a women’s issue and limited to participation
4. Insufficient monitoring of programming experiences and lack of smart indicators

2.1 Uneven levels of integration of gender equality in evaluations and interventions
Overall, this study finds that gender equality focus in evaluations not targeting gender equality issues explicitly, varies significantly. Some evaluations hardly deal with it at all while others like the Evaluation of the Farmer Field School Approach in the Agriculture Sector Programme Support Phase II in Bangladesh (Danida evaluation: 2011.06) and Impact Evaluation of Aquaculture Interventions in Bangladesh (Danida evaluation: 2009.01) are positive exceptions. The low level of gender equality focus in a significant number of the studied evaluations is noteworthy in light of gender having been a policy priority and cross-cutting issue in Danish development cooperation for decades. No overall evaluation of gender equality in Danish development cooperation has been done in the period under scrutiny.

Results from the screening show significant disparity in the degree to which evaluations use the search words. The term ‘gender’ is used 2,505 times in total. Twelve evaluations completely refrain from mentioning ‘gender’ and several evaluations only mention gender issues in a sentence or two. The top 10% of evaluations where the word figures most frequently make up 52% of use in all screened evaluations. These include evaluations with specific gender focus like the evaluation study Gender and Value Chain Development (Danida evaluation Study: 2010/02), but also evaluations, with a different overall focus but gender as a significant topic. The diagram below shows the total number of ‘hits’ of selected words in screened evaluations:
As this study is a desk review of evaluations, it is difficult to establish causality. Does the relatively low level of gender focus in many evaluations primarily pertain to absence of gender initiatives in the programmes evaluated, is it rather neglected in the evaluation phase of the programmes or a combination of the two?

Analysing those evaluations emerging from word screening with limited gender equality focus, two overall patterns stand out. Firstly, evaluation reports operating at a macro-level generally seem to reflect less gender focus than evaluations anchored in specific country and sector contexts. Examples include *Experiences with conducting evaluations jointly with partner countries* (Danida evaluation study: 2009/03) and *Evaluation of Donor Support to Public Financial Management Reform in Developing Countries – Analytical study of quantitative cross-country evidence* (Danida evaluation: 2010.11) and would appear to reflect a notion that gender aspects are mostly relevant at micro-levels of analysis.

Secondly, reports concerning methodological aspects of evaluations also tend to go easy on gender equality issues. Examples of this include *Evaluating Aid Effectiveness in the Aggregate: A Critical Assessment of the Evidence* (Danida evaluation study: 2010/01) and *The Macroeconomic Impact of HIV/AIDS and HIV/AIDS Interventions* (Danida evaluation study: 2012/01), both dealing primarily with methods of impact measuring.

An example of limited attention to gender equality in evaluation reports is the evaluation study, *Danish Support to Statebuilding and Improved Livelihoods in Afghanistan* (Danida evaluation study: 2012/04) found to make no reference to gender equality under lessons learned and recommendations, even though the opening chapter on context recognises that ‘systemic inequality – especially gender imbalance’ is one of the central ‘structural impediments to social improvement in Afghanistan’ (Ibid., p. 10).

Attention to gender equality in the evaluated interventions also varies significantly. In response to the evaluation question: *How and to what extent are cross-cutting issues like gender, human rights and good governance considered in the education programme support?* the
Evaluation of Danida Support to the Education Sector in Afghanistan (Danida evaluation: 2012.02) explains that ‘detailed planning and reporting provide few explanations of what activities or outputs were projected in any of these areas’ (Ibid., p. 100). An Evaluation of Programmatic Approaches to Support for the Environment in Africa 1996-2009 (Danida evaluation: 2010.05) reaches similar conclusions stating in a section on ‘Areas of Low Effectiveness' that there is ‘relatively weak effectiveness in terms of delivering on the cross-cutting issues of gender or human rights' (Ibid., p. 47).

The joint external evaluation of the Operation of the Least Developed Countries Fund for Adaption to Climate Change (Danida evaluation: 2009.08) likewise finds a lack of gender considerations in programmatic activities. The evaluation concludes that ‘the lack of attention to gender differentiated vulnerability in LDCF1 supported activities has led to gender being unevenly addressed across the NAPAs2 and unless this is put right this imbalance will reduce the effectiveness of adaptation implementation' (Ibid., p. 71).

2.2 Tendency to use multiple interpretations of gender-related concepts

Related to findings on overall gender focus in the studied Danida publications, this study has also assessed the use of gender concepts. The study finds a general tendency for interventions and evaluations to make use of a weak and somewhat ‘fluffy’ conceptual gender framework. These findings confirm already existing evidence, i.e., the Sida evaluation report Mainstreaming Gender Equality: Sida’s support for the Promotion of Gender Equality in partner countries (Sida evaluation: 2001), stating that multiple interpretations of gender-related concepts ‘have important implications for work at intervention level’ (Ibid., p. 95).

Several Danida evaluations seem to adopt a weak conceptual framework from programme documents making reference to objectives such as ‘women’s empowerment’ and ‘gender equality’, as well as methods of mainstreaming without qualifying the concepts and explaining them in context (see box for examples of ambiguous international interpretations of gender mainstreaming).

While some evaluations adopt weak and unclear gender concepts, others exhibit a tendency to refer to women and gender equality issues synonymously. They thus consider any issue relating to women to automatically contribute to gender equality. A case in point is the Evaluation of Danida’s ‘Women in Africa’ Regional Support Initiative (Danida evaluation: 2011.03), which makes positive efforts to specify the particular thematic focus of the initiative,

---

1 Least Developed Countries Fund.
2 National Adaption Plan of Action.
yet evades conceptual difference between women's empowerment and gender equality. Another example comes from the Evaluation Study Gender and Value Chain Development (Danida evaluation study: 2010/02), where some of the interventions studied limit gender efforts 'to mentioning that women should participate and to assuming that if women participate, they will automatically benefit' (Ibid., p. 31). The evaluation study however, argues that 'it should be kept in mind that equal participation in training on upgrading does not necessarily mean equal ability to apply the knowledge acquired nor [...] should gender equality be confused with [women's] participation' (Ibid., p. 33).

The evaluation study on Economic Empowerment of Women (Danida evaluation study: 2008/04) is an example of a study, which makes considerable efforts to clarify how the concepts are understood and used in the study. This conceptual clarification outlines the variety of meanings inscribed in commonly used gender concepts. The evaluation study thus notes that women’s empowerment generally refers to women’s abilities to control their own lives, and refers to both a state (empowered) and a process (empowering). Empowerment is reported used in reference to at least three different aspects: political, economic and social empowerment (Ibid., p. 12).

Similarly ‘gender equality’ has a number of meanings. It is used to distinguish between two different dimensions of equality: equality in outcome meaning that women and men enjoy the same standards of living and make decisions on an equal basis, and equality in opportunity suggesting that women and men have equal access to education, borrowing money etc. (Ibid., p. 9).

The Evaluation Cooperation Group (ECG) in their examination of 11 thematic gender evaluations, Gender Equality and Development Evaluation Units: Lessons from Evaluations of Development Support of Selected Multilateral and Bilateral Agencies (ECG: 2012), notes similar findings on conceptual obscurity. The report argues that evaluations tend to assess achievements against the stated objectives of the development agencies, for the most part ‘gender equality’ or ‘women’s empowerment’. However, the report concludes that it is challenging to design a strong and useful evaluation based on such concepts as ‘it is unclear what these terms mean’ (Ibid., p. iv). The report further notes a tendency for evaluations to consider any outcome related to women as automatically contributing to gender equality (Ibid., p. 14). The report recommends strengthening consensus on important conceptual gender terms (Ibid., p. 16).

2.3 Gender equality often treated as a women’s issue and limited to participation
Evaluation findings show that Danish supported gender equality activities often are equated with initiatives in support of women’s rights and empowerment, not looking at structural inequalities between women and men and their socially ascribed roles and responsibilities. The screening of evaluations show an overwhelming use of words related to women ('women', 'girl' and 'female') compared to those related to men ('men', 'boy' and 'male') illustrated in the graph below:
The disparity is unsurprising and illustrates the limited focus on men and male issues as integral part of the gender agenda in Danish development cooperation – a general trend explicitly mentioned in several of the studied Danida evaluations and observable among like-minded Danida partners as documented in the report *Gender Equality, Rights and Diversity – Danida Study in Preparation of Gender Strategy Update* (2013).

Danida’s ‘Women in Africa’ regional support initiative is an example of references to women and women’s economic empowerment taking precedence over a gender equality perspective. The evaluation of the initiative thus finds that while the initiative in general is thematically relevant, ‘there is a lack of focus on men and their involvement to advance gender equality’. Instead the evaluation notes that the majority of projects focus solely on women and their access to resources and economic growth, a general policy focus repeated in Denmark’s Africa strategy from 2007 ([Danida evaluation: 2011.03](#), p. 50). *The Evaluation of the Danish Region of Origin Initiative in Afghanistan* ([Danida evaluation: 2012.01](#)) reaches a similar conclusion.

While noting that attention to gender varies between Region of Origin projects, the evaluation finds that, ‘rather than being mainstreamed, gender is treated as a “women’s issue”’ ([Ibid.](#), p. 91).

The study furthermore finds that several of the evaluated interventions tend to focus primarily on women’s participation, downplaying other dimensions of gender justice – such as recognition and redistribution – a finding confirming existing international evidence, i.a. from World Bank studies. An example is the evaluation study *Gender and Value Chain Development* ([Danida evaluation study: 2010/02](#)), which concludes that ‘many value chain interventions still limit their gender objective (and outcome assessment) to increasing the number of women who are involved in the value chain (or who participate in training activities)’ ([Ibid.](#), p. 53). On the matter of gender outcomes, none of the experiences studied by the evaluation study related to forging changes in the broader economic or political environment ([Ibid.](#), p. 16).

The *Evaluation of Danida Support to the Education Sector in Afghanistan* ([Danida evaluation: 2012.02](#)) on how and to what extent gender has been considered in the programme similarly notes that common indicators of success was number of female teachers and enrolment by girls in schools, while the *Evaluation of Danida’s ‘Women in Africa’ Regional Support Initiative*
(Danida evaluation: 2011.03), mentions that project reports focus too narrowly on measurable outputs and results such as number of participants in training and number of handbooks and manuals produced.

The above findings confirm existing evidence from a range of studies and resonate with conclusions in a comprehensive synthesis, Mainstreaming Gender Equality: A Road to Results or a Road to Nowhere? (AfDB: 2012), commissioned by the African Development Bank (AfDB) of 26 thematic and country evaluations undertaken between 1990 and 2010. Looking into gender mainstreaming efforts in bi- and multilateral donor organisations, the report argues that the focus on women rather than gender equality found by this study is typical. The report concludes that integration of gender equality into programming often ends up as women-centred approaches that are focussed on women rather than gender, indicating that gender equality approaches in practice are reduced to ‘women-in-development’ approaches (Ibid., p. 10-11) – a narrow way of looking at gender equality. The AfDB synthesis report thus identifies general challenges within the development community of putting into practice approaches of dealing with gender inequality advocated on strategic level.

2.4 Insufficient monitoring of programming experience and lack of smart indicators

This study finds a significant lack of systematic compilation of experience and outcome from gender equality initiatives, to a large extent reported to pertain to a lack of clear gender indicators.

Examples include the evaluation study Danish Support to Statebuilding and Improved Livelihoods in Afghanistan (Danida evaluation study: 2012/04), which concludes that ‘there are no evaluations of the initiatives, either internal or independent’ (Danida evaluation study: 2012/04, p. 24) and the Evaluation of the Danish Region of Origin Initiative in Afghanistan (Danida evaluation: 2012.01) echoing findings of insufficient gender monitoring stating that, ‘lack of qualitative monitoring around gender means that there is limited evidence on this issue’ (Ibid., p. 91).

The Evaluation of Danida’s ‘Women in Africa’ Regional Support Initiative (Danida evaluation: 2011.03) notes that, even though many of the projects funded included innovative elements, they ‘have not been aggregated or analysed in light of any strategic overall framework’ and have therefore not fed into the planning process (Danida evaluation: 2011.03, p. 10-14). The evaluation concludes that ‘the portfolio of funded projects suffers from the lack of clear strategic orientation, including targets and criteria to guide the selection and monitoring of organisations and projects in light of Danish, regional and national priorities’ (Ibid., p. 71).

Development and use of smart gender indicators are found to be a particular challenge, leading to the conclusion that even where comprehensive and well-designed programme documents had been developed, indicators were ‘rarely monitored or tracked
and were rarely connected to the organisational planning process’ (Danida evaluation: 2011.03, p. 14). Similar conclusions are reached in the Evaluation of Programmatic Approaches to Support for the Environment in Africa 1996-2009 (2010) which to a large degree identifies an absence of gender indicators, or when used, a lack of reporting against them (Ibid., p. 47-48).

The evaluation study Gender and Value Chain Development (Danida evaluation study: 2010/02) highlights the importance of integrating gender mainstreaming from the initial diagnostic or project design phase all the way through the cycle of a project, including monitoring and evaluation (Ibid., p. 48-49). The evaluation study goes on to make two broad conclusions: (i) Value chain interventions should always be accompanied by a gendered analysis, and (ii) Gendered value chain analysis can be useful not only in designing value chain interventions, but also in guiding their implementation and in informing monitoring and evaluation systems (Ibid., p. 51).

These findings are by no means exclusive to Danida funded gender equality initiatives. The African Development Bank synthesis report concludes that monitoring and evaluation of programming experience including systematic application of indicators is a key challenge for most donors (AfDB: 2012, p. 21).

The report argues that the weakness in gender specific indicators and monitoring of initiatives is mirrored in evaluations ‘where inclusion and assessment of gender are generally lacking’ (Ibid., p. 21). The report notes that evaluation officers tend to only evaluate gender occasionally, rather than integrating it systematically into their work. The report finally notes that the omission of gender equality aspects in evaluations generally is not a result of ‘deliberate exclusion’, but rather ‘derive from the lack of integration of gender into intervention design and monitoring’, enabling it to be overlooked in evaluations (Ibid., p. 22).

Along similar lines, an evaluation of Gender equality in Swedish Development Cooperation (Sida: 2010) states that gender mainstreaming in Swedish development cooperation tends to be stronger in analysis, training and use of expertise, while weaker towards the end of the programme cycle in monitoring, evaluation and feedback systems: ‘In general, gender objectives and indicators are weak or nonexistent, and are consequently rarely monitored or reported on. As a result, many of the good gender results encountered were at an anecdotal level and were invisibilised. Therefore, there was neither feedback into institutional learning nor was there any use made of them to demonstrate the impact of gender equality on development results’ (Ibid., p. 12). As a result, the evaluation concludes, there is no systematic monitoring and reporting on what works or how. (Ibid., p. 14). Monitoring challenges are also confirmed in existing evidence from the World Bank in the Gender and Development: An Evaluation of World Bank Support 2002-08, which underlines that gender monitoring systems continue to be weak – especially outside the areas of health and education (Ibid., p. 54).
3 Findings in strategic priority areas

This chapter presents findings from evaluations, evaluation studies and other evaluation publications relevant to the update of the gender equality strategy and organised in the four Danida priority areas. Focus is on two-three findings in each priority areas:

3.1 Human rights and democracy

Study findings in human rights and democracy mainly focus on non-discrimination and inclusion of marginalised groups. Three key findings are identified hereunder:

1. Civil society key to sustained gender policy dialogue
2. New aid modalities can contribute to building dialogue frameworks on gender policy
3. Silence on LGBT rights

Civil society key to sustained gender policy dialogue

Findings from Joint Evaluation of Support to Civil Society Engagement in Policy Dialogue (Danida evaluation: 2012.04) show that CSOs in both Mozambique and Uganda, despite significant obstacles, have had influence on introduction and implementation of gender-related legislation through sustained pressure on duty bearers.

CSOs used different strategies to influence the policy dialogue process. Evidence-based research, in many cases linked to advocacy work and campaigning, showed to be an effective strategy: 'Examples [from Uganda] include the gender advocacy CSOs which invested time and resources to collect and analyse data on gender-based violence to inform the debate through published statistics as part of the process of calling for reform of the law' (Ibid., p. 62). Evidence-based research also played a critical role in combatting domestic violence in Mozambique. Other important strategies for influencing the policy dialogue process include network coalitions, public demonstrations, and petitions. The evaluation notes that the case study from Mozambique 'illustrates the range of strategies that may have to be employed from direct informal dialogue to indirect contribution to the dialogue, with each approach reinforcing the other to achieve the desired outcomes' (Ibid., p. 63).

A key evaluation finding on outcomes of CSO involvement in policy dialogue process is the length of time required to influence policy. In Mozambique, CSO efforts to influence the process of introducing legislation on domestic violence spanned a period of at least 15 years, with efforts taking even longer in the Uganda case. The evaluation point out that contributing factors to the slow pace of influencing policy in Uganda and Mozambique include, gender-based policy being highly political, challenges ingrained power relations, and influential vested interests acting against change.

UGANDAN CSO SUCCESS IN LEGAL REFORM

'CSOs working with the Government and the Law Reform Commission [on gender-based legislation] were able to make direct input into bills and laws, and reach communities which the Ministry was unable to do. The same case study found that gender responsive CSOs were accountable to their target groups of CSOs engaged on women's rights. A further example was the case of the Coalition for Domestic Violence Prevention which works directly with communities at grass roots level'

Joint Evaluation of Support to Civil Society Engagement in Policy Dialogue (Danida evaluation: 2012.04)
Further factors include lack of coordinated engagement by CSOs where overlapping initiatives and competition slowed progress (Ibid., p. 71). Evidence of the lengthiness of policy influence leads the evaluation to conclude that ‘there are clear lessons here for revisions to the time horizons and accommodation of unpredictability in DP (development partner) support strategies’ (Ibid., p. 11).

**New aid modalities can contribute to building dialogue frameworks on gender policy**

The *Evaluation of the Paris Declaration, Phase 2* (Danida evaluation: 2011.02), comprising 22 country level evaluations, supplemented by seven donor and multilateral development agency studies assessing how the Paris Declaration is represented in policies, strategies and procedures of these donors and agencies, highlights that ‘reports clearly show that whether priority is given to the needs of the poorest people, including women and girls, depends above all on the national and societal commitment – or lack of it – to tackle the deep roots of inequality, exclusion and disempowerment’ (Ibid., p. 46). Without national prioritisation and commitment, aid and aid reforms are limited in their capacity to address inequalities.

In a situation where donors increasingly align to national priorities, the evaluation concludes that implementation of the Paris Declaration has contributed to building partnership-based frameworks for dialogue, programming and monitoring, which have improved prospects for prioritisation of the needs of women and girls, thereby contributing to improved inclusion of marginalised groups in society.

Reports from Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia, Cambodia, Malawi, Nepal, Vietnam and Zambia all identify varying degrees of influence by aid and Paris Declaration-style operations in particular, towards prioritising needs of women and girls. Findings from Benin on impacts of the Paris Declaration show that ‘some progress has been recorded in how priorities are established with regard to the needs of the poorest, including women and girls’. Further evidence includes examples from Zambia and Malawi, indicating that Paris Declaration-related activities have increased priority in health and contributed to a national level joint support programme for gender, and Vietnam where specific influence is found in advancing policy dialogue (Ibid., p. 47).

In Cambodia, findings indicate that while positive results in gender equality cannot be directly attributed to the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action, implementation of these aid frameworks has contributed to facilitating the progress in terms of offering a platform for negotiation (see box). The evaluation notes that reports from Malawi, Zambia, Vietnam, and partly Mozambique include variations of this finding (Ibid., p. 47).
In light of these findings and the significant influence of national commitment, the evaluation finds a need for a greater sustained commitment at policy level by development partners to use aid strategically towards priorities of excluded groups such as women and girls (Ibid., p. 41).

Silence on LGBT rights
The study found only limited references to LGBT issues in any of the studied evaluations. Two evaluations included on the long list – Synthesis of Evaluations of HIV/AIDS Assistance (Danida evaluation study: 2008/01) and Evaluation of General Budget Support – Country report: Nicaragua (Danida evaluation: 2006) – each make one reference to men who have sex with men as a HIV/AIDS high risk group, but not to sexual minority rights. This is likely to be a reflection of LGBT issues being a fairly recent phenomenon in the context of Danish development cooperation.

A Danida study in preparation of the upcoming gender strategy update entitled Gender Equality, Rights and Diversity in 2013 found that LGBT rights have moved higher up on the international agenda, with recent significant developments including European Union Guidelines to protect enjoyment of all human rights by LGBTI persons in June 2013.

Several donors with Sweden, Norway, the Netherlands and the United States in the lead have taken steps to include LGBT rights in key policy documents and included LGBT support in their programmatic activities, including monitoring and evaluation with a view to measuring programmatic progress.

3.2 Green growth
Findings in this priority area mainly concern economic empowerment of women. The study presents three findings in the priority area of green growth:

1. Targeted economic interventions can be an effective empowerment tool
2. Mobility is key to economic empowerment
3. Microfinance can be a vehicle for economic empowerment

Targeted economic interventions can be an effective empowerment tool
Evaluations analysed find that targeted, gender sensitive, training and capacity building interventions can be a cost effective way of stimulating growth and empowering women. Examples include Evaluation of the Farmers Field School Approach in the Agricultural Sector Programme Support Phase II in Bangladesh (Danida evaluation: 2011.06). The evaluation finds that interventions consciously targeting both women and men have succeeded in benefitting large numbers of women by increasing ‘their confidence, ability to earn an income, to contribute to food security and participate in decision-making on smaller production issues’ (Ibid., p. 15).

Similar findings emerge from Impact Evaluation of Aquaculture Interventions in Bangladesh (Danida evaluation: 2009.01), where women’s empowerment was an integral part of the logic model of the intervention. Findings indicate results in the areas of household decision-making, women’s mobility, women’s control over credit and reduced domestic violence, although to varying degrees (Ibid., p. 56-60).

The evaluation concludes that the main impact on women’s empowerment in the aquaculture interventions seems to have come from increased consciousness and selfconfidence rather
than from application of technical skills and knowledge gained from trainings as restrictive gender roles often prevented women from putting the acquired skills to practical use. Furthermore, it is underlined that increasing the empowerment of women is a long-term process: ‘It may start with training/education of women together with some specific kind of economic empowerment, like access to credit. However, real changes in intra-household power and responsibilities cannot be expected to take place in the short term’ (Ibid., p. 63). A key finding includes female trainers as important ‘vehicles’ for attracting women to training sessions. Ex-trainers report how they become role models in their communities (Ibid., p. 61).

Mobility is key to economic empowerment

Lack of mobility for women is found to be a central constraint in all evaluations analysed in the evaluation study on Gender and Value Chain Development (Danida evaluation study: 2010/02). Lack of mobility, it is argued, generally implies limited access to markets and integration in value chains and consequently a further marginalisation of women in rural areas. Similar conclusions are reached in other Danida evaluations scrutinised by this study, including Impact evaluation of Danida Support to Rural Transport Infrastructure in Nicaragua (Danida evaluation: 2010.01). This evaluation analyses the positive and negative impacts of the Transport Sector Support Programme implemented to contribute to poverty reduction through a general improvement of the socio-economic conditions in isolated rural communities by reducing transport costs and improving access to social services and economic and administrative centres.

Examples of positive economic and social change for women include both expansions of economic activities, related to traditional gender roles, but also new roles, for instance increasing women’s participation and responsibility in handling economic activities ascribed to the catalytic effects of women’s participation as road committee members, labours and income earners in the funded projects (Ibid., p. 57).

Danida evaluation findings on mobility constraints and social marginalisation of women in rural areas are backed up by other development partner findings. The World Bank Technical Paper No. 525 Improving Rural Mobility: Options for Developing Motorized and Non-motorized Transport in Rural Areas (World Bank: 2002) concludes that ‘poor access to transport in rural areas of developing countries constrains economic and social development and contributes to poverty […] Better mobility gives people better access to services (education, health, finance), markets, income-earning opportunities, and social, political and community activities’ (Ibid., p. 1).

Several of the evaluations studied in Gender and Value Chain Development (Danida evaluation study: 2010/02) provide successful examples of how to, if not overcome, then at least reduce
some of the major mobility constraints and thereby alleviate some of the negative side effects adding to women’s vulnerable and marginalised position in society. This is mainly done by forging new vertical linkages in the value chains through new networks and intermediaries, thus ‘bringing the value chain to the villages’ (Ibid., p. 41-42).

Central conclusions from the World Bank Technical Paper regarding planning and implementing rural transportation and infrastructure interventions include all interventions, whether sponsored by governments, private sector, NGOs or international donors to apply a holistic, multi-stakeholder approach, looking at infrastructure and mobility as integrated solutions. Examples show that gender outcomes are particularly impressive when projects include women in the planning process from the start and that transport and infrastructure improvements can cause positive transformations of traditional gender roles (World Bank: 2002, p. 2-14).

It is important to note that women’s mobility constraints often not only reflect physical limitations as described above but are more often also influenced by cultural norms and practices.

Microfinance can be a vehicle for economic empowerment
Whilst imposition of targeting restrictions is widely seen as a barrier to financial sustainability, evidence from studied evaluations indicates that microfinance can have positive effects on economic empowerment and decision making of women and, at least to some extent, contribute positively towards social empowerment in health and education sectors.

A range of studies including those analysed in the evaluation study Economic Empowerment of Women (Danida evaluation study: 2008/04) concludes that targeting microfinance initiatives to women has an empowering potential at a household level and gives women a feeling of greater control over household economic decisions (Ibid., p. 23). Results from a study of the Microfinance Investment Facility for Afghanistan established in 2003 by the World Bank and the Consultative Group to Assist the Poor and referred to in the evaluation study Danish Support to Statebuilding and Improved Livelihoods in Afghanistan (Danida evaluation study: 2012/04) indicate that a third of women clients were taking loan decisions independently, while 40 per cent took decisions jointly with their husbands. The evaluation study sees this as ‘an indication of female empowerment and that participation in microfinance programmes improves the socio-economic status of women’ (Ibid., p. 47).

Besides increasing women’s economic empowerment, findings from the evaluation study Economic Empowerment of Women (Danida evaluation study: 2008/04) furthermore point to positive effects on social areas such as health and education from increasing women’s income through targeted microfinance interventions. Studies show that women, to a larger degree than men, tend to use increases in income towards improving children’s health and enrolment in educational facilities (Ibid., p. 23-24). These findings are backed up by studies on child undernutrition from Ethiopia, conveyed in the evaluation study on Addressing the Underlying and Basic Causes of Child Undernutrition in Developing Countries (Danida evaluation study: 2009/02) which indicate that ‘female clients of the WISDOM Microfinance Institution and their children had significantly better nutritional status and significantly better household food and nutrition security than those in the comparison groups’. The study concludes that targeting provision of credit to women can help to reduce undernutrition, although additional research on the subject could provide more conclusive evidence (Ibid., p. 45-46).
3.3 Social progress

Findings in the priority area of social progress concern correlations between gender balance and health, education and national development. On a broader level, the World Bank, the AfDB synthesis report and related bodies of evaluation evidence note that reported gender results are often focused on education and health interventions 'because it is easier to monitor and evaluate effects on women and gender in these areas' (AfDB: 2012, p. 10). The study presents three findings:

1. Links between gender balance, child health and development
2. Increased overall education enrolment promotes gender equality
3. Incentive structures can improve gender balance in school and training attendance

Links between gender balance, child health and development

Findings from the evaluation study Addressing the Underlying and Basic Causes of Child Undernutrition in Developing Countries (Danida evaluation study: 2009/02), establishes a strong link between status of women and nutritional status of children. Studies from South Asia, sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean found that increasing the status of women had significant positive nutritional impact on children in all of the regions. Findings showed that 'the very high rates of child undernutrition in South Asia, compared to sub-Saharan Africa, are associated with the much lower status of women in South Asia' (Ibid., p. 45).

The evaluation study refers to a range of interventions, which have contributed to successfully reducing discrimination and improving women's status. These include 'reform of legislation and delivery of basic services to equalize rights and access, improving access to childcare and Conditional Cash Transfer programmes' (Ibid., p. 45).

Besides concluding on the close link between women’s status and children’s health condition, the evaluation study further documents the key role of child nutrition in human capital and economic development. Findings point to well-established links between undernourishment and likelihood of children being 'below average height when they reach adulthood, to have lower educational achievement, to give birth to smaller infants and have lower economic status in adulthood, with effects that spill over to future generations' (Ibid., p. 7).

Increased overall education enrolment promotes gender equality

This study finds evidence that interventions increasing school enrolment in turn can lead to increased women’s empowerment at household level. Findings from the evaluation study Economic Empowerment of Women (Danida evaluation study: 2008/04) exploring impact of education initiatives on women’s empowerment in Indonesia, Kenya and Mexico, indicate that ‘there is some evidence across different development contexts that an increase in the supply of education can enhance the empowerment of women’ (Ibid., p. 39). The majority of initiatives studied did not target girls in particular, but focused on increasing general supply of education to both girls and boys.

Findings point to increased gender based differential treatment in households in states of crisis such as hunger or illness. Consequently, when household income increases, through subsidized enrolment or a subsidy for sending children to school this particularly benefits women and girls (Ibid., p. 39).
The evaluation study argues that education can help to empower women economically as it raises the ‘market or opportunity value of women’s work’ and increases women’s access and control over resources (Ibid., p. 34). Consequently, this can reduce women’s dependency on male members of the household. Education can also contribute to increase women’s general knowledge and self-esteem, which in turn can ‘affect several other developmental aspects such as e.g. the health and nutrition [of] household members, the education of the children within the household and the political participation of the women themselves’ (Ibid., p. 34).

The Evaluation of Danida Support to the Education Sector in Afghanistan (Danida evaluation: 2012.02) points out that an important factor contributing to girl’s enrolment, at least in situations where large gender equality gaps are the order of the day, is the availability of female teachers. The evaluation thus argues that while the supply of female teachers is expanding in Afghanistan there number is still not sufficient – a factor inhibiting girls’ enrolment (Ibid., p. 21-39).

Incentive structures can improve gender balance in school and training attendance
Findings indicate that programmes targeting social areas such as education and vocational training programmes may increase involvement of girls and women and reduce gender disparities through various types of incentive structures.

Examples of this were found in the Joint Evaluation of Effectiveness and Impact of the Enabling Development Policy of the World Food Programme (Danida evaluation: 2005). A central focus area of the programme was the Food-for-Training and Education initiative. The focus area included three main types of activities: 1) School feeding targeted boys and girls, 2) Special support for girls’ education through family rations provided according to level of attendance and 3) Interventions supporting women’s literacy and skills development through food-for-training activities. The intended role of the food transfer was to increase the number of particularly girls in primary school as well as encourage participation of women in training activities.

The evaluation notes how ‘particularly encouraging’ results were achieved in terms of increased school enrolment by girls through the use of special incentives targeted particularly at girls and their families (Ibid., p. x). Although less prominent, positive results were also reached in food-for-training component specifically targeting women to participate in training activities.

The evaluation study Addressing the Underlying and Basic Causes of Child Undernutrition in Developing Countries (Danida evaluation study: 2009/02) backs up the positive findings of using incentives in relation to increasing girl attendance in schools. The evaluation study refers to a paper by economists King, Klasen and Porter entitled Women and Development prepared for Copenhagen Consensus 2008, which identifies cash transfers targeted to women conditional on girls’ attendance at school as one of four top policy priority options for empowering women and improving gender equity. The other three are 1) Microfinance targeted to women, 2) Reservation of positions for women in legislative bodies and 3) Providing support for women’s reproductive role for a combination of family planning and maternal health initiatives (Ibid., p. 46).

While findings indicate that incentive structures can have positive impact on increasing attendance of women and girls in specific activities and reducing gender disparities, economic
or food incentives may not be sufficient. The Joint Evaluation of Effectiveness and Impact of the Enabling Development Policy of the World Food Programme (2005) thus conclude that food as an incentive in some cases may be insufficient as ‘other economic, social and cultural barriers also need to be taken into account’ (Danida evaluation: 2005, p. 17).

3.4 Stability and protection

Gender findings in this priority area derive from two evaluations: Aiding the Peace – a Multi-donor Evaluation of Support to Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding Activities in Southern Sudan 2005-2010 (Danida evaluation: 2011.01) and Evaluation of the Danish Region of Origin Initiative in Afghanistan (Danida evaluation: 2012.01). The study presents two gender equality findings related to stability and protection:

1. Links between gender equality and conflict insufficiently considered
2. Community development can promote gender equality results

Links between gender equality and conflict insufficiently considered

Findings from Southern Sudan point to insufficient consideration by development partners and national actors of the relationship between gender equality and conflict.

Aiding the Peace – a Multi-donor Evaluation of Support to Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding Activities in Southern Sudan 2005-2010 (Danida evaluation: 2011.01) suggests that the three themes of gender, gun-based violence and development are intricately linked to each other and to the larger theme of human security following the protracted civil war, and that ‘approaches to development and disarmament need to take into consideration the gender roles of the community actors with whom they are engaged’ (Ibid., p. 121).

The evaluation argues that gender relations and inequality seldom are considered as triggers or dynamics of conflict by conflict-monitoring and assessment frameworks – an omission strengthened by lack of sex-disaggregated data. Instead, women are depicted as victims of violence rather than as integral to building social capital and participation in a post-conflict setting (Ibid., p. 121).

The evaluation suggests that a gender-based conflict analysis can be helpful in identifying specific gender challenges and patterns of exclusion of female participation in post conflict situations such as, lack of confidence, cultural barriers, reluctance to voice an opinion, and the logistics of balancing participation with domestic responsibilities (Ibid., p. 123).

The findings are supported by international research from both the World Bank and UNIFEM. A paper by the World Bank’s Conflict Prevention and Reconstruction Unit titled Mainstreaming Gender in Conflict Analysis (World Bank: 2006) finds that gender variables are missing in most conflict frameworks. This is partly the result of (1) a general tendency to conflate gender with women, (2) insufficient data and information on the ‘gendered’ impact of the development,
conflict and poverty nexus, and (3) the fact that when and if gender is addressed, it is typically covered under social issues or indicators, rather than mainstreamed throughout the analysis (Ibid., p. 2-3). The Policy Briefing Paper, *Gender and Conflict Analysis* (UNIFEM: 2012), prepared by UNIFEM note that ‘Effective conflict prevention and resolution require analysis of the causes, triggers, dynamics and patterns of conflict, as well as the factors and social dynamics that strengthen community’s resilience to conflict’ (Ibid., p. 1). The paper further argues that ‘that bringing a gender lens to conflict analysis, monitoring and transformative responses can make a significant contribution to conflict prevention’ (Ibid., p. 1).

**Community development can promote gender equality results**

While the overall gender conclusion of the *Evaluation of the Danish Region of Origin Initiative in Afghanistan* (Danida evaluation: 2012.01) is ‘that there was insufficient attention to the gender impact of projects’ (Ibid., p. 12), the National Solidarity Programme (NSP) under the Ministry of Rural Rehabilitation and Development, proved to be a positive exception that showed significant gender equality impacts. The programme is an example of community driven development where grants are provided for projects selected and managed by the community with the assistance of facilitating partners. The NSP has worked extensively with the establishment of Women’s Community Development Councils, giving women a voice in community decisions for the first time in some parts of Afghanistan (Ibid., p. 12).

The third phase of the NSP has seen significant efforts to mainstream gender. Programme documents for the third phase includes gender sensitive indicators in the logical framework, and there are national and international gender advisors on staff in addition to the NSP gender Working Group and NSP gender Oversight Committee. Furthermore, ‘application forms are being revised to make them more accessible to women and there are plans to include the gender strategy in the NSP operations manual; monitor the participation of women in CDCs and take action when this is inadequate; set minimum quotas for female staff of facilitating partners; and provide gender awareness training for both NSP and facilitating partner staff’ (Ibid., p. 45).

Studies of impact notes that the NSP have increased ‘facilitation of women’s involvement in decision making, the provision of local governance services to women, and the initiation, selection, and /or management of development projects for women’ (Ibid., p. 79). Whereas the programmes have had great success in involving women in decision making, impacts on changing attitudes and/or opinions about female participation in community life are limited, ‘with no effects of the program identified on opinions about women working in Government or NGOs, on girls’ school attendance, or medical treatment of women by male doctors’ (Ibid., p. 79).

Findings show that impact of NSP income generating projects is limited by lack of knowledge of, and access to markets rather than lack of skills. The NSP gender study, funded by CIDA and Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, notes that ‘traditional’ project designs focus on the introduction of new skills rather than assessing the market for existing or new products and services. In fact marketability of skills is rarely addressed in project design which is based on good intentions and assumptions’ (Ibid., p. 79).
4 Recommendations

Drawing on key findings from the desk review of evaluations, this chapter presents recommendations limited to evaluation evidence and intended to address central challenges observed in Danida evaluations from the past decade. Recommendations are intended to inform the impending update of Danida's strategy, *Gender Equality in Danish Development Cooperation* (2004). For easy reference, recommendations are presented at the three levels of policy, programming and organisation – with one-line recommendations in bold and italics followed by summary of evaluation evidence in support of the recommendation.

4.1 Policy level

- **Clarify and strengthen gender equality concepts in a HRBA perspective**
  
  Danida and international evaluations point to imprecise and watered down gender related concepts – often interpreted as women's issues and narrowed down to women's participation. Evaluation evidence points to the need for clearer, bold and more holistic gender equality concepts. This includes working with comprehensive interplays of unequal power relations based on gender, class, age ethnicity etc., and culturally ascribed social roles of men and women, and boys and girls.

- **Incorporate LGBT rights in updated gender equality strategy**
  
  Evaluation findings show widespread silence on LGBT rights with only two evaluation references to sexual minorities. In line with the HRBA principles of inclusion and non-discrimination applied by Danida to other minority groups, and the stronger international and Danish policy focus, inclusion of LGBT rights in the updated Danish gender equality strategy would help fill the gap documented by evaluations studied.

4.2 Programming level

- **Develop clear outcome-focused results frameworks with corresponding indicators**
  
  Choice of intervention area has implications for the expected gender equality effects and evaluations studied find lack of clear frameworks to be a significant impediment to the strategic orientation of interventions. Furthermore, evaluations find developing and applying gender indicators that go beyond short-term quantitative outputs to be a particular challenge. Early gender country analysis as part of Country Programming is a potentially important tool in addressing the evaluation evidence of absent or weak gender outcome indicators and developing strategically relevant frameworks.

- **Incorporate gender equality targets early on in the design of programmes**
  
  Evaluation evidence indicates that gender equality initiatives are most successful when thought into programming from the identification and formulation phase and followed up on throughout the programme cycle, including implementation and monitoring and evaluations, highlighting the importance of a thorough gender analysis undertaken in the identification phase.
- **Strengthen systematic monitoring and evaluation and compile lessons learned**
  Evidence from evaluations of Danida and international interventions point to monitoring and evaluation and compilation of lessons learned as key barriers to identifying impact of interventions, thus constituting key challenges for the design of indicator, monitoring and evaluation requirements under new Country Programming.

- **Ensure programmatic time frames correspond to expected outcomes**
  Evidence from evaluations on policy dialogue influence and economic empowerment initiatives indicate that results develop over long periods of time. Seeing gender equality results often require long-term programming horizons.

- **Include gender aspects in conflict analysis of fragile situations**
  Evaluation findings suggest that gender-based conflict analysis can help to identify links between gender equality and a given conflict situation, and gender-specific challenges. Gender-based conflict analysis should be conducted in preparation of Country Programming as dimensions of male roles and masculinities in prevention and post-conflict reconstruction towards eradication of violent behaviour are evidenced by evaluations to be of particular relevance.

- **Explore potential effects of positive discrimination and incentives**
  Evaluation findings show that various types of incentive structures can help to increase attendance of girls in the education system and participation of women in training programmes. Positive and negative effects of using incentive structures to further gender equality should be considered when planning interventions.

- **Increase attention on market knowledge and accessibility in income-generation**
  Findings show that lack of mobility is a major constraint in accessing markets. Access is often impeded because of difficult accessibility to market centres or cultural restrictions on mobility influencing women in particular.

### 4.3 Organisational level

- **Include gender equality in overall policy dialogue and country programming**
  Evaluation evidence indicates a risk of policy evaporation whereby gender equality considerations are marginalised in the process of moving from programme design to implementation. Evaluations reflect the importance of gender equality perspectives throughout policy dialogue and implementation.

- **Consider gender balance in recruitment of trainers and staff**
  Several evaluations point to challenges of all male teams in accessing women, especially in countries with a high level of gender inequality. Inclusion of female trainers and staff may help to attract female participants and become role models locally. Female teachers are in many contexts also an important factor in increasing girl enrolment.

- **Ensure that gender equality requirements are followed up in ToR and reporting**
  Gender equality is a standard requirement in Terms of Reference for all Danida evaluations launched. However, this prominence does not appear to be reflected in the evaluation reports where numerous reports are found to include only brief references.
Annex A – Terms of Reference

Evaluation study on gender lessons learned in Danida’s Evaluations

June-September 2013

Background
The strengthened focus on the Human Rights Based Approach, HRBA has implications for Danish development cooperation and calls for an update of strategies and methodologies, including efforts to promote gender equality and women’s rights in partner countries. As part of the implementation of The Right to a Better Life the current gender strategy, developed in 2004, will be updated during the second half of 2013. Much of the current gender strategy is in line with overall directions spelled out in The Right to a Better Life and remains relevant. However, gender equality efforts must be linked more directly to HRBA and the four main principles of non-discrimination, transparency, accountability and participation.

The current Danida gender strategy (2004) involves a two-pronged approach of:

1) Special interventions for the advancement of women’s and men’s equal rights and
2) Mainstreaming of gender equality at all levels of development cooperation

Broad mainstreaming in all areas of development cooperation is emphasized by the ToR of this study as the overall future direction.

Purpose
To collect and compile experiences from Danida evaluations conducted between 2004 and 2013, of relevance for the development of a new gender equality and diversity policy. Experience will be presented in a report for use by UGS and others involved in the update of Danida’s strategy framework for gender equality (planned for the second half of 2013). If data and the quality of the report allows, the report may be published by EVAL either as an evaluation study or under “Other reports” on the EVAL website.

Scope
All Danida evaluations since 2004, when the current Danida strategy on gender equality was launched, will be screened, with particular focus on evaluations deemed relevant for the four priorities of The Right to a Better Life (2012), in particular the following key focus areas:

I. Human Rights Based Approach – Implications for gender
II. Gender Mainstreaming – methods, lessons learned and future perspectives
III. Budget support – gender and new aid modalities
IV. Stability and protection – UNSCR 1324, women and men in conflict
V. LGBT – gender identity and non-discrimination

A long list of evaluations is provided by EVAL (see Annex 1). The consultant is expected to screen all evaluations listed here. The evaluations can be found at www.evaluation.dk (or requested from EVAL if they are not there).
The study will be based on a closer scrutiny of the evaluations deemed most relevant for the exercise.

**Outputs**

1. A brief *inception note* including a short-list of evaluations deemed most relevant for the exercise (and justification for selection of these).

2. A *draft report* containing a comprehensive overview of lessons learned and recommendations on gender equality and diversity issues as well as a description of the methodology used to gather and compile information from the evaluations.

3. A *final report* of no more than 30 pages, not including appendices. The report must contain a brief justification for the selection of evaluations covered

**Team and input**

A total of 12 days for Rune Lamberth and 12 days for Verner Kristiansen and 3-4 days for Sarah Forti has been allocated for the exercise. The contract maximum is 250,000 DKK.

**Management and Timing**

The consultants will report to Margrethe Holm Andersen ([marand@um.dk](mailto:marand@um.dk)) with cc to Lars Christian Oxe ([laroxe@um.dk](mailto:laroxe@um.dk)) in the Evaluation Department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Screening</td>
<td>June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inception note</td>
<td>25 June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion and shortlisting in collaboration with EVAL</td>
<td>June / July 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft report</td>
<td>30 August 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments by EVAL</td>
<td>13 September 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final report</td>
<td>20 September 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Annex C – Overview of screening results**

The table below provides an overview of results from the initial word screening of the long list of Evaluations, Evaluation Studies and other evaluation publications provided by the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs' Evaluation Department. Numbers indicate how many times the search word appears in the evaluation (annexes excluded). Search words were modified in cases of Danish and French evaluations.

A total of 27 publications were shortlisted. In this annex, shortlisted publications are colour-coded according to the four priority areas identified in *The Right to a Better Life*: i) **Human rights and democracy**, ii) **Green growth**, iii) **Social progress** and iv) **Stability and protection**. Broad and cross-cutting evaluations that do not fit under the priority areas are highlighted in **brown**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>DAC sector</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Girl</th>
<th>Boy</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Mainstream</th>
<th>Minority/ies (groups)</th>
<th>Rights</th>
<th>LGBT/Homosexual/Gay/Lesbian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013.01</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of Danish support to Civil Society</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012.06</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>15130</td>
<td>Evaluation of the Access to Justice Programme in Zambia, 2006-11</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012.05</td>
<td>Interregional</td>
<td>11430</td>
<td>Evaluation of Danida's Fellowship Programme</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012.04</td>
<td>Interregional</td>
<td>99810</td>
<td>Joint Evaluation of Support to Civil Society Engagement in Policy Dialogue</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012.03</td>
<td>Interregional</td>
<td>99810</td>
<td>Joint Evaluation of Public Financial Management Reform; Burkina Faso, Ghana and Malawi 2001-2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012.02</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>99810</td>
<td>Evaluation of Danida Support to the Education Sector in Afghanistan</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012.01</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>99810</td>
<td>Evaluation of the Danish Region of Origin Initiative in Afghanistan</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/04</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>15220</td>
<td>Danish Support to Statebuilding and Improved Livelihoods in Afghanistan</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Pages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/03</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>15220</td>
<td>Effective Statebuilding? A review of evaluations of international statebuilding support in fragile contexts</td>
<td>3 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 17 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/02</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>99810</td>
<td>Economic development and service deliver in fragile states</td>
<td>1 2 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/01</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>12110</td>
<td>The macroeconomic impact of HIV/AIDS and HIV/AIDS interventions</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 2 3 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>99810</td>
<td>Evaluation of the Farmer Field School Approach in the Agriculture Sector Programme Support Phase II, Bangladesh</td>
<td>58 207 39 7 2 71 45 1 7 3 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011.06</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>99810</td>
<td>Evaluation à mi-parcours du Plan décennal de développement du secteur de l'éducation du Bénin (PDDSE 2006-2015)</td>
<td>6 15 4 77 18 2 1 0 0 7 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011.04</td>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>11110</td>
<td>Evaluation of the Danish Engagement in and around Somalia 2006-10</td>
<td>6 30 3 0 0 4 3 0 1 15 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011.05</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>99810</td>
<td>Evaluation of the Danish Neighbourhood Programme with a focus on the Economic Development Portfolio</td>
<td>3 10 3 2 0 0 0 1 2 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011.08</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>32130</td>
<td>Evaluation of Support to Anti-Corruption Efforts 2002-2009</td>
<td>11 10 1 0 0 0 0 3 0 11 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>99810</td>
<td>Joint Evaluation Study: CCPA's Open Fun Football Schools Programme</td>
<td>204 419 5 14 0 5 5 24 0 47 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011.03</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>15170</td>
<td>Study: Agricultural input subsidies in Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>0 1 0 0 0 4 2 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/2</td>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>31150</td>
<td>Joint Evaluation of the Paris Declaration, Phase 2</td>
<td>18 20 3 13 0 0 0 14 1 11 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/1</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>99810</td>
<td>Joint Evaluation of Support to Conflict Prevention and Peace building Activities in Southern Sudan 2005-2010</td>
<td>4 1 0 6 1 2 1 0 0 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>99810</td>
<td>Aiding the Peace - A Multi-donor Evaluation of Support to Conflict Prevention and Peace building Activities in Southern Sudan 2005-2010</td>
<td>58 64 12 5 0 4 0 6 3 63 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Organizations</td>
<td>Pages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010.11</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>Evaluation of Donor Support to Public Financial Management Reform in Developing Countries - Analytical study of quantitative cross-country evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010.06</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>99810</td>
<td>Joint Evaluation of the Protracted Refugee Situation (PRS) for Burundians in Tanzania</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010.05</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>99810</td>
<td>Evaluation of Programmatic Approaches to Support for the Environment in Africa 1996-2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010.02</td>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010.01</td>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>Impact Evaluation of Danida Support to Rural Transport Infrastructure in Nicaragua</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/2</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>Evaluation Study: Gender and Value Chain Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>284</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/1</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>Evaluation Study: Evaluating Aid Effectiveness in the Aggregate: A Critical Assessment of the Evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-10</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>Peer Review - UNIDO Evaluation Function</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009.08</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>Operation of the Least Developed Countries Fund for Adaptation to Climate Change</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Report Title</td>
<td>Country Code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/5</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Evaluation Study 2009/5: Synthesis of Evaluations on Support to Business Development</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/7</td>
<td>Ghana/Ethiopia</td>
<td>Thematic Evaluation of Support by Danish NGO's to Civil Society in Ghana and Ethiopia</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/3</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Evaluation of Danish Support for Financial Services in Tanzania</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/1</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Evaluation Study 2009/1: Evaluating Aid Effectiveness in the Aggregate: Methodological Issues</td>
<td>99810</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/2</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Joint Evaluation of Citizens' Voice and Accountability</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/1</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>Impact Evaluation of Aquaculture Interventions in Bangladesh</td>
<td>31320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/8</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Managing Aid Exit and Transformation</td>
<td>998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008.07</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>Evaluation of Danish Regional Support to Peace and Security, regional integration and democratisation in Southern Africa</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/5</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>25010</td>
<td>Evaluation Study 2008/5: Public Private Partnership Programme</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/4</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>Evaluation Study 2008/4: Economic Empowerment of Women</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008.06</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>Oplysningsvirksomhed om udviklingslandene finansieret af udenrigsministeriet 2006-2007</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008.05</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Evaluation of Development Cooperation between Mozambique and Denmark 1992-2006</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008.04</td>
<td>Bénin</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Evaluation Conjointe du Programme Danois de Pays du Bénin 1990-2006</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008.03</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Joint evaluation of the Ghana-Denmark Development Cooperation 1990-2006</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008.02</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>99810</td>
<td>Evaluation of the implementation of the Paris Declaration</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008.01</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>99810</td>
<td>Phase One of the Evaluation of the Implementation of the Paris Declaration - Case Study Denmark</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-08</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>92010</td>
<td>Mapping of Monitoring and Evaluation Practices Among Danish NGOs (&quot;Other Reports&quot;)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-08</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>21020</td>
<td>Overview and Synthesis of Road Sector Evaluations (&quot;Other Reports&quot;)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/3</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>99810</td>
<td>Evaluation Study 2008/3: Assessing Multilateral Organisation Effectiveness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/2</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>99810</td>
<td>Evaluation Study 2008/2: Synergies between Bilateral and Multilateral Activities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Evaluation Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/1</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Evaluation Study 2008/1: Synthesis of Evaluations of HIV/AIDS Assistance</td>
<td>2 7 3 0 0 1 5 0 0 3 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007.05</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Evaluation of Danish Support to Water Supply and Sanitation 1999-2005</td>
<td>12 6 0 0 1 0 2 0 10 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007.04</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Impact Evaluation of HIMA, Tanzania</td>
<td>60 126 18 2 0 7 5 7 4 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007.03</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Joint External Evaluation of the Health Sector in Tanzania, 1999-2006</td>
<td>14 18 11 2 1 3 3 1 0 4 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okt. 2007</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Explorative Study of Programme/Project Completion Reports (PCR)</td>
<td>5 2 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 12 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES 2007/3</td>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>Evaluating the Impact of Rural Roads in Nicaragua</td>
<td>2 2 2 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES 2007/2</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Synthesis of Evaluations on Technical Assistance</td>
<td>0 8 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 2 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES 2007/1</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Assistance to Development Research</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okt. 2007</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Follow-up Study: Evaluation of Danish Assistance to Vocational Education and Training</td>
<td>20 2 0 0 0 9 3 14 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007.02</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Provision of Technical Assistance Personnel - What can we learn from promising approaches</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007.02-1</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Country case Study - Vietnam, Oct. 2007</td>
<td>2 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 7 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007.02-2</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>Country case Study - Mozambique, Oct. 2007</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007.02-3</td>
<td>Solomon Is.</td>
<td>Country case Study - Solomon Islands, Oct. 2007</td>
<td>0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007.01</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>Final evaluation of the first phase of the National Agriculture Development Programme (Proagri) (1999-2005)</td>
<td>93 37 7 0 0 1 2 9 0 18 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006.06</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Danish Aid to Uganda 1987-2005</td>
<td>59 14 3 5 5 1 0 7 1 58 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006.05</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Parliamentarians for Global Action, PGA</td>
<td>4 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 12 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006.04</td>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>Capacity Development in Bhutan</td>
<td>3 4 0 0 0 3 2 4 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Pages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006.03</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>72010</td>
<td>Joint evaluation of the international response to the Indian Ocean tsunami (Synthesis report)</td>
<td>12 34 3 0 0 8 5 1 0 10 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006.02</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>51010</td>
<td>Evaluation of General Budget Support - Note on Approach and Methods</td>
<td>14 4 0 0 0 0 7 1 34 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of General Budget Support - Syntheses report (Country reports: Burkina Faso, Malawi, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Rwanda, Uganda &amp; Vietnam)</td>
<td>51 4 1 1 0 0 14 0 27 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of General Budget Support - Country report: Burkina Faso</td>
<td>17 16 4 1 0 0 0 0 0 46 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of General Budget Support - Country report: Malawi</td>
<td>14 6 0 3 0 5 2 3 0 17 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of General Budget Support - Country report: Mozambique</td>
<td>42 30 4 10 2 6 4 3 0 49 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of General Budget Support - Country report: Nicaragua</td>
<td>34 11 6 0 0 0 0 0 7 0 30 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of General Budget Support - Country report: Rwanda</td>
<td>34 8 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 42 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of General Budget Support - Country report: Uganda</td>
<td>37 2 1 1 0 0 0 15 0 25 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of General Budget Support - Country report: Vietnam</td>
<td>49 16 3 1 0 1 3 11 3 31 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006.01</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>33110</td>
<td>The International Trade Centre UNCTAD/WTO</td>
<td>47 22 0 0 0 2 0 20 0 5 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-06</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>Follow-up Study: 1999/3 Danish Development Assistance to Bangladesh, volume I &amp; II</td>
<td>2 1 0 0 0 0 0 4 0 10 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-06</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>Follow-up Study: 2000/6 Joint Evaluation of the Road Sub-Sector Programme 1996-2000</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-05</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peer Review - UNDP Evaluation Office</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 3 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Pages</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005.06</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>31110</td>
<td>Uganda's Plan for the Modernisation of Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005.05</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>15061</td>
<td>Humanitarian and Reconstruction Assistance to Afghanistan 2001-05</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005.04</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>WFP, Joint Evaluation of Effectiveness &amp; Impact of the Enabling Development Policy of The World Food Programme (vol I + II)</td>
<td></td>
<td>179</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005.03</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>An Independent External Evaluation of IFAD</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005.02</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>72030</td>
<td>Support to Internally Displaced Persons - Learning from Evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005.01</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>32110</td>
<td>Capacity Development Outcome Evaluation, Field-testing of Methodology</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/7</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>Lessons from Rwanda - Lessons for Today</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/6</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>32110</td>
<td>Private &amp; Business Sector Development Interventions, Meta-Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/5</td>
<td>Kosovo</td>
<td>700/163</td>
<td>Humanitarian &amp; Rehabilitation Assistance to Kosovo, 1999-2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/4</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>43010</td>
<td>Projects in Makueni and Taita Taveta Districts, Kenya</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/3</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Joint Government - Donor Evaluation of Basic and Primary Education Programme II</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/2</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>31181</td>
<td>Danish Assistance to Farm Women in India</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/1</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>Industrialization Fund for Developing Countries (IFU)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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