APPLYING GENDER RESULTS EFFECTIVENESS SCALE (GRES) IN UNDP COUNTRY PROGRAMME EVALUATIONS
Overview

- Efforts of integrating gender in evaluations at IEO
- Results of an external review of our recent CPEs and key messages
- Observations
Efforts at IEO

• Increased attention to integration of GEWE (gender equality and women’s empowerment) in our evaluations.¹

• “Thematic Evaluation on Gender (2015)”² helped produce:
  - GRES (Gender Results Effectiveness Scale)
  - “How-To Note on Gender” for ADRs/ICPEs (2014) and “How-To Note on Integrating GRES into ADRs/ICPEs” (2016)

• GRES being piloted in all ICPEs
• GEWE included as part of programme ‘effectiveness’ analysis

¹UNDP Strategic Plan ‘14-’17/ Gender Strategy ‘14-’17 => “GEWE should be reflected in all aspects of UNDP’s work”

²“Evaluation of UNDP Contribution to GEWE,” 2015
Gender Results Effectiveness Scale (GRES)

- **Gender Negative**: Result had a negative outcome that aggravated or reinforced existing gender inequalities and norms.
- **Gender Blind**: Result had no attention to gender, failed to acknowledge the different needs of men, women, girls and boys, or marginalized populations.
- **Gender Targeted**: Result focused on the number of equity (50/50) of women, men or marginalized populations that were targeted.
- **Gender Responsive**: Results addressed differential needs of men or women and address equitable distribution of benefits, resources, status, rights but did not address root causes of inequalities in their lives.
- **Gender Transformative**: Result contributes to changes in norms, cultural values, power structures and the roots of gender inequalities and discriminations.
Eight ICPE evaluations* examined against 4 UN-SWAP EPI criteria

1) “GEWE is integrated in the evaluation scope and indicators are designed in a way that ensures GEWE-related data will be collected.”

2) “Evaluation criteria and evaluation questions specifically address how GEWE has been integrated into design, planning, implementation of the interventions and results achieved.”

3) “Gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.”

4) “The evaluation findings, conclusions, and recommendations reflect a gender analysis.”

*8 countries: Albania, Dominican Rep, Gabon, Mauritania, Morocco, Sao Tome and Principe, Somalia, and Viet Nam (CPEs 2015-2016), each with GEWE/GRES analysis
Scoring of 4 Criteria

- Each of 4 criteria awarded a score between 0 and 3
- Potential max score per country => 12

Total score:
- 0-3 points = “Missing requirements”
- 4-7 points = “Approaches requirements”
- 8-10 points = “Meets requirements”
- 11-12 points = “Exceeds Requirements”
1. Average score 6.6 (“Approaching requirements”) but with a significant difference: “3” (VIE “Missing req”) to “9” (MAU/SML, “Meet req”)

2. Higher scores when: i) country context including more discussion on issues faced by women; gender data; reference to program overview with G efforts

   ii). Scope/ methodology explicitly discussed intent of assessing how program contributed to furthering GEWE and how

   iii) Data analysis, methodology called for specific gender expertise

   iv) Findings including gender parity data, staff understanding, budget allocation; Specific conclusion/ recommendation on gender

E.g. “Eval will look at how much GEWE reflected in UNDP’s overall prog support, and through direct gender interventions;” “assess factors contributing to results from programme/ operational points;” presents highlights of expected gender results from IRRF in methodology
Internal Observations

Lessons for next ICPEs/ADRs

1. Continue to include GEWE as part of prog ‘effectiveness’ analysis + gender lens in assessment of all criteria
2. Require *gender work experience in TORs*, even if no gender specialist in team
3. Include ref to gender data, issues in *country context* section;
4. Continue to include at least one gender related *conclusion/ recom*.
5. Early commissioning of an EPI assessment to feed into the ongoing ICPE reforms => Reducing *gap among evaluation managers*
6. Assign only one reviewer to *reduce “inconsistencies” in scoring*
7. Application to *other evaluations* (Joint GEF-UNDP SGP Evaluation)¹

Thank you.