



**RE-373**

***Is Gender Being Mainstreamed in  
Bank's Projects?***

---

*Office of Evaluation and Oversight, OVE*

Inter-American Development Bank  
Washington, D.C.  
July, 2010

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	THE EVALUATION.....	1
	A. Evaluative Questions .....	1
	B. Evaluation Methodology .....	2
	C. Universe of Study .....	2
III.	FINDINGS .....	4
	A. General Framework .....	4
	B. Empirical Documentation of the Distribution of the Projects’ Benefits by Gender .....	4
	C. Empirical Documentation of the Projects’ Effects by Gender Group .....	6
	D. Gender Equality Projects that Received the “Best Design Award” or “Special Recognition” .....	9
	E. The Lack of Empirical Documentation as a Topic in the PCRs’ Management Review Committee (CRG) and Quality and Risk Review (QRR) meetings.....	10
IV.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	10

[APPENDIX](#) : BASIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE EVALUATION’S UNIVERSE OF STUDY

## I. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 In May 2010, the Bank presented a draft “Operational Policy on Gender Equality in Development” that, if approved, would replace its “Operational Policy on Women in Development” (OP-761) currently in force. The OP-761 Policy, which involved the recognition, on the part of the Bank, of the advancement of women as a priority development goal, was adopted in 1987 and has guided its work in this area to this day. As stated in its draft document, the new Operational Policy intends to overcome a number of challenges that emerged under the current OP-761 Policy and demand urgent attention.<sup>1</sup> One of those challenges is the limited progress made so far in evaluating the results and overall performance of its Gender Equality (GE) interventions.<sup>2</sup>
- 1.2 One of the preconditions for evaluating a project’s performance is ensuring the availability of the information needed to ascertain how the intervention functioned, from its very beginning through completion. For that purpose, projects need to establish upfront their evaluation criteria, propose indicators with baseline values and define targets and milestones for them. This evaluation seeks to contribute to the enhancement of the Bank’s work in the field of GE by examining the gender mainstreaming efforts of 21 projects in addressing these conditions.<sup>3</sup> These projects were identified by the Bank’s Women in Development Unit in 2004 for addressing this goal. With that aim, it will focus on the projects’ efforts to document the distribution of the benefits that they provide and the projects’ effects disaggregated by gender.

## II. THE EVALUATION

### A. Evaluative Questions

- 2.1 The evaluation centered on two evaluative questions:
- (a) To what extent do the Bank’s GE projects document how the benefits that they provide are distributed by gender?<sup>4</sup>
  - (b) To what extent do they document their GE effects?

---

<sup>1</sup> IDB. GN-2531-3.

<sup>2</sup> IDB. GN-2249-1.

<sup>3</sup> IDB. “Investing in Gender Equality”.

<sup>4</sup> In the literature, the distribution of program benefits by gender (or by any other classification criterion such as income level, poverty status, etc.) is generally described as “benefit incidence” (see, for instance, Selden and Wasylenko, 1992; Lanjouw and Ravallion, 1999; Demery, 2000; Davoodi, Tiongson and Asawanuchit, 2003; Sakellariou and Patrinos, 2004; Glick, Saha and Younger, 2004). Some authors make a distinction between “benefit incidence” proper (which concerns the distribution of the costs associated with the goods or services delivered) and “benefit participation” (which focuses only on the quantities of goods or services distributed among groups) (Glick, Saha and Younger, 2004). Notwithstanding the differences between the two, this evaluation concurs with Glick, Saha and Younger (2004) in that, given the difficulties in obtaining good quality public expenditure data, *participation incidence analysis* can be taken as an acceptable proxy of *benefit incidence*. Therefore, it made no distinction between the two concepts.

2.2 In order to assess the degree of empirical documentation, the evaluation focused both on if and how the projects' ex-ante results frameworks intended to document these aspects of their performance; and on how they actually documented them after or during implementation. Having an adequate documentation strategy ex-ante is a precondition for appropriate documentation at later stages in the development of the projects. However, it does not guarantee it. Therefore, it is important to consider them both.

## **B. Evaluation Methodology**

2.3 To assess the extent of empirical documentation of the projects' GE effects, the evaluation recreated each project's ex-ante and ex-post results frameworks. The reconstruction of the ex-ante results frameworks was based on the projects' logical frameworks and other performance indicators presented in their loan proposals. To recreate the projects' ex-post results frameworks, the evaluation relied on the Project Completion Reports (PCRs) of those that had been completed and on the latest Project Performance Monitoring Reports (PPMRs) of those that were still active or had not yet submitted a PCR.

2.4 In general terms, the methodology applied to reproduce these results frameworks followed OVE's guidelines.<sup>5</sup> However, the only indicators considered as part of this exercise were those that concerned the distribution of the projects' benefits by gender and its GE effects.

2.5 The recreation of the projects' results frameworks required identifying each project's development objectives and the outcome indicators associated with each of those objectives, as well as the indicators with which they intended to document the way in which the projects' benefits were distributed by gender group. In many cases, the loan proposals presented several objectives as if they were part of a single one. Because each objective needed to have its own indicators in order to ascertain their degree of achievement, when this occurred the evaluation treated each of those individual objectives as separate objectives. The projects' loan proposals, their PPMRs and PCRs were often unclear about which indicators tracked each objective. Therefore, this evaluation made an effort to match indicators to objectives.

2.6 Based on all this information, the evaluation grouped projects in different categories that reflect the degree to which their ex-ante and ex-post results frameworks documented each of these aspects of their performance empirically.

## **C. Universe of Study**

2.7 The evaluation centers on 21 loan projects that the Bank's Women in Development Unit identified for promoting gender equality through gender mainstreaming (see a complete list of the projects in the Appendix). All the projects were approved between 2001 and 2003. As of July 12, 2010, 10 of them had been completed, 10 remained active, and one had been cancelled. The large majority (13 out of 21) are specific investment operations,

---

<sup>5</sup> See OVE (2009).

and four are multiphase lending operations. Most of them (12) belong to the Social Investment sector, followed by the Agriculture and Education sectors (three each).

2.8 An element that the projects have in common is that they all express in their loan proposals the intention to benefit women. However, there appear to be differences in the degrees of emphasis that these projects assign to the promotion of GE. Thus, three projects mention the aim to benefit women or girls as part of their objectives statement; 11 do so as they describe the activities that they propose to undertake but do not mention this aim in their objectives, and the remaining seven take women or girls as a target population (e.g., to train them during pregnancy and/or nursing on child-rearing practices, to promote healthful eating habits among them, etc.) but do not make any explicit references to the enhancement of GE (see Table 1).

**Table 1:**  
**Number of Gender Equality Projects**  
**by Way in Which Gender Equality is Treated in their Loan Proposals**

Location of references to GE in the projects' loan proposals	N
Mentioned in the objectives	3
Mentioned in the description of their activities	11
Women presented as target without making reference to GE	7
Total	21

2.9 With very few exceptions, the activities that the projects propose to undertake are not targeted at women only. Some of these activities are also targeted at other “vulnerable groups” (e.g., indigenous people, children, the elderly, etc.). Others are meant to serve a larger segment of the population or the population in general, but express the intention to prioritize, encourage or guarantee a certain level of participation of women, which they sometimes do by establishing participation quotas.

2.10 Lastly, of the 21 projects reviewed, we found that 17 proposed to benefit women/girls by providing specific services to them directly, and four projects proposed to do so by helping develop GE-oriented policies, supporting institutional strengthening in areas concerning GE or raising awareness on gender issues in a larger segment of the population or the population as a whole without a clear definition of beneficiaries (Table 2).

**Table 2:**  
**Number of Gender Equality Projects**  
**by Type of Benefit Delivered**

Type of benefit delivered	N
Goods or services delivered to intended beneficiaries directly	17
Institutional strengthening and sensitization activities	4
Total	21

### III. FINDINGS

#### A. General Framework

- 3.1 This evaluation focused on the degree to which the Bank's GE interventions document two aspects of their performance that are critical to assess their effectiveness and efficiency in enhancing GE: one of them is how the benefits that they delivered were distributed by gender; the second is how they affected each gender group.
- 3.2 In order to consider these two aspects of the projects' performance adequately documented, the evaluation required that the projects' ex-ante and ex-post results frameworks measure each aspect based on indicators that are measurable and include a complete metric. In other words, those indicators have to specify a baseline, a target and (in the case of PCRs/PPMRs only) the value they took at completion or at the time when the latest PPMR was submitted.

#### B. Empirical Documentation of the Distribution of the Projects' Benefits by Gender

- 3.3 This part of the analysis centers on the 17 projects that delivered goods or services to their intended beneficiaries directly. The remaining four projects intended to contribute to GE in a less direct way, such as by helping develop GE-oriented policies, supporting institutional strengthening in areas concerning GE or raising awareness on gender issues in a larger segment of the population or the population as a whole. Therefore, their beneficiaries are much more difficult to identify than those of projects that deliver benefits to individuals directly, which makes the distribution of those benefits among groups far more difficult to evaluate.
- 3.4 We noted that, even though all the projects identify women or girls as one of their target populations, very few of them track what proportion of the benefits that they delivered were received by them with adequately-defined indicators. This is reflected both in the projects' ex-ante results frameworks and in their PCRs or most recent PPMRs.
- 3.5 Only two of the 17 projects that proposed to deliver services to women/girls directly included at least one adequate indicator to measure how the benefits delivered were distributed by gender group in their ex-ante results frameworks. They are Nicaragua's "Rural Production Revitalization Program" (NI-0159) and Uruguay's "Comprehensive Program for At-Risk Children, Adolescents and Families" (UR-0134) (see Table 3).

**Table 3:  
Number of Gender Equality Projects  
by Adequacy of Strategy for Documenting the Distribution of the Benefits Delivered by Gender  
(as Reflected in their Ex-Ante Results Frameworks)**

Indicators to measure distribution of benefits delivered by gender group	N
None	13
One or more, without a metric	2
At least one with a complete metric	2
Project benefits do not have direct beneficiaries	4
Total	21

3.6 Two projects proposed indicators meant to measure the proportion of benefits delivered to women/girls but presented them without a metric (see Table 4). Their indicators do not include precise targets; therefore, they fail to provide a clear benchmark to assess this aspect of their performance during implementation and at completion.

**Table 4:  
Indicators to measure Distribution of Benefits Delivered by Gender without Metrics Included in the  
Ex-Ante Results Frameworks of Projects GU-0158 and PN-0125**

Project	Indicator	Baseline	Target
GU-0158 LABOR MARKET PROGRAM	% of the training recipients who are women	[Not applicable]	At least 50%
PN-0125 ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR THE BUILDING OF A TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT SYSTEM IN PANAMA	% of the trainees who are women	[Not applicable]	At least 40%
	% of program participants who are women	[Not applicable]	At least 45%

3.7 The ex-ante results frameworks of the rest of the projects did not include any indicators to measure the distribution of the benefits to be delivered by gender.

3.8 Based on the information included in their PCRs or most recent PPMRs, the efforts to document the proportion of the projects' benefits that were delivered to women/girls during implementation and at completion are even weaker. As shown in Table 5, only one of the 17 projects included adequate indicators to track this aspect of its performance in its most recent PPMR: Panama's "Assistance Program for the Building of a Training and Employment System" (PN-0125).

**Table 5:  
Number of Gender Equality Projects by Degree of Documentation of the Distribution  
of their Benefits by Gender in their PCRs or Latest PPMRs**

Indicators of distribution of benefits delivered by gender included in the projects' PCRs/latest PPMRs	N
None	14
One or more, without a metric	2
At least one with a complete metric	1
Total	17

3.9 One<sup>i</sup> project reports on the proportion of benefits delivered to women based on indicators that do not define a metric (see Table 6): It defines its target as a “threshold” value and reports on its progress based on a qualitative classification (i.e., “Very Unsatisfactory”) that is not supported with empirical data.

**Table 6:  
Incompletely-Defined Indicators to Measure the Distribution of Benefits Delivered by Gender  
Included in the Latest PPMR of Project GU-0158**

Project	Indicator	Baseline	Target	End value
GU-0158 LABOR MARKET PROGRAM	% de los beneficiarios que son mujeres	[Not applicable]	At least 50%	“Very Unsatisfactory”

3.10 The remaining 15 projects did not include any indicator to document how the benefits that they delivered were distributed between gender groups in their PCRs or latest PPMRs.

### C. Empirical Documentation of the Projects’ Effects by Gender Group

3.11 As explained above, the effects of all the projects on GE can be estimated regardless of whether the number and gender of the direct recipients of the benefits delivered can be established or not. Therefore, this part of the analysis concentrates on the 21 projects.

3.12 Like the documentation of the distribution of the projects’ benefits by gender group, the documentation of the projects’ effects on GE is also very deficient. In reporting on the results achieved, the few projects that include GE-related empirical data rely in some cases on outcome indicators, in others on output indicators and, in one case only, on a combination of both.

3.13 None of the 21 projects proposed adequately defined outcome indicators by gender in their ex-ante results frameworks (see Table 7).

**Table 7:  
Number of Gender Equality Projects  
by Adequacy of Strategy for Documenting Effects on Gender Equality  
(as Reflected in their Ex-Ante Results Frameworks)**

Ex-ante gender-specific output indicators	Ex-ante gender-specific outcome indicators		Total
	None	One or more, without a metric	
None	14	3	17
One or more, without a complete metric	1	0	1
At least one with a complete metric	2	1	3
Total	17	4	21

3.14 Four projects proposed gender-specific outcome indicators but failed to define for them a metric (see Table 8). Two of them did not specify baselines or targets; one stated its target in relation to a “control group” but failed to define what the expected level of the intended outcome was; and the fourth project presented its outcome targets as percent changes relative to baseline values that were left undefined.



**Table 8:  
Incompletely-Defined Gender-Specific Outcome Indicators Included  
in the Ex-Ante Results Frameworks of Projects HA-0079, NI-0153, NI-0161 and UR-0134**

Project	Indicator	Baseline	Target
HA-0079 LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM	Infant mortality rate disaggregated by sex	---	---
	Primary school enrollment disaggregated by sex	---	---
	Incidence of water-borne diseases disaggregated by sex	---	---
	Malnutrition rate among children 0-5 year old disaggregated by sex	---	---
NI-0153 COMPREHENSIVE CHILD CARE PROGRAM - STAGE 2	Average age of first pregnancies in the localities served	---	12 months higher than in control group
NI-0161 SOCIAL SAFETY NET, PHASE II	Rate of net school enrollment by grade and gender	---	---
	Rate of school promotion by grade and gender	---	---
	School retention rate (grades 5 and 6) by gender	---	---
	Overage pupils by grade and gender	---	---
	Anthropometric measurements (weight/height, height/age, weight/age) by age group and gender	---	---
	Incidence of respiratory illnesses by gender	---	---
	Incidence of diarrhea by gender	---	---
	Employment by gender	---	---
UR-0134 COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM FOR AT- RISK CHILDREN, ADOLESCENTS AND FAMILIES	Birth rate among teenagers (13- to 17-year-olds) living in program intervention zones	---	20% drop
	Number of adolescent program beneficiaries that become pregnant again	---	50% reduction
	Number of young people dissatisfied with health care received during pregnancy and childbirth	---	70% reduction

3.15 One of those projects complemented its outcome indicators without metrics with output indicators with full metrics. Another two projects proposed to measure their gender-related results with fully-defined output indicators only, and one with an output indicator that had no metrics (see Table 9).

**Table 9:  
Incompletely-Defined Output Indicators Included in the  
Ex-Ante Results Frameworks of Project BO-0221**

Indicator	Baseline	Target
Number of female heads of household eligible for regularization in the intervention area whose property rights are registered in the DRR	---	"All"

3.16 The remaining 14 projects did not include any gender-specific outcome or output indicators at all.

- 3.17 The ex-post documentation of the projects' effects on GE was not significantly better. One of the projects included at least one gender-specific outcome indicator and one output indicator with complete metrics, while another three documented their results with fully-defined output indicators only (see Table 10).

**Table 10:  
Number of Gender Equality Projects  
by Degree of Documentation of their Results on Gender Equality in their PCRs or Latest PPMRs**

Ex-post gender-specific output indicators	Ex-post gender-specific outcome indicators			Total
	None	One or more, without a metric	At least one with a complete metric	
None	16	1	0	17
At least one with complete metric	3	0	1	4
Total	19	1	1	21

- 3.18 Other than that, one project mentioned one outcome indicator that did not include metrics: it only included a qualitative statement asserting that its gender-specific output target had been reached “very satisfactorily” (see Table 11).

**Table 11:  
Incompletely-Defined Gender-Specific Output Indicator Included in Project NI-0153's PCR**

Indicator	Baseline	Target	End value
% de las Entidades Participantes que cumplen con la norma de relación 1 Madre voluntaria / 8 madres de familia en la Modalidad Itinerante	---	Al menos 90%	Calificación: MS

- 3.19 The remaining 16 projects did not include any gender-specific results indicators in their PCRs or latest PPMRs.
- 3.20 Interestingly, this lack of empirical evidence did not prevent the vast majority of projects from assigning themselves high ratings on the Development Objectives (DO) section of their PCRs/latest PPMRs. This is true both for projects in general (14 of the 17 that assigned themselves a “Probable” or “Very Probable” rating did not include any gender-specific data) and for the three projects that expressed an intention to benefit women/girls in the DO section of their loan proposals (among which only one of the two that rated themselves as “Probable” included gender-specific data).
- 3.21 The lack of empirical documentation of outcomes is not exclusive of the gender-related aspects of the projects' results. However, the documentation of gender-specific outcomes is far more limited than for the projects' outcomes in general. More specifically, while the PPMRs/PCRs of 7 projects include at least one outcome indicator with complete metrics, only one project documented gender-specific outcomes. Similarly, when outcome indicators with incomplete metrics are also considered, the number of projects with at least partial documentation is 10 for outcomes in general, out of which only two projects documented gender-specific outcomes. The magnitude of this problem becomes even clearer when the analysis is conducted at the indicator-level. The PPMRs/PCRs of the projects include a total of 51 outcome indicators, out of which 15 define a complete metric, six include incomplete metrics, and 30 do not include a metric at all. Interestingly,

among all these indicators, only two are gender-specific: as noted above, one includes a full metric while the metrics of the other are incomplete.

**D. Gender Equality Projects that Received the “Best Design Award” or “Special Recognition”**

3.22 In November 2004, the Bank selected project ME-0233 as the “Best Project Design of 2000-2002,” and awarded projects BO-0197 and NI-0153 with a “Special Recognition.” Interestingly, notwithstanding the critical importance of ensuring evaluability as part of projects’ design, none of these projects included the elements required to assess how the projects’ benefits were distributed or their effects by gender in their ex-ante results frameworks.

3.23 More specifically, as shown on Table 12, the project that obtained the “Best Project Design Award” (ME-0233) did not include any indicators to measure the distribution of its benefits or its effects by gender group in its ex-ante results framework, while the other two included only partial elements. Project BO-0197 proposed fully-defined output indicators but failed to include indicators to measure the distribution of its benefits by gender or gender-specific outcome indicators, whereas project NI-0153 cited one gender-specific outcome indicator, but failed to specify a concrete target for it. This project defined its targets as a percentage points difference relative to a “control group” without indicating what actual outcome levels it intended to reach.

**Table 12:**  
**Projects that Received Recognition for the Quality of their Design**  
**by Adequacy of their Strategy for Documenting the Distribution of their Benefits by Gender and their**  
**Results on Gender Equality (as Reflected in their Ex-Ante and Ex-Post Results Frameworks)**

Project	Type of acknowledgment received	Indicators in the ex-ante results framework to measure...		Gender-specific indicators in the ex-post results framework
		Outputs linked to Gender Equality	Outcomes linked to Gender Equality	
ME-0233 MULTIPHASE TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT SUPPORT PROGRAM - PHASE I	Best Project Design Award	None	None	None
BO-0197 PROGRAM TO STRENGTHEN TECHNICAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL TRAINING	Special Recognition	One with complete metrics	None	Only one output indicator with complete metric
NI-0153 COMPREHENSIVE CHILD CARE PROGRAM - STAGE 2	Special Recognition	None	One without metrics	One outcome indicator without metrics

3.24 This suggests that the projects’ ex-ante evaluability in terms of these two critical aspects of their performance received very little or no attention at the time of selecting the projects that would be rewarded for the quality of their design. Table 12 also suggests that the degree of documentation of the distribution of the projects’ benefits and specific

effects by gender during implementation remained as limited as in their ex-ante documentation strategies. This highlights the importance of setting up a strong evaluability framework at the design stage so as to facilitate the monitoring and evaluation of the projects' performance both throughout implementation and at completion.

**E. The Lack of Empirical Documentation as a Topic in the PCRs' Management Review Committee (CRG) and Quality and Risk Review (QRR) meetings**

- 3.25 At the time when this evaluation was conducted (July 2010), only five of the 21 projects had been completed and submitted PCRs. Those five PCRs had undergone either Management Review Committee (CRG) reviews or Quality and Risk Reviews (QRRs), but the evaluation could obtain meeting minutes only for three of them. It is important to note that none of these meeting minutes addresses the lack of empirical evidence on how the projects' benefits were distributed by gender or of their effects on GE. While the number of CRG and QRR minutes available is too small to draw conclusions, the finding raises the question of how effective the quality control mechanisms in place are at detecting and helping correct this critical deficit.

#### **IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 4.1 The evaluation found a very low level of empirical documentation of two critical aspects of the Bank's GE projects' performance. One of them is how the projects distribute the benefits that they deliver between gender groups; the other, their effects on GE.
- 4.2 The weakness of the documentation efforts is manifest in both their ex-ante results frameworks and their PCRs/PPMRs. This comes as no surprise, given that having a solid documentation strategy upfront is a pre-condition for good documentation during project execution and at completion.
- 4.3 Like the majority of the other projects, the three projects that received an award or special recognition for the quality of their designs did not have an appropriate documentation strategy to evaluate these aspects of their performance. This suggests that, when it came to ascertaining the quality of the projects' design, their evaluability received little or no attention.
- 4.4 The new "Operational Policy on Gender Equality in Development," which is currently under the Board of Directors' consideration, seeks to close the gap that the implementation of the OP-761 Policy has left in terms of the evaluation of GE interventions' results and performance. In order to accomplish this objective, the Bank will need to overcome the current situation and ensure that its GE interventions adopt appropriate evaluability and documentation strategies to measure the distribution of the benefits that they deliver and their effects by gender group as well as other relevant aspects of their performance. These strategies should be developed as part of the projects' design and applied consistently throughout their implementation and at completion.

- 4.5 The Bank should ensure that Guidelines to inform the preparation of the ex-ante results frameworks, Project Monitoring Reports (PMRs) and PCRs of all the GE interventions require the inclusion of adequate and fully-defined indicators to measure each of the aspects of the projects' performance mentioned above. At the same time, it should take advantage of every opportunity to encourage compliance with these requirements. In this regard, the award of special prizes and other forms of recognition can be a valuable instrument. Therefore, it is important that, in the future, the decisions on which project designs will receive recognition takes the projects' documentation strategies to assess these and other aspects of their performance into consideration.
- 4.6 At the same time, it is important for the Bank to ensure that the quality control mechanisms in place pay particular attention to the quality of the documentation of the projects' performance and, when they detect a deficit in this regard, they help correct it.

## REFERENCES

- Davoodi, H.R.; E.R. Tiongson and S.S. Asawanuchit. 2003. "How Useful Are Benefit Incidence Analyses of Public Education and Health Spending?" IMF Working Paper WP/03/227.
- Demery, L. 2000. "Benefit Incidence: A Practitioner's Guide". Poverty and Social Development Group Africa Region, The World Bank.
- Glick, P.; R. Saha and S.D. Younger. 2004. *Integrating Gender into Benefit Incidence and Demand Analysis*. Cornell University Food and Nutrition Policy Program
- IDB. GN-2249-1. "Promoting Gender Equality Through Gender Mainstreaming and Investing in Women's Empowerment. A Report to the Board of Executive Directors on the Implementation of the Bank's *Women in Development Policy 2002-2005*. Policy and Evaluation Committee. May 2007.
- IDB. GN-2531-3. "Policy on Gender Equality". Draft. Policy and Evaluation Committee. May 2010.
- IDB. "Investing in Gender Equality". Women in Development Unit. [<http://www.iadb.org/document.cfm?id=1442106>, retrieved on July 15, 2010].
- Lanjouw, P. and M. Ravallion. 1999. "Benefit Incidence, Public Spending Reforms, and the Timing of Program Capture". The World Bank Economic Review, Vol. 13, No. 2: 257-73.
- OVE. 2009. "Guidelines for Preparing Results Frameworks". Draft: April 30, 2009.
- Sakellariou, C. and H.A. Patrinos. 2004. "Incidence Analysis of Public Support to the Private Education Sector in Côte d'Ivoire". World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 3231.
- Selden, T.M. and M.J. Wasylenko, 1992. "Benefit Incidence Analysis in Developing Countries". Policy Research, Working Paper WPS 1015, Public Economics. The World Bank, Country Economics Department.

**APPENDIX**

**BASIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE EVALUATION'S UNIVERSE OF STUDY**

Operation number	Title	Year of approval	Type of lending operation	Original approved amount (US\$ mills.)	Sector	Operation status (as of 7/10/2010)	DO rating on PCR/latest PPMR
BO0197	Strengthening Technical Education	2001	Innovation Operation	6.0	Education	COMPLETED	Poco efectivo
BO0221	Land Regularization and Legal Cadastre	2003	Specific Investment Operation	22.0	Agriculture	ACTIVE	Probable
BR0373	Culture and Citizenship for Social Inclusion	2003	Specific Investment Operation	20.0	Social Investment	ACTIVE	Probable
CO0241	Social Housing Program	2003	Specific Investment Operation	150.0	Urban Development	COMPLETED	Muy probable
CR0142	Sustainable Development of the Food and Agriculture Sector	2002	Specific Investment Operation	14.4	Agriculture	ACTIVE	Probable
CR0144	Health Sector Development	2003	Innovation Operation	6.4	Health	COMPLETED	Probable
GU0155	Program Against Urban Poverty	2002	Global of Multiple Works Operation	46.8	Urban Development	ACTIVE	Probable
GU0158	Labor Market Program	2002	Specific Investment Operation	10.0	Social Investment	CANCELLED	Improbable
HA0079	Local Development Program	2003	Global Credit Operation	65.0	Social Investment	COMPLETED	Probable
HO0205	Sula Valley Citizenship Security	2003	Specific Investment Operation	14.0	Social Investment	ACTIVE	Probable
HO0220	Poverty Alleviation and Local Dev. phase II	2003	Multi-Phase Lending Project	35.0	Social Investment	ACTIVE	Probable
ME0233	Labor Market Policy Program	2001	Multi-Phase Lending Project	300.0	Social Investment	COMPLETED	Probable
ME0238	Community Education	2003	Multi-Phase Lending Project	210.0	Education	COMPLETED	Probable
NI0153	Comprehensive Child Care Program II	2001	Specific Investment Operation	25.0	Social Investment	COMPLETED	Muy probable
NI0159	Rural Production Reactivation Program (PRPR)	2002	Specific Investment Operation	65.0	Agriculture	ACTIVE	Probable
NI0161	Social Safety Net Stage II	2002	Multi-Phase Lending Project	20.0	Social Investment	COMPLETED	Probable

Operation number	Title	Year of approval	Type of lending operation	Original approved amount (US\$ mills.)	Sector	Operation status (as of 7/10/2010)	DO rating on PCR/latest PPMR
PE0193	Foncodes III	2002	Specific Investment Operation	150.0	Social Investment	COMPLETED	Probable
PN0125	Training and Employment System Development	2002	Specific Investment Operation	8.4	Social Investment	ACTIVE	Low probability
PR0124	Primary and Pre-School Education	2003	Specific Investment Operation	46.8	Education	ACTIVE	Probable
PR0125	Social Investment Program II	2002	Specific Investment Operation	56.8	Social Investment	ACTIVE	Low probability
UR0134	Infancy, Adolescent & Family At Risk	2002	Specific Investment Operation	40.0	Social Investment	COMPLETED	Probable

---

<sup>i</sup> The number here changes from two to one because the second project (i.e., NI-0153) included a coverage indicator (instead of one that would be relevant to measure the proportion of benefits delivered to women).