GENDER IN PARTICIPATORY INNOVATION DEVELOPMENT

Introduction

In many cultures, growing of crops/trees and keeping livestock is still thought of primarily the domain of men. As such, many development professionals (decision makers, project managers, extension officers, researchers and community workers) still work mainly with male farmers. While studies have shown that women are actively involved in agriculture in many parts of the world, most development professionals continue to assume that men can speak for women and will communicate the messages back to them. Of course, it has been shown that this is not usually the case.

Development interventions by government and NGOs have mostly focused on strengthening the traditional roles of women which include cooking, childcare, nutrition, housekeeping, and addressing their fuel and water needs. While these are helpful, they lose sight of the vital roles that women play in agriculture and natural resource management (NRM).

The socially differentiated roles of women and men affect their influence in decision making, their access to resources for innovation and development and the nature and extent to which they benefit from this. In many countries, access to land is vested in men. Women get access to land only through men. Their mobility is constrained by their reproductive role. They usually would have less formal education compared with men. Given these limitations, approaches to women's participation in development innovations must carefully consider them.

Prolinnova has carefully addressed this issue in its work and identified by which the country programs can integrate gender in innovation development. IIRR seeks to cast the net wider by integrating gender in participatory innovation development in its courses.

As part of its mandate, IIRR offers international training courses and customized courses in the areas of participatory approaches to organizational development and management, food security, asset-building and wealth creation, disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation and education for marginalized communities.

Session description

This one-day session on Gender in Participatory Innovation Development is designed for development professionals who work directly or indirectly with the beneficiaries of the development projects initiated in communities. It has in mind the profiles of training participants that attend the IIRR international training courses who wishes to introduce changes in their projects, programs and/or the bigger organization in terms of approaching processes and systems in the management of development interventions.

Objectives

The participants will be able to:
- Define basic concepts in gender in participatory innovation development;
- Identify gender issues and areas for integration of gender in food security, and agricultural livelihoods;
- Use select tools in integrating some of these concerns in their own projects/programs
- Reflect on the role of the development professionals in the whole process of integration.

Content

- Participatory innovation development
- Gender and participation
- Gender and food security
- Gender and agricultural livelihoods
- Select tools for integrating gender in programs/projects
- Institutionalizing Gender in agriculture sector

Methodology

A balance of theory and practice will be ensured in the selection of methodologies. Lecture discussion, practical exercises in the use of tools and analysis of short cases will be the methodologies in use for this session

Schedule

8.30	-	9.30	Introduction to Participatory Innovation Development
9.30	-	10.30	Gender and participation
10.30	-	10.45	Break
10.45	-	12.00	Using select tools for integrating gender in PID related projects
12.00	-	1.00	Break
1.00	-	3.00	Select tools for integrating gender in PID related projects
3.00	-	3.15	Break
3.15	-	5.00	Institutionalizing gender in PID

Materials

Prolinnova, N.D. "Addressing gender issues in participatory innovation development: Some considerations and questions for reflection."

BRIDGE. "Gender and participation." Cutting edge pack, report summary.

IIRR. Dec 2010. "Overview of the Concepts of Gender." Training material for the Community-Based Integrated Watershed Management Course. IIRR, Philippines.

Nazneen Kanji. December 2004. "Reflections on Gender and Participatory Development." Participatory Learning and Action.

IIRR. Dec 2010. Tool for Integrating Gender Perspectives in Activity Preparation and Design: Guide Questions. IIRR, Philippines.

TRAINERS' GUIDE

Gender in Participatory Innovation Development

<table>
<tr>
<td colspan="2" style="background-color:#00FF00; text-align:center">Session outline # 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Session title*</td>
<td>**Participatory innovation development**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Time*</td>
<td>**1 hour**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Objectives*</td>
<td>Participants will be able to:

• explain key concepts in participatory innovation development; and
• recognize local innovations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>

Activity 1: What is local innovation?

1.1 The facilitator begins the session with this instruction:

• Think of a word or a phrase that you associate with local innovation.
• Write each word or phrase in a card. Ensure that people at the back will be able to see what you have written.
• Each person should be ready with 3-5 cards.

1.2 After 5 minutes, the facilitator divides the participants into groups of 5 members each. He/she gives the following instructions:

• In the group, each participant shares his/her cards
• The group looks at the cards and take note of similar words/phrases, ask members of the group explanations on their cards if needed and then using the words that the group shared proceeds to define local innovation.
• The group presents to the plenary their definition.

1.3 The facilitator highlights the following:

• Local innovation refers to the dynamics of indigenous knowledge, the knowledge that grows within a social group, based on learning from experience over generations but also include what was gained at some time from other sources that that been completely internalized within the local ways of thinking and doing.
• Local innovation (without an 's') refers to the process by which people in a given locality discover or develop new and better ways of doing things using the locally available resources and their own initiative without pressure or direct support from formal research or development agents.
• Local innovations (with an 's') is the outcome of the process described above, such as farming techniques or new ways of organizing work that are new for that particular locality.

</td>
</tr>
</table>

	Activity 2: Who are the local innovators? 2.1 The facilitator proceeds with these follow-up question: • Who are the local innovators in your locality? • What have they innovated? • Why do they innovate? 2.2 The participants, in dyads, do a quick buzz session in 10 minutes. 2.3 Facilitator asks each dyad to share their responses. 2.4 He/she takes note of the responses on the board and summarizes as follows using a PowerPoint presentation: • All farmers innovate, many of them, simply to survive • We recognize innovators that are doing something outstanding to improve their lives, their communities and/or their natural environment. • They build on local knowledge. • They are naturally curious people who are willing to take risks. • It is our role not only to document or validate local innovations, as development professionals we have to help these innovators to develop their ideas further, in joint experimentation and integrating relevant information and ideas that are already available.
	Activity 3: What is the difference between PID and PTD? 3.1 The facilitator begins by saying that: Many of you may already be familiar with the term Participatory Technology Development (PTD) and the activities involved in it. Anyone who can recall some of the activities that one engages in PTD? 3.2 He/she takes note of the participants' responses on the board and summarizes as follows: • Some of the activities in PTC include: getting started, jointly analyzing the local situation, looking for things to try to improve, trying them out in community-led participatory experimentation, jointly analyzing and sharing the results and strengthening the process of PTD through strengthening local organization and linkages with other actors in agricultural research and development. • Identifying local innovation provides an entry point to PTD. Finding out what the farmers are already trying, their own efforts to solve their problems or to grasp opportunities they have already identified is where PTD begins. • In doing so, we tend to look at farmers as proactively doing experimentation

	and not as passive recipients of research efforts by more organized groups such as research institutions. • PID embraces the broader understanding of participatory research and development. It differs from the farmers' informal experimentation. PID is practiced not only by farmers but by other actors who give value to local peoples' knowledge and creativity. • PID therefore is not seen simply as an approach to research but an approach to development.
Learning aids and materials	Handout 1: Promoting local innovation: Enhancing IK dynamics and links with scientific knowledge PowerPoint presentation Meta cards, flip charts, permanent markers and white board markers, pushpins, masking tape, LCD and computer

Session outline # 2	
Session title	**Data collection for monitoring and evaluation**
Time	1 hour
Objectives	At the end of the session, participants will have: • differentiated the stages of participation; and, • identified the characteristics of facilitators that would be able to combine the ideals of gender equality and participation.
Activities/ methods	***Activity 1: Participation*** 1.1 The facilitator introduces the topic by saying: The word participation has different connotations for different people in different contexts. Its definition has changed over time. Development practitioners and organizations tend to use dimensions of participation to define it. 1.2 He/she proceeds by asking the following question: How do you define participation? 1.3 He/she takes notes of the responses on the board and summarizes these as follows: • Participation may be defined through the ways people participate. Thus participation can be passive, simply listening to the outsiders who initiate development projects. Participation can be defined as contribution where people contribute time, money, land and any other resources that are available to them. Participation can be seen as involvement where people involve themselves in project processes such as planning, implementation and monitoring and evaluation. It can be defined as organization where people through organized structures take responsibility of certain decisions that would contribute to the development of the community. It can be empowerment where people take charge of their own development, defining their problem, finding solutions to these problems, mobilizing resources and taking action. • Participation can also be seen in terms of people's engagement in the processes and benefits from these processes including the risks that may result from these processes. ***Activity 2: Gender and participation***

	2.1 The facilitator introduces the topic by saying: From a totally women focused approach in the 70s, gender and development came to fore to address the issue that women's issues cannot be addressed by working with women alone. Much has to be desired in terms of bringing in men to address the issue of gender relations given that women and men have been socialized differently. 2.2 Facilitator distributes to participants' cards with farming roles (Activity sheet 1). Each participant must have a card. Before the session the facilitator prepares these cards. 2.3 On the board, the facilitator writes "Women" on one side and "Men" on the other. He/she invites participants to tape the cards under the appropriate headings. 2.4 When all the cards have been put up, he/she invites others to make a comment on the lists. He/she takes notes of these comments and summarizes them as follows: • Women and men, depending on culture, perform all these roles. In some cultures, some of these roles are dominated by men and in some by women. • Women are equally capable in performing these roles. • Many of the roles that are assigned to women are generally attributed to their traditional socially and culturally assigned roles. The same applies to men. However, across cultures, we can observe that they differ.
	Activity 3: Facilitating gender and participation 3.1 The proceeds to ask participants what would make an effective facilitator for gender and participation? 3.2 He/she writes responses on the board. She summarizes these responses by emphasizing the following: • Gender and participation are political issues. Making people gender sensitive is a political process. It has implication on the power relations between women and men. In the process of examining the existing power relations, conflict may arise between groups and individuals. • It is important that the context has to be understood well and identify appropriate strategies that would support more empowering relations between women and men. Sometimes, you need to bring in men to be able to support any project that would address women's issues. Sometimes you need to separate women and men in discussions so

	that decisions are not influenced by the dominant groups.
	• Change is a dynamic process. It is very sensitive especially if it addresses issues of power within the community.
Learning aids and materials	Handout 2: Gender and participation
	LCD, computer, meta cards, flipcharts, markers(white board and permanent), pushpins and masking tape

Session outline # 3	
Session title	**Using select tools for integrating gender in programs/projects**
Time	3 hours and 15 minutes
Objectives	At the end of the session, participants will have: • analyzed access and control over resources for agriculture and NRM and analyzed implications for PID; • given a case, reflect on women's participation in PID.
Activities/ methods	***Activity 1: Access and control over resources*** 1.1 The facilitator introduces the topic by saying: In many areas, land, a very important resource for production is vested in men. Women would generally get man's permission to access it. Women's time and mobility are constrained by their domestic and reproductive roles, thus, their access to technologies become limited. Women usually have less formal education than men. Given the resources that are available to women and men, development workers need to understand gender roles and responsibilities in terms of: • Division of labor • Access to resources and benefits • Decision making within the household and community 1.2 Refer to Activity sheet 2 for the case analysis. 1.3 Participants present their group output. 1.4 The facilitator summarizes the presentations as follows: • Our data shows that men have more access and control compared to women over resources such as land, water, trees, labor, livestock, inputs, cash, implements and others for farming purposes • Generally, small livestock are accessed and controlled by women. Some of the reasons given include: these animals being taken cared of just around the house or nearby the house which shows limits in terms of women's mobility and also, the price of small animals are less compared to big animals and so men tend to take care of them to ensure they do not get sick so that they get their investments back. • Men tend to dominate the access and control of cash in many cultures. In the Philippines, women dominate the access and control of cash in the family. • Because of the properties they own, men have more access and control

	of credit available in formal institutions.
	• Given this situation, the talents and insights that women have are not tapped into to develop local innovation further this is because these are not given value as those insights that men would have, they have limited resource to develop them further and they have less education to articulate their insights in ways that they can be understood better or they themselves dismissing what they learn because society does not give value to it anyway.
Learning aids and materials	Activity sheet 1 Handout 3: Gender in PID Handout 4: Tool for Integrating Gender Perspective LCD, computer, meta cards, flipcharts, markers (white board and permanent), push pins, masking tape

Session outline # 4	
Session title	**Mainstreaming gender in PID**
Time	1 and a half hours
Objectives	At the end of the session, participants will have • explained the need for institutionalizing PID in their work; and • compared various efforts in institutionalizing PID.
Activities/ Methods	***Activity 1: Why Mainstream Gender in PID?*** 1.1 The facilitator introduces the topic as follows: Mainstreaming gender in PID requires institutional change in many institutions that advance PID as an approach. With civil society actors, PID revolves around empowerment and building competencies so that individuals and groups can pursue innovations on their own. As PID projects mature, partners adjust roles in order to keep apace. Mainstreaming gender in PID requires institutional commitment and adjustments in the organization's culture. 1.2 In three groups, the participants answer the following questions: • Why mainstream gender in PID? • What are some of your efforts in mainstreaming gender in your other projects? What would apply to PID? Participants are given 15 minutes to discuss and 10 minutes each to present their work. 1.3 Facilitator takes note of the responses and summarizes the presentation and discussions as follows: • Most of the projects or development interventions generally focus on traditional roles of women, mainstreaming gender in PID challenges this traditional role subscribed to women. • In most cultures, the relations between women and men affect the women's decision making capabilities, their access to resources for innovation and development and the nature and extent to which they benefit from these decisions. • Mainstreaming gender in PID would be a very challenging task given the multiple roles that are already assigned to women and given that traditionally, men are expected to provide the leadership and women to follow men's orders in farming activities and practices.

	Activity 2: Genderizing PID 2.1 The facilitator distributes Handout 6: Genderizing PID. He/she divides participants into groups. The groups discuss the following: • What makes the strategies identified in this particular case strong in mainstreaming gender in PID? • Which of these strategies would be useful to your own efforts towards mainstreaming gender in your project? 2.2 The participants share the highlights of their discussions. The facilitator takes notes and summarizes as follows: • Specific indicators and targets provide more clarity in for project implementers in terms of specific actions needed to be able to reach these indicators and targets • The activities need to be appropriate so that we able to attain indicators and targets in the most efficient way • Linking these activities to the higher level results (outcomes) gives these activities more meaning in the broader sense
Learning aids and materials	Activity sheet 2 Handout 5: Gender Responsiveness Checklist Handout 6: Mainstreaming gender in PID Handout 7: Genderizing PID LCD, computer, meta cards, flipcharts, markers(white board and permanent), push pins, masking tape

Activity sheet 1: Case analysis

The facilitator distributes the case study, "Recognizing local innovation in livestock-keeping – A path to empowering women" to participants giving them time to read (15 minutes).

In three groups, the participants discuss the following:

Group 1
- List the resources that are available to women and men as described in the case.
- Reflect on these resources and identify who has control and access to these resources in your respective cultures.
- What are the implications to PID of women's inability to access and control these resources?

Group 2
- Describe the innovations in the case?
- Do you think there will be differences between innovations, interests and constraints of women in male versus female-headed households? Why would that be?

Group 3
- What benefits are women getting from the innovations described in the case?
- What other support do you think these women needs to encourage them develop new innovations?

Activity sheet 2: Project analysis

The facilitator divides the participants into 3 groups. In the group, participants agree which of the projects that they are involved in would be analyzed by the group. The selected project will be presented in details to the group.

Each of the groups analyzes the project they agreed to analyze by answering the following questions:[1]

Objectives
- Do project objectives explicitly refer to women and men?

The gender division of labor in agriculture
- Have the roles of women and men in the project been identified?
- Do these roles fit with other productive, reproductive and community roles of women and men?
- Do extension strategies take into account of women's time and mobility constraints?

Access and control of resources
- Do women and men have equal access to resources? Have constraints been identified and strategies proposed to address these?

Access and control of benefits and project impacts
- Will the project activities benefit some women or men and disadvantage others?
- Will the project strengthen or undermine current productive activities and access to resources of women or men?

Socio-cultural, religious, economic, political, environmental and demographic factors and trends
- What socio-cultural factors will inhibit women's participation and decision-making in project activities?
- Do extension strategies take account of these constraints?

Participation and consultation strategies
- Will a separate programming be needed for women to ensure that they have equal opportunities to participate as beneficiaries and decision makers?

Women's social statue and role as decision-makers
- What practical and strategic interests of women are addressed in the project?
- How will the project affect the existing gender relations?

---

[1] These are just a few of the questions from the long list of questions in Handout 4.

Project monitoring
- Are arrangements in place to monitor gender impacts?
- Have targets been set for women's and men's participation and benefits?
- Will all data collected be disaggregated by sex?

Project resources
- Are project resources adequate to deliver services and opportunities to women and men?

Handout 1

Title: PROMOTING LOCAL INNOVATION: ENHANCING IK DYNAMICS AND LINKS WITH SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE

What is local innovation?

Local innovation refers to the dynamics of IK – the knowledge that grows within a social group, incorporating learning from own experience over generations but also knowledge gained from other sources and fully internalised within local ways of thinking and doing. Local innovation is the process through which individuals or groups discover or develop new and better ways of managing resources – building on and expanding the boundaries of their IK.

Local innovation through informal experimentation has always been happening, but only recently has increased attention been given to identifying and documenting the innovations and the innovation processes. But documenting local innovation is not enough. In rural development, the challenge is to move beyond the existing innovations that farmers have developed, using their IK and creativity, and to develop these ideas further in joint experimentation, integrating relevant information and ideas from elsewhere.

Why is it important to recognise local innovation?

In the past, rural development efforts usually focused on technical interventions relying on the use of external inputs. These efforts generally failed to improve the farming and livelihood systems of the poor. Most of the introduced technologies were inappropriate for rainfed farming under marginal conditions such as dry or mountainous areas. In such settings, the key ingredients for sustainable resource management are not external inputs but rather the farmers' knowledge and management capacities and their skilful manipulation of the locally available resources. Most rural development efforts have failed to mobilise and enhance these "internal inputs". The dominant approach to research and extension still follows the pattern of "transfer-of-technology", based on the assumption that knowledge is created by scientists, to be packaged and spread by extension and to be adopted by farmers. This approach denies and often suppresses local initiatives.

Some alternative approaches to agricultural research and development (R&D) have been capitalising on the knowledge, creativity and management capacities of local people, and linking IK and external knowledge in joint exploration and experimentation (e.g. Gupta 2000, Reij and Waters-Bayer 2001). They commence by identifying what farmers are already doing in their own development and experimentation efforts, and promote action learning by farmers and supporting agencies to develop the local innovations and complementary techniques further.

Identifying local innovations is a first step toward changing the way development workers regard farmers and interact with them. They start to see farmers as partners with something to offer, not just to receive. A positive approach that starts from (but is not confined to) local ideas, that focuses on local people's strengths and explores the particular opportunities open to them – rather than dwelling on their weaknesses and problems – is key to stimulating local innovation processes.

The purpose of identifying local innovation is not primarily to disseminate them in a transfer-of-technology mode of extension – picking out what seem to be the "best", most widely applicable technologies. Such an approach is not suited for the highly diverse environments in which many smallholder farmers live. A local innovation is developed to fit a particular biophysical and socio-economic setting and usually cannot be transferred "as is" to other settings. However, the documentation and sharing of local innovations can provide ideas and inspiration for others to try out and adapt new ideas to their own setting.

Entry points to Participatory Innovation Development

Local innovations offer entry points for linking IK and scientific knowledge in community-led Participatory Innovation Development (PID). This is a more comprehensive term than Participatory Technology Development (PTD), an approach that NGOs have long promoted. Basically, the activities involved in PTD are:

- getting started (getting to know each other);
- joint analysis of the situation – problems and opportunities;
- looking for ways to try to improve the local situation;
- trying them out in community-led participatory experimentation;
- jointly analysing and sharing the results; and
- strengthening the process, often through improving local organisation and linkages with other actors in R&D, so that the PTD process will continue.

As innovation in agriculture and NRM goes far beyond "hard" technologies to "soft" innovations such as new ways of gaining access to or regulating use of natural resources or new ways of farmer organisation (e.g. for marketing), the term Participatory Innovation Development (PID) is increasingly being used instead of PTD to embrace this broader understanding of the approach.

The local-innovation approach to PID starts with looking at what farmers are already trying, in their own efforts to solve problems or grasp opportunities they have already identified. The joint situation analysis by community members and outsiders is based on these concrete examples. Local innovations become foci for community groups to examine opportunities, to plan joint experiments to explore the ideas further and to evaluate the results together. This process, around concrete joint activities, helps to strengthen community organisation for development.

For researchers, as for development agents, learning to recognise local innovation and informal experimentation by farmers is an important step towards engaging in truly participatory R&D. It starts off the collaboration on a completely different footing than approaches that start with introducing external technologies for farmers to test. From the outset, value is given to local people's knowledge and creativity. Farmers are recognised as partners in R&D.

As useful as PID may be in agricultural research, it is primarily an approach to development. Most of the PID that is happening today is being done by farmers and development agents without involvement of formal researchers. This should be encouraged, as it will not be possible for formal researchers to work together with the millions of farmers in remote, marginal and highly diverse areas throughout the world. In such areas, local experimentation is necessary to see if new ideas – whether from other farmers or from formal research – can fit the local setting. Moreover, since conditions are constantly changing, all farming communities need to be able to adjust to these changes. Therefore, farmer innovation must be a never-ending process. PID strengthens this process.

The role of NGOs in promoting PID

Many development-support NGOs have, for a long time, recognised the potential of building on IK and local innovation, combining this with relevant external knowledge, so that farmers can improve their livelihoods in a sustainable way. They realise that, to be able to link IK and scientific knowledge systems, the farmers and NGOs engaged in PID in the field need to work more closely together with government agencies of agricultural research, extension and education.

Development-support NGOs are in a good position to bring together different stakeholder groups in PID. They have normally established good working relationships with individuals and groups of farmers, and are actively strengthening farmer organisations. It is not always so easy to establish good relations with government organisations, which often regard NGOs with some reserve. On the other hand, because of dwindling funds and growing pressures toward decentralisation and local governance, many agricultural R&D institutions are now seeking partnership with NGOs in order to be able to carry out their work.

The NGOs that are practising and advocating PID have grasped this opportunity to step into the national and international arenas of agricultural R&D and to try to facilitate the building of balanced partnerships of farmers, development agents, scientists, educators and other actors in R&D – starting with recognition of the knowledge and creativity of farmers. These NGOs are encouraging processes of site-specific development in which farmers take the lead. While building up the capacities of weaker stakeholder groups – especially women and poorer farmers – and gradually empowering them to become equal partners with formal researchers and development agents, the NGOs keep watch that the R&D activities focus on the concerns of the weaker groups. The examples of PID on the ground also provide the basis for policy dialogue aimed at creating more space within institutions and government policies for this approach.

Many NGOs now give high priority to forging closer links with government agencies so as to stimulate the changes in attitude and behaviour needed to promote local innovation, to capitalise on potential synergies and to scale up participatory approaches to R&D. This marks a fundamental shift in the work of many development-support NGOs. In the past, they tended to operate parallel to and separate from government agencies. Now, they have recognised the need to bring about institutional and policy change so that PID is integrated into the regular work of government agencies. Some of these NGOs therefore took the initiative to establish PROLINNOVA, a global platform to promote local innovation in ecologically-oriented agriculture and natural resource management (NRM).

The PROLINNOVA initiative

Four years ago, when NGOs from the North and South were preparing for the Global Forum on Agricultural Research in Dresden, Germany, they developed the idea of PROLINNOVA to forge multi-stakeholder partnerships in agroecological R&D. Since then, the initiative has grown in a decentralised way. NGOs in Ethiopia, Ghana and Uganda (Agri-Service Ethiopia, Ecumenical Association for Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development, and Environmental Alert, respectively) have facilitated the building of R&D partnerships around promoting local innovation in each of these countries. Support for their work was provided by the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), which is supporting a similar process in Niger.

In each country, local NGOs have brought together governmental and non-governmental agencies involved in agricultural and NRM research, development and education. Multi-stakeholder steering groups collected local experiences in recognising farmer innovation and informal experimentation and in doing PID. The groups convened workshops to analyse in-country experience and developed national action plans to improve and scale up participatory approaches to farmer-led R&D. NGOs in several other countries – Cambodia, Nepal, South Africa, Sudan and Tanzania – have recently developed proposals to facilitate participatory design of PROLINNOVA programmes in a similar way. Together, they succeeded in gaining support from the Netherlands Directorate General for International Cooperation (DGIS) to realise their plans.

The country plans differ, depending on the self-identified strengths and weaknesses in engaging the dynamics of IK in PID and in scaling up the approach. However, they have some elements in common:

- making an inventory of initiatives in promoting local innovation and of the organisations involved;
- building capacity to identify and document local innovations and innovation processes and to engage in PID;
- implementing PID on the ground;
- participatory monitoring and evaluation of joint activities, outcomes and impacts;

- facilitating multi-stakeholder platforms for learning through joint analysis of on-the-ground experiences; and
- raising awareness and engaging in policy dialogue to create favourable environments for this approach.

In collaboration with existing electronic networks and databases serving groups with similar interests, including the World Bank's "IK for Development" Programme, PROLINNOVA is building platforms for discussion of concepts and experiences in promoting local innovation. To overcome the digital divide, printed brochures, posters, books and circulars are being disseminated, and links with other media, such as radio, are being made. An exciting new prospect being explored is the use of participatory video to give local innovators an opportunity to document their innovations from their own perspective, to share their ideas with other communities and to influence policymakers.

The country-level programmes function autonomously but seek inspiration and strength from each other. They are supported by an international team composed of four organisations: the International Institute for Rural Reconstruction, ETC Ecoculture, the Centre for International Cooperation (Free University of Amsterdam) and the Swiss Centre for Agricultural Extension (LBL). Their roles include international coordination, capacity building, methodological support, advocacy, web-based knowledge management, documentation, editing and publishing and encouraging mutual learning through analysis of experiences. PROLINNOVA remains open to grow beyond the nine countries currently involved – to reinforce other, similar initiatives to promote local innovation and integrate this approach into agricultural and natural resources management research, extension and education.

References

Gupta AK. 2000. Grassroots innovations for survival. *ILEIA Newsletter* 16 (2): 5–6.

Reij C & Waters-Bayer A (eds). 2001. Farmer innovation in Africa: a source of inspiration for agricultural development. London: Earthscan.

This article was written by Ann Waters-Bayer and Laurens van Veldhuizen in consultation with members of the International Support Team for PROLINNOVA: the International Institute for Rural Reconstruction (IIRR) in the Philippines, the Swiss Centre for Agricultural Extension (LBL), the Centre for International Cooperation of the Free University of Amsterdam and ETC Ecoculture in the Netherlands. For more information on PROLINNOVA, see the website: www.prolinnova.net Contact: ann.waters-bayer@etcnl.nl or prolinnova@etcnl.nl

URL SOURCE: http://www.worldbank.org/afr/ik/iknt76.htm

Handout 2

Title: GENDER AND PARTICIPATION

Participation

Participation is defined in many different ways by many development authors. Pretty, et al categorized participation into eight stages[1]:

1. Passive participation where people are told what is going to happen or has already happened. The information shared belongs to external professionals.
2. Participation in information giving where people participate by answering questions posed by researchers.
3. Participation by consultation where external professionals define both problems and solutions and may modify these in the light of people's responses.
4. Participation for material incentives where people provide resources such as labor, land, etc. in return for food or cash or other material incentives. Farmers provide the field but not involved in the experimentation.
5. Functional participation where people participate through externally initiated formation of groups. These groups tend to be dependent on external facilitators.
6. Interactive participation where people participate in joint analysis which leads to action plans and the formation of new local institutions or strengthening of existing ones. These groups take control over local decisions and so people have a stake in maintaining structures or practices.
7. Self-mobilization where people participate by taking initiatives to change systems independent of external institutions. They engage in self-initiated mobilization and collective action and may or may not challenge existing inequitable distributions of wealth and power.
8. Catalyzing change where the involvement and stakes of community members is now influencing others in the environment to initiate change.

Many efforts at participation as described in the typology above emphasizes on community cohesion and consensus at the cost of ignoring gender differences. Many of these efforts are gender blind and have failed to create space for dissenting voices to be heard.

Gender and development

'Gender and Development' approach is a response from a totally women focus approach (Women and Development) to a more holistic approach of thinking about relations *between* women and men, and how masculinities and femininities have been constructed. As

---

[1] IFAD, ANGOC and IIRR. 2001. Enhancing Ownership and Sustainability: A Resource Book on Participation. International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), Asian NGO Coalition for Agrarian Reform and Rural Development (ANGOC) and International Institute of Rural Reconstruction (IIRR). 335 p.

development workers, we often have ideals on desirable gender relations which oftentimes, conflict with the views expressed by people during our interactions with them.

Gender and participation: learning from each other[2]

Experiences show that facilitating organisations and their personnel's own orientation play an important role in any social change process. Important characteristics that contribute to the success in bringing these two ideals together include:

1. *Awareness that both 'participation' and 'gender' are political issues, and that making participation gender sensitive is a political process.*

   Participation and gender have implications on power distribution within communities. Changes emerging from these processes are not always win-win, and there may be conflicts of interest between different groups or individuals.

2. *Recognition that strategies are needed to enable different voices to emerge.*

   There would always be conflict of interests between different groups. Separating discussion groups for women and men can be an important strategy in some cultures and situations.

3. *Active management of change, power and conflict*

   Facilitators must be sensitive with power differences and ensure that those with less power are able to express themselves and that conflicts are immediately mediated and/or managed.

---

[2] Bridge, Development-Gender. "Gender and Participation." Cutting edge pack: Report Summary.

Handout 3

Title: ADDRESSING GENDER ISSUES IN PARTICIPATORY INNOVATION DEVELOPMENT: SOME CONSIDERATIONS AND QUESTIONS FOR REFLECTION[1]

Rural development work with women generally focuses on traditional roles of women such as child care, housekeeping, food, fuel, etc. These are important aspects of women's lives but lose sight of the vital roles that women play in agriculture and natural resource management (NRM). If attention is not given to women's concerns, innovations in agriculture and NRM may be promoted that bring even more work for women, or that deprive women of control over activities important for family welfare and for the women's own self-esteem. Moreover, the creativity and potential of women to improve agriculture and NRM will be foregone.

The socially determined roles of men and women and the relations between them differ from one culture or socio-economic group to another. They differ not only according to gender but also according to age and to social and health status. These differences affect the relative influence of men and women in decision-making, their access to resources for innovation and development, and the nature and extent to which they benefit from this. Moreover, gender roles and relations change over time. Indeed, taking on a non-conformist gender role can be a socio-institutional innovation in itself, such as widowed women who start to plough the land or men weakened by HIV/AIDS who start home-based activities like basket-making.

Consider the following differences between men and women that can be found in many countries:

- In many areas, land tenure is vested in men. If women have rights to use land, they tend to have access to less land than do men, and may therefore be more interested in types of innovation that demand little land.

- Women usually have more limited access to credit and inputs than do men, and may therefore have a greater tendency to innovate and experiment with low-external-input technologies or in ways of organising themselves to gain better access to credit and inputs.

- Women's time and mobility are constrained by their domestic and reproductive roles and often also for cultural reasons, and they usually lack appropriate technology for transporting water, fuel, fodder and agricultural products (most commonly women's tasks). Women are therefore likely to be (interested in) innovating and experimenting with ways to save labour energy and time and in activities that can be done relatively close to their homes, e.g. in their backyards.

---

[1] Condensed from the paper prepared by Ann Waters-Bayer, Chesha Wettasinha and Jitendra Sinha, PROLINNOVA International Support Team, 14 June 2008.

- Women usually have less formal education than do men, and women in indigenous ethnic groups are less likely to speak the national language fluently. Therefore, different means of communication may need to be used than in the case of men when women want to make proposals for participatory innovation grants or when they want to share information about their innovation and experimentation activities.

Finding out about gender issues in agriculture and NRM

Development workers need to understand gender roles and responsibilities particularly in terms of:
- division of labour
- access to resources and benefits
- decision-making (social and political influence) within the household and the community.

The following can be used to increase the participants' awareness (including farmers') of gender issues in agriculture and NRM:

- ***Rapid differentiated surveys*** of men's and women's (young and old) concerns in agriculture, e.g. using PRA (Participatory Rural Appraisal) tools such as:

  - *Activity profile*: exploring tasks and time inputs by gender and age, differentiating according   to work related to reproductive roles (childcare, cooking, fetching fuel and water etc), productive roles (cropping, livestock-keeping, food processing, marketing etc) and community management roles (committee meetings, conflict resolution etc)

  - *Daily timelines* (who does what when over the day)

  - *Matrix of access and control over resources* (such as in Table 1)

- ***Group interviews with farmwomen*** (without any inhibiting presence of husbands or other male authority figures in the village or group) to discuss their activities, problems and aspirations related to agriculture and NRM

- ***Case studies of women's, men's, girls' and boys' activities*** in households selected according to sex of household head, family size, stage in family life cycle and access to resources (e.g. without livestock and/or with little land; with livestock and/or more land)

- ***Community "portraits"*** to compare and contrast farming and NRM practices and gender division of labour, resources and responsibilities across villages or groups, to use as a basis for discussion within villages/groups about gender roles, how they differ, how they could be changed, and how this would affect family and community life. In such discussions, both men and women, young and old should be involved.

Table 1: Access to and control* over resources for agriculture and NRM

Resource	Who has access?	Who has control?	Implications for PID?
Land			
Water			
Trees			
Labour: own family hired			
Livestock: large small			
Inputs: purchased produced in area			
Working implements			
Cash			
Credit			
Information			
Transport			

* "Control" over a resource implies final decision-making over its use.
Source: after HS Feldstein & SV Poats. 1989. **Working together: gender analysis in agriculture.** Kumarian, West Hartford.

The women themselves should describe their activities and voice their views, just as men describe their own particular activities and voice their views. Men often cannot describe accurately the tasks they do not carry out themselves, such as making butter from milk. But even the women's responses should be verified by direct observation, as women sometimes downplay their own agricultural activities, particularly if these do not conform to the community's cultural norms (e.g. women behind the plough).

The following questions should be able to help participants reflect on women's participation in PID:

In identifying and documenting local innovation:

- Did you deliberately seek local innovation in activities in which women play important roles or have priority concerns? (For example, in many areas, these may include keeping small ruminants and poultry, gardening, marketing agricultural products.)

- When looking for local innovators, how did you ensure that both men and women innovators were included in your search? If you did not, why not?

- Were both men and women involved in looking for local innovators? Did the relative number of men/ women innovators identified differ depending on whether men or women researchers / extensionists were looking for them?

- Did the type of innovations developed by women in male-headed households differ from those of women in female-headed households?

- Are your innovation catalogues/ databases well-balanced in featuring men and women innovators? Were gender and age among the criteria used in selecting innovators to include?

- Which innovators were easier to identify – men or women – and why?

- What socio-cultural aspects did you encounter that favoured or inhibited innovation by men or women?

In designing and implementing experiments / research together with farmers:

- Were roughly equal numbers of men and women involved in the discussions about the farmer-led PID: which innovations to explore, what questions to answer, how to design the research, what information to collect and how, etc?

- Were male and female youths involved in planning and implementing the PID? If so, how?

- Were female or male farmers more eager to be involved in joint experimentation? What caused these differences? How does this affect the process and outcome of the PID?

- How did the male farmers' and female farmers' research questions and their criteria for assessing research results differ? (Women and men may have different aims and therefore different criteria for assessing innovations in crop / tree growing and livestock-keeping. Often, women seek reliability and stability of yield, availability of food in the hunger season, useable byproducts, and ease of harvesting, processing and storing. Were both women's and men's aims considered when formulating research questions and assessment criteria?)

- Were the differences between innovations, interests and constraints of women in male versus female-headed households taken into account when considering innovations to explore further? (For example, female heads of household may have access to less land, equipment and livestock for ploughing.)

- Before joint decisions about who in the farming community should carry out the experiments, did you clarify who is normally responsible for which tasks (including post-harvest activities such as threshing, winnowing, seed selection, storage, processing and marketing) and how rigid or flexible the division of labour is? Were the implications of this for the PID taken into account? (see Table 2)

- More specifically, are the crop or livestock species included in the experiments normally the types that are cared for by women? If so, did women have relevant roles in the experiments?

- Who drew up the criteria for selecting farmers to carry out the experiments? Who selected the farmers? Who were/are the experimenting farmers (gender, age, economic status)?

- Did men or women in the community have better access to and more control over the resources needed for the local experimentation? What were the implications for community members with limited access or control? (see Table 2)

- Did both men and women in the households / community identify what resources (including labour) they have and need for the PID and who will pay for the inputs? (see Table 3)

- If crop trials were being planned, was it discussed and decided in the community whether women may continue harvesting "weeds" from the farmland for vegetables or fodder (if this is something they normally do)?

- If changes in NRM were being tried out, was it discussed and decided in the community whether women and poor people may continue gathering natural products (if this is something they normally do)?

- During the farmer-led joint experiments, who in the household/community gave the instructions and who did the actual work?

- Who in the household / community collected which data from the experiments, and how was this related to the gender division of labour?

Table 2: Implications of different patterns of gender responsibility in farming for PID

Patterns of gender responsibility	*Implications for PID*
Separate enterprises within the farm (e.g. men keep cattle, women goats; men grow cereals, women spices)	Seek local innovations and support PID in both men's and women's enterprises
Separate fields or grazing areas (e.g. men's beans, women's beans; men's irrigated and women's rainfed plots)	Seek local innovations and support PID in both men's and women's fields / livestock-grazing areas
Separate tasks (e.g. men plough, women sow, men weed, women spread manure)	Is the innovation to be explored likely to increase men's or women's tasks or require a change in their timing? Will the increase in labour correspond with the benefit to be gained by the person who exerts the labour?
Shared tasks (e.g. both men and women are involved in harvesting)	Does the innovation make this a separate task and, if so, what will this mean for relative influence of men and women within the household?
Women-managed farms	Do these women develop different types of innovations than do male farmer managers? Do they have the resources and time to be involved in PID? If not, how can others in the community assist so that these women can be involved?

Table 3: "Who" questions in planning PID

Who …	*Questions for planning PID*
makes decisions?	Is the innovation being explored oriented to only their goals and not the goals of others in the household/ community?
does the actual work?	Will the innovation increase or decrease their workload?
controls the land and capital resources?	Who pays for what? Will the PID require the use of these resources? Can other options be explored that require less of these resources?
uses the products?	Will the uses made by different household / community members change as a result of the innovation?
controls the output?	Who decides on sales? Who controls the money? Does this person also pay for the inputs?

Participatory monitoring and evaluation (PM&E):

During assessment of the PID results, the following questions could be considered, e.g. in both separate and mixed groups of men and women farmers, together with PID facilitators:

- How were the products and byproducts coming out of the experiments used and by whom in the household/community? Who controlled the income from them? Were all these household / community members involved in doing the assessment?

- How did men and women, younger and older, differ in their assessment of the PID process and results?

- What impact did the innovation have on demand for and return to labour of different household / community members? Is this innovation resulting in a shift in gender roles? If so, what do the men and women think about it?

- Have there been changes in the nature, amount and timing of availability of products (including byproducts and residues) as a result of the innovation, and what consequences do these changes have for which family / community members?

- Are the inputs and services needed for scaling up the innovation normally available to both women and men? If not, what changes are needed to make equal availability possible?

- Since starting the PID, has there been any difference in the extent to which women and men, younger and older, express themselves in public about ARD, both within the community and to "outsiders", e.g. researchers, extension staff, NGO staff, policymakers at different levels?

In farmers' meetings and trips / cross-visits / farmer-to-farming sharing:

- Who proposed the time to meet? local men? local women? women with young children? women without children? If women were not involved in proposing the time, was the time of day/week/year convenient for them (not a time of labour peak for them?)

- Were meetings scheduled to be short enough that women could still complete their daily chores in the household, livestock-keeping, etc?

- Were the meeting held in locations that could be easily reached by both women and men and, if not, what arrangements were made so that both could attend?

- Were arrangements made that participants had something to eat and drink during and after the meetings, so that women participants did not have to prepare this during the meeting?

- Were arrangements made that small children were taken care of so that mothers could join the meeting or trip? Could women arrange this within their family / community?

- Could the language used at the meetings be readily understood by both the women and the men? If translation into a local language was needed, how was this handled?

- In what ways did the women and the men participate (mere presence, asking and/or answering questions, making comments and suggestions …)?

- In mixed meetings, what proportion of participants was female, male, youth, adults? Did women and/or youth express themselves to a greater or lesser extent and raise different issues when they were in a higher proportion in the group?

- In all-women or all-youth meetings, did women/youth raise different issues than when they were in mixed meetings? How did these issues differ?

- What special efforts were made by partners to encourage women and/or youth to attend meetings (innovation fairs, PID planning, PM&E etc)?

- What were the differences between men and women in sharing their innovations with others? How did these differences affect dissemination? Did the level of acceptance by other farmers, extensionists or researchers differ according to whether the innovations had been developed by men or women farmers?

Giving attention to gender issues in institutions and multi-stakeholder partnerships

Attention needs to be given to gender issues not only in the field but also within the institutions and multi-stakeholder partnerships concerned with ARD. You can analyse and document and – in the process – stimulate learning about gender issues in PID by discussing with people in ARD institutions some of the following questions:

At national and/or sub-national level in multi-stakeholder platform building:

- Was gender balance a criterion for selecting participants in multi-stakeholder meetings?

- What was the actual gender balance in the meetings, and why was it so?

- Does the multi-stakeholder platform examine its own gender balance periodically? If so, how often, what were the conclusions drawn and what actions did it take?

- Is gender in PID a point on the agenda for discussion during platform meetings? If so, how often, what was discussed, and what actions were taken as a result of this discussion?

- What difference did it make whether men or women were involved in the platform with respect to giving attention to gender issues their work in their respective organisations?

- To what extent and how did you deliberately bring gender issues into your organization's awareness-raising and policy-dialogue activities, e.g. in presentations to workshops, innovation catalogues, promotional materials, posters, selecting innovators to meet with policymakers?

At institutional level in interactions within institutions involved in PID (e.g. Ministry of Agriculture, agricultural university/college, research institution)*:*

- What difference did it make within the institution whether men or women were the key persons directly involved in the Organization activities, e.g. with respect to taking PID seriously?

- Has the institute become more aware of the need to give attention to gender issues in PID? How is this evident?

- What have you done to highlight gender issues in PID within the institution? How successful has this been?

- In the case of an educational institute, how have gender issues in PID been brought into the teaching materials and learning exercises?

At institutional level training activities

- In selecting participants was a gender balance sought? Was it attained? If not, why not? What is being done about this?

- In conducting the PID training, were gender issues incorporated and, if so, how?

- What difference did it make whether PID trainees were men or women with respect to subsequent attention to gender issues in the work 1) on the ground with farmers, and 2) in the institutions involved, including their own?

In your monitoring & evaluation activities:

- Are you regularly doing gender-disaggregated recording of men's and women's involvement in PID related activities in quantitative terms (e.g. number of male and female innovators, men and women involved in farmer-led joint experimentation/research and cross-visits, male and female participants in training sessions and workshops, men and women from institutions of ARD involved in the NSC and Working/Core Group, men and women in committees at different levels)?

- Are you seeking reasons and remedies for any imbalances noted?

- Are you disaggregating impacts of PID (not only of the innovations but also of the PID process) according to men and women, and including information about this in your documentation and presentations to policymakers?

Quantitative recording of data can reveal the "what" but it does not reveal the "why". To explain the results, answers to many of the qualitative questions listed further above will be needed. Members of your provincial or national multi-stakeholder learning platform can gain deeper insight by making field visits and facilitating focus-group discussions with specific groups, e.g. at field level: female household heads, male household heads, richer, poorer, younger, older community members; and within the partner institutions: male and female field staff and managers, both those involved and those not directly involved in the PID activities. It will be important to record their views and explanations, as qualitative data for M&E, to be able to explain the quantitative findings and, if necessary, to do something to change the situation.

References:

Feldstein HS & Jiggins J (eds). 1994. Tools for the field: methodologies for gender analysis in agriculture. Kumarian, West Hartford, CT.

Feldstein HS & Poats SV. 1989. *Working together: gender analysis in agriculture.* Kumarian, West Hartford, CT.

Pretty JN, Guijt I, Thompson J & Scoones I. 1995. *Participatory Learning and Action: a trainer's guide.* International Institute for Environment and Development, London.

Veldhuizen L van, Waters-Bayer A & de Zeeuw H. 1997. *Developing technology with farmers: a trainer's guide for participatory learning.* ZED Books, London.

Handout 4

**TOOL FOR INTEGRATING GENDER PERSPECTIVES
IN ACTIVITY PREPARATION AND DESIGN**

Guide Questions[1]

Project objectives and target group	Do project objectives explicitly refer to women and men? Does the project target women's agricultural production needs as well as men's? Do project activities build on women's and men's knowledge and skills?
The Gender Division of Labour in Agriculture	Have the roles and responsibilities of women and men in agriculture been identified? *(different crops/activities, through each phase of the production cycle, for each socio-economic or ethnic group targeted or affected by the project)* Are women active in both the subsistence and cash crop sectors? Has consideration been given to how women's and men's agricultural activities fit in with other productive, reproductive, community service and community management tasks? Are project inputs suited to women's productive activities? *(e.g. seed supply, vaccines)* Do extension strategies take account of women's time and mobility constraints? Has consideration been given to how women's and men's participation in the project will affect their other responsibilities? (food and cash crop production, family health and nutrition, and community activities)

---

[1] IIRR. 2010. Hand out used in a session on Gender and Natural Resource Management, International Training Course on Community-Based Integrated Watershed Management. International Institute of Rural Reconstruction, Silang, Philippines.

| | Has consideration been given to how women's and men's other roles and responsibilities may constrain their participation in project activities?

Will the project increase the time spent by women or men on agriculture-related activities? Will new technology introduced for men affect women's work schedules or their overall workloads?

Will new technology be introduced to assist women's agricultural roles? |
|---|---|
| Access and Control of Resources For Agricultural Production | Do women have land tenure, or access to sufficient land area to participate in the project?

Do women and men have equal access to credit, extension officers and information on agricultural technology introduced by the project? (have constraints to participation been identified and strategies proposed to address these)

Will female extension officers and/or female group leaders be involved in the project?

Is training and technology suited to women's productive roles?

Will women and men have equal opportunities to all types of training available through the project?

If not, are the reasons for this clear and acceptable?

Are trainers aware of women's and men's roles in agriculture?

Will women's or men's traditional markets or trading activities be affected by project activities? (e.g. will women face more competition in their traditional crop markets) |
| Access and Control of Benefits and Project Impacts | Will the introduction of new techniques or production activities displace women from their |

	current positions in the sector? Will project activities benefit some women or men and disadvantage others? Will the project strengthen or undermine current productive activities and access to resources of women or men? (or certain groups of women and men)
Social, Cultural, Religious, Economic, Political, Environmental and Demographic Factors and Trends	Are there legal barriers to the participation of women in agriculture? (such as property rights and credit regulations) What socio-cultural factors will inhibit women's participation and decision making in project activities? Do extension strategies take account of these socio-cultural constraints? (e.g. are separate extension activities needed for women) Have seasonal migration patterns been taken into account in project design?
Participation and Consultation Strategies	Have constraints to men's and women's participation in each of the above areas been considered? Has the project design devised strategies to overcome these constraints to women's and men's participation? Will any separate programming be needed for women to ensure that they have equal opportunities to participate as beneficiaries and decision makers? (e.g. separate groups, activities or components)
Women's Social Status and Role as Decision Makers	What practical needs and strategic interests of women are addressed in the project? Are both women and men seen as agents of change in the project design? How will the project affect existing gender relations? (e.g. how will participation by women

	in project activities affect men's and women's attitudes)
Counterpart Agency Capacity	Does the Recipient Government/counterpart agency have a national policy or other statements acknowledging/promoting the roles of women in agriculture? Does the counterpart agency have male and female extension agents, and do they undertake work of similar status and value? Has a sex disaggregated employment profile of the counterpart agency been undertaken? Has an affirmative action plan been developed to train, support and resource female staff? How does the project plan to increase counterpart capacity for gender-sensitive planning and implementation?
Project Monitoring	Are arrangements in place to monitor gender impacts? (the different impacts of the project on women and men, and on the relations between them) Have targets been set for men's and women's participation and benefits? Will all data collected be disaggregated by sex? Will there be on-going consultation with women and men directly or indirectly affected by the project, or with women's groups? Will gender differences in adoption rates for new technology be monitored?
Project Resources	Are project resources adequate to deliver services and opportunities to women and men? Is gender expertise being utilized throughout the project?

Handout 5

Checklist of Gender Integration Indicators
For Agricultural Organization
Guide to the Organizational Self-Assessment and Action Process[1]

Objective of the Checklist: It aims to gauge members, leaders/board, and staff's perception/knowledge of and attitude towards the gender perspective and the promotion of gender equality in the different phases and aspects of program/project and organizational development and management of the Agricultural Organization.

I. Organization

A. *Gender Policy*

1. Does the organization have a written gender policy that affirms a commitment to gender equality? If there is, how is the gender policy stated?
2. Does the organization's gender policy have an operational plan that includes clear allocation of responsibilities, time and financial/material resources for monitoring and evaluation?
3. Is gender equality taken into account during the organization's strategic planning?
4. Does everyone in the organization feels ownership over the gender policy.
5. Does the leadership/management take responsibility for the development, information dissemination and implementation of the gender policy?

B. *Membership, Leadership and Staffing*

1. Has there been an increase in the membership of women/(men) in the organization in the past three years?
2. Has there been an increase in the representation of women/men in Board in the past three years?
3. Has there been an increase in the representation of women/men in leadership positions in the organizational structure in the past years?
4. Are there proactive strategies implemented to recruit or promote women/men members and into leadership positions in the organization?

---

[1] IIRR. 2010. Handout used in the Action Planning session of the International Course on Community Based Integrated Watershed Management. International Institute of Rural Reconstruction, Silang, Philippines.

C. *Human Resources*

1. Is there a written equal membership/leadership/staffing opportunity policy in the organization?
2. Are there flexible work arrangements in the organization?
3. Is the organization staff encouraged to take advantage of flexible work arrangements?
4. Is there a maternity leave policy in the organization? Is there a paternity leave policy in the organization?
5. Is the organization staff encouraged to take advantage of maternity leave?
6. Is the organization staff encouraged to take advantage of paternity leave?
7. Is there a child care and dependent care leave policy in the organization?
8. Are there other forms of assistance or programs extended to mothers or fathers with regard to their domestic concerns (e.g for care of the children, etc.) Please give identify these forms of assistance if there are.
9. Is gender awareness included as an ideal characteristic of membership?
10. Is gender awareness included as a leadership criteria in the organization?
11. Is there training of the members and leaders (and staff if applicable) of the organization in gender awareness and sensitization?
12. Is there training of leaders/board and members of committees in institutionalizing the integration of gender equality into the management of the organization?
13. Are gender and development concepts integrated in the regular education, training and service programs of the organization?
14. Is the organization's membership committed to promote female representation at its leadership, including the Board?

D. *Advocacy, Public Relations and Communication*

1. Are the organization's advocacy campaigns and initiatives planned and informed by a gender equality perspective?
2. Are the organization's public relation campaigns and initiatives planned and informed by a gender equality perspective?
3. Are the organization's advocacy policies/public relations policies and plans influenced and advised by women's organizations, networks and gender experts?
4. Is gender equality incorporated in the organization's communications, fund-raising and media strategies?
5. Is a gender perspective reflected in the organization's publications, for example, annual reports, books, brochures, newsletters?

E. *Financial Resources*

1. Has the organization budgeted adequate financial resources to support its gender integration work?
2. Are financial resources allocated for the implementation of the gender policy at all levels?
3. Is staff training on gender equality issues and gender analysis systematically budgeted for in the organization?

F. *Organizational Culture*

1. Based on your observation or knowledge, does the organization encourage gender sensitive behavior, for example, in terms of language used, jokes and comments made?
2. Based on your observation or knowledge, does the organization reinforce gender sensitive behavior and procedures to prevent and address sexual harassment?
3. Based on your observation or knowledge, are the members and leaders of the organization committed to the implementation of a gender policy?
4. Based on your observation or knowledge, are gender issues taken seriously and discussed openly by men and women in the organization?
5. In your opinion, there is a gap between how men and women in the organization view gender issue.
6. In your opinion, do the members think that the promotion of gender equality is relevant to their work   in the organization? and in their own personal and community lives?
7. In your opinion, do the members think that the promotion of gender equality is also important to their home and community life?
8. In your opinion, the women/men in the organization think that the organization is woman friendly.
9. In your opinion, the organizational culture of the organization places a higher value on the ways males tend to work and less value on the ways females tend to work.
10. In your opinion, meetings in the organization tend to be dominated by male staff.
11. In your opinion, the working environment in the organization has improved for women over the past three years.

II. Programming

This section focuses on procedures and methods used to integrate gender in the conceptualization and design of Sustainable Agriculture projects

A. *Program Planning and Design*

1. Is the integration of gender equality in sustainable programs/projects mandated by the organization?
2. Are gender equality goals and objectives included in the organization's SA program/project designs?
3. For each SA program/project, do the objectives and/or outcomes statement clearly state how the project will benefit/affect the female beneficiaries? The male beneficiaries?
4. For each SA program/project, is there an analysis and differentiation of the particular conditions of women as compared to those of the men, particularly in terms of women's particular work burden, access to resources and participation in the development process?
5. For each SA program/project, is there an assessment of the practical and strategic   needs of the women and men partners and beneficiaries?
6. For each SA program/project, is there an analysis of gender roles and responsibilities in the targeted community?
7. For each SA program/project, are the female beneficiaries/partners involved in the problem and needs analysis? /male beneficiaries?
8. For each SA program/project, are the female beneficiaries/partners involved in designing the most appropriate strategies for addressing the identified needs and problems? /male beneficiaries/partners?

B. *Program Implementation*

1. Does the implementation plan for SA programs and projects include activities that strengthen skills and provide women/girls (men/boys) with equal access to services and training?
2. Do SA program/project implementation strategies and plans include specific ways for encouraging and enabling women (men) to participate in decision-making processes with regard to the programs/projects?
3. Do the agricultural organization's program/project implementation strategies and plans include specific ways for enabling women (men) to participate in the program/project through the provision of needed social support systems (e.g. day care/child care services, health care, etc.) and social protection (health insurance, education, community-based savings facility etc.)?
4. Do the organization's project implementation strategies and plans challenge and provide an alternative arrangement to the existing or traditional gender roles or sexual division of labor, tasks, opportunities and responsibilities of women and men?
5. In your opinion, do female (male) beneficiaries of the organization's programs and projects value and see the programs/projects as beneficial to their lives?
6. What are the positive impacts of the organization on its female (males) program/project beneficiaries?

[ ] increased confidence and sense of self worth
[ ] increased participation in decision-making
[ ] increased access and/or control over resources
[ ] higher consciousness of their rights
[ ] greater participation in leadership in their organizations and/or communities
[ ] improved health and nutrition for themselves
[ ] improved health and nutrition for their household members
[ ] some degree of financial autonomy
[ ] others. Please specify below.

7. What are the emerging women's issues/gender issues in the organization's SA program implementation?
   [ ] multiple burden
   [ ] women's lack of access/control over capital
   [ ] women's lack of access to trainings
   [ ] women's limited participation in decision making
   [ ] women's lack of management skills
   [ ] limited supply of raw materials
   [ ] no formal recognition and support for women
   [ ] invisibility of women's work
   [ ] violence against women
   [ ] victimization by usurers

8. What are some of the obstacles to incorporating gender analysis in program/project planning, implementation and evaluation in the organization? Please check all that apply.
   [ ] organization size
   [ ] level of staffing
   [ ] office culture/environment
   [ ] national culture
   [ ] religious beliefs
   [ ] lack of financial resources for gender programming
   [ ] lack of staff training on gender
   [ ] lack of gender analysis tools
   [ ] lack of support from senior management
   [ ] lack of support from the Board
   [ ] low organizational policy for gender issues
   [ ] others. Please specific below.

C. Technical Expertise

1. Is there a person or committee responsible for gender in the organization?
2. Is there assigned staff responsibility for gender integration in different committees in the organization?

3. Does the organization consistently draw upon a person or committee within the organization who is responsible for gender programming?
4. Do the organization staff/leaders have the necessary knowledge, skills and attitude to carry out their work with gender awareness?
5. Is there training of project and program staff in gender planning and analysis?
6. Is there training of project and program staff in the documentation of efforts of gender integration in the agricultural organization programs and planning?
7. Are Program/project planning, monitoring, evaluation and advisory teams in the agricultural organization composed of members who are gender sensitive?
8. Do program/project planning, monitoring, evaluation and advisory teams in the organization include at least one person with specific expertise and skills on gender issues?
9. Is gender-disaggregated data collected for the organization's projects and programs?
10. Do the female (males) program/project partners/beneficiaries of the organization participate in monitoring and evaluation?

D. *Monitoring and Evaluation*

1. Is the gender impact of the organization's SA projects and programs monitored and evaluated?
2. Does the organization have sector-specific indicators that include a gender dimension?
3. For the organization, gender disaggregated data provides useful information for program/project evaluation and subsequent program/project design
4. Based on project documentations and reports, the organization's programs/projects contribute to the empowerment of women/girls (men/boys) and the changing unequal gender relations
5. Based on project documentation and reports, the organization's programs/projects contribute to increased gender equality in the following areas:

Material well being	[ ] Yes	[ ] No	[ ] DK
Access to resources	[ ] Yes	[ ] No	[ ] DK
Access to training	[ ] Yes	[ ] No	[ ] DK
Access to basic social services	[ ] Yes	[ ] No	[ ] DK
Access to social protection	[ ] Yes	[ ] No	[ ] DK
Access to 'women-friendly' and appropriate technology	[ ] Yes	[ ] No	[ ] DK
Participation in decision-making	[ ] Yes	[ ] No	[ ] DK
Self-respect/legal status	[ ] Yes	[ ] No	[ ] DK
Control over benefits	[ ] Yes	[ ] No	[ ] DK
Control over resources	[ ] Yes	[ ] No	[ ] DK
Participation in the public Sector	[ ] Yes	[ ] No	[ ] DK

E. *For Members*

1. Does the organization provide gender awareness training programs for its members and beneficiaries?
2. Does the organization   provide training and tools on gender planning, analysis and evaluation to members and staff?
3. Does the organization have affirmative actions in terms of providing more women members access to its resources, trainings and advocacies?
4. Does the organization have affirmative actions in terms of providing more 'ultra poor women' members access to its programs, resources, trainings and advocacies?
5. Are the organization's members/leaders   encouraged and assisted to initiate efforts at mainstreaming gender in the local governance of their area (e.g. gender mainstreaming in local government policies; accessing the GAD fund)?
6. Are the organization's members/leaders encouraged and assisted to initiate advocacy efforts for the provision by LGUs of social programs like health, education, childcare, social protection which have a great bearing especially on the empowerment of poor women?

F. *On Designing Training*

1. What training could be included in the project to offset changes in production affecting women's role, or to increase women's equity in and benefits from the productive system as well as their productive skills?
2. Is the project likely to precipitate changes in lifestyle in the client population, such as increased incomes following a shift from subsistence to cash production?
3. What training might help women benefit from the changes?
4. Is there potential for supplementary intersectoral programs involving health, social development, and education agencies?
5. Should women be trained separately from men to ensure that they receive and benefit from training?
6. Can training be scheduled for times that suit and fit women's other responsibilities?
7. What training can be provided to women to address their strategic gender needs and increase their influence and control over decision making (e.g., training in the maintenance and repair of agriculture equipment)?
8. Would local demonstration farms help women and men understand and obtain access to project?
9. Will the project need a communication strategy and innovative teaching methods for illiterate women and men?
10. Can the project include training in small-business management, accounting and entrepreneurial skills, and marketing, in support of rural women's income-generating activities?

G. *On Institution Building* - Could technical assistance be included in the program or project to:

1.   Provide training in gender awareness or assistance in the development of gender planning and policy formulation, to enable the executing agency to promote women's participation in the project and to monitor the project's benefits to women?
2.   Provide a GAD specialist during project implementation to increase the effectiveness of the project?
3.   Provide training in participatory modes of development (e.g., ways to ensure community participation in the setting of objectives and activities)?
4.   Develop a gender database, if the present database is inadequate for gender planning?

References:
This guide borrowed heavily from the following literature:

Morris, Patricia. 1995. The Gender Audit: Questionnaire Handbook. Commission on the Advancement of Women (CAW). InterAction, Washington.

Gender Checklists and Tool Kits - Gender Checklist: Agriculture. Sectoral Gender Checklists developed by the Asian Development Bank.

Handout 6

MAINSTREAMING GENDER IN PID

Mainstreaming gender in PID deals with the question: who controls the processes of relationship building with relevant actors, identifying local innovations, pursuing the experiment, sharing results with others and sustaining the process.

A genuine integration of gender and participation into projects and programmes needs to be done at each stage of the PID processes. The following characteristics are important for successful mainstreaming efforts[1]:

1. *Conscious integration of knowledge and social action with a rights-based emphasis*

   Top-down commitments to rights can be used as leverage, in combination with working to increase people's awareness of their rights, and of their potential to influence policy and practice.

2. *The continual innovation of participatory methods to create a better understanding of aspects of social relationships, especially those of gender.*

   Participants should be allowed to revise and develop participatory methods to better match their situation.

3. *Recognition of the difficulties of language and translation.*

   Translations from English jargon around gender or other issues can immediately alienate stakeholders, yet sometimes it is hard to find equivalent concepts in local languages. Participatory approaches can help identify and formulate local concepts of gender, in some cases developing language which may challenge rather than simply translate the original meanings of the terminology.

4. *Mainstreaming gender as part of adapting institutions.*

   Gender approaches are not just for project activities and 'beneficiaries', but also require changes in institutions and staff themselves in order to be sustainable and non-hypocritical.

---

[1] *This is a summary of the overview report written by Supriya Akerkar. Both the summary and the overview report form part of the Cutting Edge Pack on Gender and Participation. The Pack also includes a copy of the BRIDGE bulletin in brief, and a collection of supporting resources.* ©Institute of Development Studies, November 2001 ISBN

Gender and Participation in the Policy Context

For the last twenty years, the concept of 'participation' has been widely used in development, referring primarily to participation in projects or in the 'community'. Now the process of inclusion and critical reflection encouraged by participatory approaches has been brought together with the debate on good governance. This is reflected on the one hand in the decentralisation of the political processes, and on the other in efforts to provide a platform for policy level dialogue. Such a dialogue between civil society and the state is considered necessary to formulate people-centered policies.

Efforts to mainstream gender and/or participation into policy include:
- The recent Participatory Poverty Assessments and Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSP) led by the World Bank
- Attempts by some countries to mainstream gender into policy processes through the creation of 'national machineries' for women
- Gender analysis of national and local budgets

In practice, these have varied in their degree of success in bringing participation and gender into policy. The following lessons can be drawn from these experiences:

1. *Participatory processes can contribute to the generation and interpretation of sex disaggregated data.*

   Participatory approaches provide opportunities for local collection and interpretations of such data. However data is not sufficient to ensure that the impact of gender relations on well-being is understood, and that this understanding is then fed into the policy agenda.

2. *Who participates and at what level is an important consideration.*

   Participatory processes may allow policy insights to emerge at local level, but the further up the information travels, the more likely it is to be filtered out. To ensure these perspectives are heard and retained at higher levels, it is important to consider such questions as: Who records proceedings and checks conclusions? Who writes reports and edits any plans? To whom are decision makers accountable? Who monitors their accountability?

3. *Transparency and accountability are needed if consultation processes are to be meaningful.*

   Consultations with women in civil society in the framing of the constitution in Uganda and in the South African Budget initiative, both illustrate transparency and accountability at various levels of policy dialogue. This allows for multiple perspectives to enter and influence public debate and the policy arena.

Decentralisation and affirmative action: increasing participation of women in policy making

Some national governments have attempted to institutionalise gender equality and participation through affirmative action and decentralization. NGOs have responded by initiating training of government officials, and training people in how to pursue their rights. The assumption is sometimes made that this will ensure women's participation in politics and will promote the formation of women's civil society groups. However, case studies of affirmative action in the Philippines and India, and participatory gender training in Uganda suggest that affirmative action and decentralization processes will have a positive impact on gender relations only if they go hand in hand with:

- civil society and government dialogue on the quality of political participation and on overcoming the barriers to an effective political voice
- rights training for citizens, staff of development institutions and government employees that is relevant and accessible to all, including marginalized groups.

Participatory approaches to development have a role to play in achieving these aims.

Conclusions

Combining gender with participatory approaches can strengthen both gender and participation, grounding gender in the realities of people's lives, and making participation a more effective channel for the expression of marginalised people's demands. The mainstreaming of both approaches can increase the redistribution of positive outcomes of projects, programmes and policy.

Handout 7

(DRAFT) STRATEGIC PLAN GENDERISING PID IN PROLINNOVA (November 2008)

	LONGTERM / INTERMEDIATE GENDER OUTCOMES			
	Vision: A world in which men and women farmers play decisive roles in agricultural research and development for sustainable livelihoods *Mission: Foster a culture of mutual learning and synergy in local innovation processes in agriculture and natural resource management*			
FOCUS AREAS	**SPECIFIC GENDER OUTCOMES**	**ACTIVITIES**	**WHOM**	**INDICATORS / TARGETS**
Documenting and promoting innovations	1a) Range of innovations in the productive, reproductive and community domains, including Indigenous Knowledge	1.1 Catalogue of female innovators	CP partners with Gender Focal Points	By 2010, all CPs have published a catalogue of female innovators (from different age groups) By 2010, at least one third of the identified, documented and/or promoted innovations are from women innovators, including different age groups By 2010, at least one third of the identified, documented and/or promoted innovations are in the reproductive and community domains, including IK Documentation of PID process provide evidence that there are no negative gender nor cultural impacts
	1b) Innovations from men and women (from different age groups) in each domain. And include household and community innovations.	1.2 Engender all publications at all levels	CP/IST	
	1c) Innovations have no negative gender nor cultural impacts			

PID process	2. Gendered PID (joint experimentation) process (continuously improved)	2.1 Complete/get comments on Gender and PID case studies	Participants write shop /Chesha	Improved Gender and PID case studies by end of Jan 2009
		2.2 Complete/get comments on workshop document (manual) to engender LI/PID	AWB/CW	Gender and PID workshop document (manual) revised with comments of all CPs and IST by March 2009
		2.3 Communicate outcomes of gender workshop to all CPs and IST	GF/CW	Gender Action plans are presented and approved by the National Steering Committees for incorporation into Country Plans by end 2008
		2.4 Share findings and follow up plans of gender workshop with Country partners and National Working Group	Participants write shop	
Impact on R&D	3. Women innovators actively involved in setting agricultural research agenda	3.1 Initiate PID/joint experiments with female innovators, involve women in (mixed and/or same gender) innovator platforms	CPs	By 2010, at least one third of joint experiments are based on women's innovations and led by woman innovator(s) (from different age groups), and is reflected in all promotional materials (posters, radio, innovator fairs, and publications
		3.2 Genderise local innovation messages and ensure gender balance in partnerships (and meetings) with stakeholders in research and development	CP's/Gender Focal Points	

PID capacity	4. PID practitioners apply gendered PID (joint experimentation) processes	4.1 Document and train in gender-sensitive facilitation techniques 4.2 All Gender Focal Points to attend engendered PID training of Facilitators 4.3 Specific gender training and coaching 4.4 Improve gender content in PID training (International/national)	Trainers/ Gender Focal Points/ Gender Group/Other Gender experts	Each CP sends a male and female participant, including Gender Focal Points, to International PID training of facilitators Gendered PID process and gender-sensitive facilitation techniques are included in PID training workshops at national and International level Note: Training should result in outcomes under 1
R&D Partnerships	5. Balanced gender representation in multi-stakeholder partnership (NWGs, NSCs etc)	5.1 Expertise in gender as criteria for selection of Country Programme coordinators 5.2 More women PID facilitators 5.3 Organization with Gender in Development expertise to be a member of NWG	NSC/NWG CP coordinators, Gender Focal Points	By end 2009, all CPs have a Gender Organization as partner in country multi-stakeholder platforms By end 2009, at least one third of PID facilitators are female By end 2009, at least one third of National Working Groups and/or National Steering Committee members are female

Planning	6. Genderise CP action plans and budgets (including FAIR project) to reflect points 1-5	6.1 Include gender activities in 2009 Country Plans and budgets 6.2 Country backstoppers to ensure that gender activities are reflected in 2009 action plans and budgets 6.3 No continued funding for CPs unless gender is integrated 6.4 Special funding for genderising activities at International and country levels	Backstoppers/IST, CP coordinator, Gender Focal Point	From 2009 onwards, country action plans and budgets of at least 9 CPs reflect/include gender-related activities, with support from backstoppers Gender work is included in next round DGIS funding proposal end 2009 By 2010, additional funds are raised to support further gendering work at all levels
Global impact	7. Global Partnership Programme can show positive gender impacts	7.1 Develop a working definition for gender in the context of PROLINNOVA 7.2 Genderise mission and vision statements 7.3 Include gender outputs and outcomes into M&E system 7.4 Gender discussed as main point on agenda (not as side event) of International Partners Meetings (IPM) 7.5 Revisit and restructure Gender group formed at Ghana IPM	IST/Gender Group/Gender Focal Points	Mission, vision and working definition of gender enable all PROLINNOVA partners to understand and work with gender IST has read and commented on the Gender and PID workshop document, and supports the CPs and IPM in integrating gender. Gender Group is restructured to effectively integrate gender at all levels, and to provide support to Gender Focal Points