



# Evaluation of Gender in CGIAR Research

*Annex F – Issue Paper*

*April 2017*



Sally Baden (Team Leader)  
Lynn Brown  
Deborah Merrill-Sands  
Rachel Percy

Federica Coccia (IEA)



Independent  
Evaluation  
Arrangement

This evaluation has been commissioned by the Independent Evaluation Arrangement (IEA) of CGIAR.

The Independent Evaluation Arrangement (IEA) of CGIAR encourages fair use of this material provided proper citation is made.

Correct citation: CGIAR-IEA (2017), Evaluation of Gender in CGIAR. Rome, Italy: Independent Evaluation Arrangement (IEA) of CGIAR.

<http://iea.cgiar.org/>

## Table of Contents

Annex F: The relevance and contribution of CGIAR gender research (2011-16) .....	3
1. Introduction.....	3
2. Gender issues beyond CGIAR: The big picture .....	4
3. CGIAR gender research 2011-2016: Achievements, strengths and future challenges .....	12
4. CGIAR gender research moving forwards .....	21
Appendix 1 .....	22

## Annex F: The relevance and contribution of CGIAR gender research (2011-16)

Issue Paper by Christine Okali

### 1. Introduction

This Issue paper was commissioned as an input into the Independent Evaluation Arrangement (IEA) *Evaluation of Gender in CGIAR research and in the CGIAR workplace*. The purpose and scope of this paper are specified in the Terms of Reference included in Appendix 1. They relate primarily to Evaluation question 4A: *Does CGIAR gender research focus on the most relevant priorities in the context of overall CGIAR priorities, based on clear comparative advantage?* More specifically, the paper seeks to enlarge on the understanding of gender and gender-related concepts in the area of agriculture and rural development, and on new methods being used in conducting research and disseminating research findings<sup>1</sup>, and to report on the extent to which CGIAR has contributed to these, and to filling evidence gaps.

For CGIAR research, the paper refers to gender research that is relevant to meeting CGIAR objectives as laid out in its Strategy and Results Framework (SRF) documents (SRF 2010-2015; SRF 2016-2030). The first SRF (2010-2015) was completed in 2015, and the second (SRF 2016-2030) was to be built on the acquired experience of the first. The research identified within both SRFs is covered by the three 'Strategic' outcomes specified in the 2016-30 SRF:<sup>2</sup> *Reduced Poverty, Improved Food and Nutrition Security for Health, and Improved Natural Resource Systems and Ecosystem Services*, with gender being a cross-cutting issue with its own Intermediate Development Outcome (IDO), 'Equity and Inclusion achieved' in the SRF 2016-30, with three specific researchable and measurable sub-IDOs - *Gender equitable control of productive assets and resources, Technologies that reduce women's labour and energy expenditure developed and disseminated, and Improved capacity of women to participate in decision-making*<sup>3</sup>. Each of these have long been a focus for those working on women in agriculture. This paper makes direct reference to these SLOs and IDOs, and speaks to their research and development implications in Section 3.

The first SRF gives far less attention to gender than the second SRF. This difference largely reflects the state of gender research capacity within CGIAR as a whole in 2010, and even the extent to which the new structures and programs, the CRPs, introduced in 2011, were up and running. 2010 was the year when a decision was taken to integrate gender system-wide, a decision that entailed a major gender mainstreaming effort. A small number of CRPs (AAS, CCAFS, FTA and GRISP<sup>4</sup>) were well ahead of others in their gender preparations having a number of relevant researchers on board and some considerable

<sup>1</sup> With respect to dissemination, CGIAR and partners produce large numbers of different kinds of documents relevant to their various audiences.

<sup>2</sup> The System Level Outcomes (SLOs) 1-4 listed in the 2011-2015 SRF are: reducing rural poverty, improving food security, improving nutrition and health, and the sustainable management of natural resources SLOs.

<sup>3</sup> CGIAR Strategy and results Framework 2016-2030, available at: <https://library.cgiar.org/bitstream/handle/10947/3865/CGIAR%20Strategy%20and%20Results%20Framework.pdf?sequence=1>

<sup>4</sup> CGIAR Research Program Portfolio Report 2011

history of gender and social (not economic) research. A4NH has a significant history in research on nutrition where the role of women in ensuring nutrition and food security is emphasised. The contribution of A4NH internationally to the analysis of nutrition and related health issues, one of the CGIAR SLOs, is widely acknowledged. More recently, A4NH has partnered with the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine to enhance its gender capacity.

The analysis in this paper takes into account that many changes within the CGIAR are still new, and that it is probably too early to assess progress towards meeting overall and intermediate SRF goals. This practical difficulty is accompanied by others, related especially to the expansion of CGIAR research for development to include 900 or so partners who presumably have contributed to program design. For this paper, CGIAR gender research includes research in which CGIAR is a partner, but pragmatically attempts to focus on where CGIAR is an important player, if not the lead partner – with the assumption that if CGIAR is an important player, it has been influential in the research design.

Bearing these concerns in mind, and the large quantity of documentation produced by CGIAR for dissemination, from policy briefs to field reports, manuals for data collection and analysis, and articles published in refereed journals, the actual documentation reviewed here inevitably reflects expediency, but also personal selection based on the author's prior knowledge of gender research in agriculture and of CGIAR. It focuses especially on journal articles published in refereed journals, with a focus on papers reporting on the most recent gender research and its findings.<sup>5</sup> Given the time period involved (2011-2015), these represent a comparatively small body of material.

Following this brief introduction the paper first draws the big picture of gender in agriculture and rural development issues from the viewpoint of organizations and individuals outside CGIAR and within the A4RD community (and detailed in the terms of reference for this document) and concludes with a summary of widely agreed gender research priorities to-day (Section 2). These research priorities are then examined in relation to CGIAR gender research since 2011 in Section 3. These point to conceptual and methodological challenges for their incorporation into CGIAR gender programs. The paper concludes with reflections on outstanding issues.

## 2. Gender issues beyond CGIAR: The big picture

For identifying research priorities in the wider A4RD community, the paper first explores documentation from the UN agencies of FAO, IFAD and UNRISD, and then more briefly, the World Bank<sup>6</sup>. Much of this documentation draws on and synthesises material from other sources: it reflects the views of a wide range of actors in the A4RD community from individual researchers including feminists to other development institutions and beyond around which there is wide agreement. In the case of the UN agencies, these include the gender issues of concern to member countries where these are detailed.

---

<sup>5</sup> There appears to be no central list of documents published over this time period.

<sup>6</sup> Along with IFAD and FAO The World Bank played a key role in the publication of the "Gender in Agriculture Sourcebook" detailed in section 2.1. The comment here refers to independent World Bank publications.

## 2.1. What can we learn from UN and related literature?

We begin with the *Gender in Agriculture Sourcebook* (hereinafter the Sourcebook) jointly published in 2009 by FAO, IFAD, and the World Bank<sup>7</sup>. For the World Bank this document forms part of its Agriculture and Rural Development Series. One of the main objectives of the Sourcebook was to provide “Good Practice Examples”. Arguably these three agencies, jointly and/or separately, have played a key role not only in keeping the status and position of women at the top of the international social development agenda, but also in determining+ the broad contours of the debate about women in agriculture that are visible to-day in the various programs of CGIAR and its partners.

The Sourcebook “examines key gender issues present across the concerned subsectors at the conceptual level”<sup>8</sup> and draws together material on women’s issues in agriculture and rural development since the early 1980s covering different natural resources, with the intention of “showcasing promising development interventions” from specific technologies of improved seeds and new crops to cage culture in fisheries, and broader changes in resource management for example, that “work for women”. The Sourcebook includes papers on a small number of specific issues on Rural Finance (Module 3), Land Policy and Administration (Module 4), Agricultural Markets (Module 5), Agricultural Innovation and Education (Module 7), labour (Module 8), and Gender and Gender and Food Security (Module 1). The sector analyses are informed by livelihoods thinking, and grounded in gender and development planning frameworks, on womens’ roles (Moser 1993), on the sex distribution of resources and assets, and work (The Harvard Framework detailed in Overholt et al. 1984) and a social relations framework based on Kabeer (1994)<sup>9</sup>.

Apart from demonstrating the significant contributions made by women to agriculture and rural development, the Sourcebook makes the case for gender equality in access to the various resources and inputs needed for ensuring increased production and productivity of the sector, and in decision-making. It includes a review of existing toolkits including checklists and indicators to “assist task managers and technical officers in their efforts toward greater gender inclusion in agricultural policies, projects, and programs”. It also includes an Executive Summary that is echoed in a large part in CGIAR and partner documentation: “Investing in Women as Drivers of Agricultural Growth”<sup>10</sup>. At the same time, its main audience is development practitioners.

<sup>7</sup> World Bank; Food and Agriculture Organization; International Fund for Agricultural Development. 2009. Gender in Agriculture Sourcebook. Agriculture and Rural Development; Washington, DC: World Bank. Available at: <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTGENAGRLIVSOUBOOK/Resources/CompleteBook.pdf>

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., p.8

<sup>9</sup> Moser, Caroline O.N. 1993. *Gender Planning and Development: Theory, Practice, and Training*; Overholt, Catherine, Anderson, Mary B., Cloud, Kathleen and James Austin 1984. *Gender Roles in Development Projects: A Case Book*. Kumarian Press, Connecticut; March, Candida, Smyth, Ines and Maitrayee Mikhopadhy. 1999. *A Guide to Gender Analysis Frameworks*. London: OXFAM GB.

<sup>10</sup> J. Ashby, M. Hartl, Y. Lambrou, G. Larson, A. Lubbock, E. Pehu, and K. Ragasa, each representing one or another of the three agencies involved, and CGIAR.

## FAO The State of Food and Agriculture (SOFA) documents

**The State of Food and Agriculture. 2010-2011. Women in Agriculture: Closing the Gender Gap in Agriculture' (SOFA)**<sup>11</sup> picks up on all the gender issues raised in the Sourcebook<sup>12</sup>. It again brings together contributions from numerous sources: individual feminists, development actors and UN and other international agencies, including CGIAR, on different themes. The key themes for the SOFA include gender equity, social inclusion, food security and nutrition, making this a widely referenced document with analyses of women's contribution to agriculture for example, based on data in its supporting statistical annex being widely quoted. Its key gender message is that agriculture underperforms because half of all farmers, who are women, lack equal access to the resources and opportunities they need to be more productive.

As with CGIAR SRFs, the SOFA speaks to equality in decision-making, laws, policies, in access and control over land and other productive resources, goods and services, and in access to markets; 'decent employment' (a UN commitment) including pay and conditions; reduced work burdens with better infrastructure, services and technologies.

Given FAO's role in providing global statistics on agriculture, including livestock and fisheries production, it calls for more sex-disaggregated data to provide evidence on women's disadvantage for closing the gender gap "between the contributions of women and men", determining the size of the "gender gap" and its cost to society, for "identifying supporting and/or constraining norms, and for gender analysis". The key question/issue raised in relation to this SOFA and relevant to this Issue paper is: "Can agricultural policies close the gap?" The Statistical Annex for this gender-specific SOFA covers sex-disaggregated data comparing individual women and men, and male and female-headed households (as proxies for men and women). At the time of its publication the data analysis concluded: "Data analysis using these categories demonstrated that "gender gaps in production can be explained by input use differences."

### **FAO, 2013. 'FAO Policy on Gender Equality - Attaining food security goals in Agriculture and Rural Development.'**<sup>13</sup>

This SOFA document reiterates the 2011 gender policy commitments to achieving gender equality and women's empowerment that are "key both to the eradication of hunger and poverty worldwide, and to improved nutrition and child care." It also speaks to the "proof provided by the analysis of sex-disaggregated data that gender resource gaps need to be closed if outcomes on gender equality and women's empowerment, and hunger and poverty eradication" are to be achieved (as the 2011 SOFA). While the document refers to the need for competitive players – women and men having equal access to inputs and resources including land - it also introduces the understanding that "agricultural production relies on interdependence" and "complementarity and partnership between women and men within the family", this nod towards a more relational approach is not developed further. It does however point to the **2014 SOFA on "Innovation in Family Farming."**<sup>14</sup> This SOFA features three

<sup>11</sup> Available at: <http://www.fao.org/publications/sofa/2010-11/en/>

<sup>12</sup> The SOFA are FAO flagship policy documents that are widely quoted. A key contribution of SOFA was to build on existing evidence re gender gaps to estimate implications of these for global agricultural productivity/ growth, and nutrition and hunger (vs only documenting gender gaps).

<sup>13</sup> Available at: <http://www.fao.org/docrep/017/i3205e/i3205e.pdf>

<sup>14</sup> Available at: [www.fao.org/3/a-i4040e.pdf](http://www.fao.org/3/a-i4040e.pdf)

women on its frontispiece and women are compared with men throughout (there are 112 mentions of women in the main text), and introduces young people – youth – along with women as key social categories to be targeted<sup>15</sup>.

**Poverty and social protection is the key theme of the 2015 SOFA**<sup>16</sup>. Although this SOFA pays less attention to the gender policy commitments made in 2011, women are a continuing theme as targets for social protection programs, especially cash transfers, given evidence that women use income in their hands to support household welfare, and especially the welfare of children. Based on its analysis of development programs it concludes that the vast majority of programs target women in male-headed households (not, as was common previously, women in female-headed households). The document calls for social protection programs for small family farmers as also indicated in the Sourcebook. The importance of social protection for addressing poverty, over and above, and perhaps especially given the policy of social inclusion, is an issue that up to this point in time has not appeared strongly within CGIAR portfolio of issues related to its poverty goal and its focus on the use of women to achieve all of its SLOs.

**Report of the UN Women Expert Group meeting on *Enabling Rural Women's Empowerment: Institutions, Opportunities and Participation*. 20-23 September 2011**<sup>17</sup>

This meeting was hosted in cooperation with FAO, IFAD and WFP. It covered a wide range of issues around understandings of gender inequality and focussing principally on the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) and policy gaps to be filled in order for these to be achieved. Its main output was a long list of policy recommendations. In relation to agriculture it concluded by prioritising policies to improve women's access to and control over land and other rural productive resources, along with provision of and entitlement to services more generally. It also called for action to women's disadvantaged position in the labour market drawing on evidence of women's position at the bottom of production chains where employment is casual, intermittent and poorly remunerated. A persistent topic raised at this meeting was women's poor representation in leadership positions, their inadequate decision-making power and lack of voice, but indeed all concerns around women and girls from education to violence and neglect were addressed.

This was not a meeting designed to identify issues for agricultural research within organisations such as the CGIAR although a whole session was devoted to exploring the statistical resources sitting within FAO and the other UN organisations. While it is interesting now to reflect on this session given the more recent concerns being raised about the inadequacy of available data for arriving at policy or even for identifying researchable issues (discussed in Section 3 of this paper), the session at this meeting was directed at encouraging members to access and use the data available.

**Synthesis Report on GCARD/ Global Conference on Women in Agriculture and Emerging Priorities held 13-15 March 2012, Delhi**<sup>18</sup>. This conference was organized by the Indian Council of Agricultural

<sup>15</sup> This appears to be first time that youth are identified as a social category to be targeted in FAO documents and this may also be true for documents produced by wider A4RD organisations.

<sup>16</sup> Available at: [www.fao.org/publications/sofa/2015/en/](http://www.fao.org/publications/sofa/2015/en/)

<sup>17</sup> Available at: [http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/csw/csw56/egm/Hill-BP-1-EGM-RW-Sep-2011\\_CH.pdf](http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/csw/csw56/egm/Hill-BP-1-EGM-RW-Sep-2011_CH.pdf)

<sup>18</sup> GCARD builds on what used to be CGIAR Annual Meetings and transforms it into a 'partnership' and 'donor' meeting with the CGIAR and GFAR (a global platform for agri-food research and innovation), organised in the framework of Collective

Research (ICAR), the Asia-Pacific Association of Agricultural Research Institutions (APAARI), and was supported by the multi-stakeholder Global Forum on Agricultural Research (GFAR) through a new mechanism called the “Gender in Agriculture Partnership (GAP)”. The priorities for action moving forward through collective action, including CGIAR, through (GAP) identified at this meeting resemble much of the CGIAR gender research identified in the 2010 and 2015 SRFs: Assessing women’s empowerment; identifying technical innovations designed to reduce drudgery; linking women to markets; supporting women’s roles in ensuring household food security and nutrition; increasing women’s access to assets, resources and knowledge; assisting in the development of policies and services designed to increase gender equity; and providing support for addressing climate change and its related risks and uncertainties. They also reflect priorities identified in the Sourcebook and the 2011 FAO SOFA. The report also refers to the cost to the world of failing to close the gender gap (referencing FAO statistics on lost production etc.). Perhaps more important is the fact that it was at this meeting that the CG Gender Network first got together.

Especially relevant to this issue paper are references made to the dramatic changes that agriculture is undergoing worldwide from “increasingly globalized markets.... the feminization of agriculture spurred by male out-migration”, the increasing uncertainty arising from climate change to population growth, and “the diversion of cropland to biofuel production” all of which is “increasing the pressure on natural resources and polluting land, water and coastal fisheries resources” (p.5)<sup>19</sup>.

The synthesis concludes with a small number of statements as follows: “Food insecurity is worse in countries (and households) with a high gender inequality gap: social norms and low female status often result in women eating last and less in quantity and quality than other family members, especially men: Increased production and availability of food does not necessarily advance the right to food or lead to improved nutritional outcomes, especially for women and children: Increased enjoyment of rights to education are important in their own right, but women’s higher educational levels do not necessarily increase women’s voice in decision-making, even at the household level: Higher female earnings controlled by women themselves tend to improve their status and decision-making power within the community and household ..... and awareness of the widespread injustices faced by women” (pag. 8).

The Sourcebook notes the need for “context-specific, inter-disciplinary research to be conducted in priority areas to “identify what works, how and why”, and to “create new tools, methods and approaches that are capable of grappling with the measurement of multidimensional issues such as women’s empowerment and cultural change<sup>20</sup>. It further highlights the importance of “creating diverse and interconnected platforms that can be used by a variety of actors to record, share and exchange knowledge and evidence”. These are all characteristics of the current CGIAR CRPs.

In framing the collective actions of greatest value to be taken forward at different levels via the Gender in Agriculture Partnership (GAP), the Conference identified the following:

- Gender disaggregated information and analysis for advocacy

---

Action advocated by GFAR, GCARD is an opportunity to bring the CGIAR together with other constituents”. Synthesis Report available at: <http://www.apaari.org/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2012/06/Synthesis-Report-GCWA.pdf>

<sup>19</sup> No references elaborating on the way these various factors impact on agricultural production are given in the report.

<sup>20</sup> The Women’s Empowerment in Agriculture Index (WEAI), released by IFPRI in early 2012 was reported at this Conference.

- Women-centred innovations in agriculture, food and nutrition
- Learning, sharing and knowledge management.

The abstract for the **World Development Report 2012: Gender Equality and Development**<sup>21</sup> speaks for itself: “The main message of this year’s World Development Report: gender equality and development, is that these patterns of progress and persistence in gender equality matter, both for development outcomes and related policy making. They matter because gender equality is a core development objective in its own right. However, greater gender equality is also smart economics, enhancing productivity and improving other development outcomes, including prospects for the next generation and for the quality of societal policies and institutions. Economic development is not enough to shrink all gender disparities-corrective policies that focus on persisting gender gaps are essential. This report points to four priority areas for policy going forward. First, reducing gender gaps in human capital-specifically those that address female mortality and education. Second, closing gender gaps in access to economic opportunities, earnings, and productivity. Third, shrinking gender differences in voice and agency within society. Fourth, limiting the reproduction of gender inequality across generations. These are all areas where higher incomes by themselves do little to reduce gender gaps, but focused policies can have a real impact...” (pag. Xiii).

“Gender gaps have not narrowed in women’s control over resources, women’s political voice, or the incidence of domestic violence. In some cases, individual preferences, market failures, institutional constraints, and social norms continue to reinforce gender gaps despite economic progress...” (pag. 76).

This brings this section to the 2014 World Bank document below. While the research reported here reflects on gender gaps that have dominated the women and development agenda since the 1980’s, it also raises issues of socio-structural constraints, or norms, that have not been a focus of research to date, and of the environment within which rural communities live.

**World Bank and One (campaign) 2014. *Levelling the Field*; Improving Opportunities for Women Farmers in Africa. Ethiopia, Malawi, Niger, Nigeria, Tanzania and Uganda**<sup>22</sup>.

Press Release “Gender gap holds back Africa’s women farmers”<sup>23</sup>

Twenty years since Beijing, five years since the Sourcebook publication, three since the gender SOFA, and two since the GCARD conference and the World Development Report referred to above, this 2014 document reiterates the issue of closing ‘Gender Gaps’ – in land ownership, access to credit and productive farm inputs like fertilizers and pesticides and farming tools, support from extension services, and market access - which constrain the ability of, especially, African women to feed their families, increase farm incomes and lift the burden of poverty.

---

<sup>21</sup> Available at: <https://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTWDR2012/Resources/7778105-1299699968583/7786210-1315936222006/Complete-Report.pdf>

<sup>22</sup> Available at: <http://www.worldbank.org/en/region/afri/publication/levelling-the-field-improving-opportunities-for-women-farmers-in-africa>

<sup>23</sup> Available at: <http://www.worldbank.org/en/news/press-release/2014/03/18/gender-gap-holds-back-africas-women-farmers-new-report-identifies-policy-interventions-to-narrow-and-eliminate-gender-inequality>

It speaks of improvements in data measurement that have made it possible to further disaggregate data on gender gaps and determine how these might be closed in different countries. At the same time, significantly, it concludes that closed gender gaps will not always translate into equal returns for women farmers, and suggests that even where this is the case, as long as they are more productive than they are at present, the next generation of women farmers might benefit. This document also returns to the established understanding that women who are more productive will influence economic decision-making and “allocate more income to food, health, education and children’s nutrition” (pag. 6).

### *2.2. Section Summary and Conclusions*

The study draws together a list of priorities identified in these various documents in Box 1 below. It is clear from this summary that a number of the research priorities listed are framed as policy statements, and are aspirational, rather than research questions around a specific issue. In large part, the present CGIAR research agenda as expressed in the two SRF’s reflects these priorities. There is considerable agreement within the documents around the CGIAR three strategic goals of reduced poverty, improving food and nutrition security for health and improved natural resource systems and ecosystem services, and on women’s disadvantage and gender gaps. In relation to gender, there was unanimous support for a substantive crosscutting gender research program. To reach its targets, CGIAR lists eight research priorities where it has a comparative advantage to address the identified pressing global needs from, Genetic improvement of crops, livestock, fish and trees (Item 1) to Nutrition and health emphasizing dietary diversity, nutritional content and safety of foods and the development of value chains of particular importance for the nutrition of poor consumers (Item 6), Climate smart agriculture focusing on urgently needed adaptation and mitigation options for farmers and other users (Item 7). A specific gender priority of Gender and Inclusive growth, creating opportunities for women, young people and marginalised groups, is also identified (Item 3) (page 18 of the CGIAR Strategy and Results Framework 2016-2030).

Even for those who have been involved in working with agricultural/natural resource researchers over a lifetime, it is amazing to see how central women have been made to the achievement of CGIAR goals. Gender, as women, appears on the covers of all the reports listed above, with women presented as both drivers and beneficiaries of desired changes. This vision is perhaps best demonstrated by the quote placed at the beginning of the 2012 Global Conference on Women in agriculture report by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the First Prime Minister of India: “In order to awaken the people, it is the women who have to be awakened. Once she is on the move, the family moves, the village moves, the nation moves.” At the same time, translating these messages into a coherent gender research strategy and programs is not straightforward and this paper examines these in relation to CGIAR gender research since 2011 in Section 3.

**Box 1 Summary of CGIAR SRF and Issues raised by members of the wider A4RD community**

**Global Conference on Women in Agriculture 2012 Synthesis Report**

“Assessing women’s empowerment; identifying technical innovations designed to reduce drudgery; linking women to markets; supporting women’s roles in ensuring household food security and nutrition; increasing women’s access to assets, resources and knowledge; assisting in the development of policies and services designed to increase gender equity; and providing support for addressing climate change and its related risks and uncertainties” are all listed in the report as issues to be addressed within agricultural research and development. At the same time the Conference admitted to the complexity and context specificity of the “inter-relationships between agricultural development and household food security and the importance of women’s rights and empowerment” with “gender equality in rights (being) a precondition for the growth of agricultural production, value addition, incomes, and food and nutrition security”.

The conference concluded with several statements that pointed to possible issues for further research:

- Food insecurity is worse in countries (and households) with a high gender inequality gap.
- Social norms and low female status often result in women eating last and less in quantity and quality than other family members, especially men.
- Increased production and availability of food does not necessarily advance the right to food or lead to improved nutritional outcomes, especially for women and children.
- Increased enjoyment of rights to education are important in their own right, but women’s higher educational levels do not necessarily increase women’s voice in decision-making, even at the household level.
- Higher female earnings controlled by women themselves tend to improve their status and decision-making power within the community and household and awareness of the widespread injustices faced by women.

**World Development Report 2012: Gender Equality and Development**

Points to four priority areas for policy going forward: reducing gender gaps in human capital, specifically those that address female mortality and education; closing gender gaps in access to economic opportunities, earnings, and productivity; shrinking gender differences in voice and agency within society; and limiting the reproduction of gender inequality across generations.

It concludes: “Gender gaps have not narrowed in women’s control over resources... In some cases, individual preferences, market failures, institutional constraints, and social norms continue to reinforce gender gaps despite economic progress...”

**World Bank and ONE campaign 2014. *Levelling The Field*** This 2014 document reiterates the issue of closing ‘Gender Gaps’ ...“in land ownership, access to credit and productive farm inputs like fertilizers and pesticides and farming tools, support from extension services, and market access - which constrain the ability of, especially, African women to “feed their families, increase farm incomes and lift the burden of poverty”, but also cautions that “closed gender gaps will not always translate into equal returns for women farmers” .... and suggests that “even where this is the case, as long as they are more productive than they are at present, the next generation of women farmers might benefit.”

### 3. CGIAR gender research 2011-2016: Achievements, strengths and future challenges

Does CGIAR gender research focus on the most relevant priorities in the context of overall CGIAR priorities, based on its comparative advantage, and in the context of broader priorities identified in the wider A4RD community?<sup>24</sup> While trying to answer this question based on the sets of research papers reviewed, this study comments on the understanding of gender analysis and gender-related concepts, and points to any innovative ways in which CGIAR research appears to be moving in terms of research methods and concepts, always bearing in mind their relevance to the overall CGIAR research program. This study also suggests possible research gaps. Finally, in undertaking this review this study aims at demonstrating the different ways in which gender is being incorporated into CGIAR research programs and the implications of this for the way the gender research program has developed.

This study organizes the selected papers against the SRF sub IDOs already detailed and begin with research relating to the **sub IDO Gender equitable control of productive assets and resources**. Much of the research completed under this IDO has been directed at closing what are widely referred to as 'gender gaps' in the control over productive assets and resources.

This issue of women's productivity compared with men, establishing the size of the 'gender productivity gaps' and identifying the action needed to close these gaps, has been a focus of IFPRI research since 2011, although researchers working in IFPRI and other institutions initiated these studies in the mid 1990s<sup>25</sup>. Action to close the gaps has centred significantly on the need to improve women's asset and resource access and/or control and this research now sits within the GAPP program<sup>26</sup>. The research has involved the design, collection and analysis of sex-disaggregated data to measure the impact on women's agricultural productivity against that of men, and to identify points of entry for reducing the identified gaps to release women's productivity potential, thereby contributing to the overall strategic goals (SLOs) of reducing poverty and achieving food and nutrition

<sup>24</sup> The documentation of CGIAR research is substantial, covers a wide range of material relevant to its various audiences, and is disseminated through different sources. The gender research documentation forms a small part of this, reflecting its more recent introduction on any scale into the CGIAR, and does not appear to be collected in one part of the CGIAR GSpace. This makes it difficult to review, and especially to gain an overall perspective on its strengths. On the other hand, the numbers of publications appearing in refereed journals based on research completed under the new CRPs is comparably small.

<sup>25</sup> Udry, Christopher, Hoddinott, John, Alderman, Harold and Lawrence Haddad. 1997. "Gender differentials in farm productivity: implications for household efficiency and agricultural policy". *Food Policy*, 20(5): 407-423. This study involved the World Bank, IFPRI, Oxford University and Northwestern. It used data from Burkina Faso collected by ICRISAT in the 1980s and concluded that a reallocation of factors of production across plots could lead to an increase in household-level production from 10-15%. The goal of the study was to assess whether decision-making authority over plots and output is reflected in resource allocation across plots.

<sup>26</sup> GAAP: the CGIAR's Gender, Agriculture and Assets Program led by IFPRI was set up in 2010 with funding from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation to identify how development projects impact men's and women's assets; clarify strategies that have been successful in reducing gender gaps in asset access, control and ownership; improve partner organization abilities to measure and analyse qualitative and quantitative gender and assets data in their monitoring and evaluation plans for current and future projects. GAAP2 (2015-2020) will focus on modifying the WEAI for use by projects to diagnose disempowerment.

security, through the empowerment of women, and achieving gender equity in agricultural development.

The outputs from this gender gap research have been published in refereed journals consistently since 2011 and these are listed below. All CRPs have been encouraged to collect sex-disaggregated data, and the program has produced guidelines and capacity training to make this happen. This research definitely responded to the call to address women's apparent disadvantage and was relevant to CGIAR SRF. Historically it has not been especially innovative given that the analyses or related analyses have continued over two decades. However, more recently, and since 2011, using reported innovations in the level of disaggregation possible from these data sets<sup>27</sup>, and analyses undertaken within development interventions that provide resources and inputs to women, remaining differences/gaps have been attributed to social-structural constraints, specifically gender norms that act as a constraint on women's on productivity and ability to innovate, including their uptake of new (to them) technologies or innovations in practice.

All the papers below are reporting on this shift in the research methodology for analysing gender gaps and in relation to the last publication, for 2016, we read that: "All projects were associated with increases in asset levels and other benefits at the household level; however only four projects documented significant, positive impacts on women's ownership or control of some types of assets relative to a control group, and of those only one provided evidence of a reduction in the gender asset gap" but concludes that "greater attention to gender and assets by researchers and development implementers could improve outcomes for women in future projects." In its conclusion the paper notes that the "contexts within which the projects operate is important to understanding their success, and the differences in outcomes", and In line with the shift to looking at gender norms within this CGIAR research, it also notes that it is "especially important is understanding social and gender norms and their implications for rural women's ability to participate in and benefit from projects". In relation to the last item in the list published in 2016 we read of concerns related to women's increased involvement in market-oriented agriculture of supporting this shift while not compromising their own and their families' health and nutrition. Projects with this objective are referred to as "gender-sensitive high value agriculture projects" and tell us something about issues around the CGIAR strategy of engaging women in high value markets<sup>28</sup>.

**Meinzen-Dick, R., N. Johnson, A. Quisumbing, J. Njuki, J. Behrman, D. Rubin, A. Peterman, and E. Waithanji. 2011.** "Gender, assets, and agricultural development programs: A conceptual framework." CGIAR system-wide program on Collective Action and Property Rights (CAPRI) *Working Paper* No. 99. Washington, DC: International Food Policy Research Institute.

<sup>27</sup> To document the extent and drivers of the gender difference in agricultural productivity, the background papers that underlie the World Bank and One report (2015) entitled "Levelling the Field: Improving opportunities for women farmers in Africa" rely specifically on an "Oaxaca Blinder regression-based mean decomposition" detailed in Appendix 5 (p.23), of the Technical Annex on decomposition methods in this report. A set of similar research findings on gender gaps and productivity outcomes have been published by the World Bank in a Special Issue of the *Agricultural Economics Journal*. The Introductory paper to this special Issue suggests that the studies reported address a number of concerns related to study designs in previous research: unrepresentative and small samples, the absence of a multi-sectoral approach and a lack of recognition that "agricultural production decisions are taken within the complex web of intra-household relationships and livelihood strategies."

<sup>28</sup> This concern about competing objectives of increasing commercialisation and improved food security, and nutrition, is longstanding and was even voiced during the colonial era in parts of sub-Saharan Africa where cash cropping expanded.

**Quisumbing, A.R., S. Roy, J. Njuki, K. Tanvin, and E. Waithanji. 2013.** “Can dairy value-chain projects change gender norms in rural Bangladesh? Impacts on assets, gender norms, and time use.” *Discussion Paper No. 1311*. Washington, DC: International Food Policy Research Institute.

**Johnson, N., J. Njuki, E. Waithanji, M. Nhambeto, M. Rogers, and E. Hutchinson. 2013.** ‘The gendered impacts of agricultural asset transfer projects: Lessons from the Manica Smallholder Dairy Development Program. CGIAR system-wide program on Collective Action and Property Rights (CAPRI)’. *Working Paper No. 115*. Washington, DC: International Food Policy Research Institute.

**Johnson, N., J. Njuki, E. Waithanji, M. Nhambeto, M. Rogers, and E. Hutchinson. 2013.** “The gendered impacts of agricultural asset transfer projects: Lessons from the Manica Smallholder Dairy Development Program. CGIAR system-wide program on Collective Action and Property Rights (CAPRI)”. *Working Paper No. 115*. Washington, DC: International Food Policy Research Institute.

**Quisumbing, Agnes. R., Rubin, Deborah, Manfre, Cristina, Waithanji, Elizabeth van den Bold, Mara, Deanna Olney, Deanna, Johnson, Nancy and Ruth Meinzen-Dick 2015** “Gender, assets, and market-oriented agriculture: learning from high-value crop and livestock projects in Africa and Asia” *Agriculture and Human Values* (32): 702-725.

**Johnson, Nancy, L., Kovarik, Chiara, Meinzen-Dick, Ruth, Njuki, Jemimah and Agnes Quisumbing, 2016.** “Gender, Assets, and Agricultural Development: Lessons from Eight Projects”, *World Development*, 83:295-311.

In looking forwards it is important to examine the outcomes of CGIAR research on norms that are referenced in a number of the documents reviewed in Section 2 and are visible in the papers on assets already referenced above. In 2013, funding for research on gender norms under a program called GENNOVATE, with gender norms being viewed largely as constraints on women’s behaviour, in particular on their innovativeness, or ability to innovate was initiated. The manual designed for this research included questions covering a range of topics, including for instance norms around women’s mobility, based on the understanding that mobility has implications for resource, especially knowledge, access. This research involved a methodology not previously used by CGIAR: The collection of qualitative data from individual interviews and single and mixed sex focus groups (FDGs), with 10 or so members, within 135 rural communities in 26 countries. Overall the research included up to 6,000 rural women and men. Each CGIAR CRP involved in this activity facilitated the training of interviewers, and at times researchers participated in data collection and are involved in the data analysis and the documentation of findings. The data were centrally coded.

The following blog identifies a number of issues that were raised about the data during a write-up session:

- Local insights in a global gender dataset: <http://humidtropics.cgiar.org/local-insights-in-a-global-gender-dataset/>

The blog talks about issues of interpretation of the data that consist of public statements made in response to specific often sensitive questions, about for example: “How would you describe a good wife?”, and of the meaning of words used by researchers themselves e.g. norms, and gender equity. During the process of data analysis, the researchers were also aware that data interpretation must reference the place and context, even though there was a sense amongst them that there was a degree of similarity in responses across sites. All the comments raised by these researchers demonstrate the

challenge for CGIAR, whose comparative advantage would seem to lie in its capacity to standardise large scale data collection and analysis on clearly measurable variables. The GENNOVATE data is qualitative, focussed on increasing understanding of processes of change than on measuring outputs, and consists of reported public speech on questions not usually included in questionnaire surveys.

The challenge going forward for this research on gender equitable control of productive assets and resources is to continue to develop a capacity for new investments in data collection, designed specifically to illuminate the socially embedded change processes, to elaborate on ways in which transformative changes might be achieved (as the 2016 paper above suggests in its conclusions), in addition to ensuring the consistency of the sex disaggregated data sets as it does already. In addition, while it is a little early to reach any conclusions about the value of the gender norms research program since analysis is not complete, it is clear that CGIAR will need to learn more about the methodology itself, the challenges in data analysis and interpretation, and its value for exploring sensitive information about relationships and exchanges between women and men, including, perhaps especially, husbands and wives.

Related to this research designed to illuminate on how to achieve gender equity is the role of IFPRI in the development of an index for measuring levels of women's empowerment: The Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (WEAI)<sup>29</sup>. The importance attributed to women's empowerment both as a driver and as an outcome of development has impacted widely on research and development thinking in different parts of the world, especially since women's empowerment appeared in the MDGs. It is in this context that WEAI, developed by IFPRI as part of a collaborative effort involving a range of institutions that included its practical testing in a number of countries, has to be assessed. It has possibly been one of the most celebrated CGIAR gender outcomes to date, since reports suggest that the Index is widely used by a range of development programs: It responded to a gap in programs seeking to demonstrate improvements in the status and position of women as a consequence of their interventions. IFPRI reports that it engages in a continuous program of reflexion and updating based on these program reports.

Moving beyond the Index itself, the word 'empowerment' is used liberally in a wide range of research publications from different organisations, and including CGIAR. A "theory of change that involves empowering individual women to invest in agriculture to meet food security needs, and at the same time to engage with markets to increase incomes and acquire resources to invest in future production, is now embedded in all CGIAR programs and is available on the Gender Network website."<sup>30</sup> While this could be celebrated as a sign of successful CGIAR inclusion of women in its A4RD, it is possible at the same time to hesitate to view the expected contribution of empowered women as transformative for them. Also it is impossible to foresee the implications for men and for gender relations more broadly of these expected changes. Furthermore, it would seem that there is no plan to explore actual changes in rural areas, between women and men around what appear to be expected shifts in responsibilities and so on. This would be an innovative move if it were to occur.

The following paper, also from IFPRI, explores the evidence of a presumed link between women's empowerment (based on the indicators used in the construction of the WEAI), and nutrition outcomes

<sup>29</sup> Alkire, S., R. Meinzen-Dick, A. Peterman, A. Quisumbing, G. Seymour, and A. Vas. 2013. "The Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index." *World Development* 52(1): 71–91.

<sup>30</sup> This sentence is adapted from CG Space.

for women and children. It characterises the kind of research in which IFPRI itself is engaged based on the use of this Index:

**Van den Bold, M., Quisumbing, A., and S. Gillespie.** 2013. “Women’s empowerment and nutrition: An evidence review”. IFPRI Discussion Paper, 1294. Washington, DC: *International Food Policy Research Institute*.

The paper is based on a thorough review of evidence provided in worldwide documentation from different countries since the mid 90s. It includes assessments of the impacts of what are described as ‘women’s empowerment interventions’; cash transfers, agricultural interventions and microfinance. It details a range of outcomes from the research undertaken in different settings and concludes that women’s empowerment is more strongly associated with infant and young child feeding practices and only weakly associated with child nutrition status. In addition, the extent to which good practices result in improved nutrition outcomes depends on other underlying household and community-level processes, such as food security, access to health services, water and sanitation, and childcare capacity and feeding practices (UNICEF 1990; Gillespie 2013). The authors present the following key question for this research: ‘How can women’s empowerment interventions be made more nutrition sensitive?’ which is more of an engineering question driven by the need to achieve specific outcomes, rather than a research question. We might translate this into a research question by asking: “Why is it that some women’s empowerment interventions are associated with improved nutritional outcomes for children and or the women themselves, and others are not?” This would be followed by the setting up of a series of hypotheses to question, for example, the targeting (i.e. which women etc. were targeted), the programs/interventions (i.e. their precise nature and the context within which they were implemented etc.), and possibly even the empowerment index itself.

#### ***SubIDO -Technologies that reduce women’s labour and energy expenditure developed and disseminated***

Moving from the analysis of sex disaggregated data, which this paper categorise as *ex ante* gender research that is difficult to link directly with the technical research which lies at the core of CGIAR research to research, research on this IDO responds directly to the demand for “gender sensitive technology” that has featured in the women in agriculture policy documents since the 1980s. It is one of the main themes within the Agricultural Sourcebook, and is on record as being considered the driver of an agricultural revolution within which women are considered to be key players. The need for ‘improved’ or ‘new’ technology and even ‘old’ technology for women appears in all the gender strategy documents of CGIAR CRPs in reference to this SRF IDO.

In her 2001 paper, Cheryl Doss takes up a number of issues around the call for ‘gender sensitive technology’. She argues that this is a vague call, and anticipating the gender effects of any new technology or ways of working is difficult, if not impossible and this has implications for evaluations. In an earlier paper (2002), Doss also dismissed the understanding that there are such things as women’s and men’s crops, and that women are more interested in producing crops for home consumption than men. Both these claims have survived over decades even though all the evidence suggests that who grows what crops is not fixed over time and the same crop may serve as a consumption crop at one point in time and as a commercial crop at another.

The issue expressed within this IDO is about the implications of the introduction of new technology for women's labour burdens. Regardless, while the 2015 CGIAR evaluation<sup>31</sup> report points to some of the technologies that have been developed and disseminated: GRISP was reported to have successfully transferred a mechanised planter to targeted women: Livestock and Fish was reported to have developed a crop residue chopper to reduce women's labour involved in the preparation of livestock feed, in India; CCAFS reports on its engagement of women in training to ensure their access to its climate-smart technology; NERICA rice adoption is reported for women in Benin, the actual gender-specific benefits of these technologies (whether in terms of reduced labour demands overall or a reduction in drudgery, or wider benefits), have hardly been calculated. The same 2015 evaluation report notes that several outputs of this 'gender-responsive research' are being tested/disseminated with/through partners, but studies of who innovates and benefits are not undertaken routinely. The need for a common approach to technology assessment was identified in the earlier 2012 CGIAR evaluation report.

Overall, there appears to be less evidence of 'gender-sensitive technology' in the current body of CGIAR gender research reported in refereed journals than might be expected given the centrality of technology design/development to CGIAR, although for this Issues paper only articles with some gender research focus were assessed. Regardless, the seven articles listed below together demonstrate a range of technology research assessments where the technology is more or less of a challenge depending on the complexity of the technology. Therefore, a gender assessment of orange sweet potato biofortification (Item 1 below), compared with a gender assessment of conservation agriculture or climate smart technology (Items 3 and 5), or within systems research more broadly (Item 4) would seem to be simpler and easier to structure. However, none of it is straightforward, and definitely, there is some agreement that *ex ante* assessments are unlikely to enable us predict in advance what will happen once these are introduced into rural communities. We might have expected this understanding to have led to more post introduction follow-up studies and this is an issue for gender research within CGIAR.

Item 3 presents an interesting perspective on research technologies related to two major research areas, of climate change (specifically REDD+ that seems to be regarded as especially valuable for women), and conservation agriculture (CA). Item 3 is the only paper in this collection that addresses directly the issue of women's labour burdens. Especially in the case of CA, this paper talks of trade offs to be made if a decision is taken to test this technology which indeed involves a major change in farm practice generally, which suggests there would need to be some agreement within the farm household before this 'technology' is taken on. This paper also takes up the issue of who might gain or lose from or as a result of changes made to incorporate a new technology/ practice etc., and suggests that this is not predictable (as Doss 2012), and of course it is quite possible that smallholders, who may be family members, do not calculate in this way: The exchanges involved are likely to form part of a broader set of exchanges that enable everyone to gain, if not equally. The authors also produce a set of possible 'Gender Research Questions' to be used in exploring potential effects of CA on women and men in smallholder agricultural systems. The questions revolve around Food and nutrition security, Health, Access to information and technology, Resources and labour, Income, Marketing and value chains, thereby covering a large proportion of the issues to be raised around. The paper by Giller et al provides

<sup>31</sup> CGIAR Research Program Portfolio Reports. These are yearly reports – 2012-2015 prepared by the CGIAR Consortium Office. This paper simply refer to them as CGIAR evaluation reports in the text and mention the year to which the evaluation applies.

a critique of CA reminding us that technology development is not without its controversy.<sup>32</sup> Finally, there is also some considerable controversy around the value of the biofortification research covered in the first two items.<sup>33</sup>

Within this small collection the terms ‘gender analysis’, ‘gender and social differentiation’, ‘gender bargaining’ all appear suggesting a broad appreciation of how gender issues are framed. This study does not suggest that any of these are especially helpful for technology assessment but they suggest ways in which CGIAR researchers are attempting to incorporate what is understood to be gender analysis into these. The last item in this list raises an issue that it is considered to be essential to technology analysis, which is described here as “Bringing the analysis of gender and social–ecological resilience together” but which we might refer to as ‘interdisciplinarity’. For this to happen there would need to be a greater appreciation of the positions adopted by different disciplines (Jackson 2006), and of their collaborating partners who are responsible for implementation on the ground (Harrison and Watson, 2012)<sup>34</sup>. This would seem to be especially important for systems research. The case of agroecology, as a systems approach to sustainable agricultural development, food production and natural resource management, is taken up by three sets of researchers and suggests a starting point for integrating social research, including gender research, more closely with others.<sup>35</sup> More on this issue is to be found in the last section of this paper.

**Gilligan, D., N. Kumar, S. McNiven, J.V. Meenakshi, and A.R. Quisumbing. 2014.** “Bargaining-power and biofortification: The role of gender in adoption of orange sweet potato in Uganda”. *Discussion Paper No. 1353*. Washington, DC: International Food Policy Research Institute.

**van den Bold, M., A. and D. Gilligan, D. 2012.** “Biofortification, agricultural technology adoption, and nutrition policy: Some lessons and emerging challenges.” *CESifo Economic Studies* 58(2): 405–421.

**Beuchelt, T.D. and L Badstue, L. 2013** “Gender and Social Differentiation: Gender, Nutrition- and climate smart food production- opportunities and trade-offs.” *Food Security*, 5(5) 709-721.

**Tegbaru, A., FitzSimons, J., Kirscht, H. and Hillbur, P. 2015.** “Resolving the Gender Empowerment Equation in agricultural research: A systems approach.” *Journal of Food, Agriculture and Environment* 13(3&4): 131-139.

<sup>32</sup> Some critique of these more complex ‘technologies’ is taken up in the 2015 Upsalla Conference, and in articles included in *Contested Agronomy: Agricultural Research in a Changing World* Earthscan, Routledge

<sup>33</sup> Brooks, Sally and Sarah E. Johnson Beebout. 2012. “Contestation as continuity? Biofortification research and the CGIAR”, in *Contested Agronomy: Agricultural Research in a Changing World* edited by James Sumberg and John Thompson. Earthscan, Routledge.

<sup>34</sup> Jackson Cecile. 2006. “Feminism Spoken Here: Epistemologies for Interdisciplinary Development Research”, *Development and Change* 37(3): 525-547; Harrison, E.A. and Watson, E.E. 2012. “Mind the Gap: Disciplinary Dissonance, Gender, and the Environment”, *Insights and Applications: Society and Natural Resources*, 25:933-944.

<sup>35</sup> Tegbaru, A., FitzSimons, J., Kirscht, H. and Hillbur, P. 2015. “Resolving the Gender Empowerment Equation in Agricultural Research: A Systems Approach. *Journal of Food, Agriculture and Environment* 13(3&4): 131-139; Giller, Ken, E., Anderson, Jens. A., Corbeels, Marc, Kirkegaard, John, Mortensen, David, Erenstein, Olaf and Bernard Vanlauwe. 2015. “Beyond Conservation Agriculture”, *Front.Plant.Sc.* 6:870. doi: 10.3389/fpls.2015.00870; Kawarazuka, Nozomi, Locke, Catherine, Cynthia McDougall, Paula Kantor, Miranda Morgan. 2016. “Bringing analysis of gender and social–ecological resilience together in small-scale fisheries research: Challenges and opportunities”, *Ambio*: DOI 10.1007/s13280-016-0814-5

**Giller, Ken, E., Anderson, Jens. A., Corbeels, Marc, Kirkegaard, John, Mortensen, David, Erenstein, Olaf and Bernard Vanlauwe. 2015.** "Beyond Conservation Agriculture", *Front .Plant. Sc.* 6:870. doi: 10.3389/fpls.2015.00870;

**McKinnon, Katherine, Carnegie, Michelle, Gibson, Katherine, and Clare Rowland. 2016.** "Gender equality and economic empowerment in the Solomon Islands and Fiji: a place-based approach." *Gender, Place and Culture*, 23 (10): 1376-1391 .

**Nozomi Kawarazuka, Nozomi, Locke, Catherine, Cynthia McDougall, Paula Kantor, Miranda Morgan. 2016.** "Bringing analysis of gender and social–ecological resilience together in small-scale fisheries research: Challenges and opportunities", *Ambio*: DOI 10.1007/s13280-016-0814-5

### ***Sub IDO - Improved capacity of women to participate in decision-making***

This study already referred to the impact of the WEAI which has to be seen to be part of the interest in women having greater decision-making power. Here two categories of gender research are covered: participatory plant breeding and natural resource management, and research on women's empowerment.

It is not possible here to elaborate on participatory research and development *per se*, although having read a number of the research outputs related to this theme, the author reckons that a detailed review under the title 'Rhetoric and Reality' should be completed, using CGIAR research as the case study. In the context of thinking about gender equity and social inclusion, it is deemed that participatory research is about power and powerlessness, and therefore underpins the potentially fuzzy but challenging idea of transformative change for women that has filtered into CGIAR research, and mentioned at the end of one of the papers included in my review of research on control over assets and resources, A glance at the documentation reviewed for by Farnworth reflects on the ideas that underpin all of this<sup>36</sup>.

The participatory planning and decision-tools that now feature in virtually all CGIAR research demonstrate the way in which these tools continue to provide a space within which a range of actors can be seen to be involved all together in decision-making<sup>37</sup>, who appear to have become more complex over time. The stream of research on decision-making Platforms should also be assessed given that documented evidence is becoming available. Platforms are not covered here but they are seen as central to both research and subsequent development activities and a gender analysis is necessary.

As someone who has explored participatory research, now two decades ago,<sup>38</sup> the author is aware that much of the participatory research and development being undertaken to-day under this theme has

<sup>36</sup> Full list of references/ bibliography from Cathy Farnworth, Melinda Fones Sundell, Akinyi Nzioki, Violet Shivutse, and Marion Davis. 2013. 'Transforming Gender Relations in agriculture in SSA', SIDA. 'Addressing gender inequality will result in more sustainable development of the agricultural sector.'. available at: <https://www.sei-international.org/mediamanager/documents/Publications/SIANI-Gender-Africa-book/SIANI-2013-Transforming-Gender-Relations-Agriculture-Africa.pdf>

<sup>37</sup> See especially Schut, M., L. Klerkx and C. Leeuwis, 2015. "Rapid Appraisal of Agricultural Innovation Systems (RAAIS). A toolkit for integrated analysis of complex agricultural problems and innovation capacity in agrifood systems." International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA) and Wageningen University.

<sup>38</sup> "Farmer Participatory Research: Rhetoric and Reality" by Christine Okali, James Sumberg and John Farrington. 1994. Intermediate Technology Publications.

changed. Nevertheless, based on the documentary evidence below, the author senses that there is much continuity. If true, then this conclusion supports the idea of undertaking a more comprehensive review of this research.

### **Participatory Plant Breeding or Client –oriented participatory research**

There is now substantial experience within the CGIAR of participatory plant breeding research that includes women as essential to the development of new crop varieties of value to them. Evidence of women’s continued engagement in crop breeding research is provided in all the CRP program proposals. The 2015 CGIAR portfolio report also states that considerable effort has gone into developing the necessary institutional capacity for more client-oriented participatory research, particularly in plant breeding, in public sector agricultural research systems and that this activity is now central to their research strategy for CGIAR.

The first paper under this theme reflects on the PRGA research program that has since been closed. It provides a broad overview of the development of participatory research and of the participation of women in this research. It refers to evidence of an early link between participation and empowerment but, quotes Doss (1999) in arguing that it is difficult to predict *ex ante* what will be the gender outcome of this research process. We are also reminded that this research activity is only the first step in reducing the gender disparities in access to new seeds and techniques.<sup>39</sup>

**Lilja, Nina and John Dixon 2008** “Responding to the Challenges of Impact Assessment of participatory Research and Gender Analysis” *Experimental Agriculture*, 44: 3-10.

### **Natural Resource Management Groups**

Within a list of 66 articles in refereed Journals and published between 2008 and 2016 (of 84 papers on the CG Space Gender Network Articles website), performance assessments of natural resource management groups, and similar management and related forest and fish themes, account for up to half the articles.

A key research question underpinning much of documentation on natural resource management groups is: “What is the link between women holding senior (or possibly any position) on natural resource management groups and the performance of the group?” One of the earliest papers that attempts to answer this question is the first in this selection (Westerman et al.). Others are similar, in spite of the time difference between the publications: “What is the evidence that the gender composition of forest and fishery management groups affects resource governance and conservation outcomes?” This ‘Systematic Review Protocol’ (Craig Leisher et al.) produces a systematic map of the evidence highlighting both the geographic distribution and quality of the evidence, and the consistency and robustness of the findings, and points to a way in which a review of the participatory research as a whole might begin. The protocol itself provides a complete guide to steps in this assessment activity.

**Westermann O, Ashby J, J. Pretty, 2005.** “Gender and social capital: the importance of

---

<sup>40</sup> Sumberg James, John Thompson, John and Philip Woodhouse. 2012. *Contested Agronomy. Agriculture Research in a Changing World*. Routledge. Taylor & Francis Group. New York and London.

gender differences for the maturity and effectiveness of natural resource management groups.” 2005.*World Development* 33:1783–99.

**Sun Y, Mwangi E, Meinzen-Dick R. 2011** “Is gender an important factor influencing user groups’ property rights and forestry governance? Empirical analysis from East Africa and Latin America.” *Int For Rev.* 13:205–219.

**Coleman EA, Mwangi E. 2013.** “Women’s participation in forest management: a cross-country analysis.” *Global Environ Chang.* 23:193–205.

**Sunderland, Terry, Achdiawan, Ramadhani, Angelsen, Arild, Babigumira, Ronnie, Ickowitz, Amy, Paumgarten, Fiona, Reyes-Garcia, Victoria and Gerald Shively, 2014** “Challenging perceptions about men, women and forest product use. A global comparative perspective”, *World Development*, 64: 856-866.

**Craig Leisher, Gheda Temsah, Francesca Booker Michael Day, Bina Agarwal, Elizabeth Matthews, Dilys Roe, Diane Russell, Leah Samberg, Terry Sunderland and David Wilkie . 2015.** “Does the gender composition of forest and fishery management groups affect resource governance and conservation outcomes: a systematic map protocol” *Environmental Evidence.* 4 (13).

The CIFOR website reveals a number of research reports on a range of topics that are not covered here. These include women’s interests in forest products and the implications for forestry institutions (Coleman et al. and Sunderland et al. above). Positive institutional outcomes examined include, especially, improvements in conflict resolution and fairness of rules. While there appears to be some evidence to support these kinds of performance outcomes, there is also much agreement that more evidence is needed. The reports suggest that the women themselves, as individuals will gain in many ways, and especially from improvements in their status and position within their community. These outcomes resemble those reported for women’s group membership of various kinds but it is not always evident that there has been much gender analysis of outcomes.

The section concludes by drawing together comments on the contribution of this gender research to the CGIAR research program in terms of methods, concepts and relevance to the CGIAR technical research program.

#### 4. CGIAR gender research moving forwards

It is clear from this review that CGIAR gender research covers a variety of research and encompasses a range of what is referred to as gender analysis. This varies from the analysis of sex disaggregated data covering roles and access to and control over resources and assets, to studies of changes in institutional behaviour depending on the sex composition of management, the analysis of gendered norms that structure behaviour and social relations, and gender analysis of technical innovations, including new crops or new varieties of existing crops and the broad landscape-level changes required for CA to have an impact. All of this is valid gender research and there is no reason to suspect that it will not grow in strength if funding is provided and space is given for the now considerable body of gender expertise to undertake good gender research.

In terms of research methods, it is evident that the GENNOVATE program has introduced qualitative research into a program that to date has largely only dealt with large, global data sets. Data analysis is ongoing and it remains to be seen whether all the different CRPs have the capacity to support the

analysis. More interesting is the possibility this this qualitative study will set the scene for the introduction of other qualitative approaches, from life histories to panel studies and others. If this happens, support will be needed from experts, a number of whom work in academic institutions.

At the same time as this has happened, there has also been a re-emergence or re-reading of earlier papers of Cheryl Doss, for example, that point to the problem of attempting to predict adoption or uptake of technologies of various kinds based on *ex ante* studies, and of the weak guidance for technology development for women given by the term “gender-sensitive technologies.” A small number of more recent papers have also challenged methods of data collection and poor data, and inadequate definitions of different forms of land tenure. All of this would seem to suggest that it is time to move beyond concerns about sex disaggregated data on which the Gender Network has spent some considerable time and effort to ensuring good practice for a range of quantitative and qualitative methods. The challenge going forward is to develop a capacity for new investments in data collection designed specifically to illuminate the “non-binary, non-linear, socially embedded processes and dynamics of (technological) change”.<sup>40</sup>

A small number of the papers included under the three main sub-IDs point directly to the need to link the social and technical research in order to make gains in technology development and challenge the assumption that the contribution of social science is simply one of ensuring good fit of the technical. The solution is not simply a process of bringing researchers from different disciplines together, but rather one of agreeing on a research problem, defining the contours of the research to address the problem, and relevant research questions, and undertaking the research together. This approach would be ideal for researching how men and women negotiate/manoeuvre/calculate around an innovation, a new tool, a different field design, new crop of new organisation for natural resource management. It is suggested that this research will provide more insight into planning new technology than the *ex ante* research undertaken to date given that it places the technology in the context of the lives of the men and women who are expected to use it.

The author does not see CGIAR as having any particular advantage around gender analysis and it would appear that it never claimed to have such an advantage. The consortium evaluations are about establishing how effective the CGIAR has been in incorporating this given (by the donors and other external actors) gender agenda. There are doubts whether it can unravel all the noise that inhabits this space, from gender analysis as women in development, as the identification of ‘gender gaps’ to be filled by increasing women’s control over productive assets and resources, as ‘role analysis’ providing some basic guidance for targeting innovations, as providing insight into social change as populations respond to development interventions, government policies, increasing urbanization and globalization etc. but it is now in an ideal situation to contribute to this agenda.

### Appendix 1

Issue Paper 1: The relevance and contribution of CGIAR gender research 2011-16, to developing key concepts, filling critical evidence gaps, and developing gender-relevant technologies and methodologies, in relation to wider CGIAR objectives: 2011-16

---

<sup>40</sup> Sumberg James, John Thompson, John and Philip Woodhouse. 2012. *Contested Agronomy. Agriculture Research in a Changing World*. Routledge. Taylor & Francis Group. New York and London.

### Summary Terms of Reference:

The purpose of this paper is to qualitatively assess the extent to which CGIAR gender research has responded to priorities identified in the wider gender and A4RD community, with reference to the main thematic areas and objectives identified in the CGIAR Strategic Results Frameworks (SRF 2011-15; SRF 2016-30), as well as any 'cross cutting' areas, focusing on research completed during 2010-2016. This Issue paper relates primarily to evaluation question 4A in the gender evaluation:

Does the CGIAR gender research focus on the most relevant priorities in the context of overall CGIAR priorities, based on clear comparative advantage?

Building on the initial analysis in the inception report, the Expert will first identify globally recognised conceptual, technological or methodological challenges and evidence gaps, for or relevant to gender in ARD, arising from existing evidence reviews, 'flagship' reports and publications, as well as proceedings of key global meetings or conferences in CGIAR priority areas. Examples of sources that might be drawn on are:

- WB Gender in Agriculture Sourcebook 2009<sup>41</sup>
- FAO State of Food and Agriculture 2011<sup>42</sup>

Insights and recommendations of relevant global meetings/ Conferences, e.g:

- UN Women Expert Group meeting on Enabling Rural Women's Empowerment<sup>43</sup>
- Global conference on Women in Agriculture (2012).

The Expert will then assess the extent to which CGIAR gender research during 2010-16 has contributed towards the development of new and relevant gender-related concepts, towards identifying and/or filling key evidence gaps and towards developing, testing or refining new gender-relevant technologies for agricultural development, or methodologies for conducting or disseminating research. In doing so, the Issue Paper would seek to highlight a handful of particularly influential and/or ground-breaking examples of CGIAR in gender research whether in terms of concepts, new evidence or methodological approaches, produced during this period.

The paper will be based primarily on documentary review as well as building on the Experts own knowledge. It is expected that the Expert will draw on an existing database of gender research developed by the Gender and Agricultural Research Network and/or a related database of gender outputs, under development for the evaluation itself. The IEA Evaluation Analyst will provide support in accessing relevant CGIAR materials and databases.

The assignment is home-based and does not involve travel.

Estimated number of days: 10 days

---

<sup>41</sup> <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTGENAGRLIVSOUBOOK/Resources/CompleteBook.pdf>

<sup>42</sup> <http://www.fao.org/docrep/013/i2050e/i2050e00.htm>

<sup>43</sup> <http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/csw/csw56/egm.htm>

Assignment to be completed by 1 September 2016