



Lessons Learned
Evaluation of Norway's bilateral
agricultural support to food security

Why women farmers
are left out of programs





Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation

P.O. Box 8034 Dep, NO-0030 OSLO
Ruseløkkveien 26, Oslo, Norway
Phone: +47 23 98 00 00
Fax: +47 23 98 00 99

ISBN 978-82-7548-708-5
ISSN 1502-2528

Responsibility for the contents and presentation of findings and recommendations rests with the study team.
The views and opinions expressed in the report do not necessarily correspond with those of Norad.

Lessons Learned

Evaluation of Norway's bilateral agricultural support to food security

Why women farmers are left out of programs

Prepared by Pernille Nagel Sørensen

Introduction

Norway's Bilateral Agricultural Support to Food Security 2005-2011 was reviewed in 2012-2013. This Lessons Learned document was prepared as a continuation of that review. Its purpose is to identify lessons learned regarding women's rights and gender¹ issues in the projects/programmes² reviewed, in order to achieve more gender equality in Norwegian-funded agricultural programmes. The paper is intended for Norad, the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA), Embassies, and implementing partners.

A total of 25 projects/programmes were reviewed under the global evaluation, twenty country-level projects and five regional/global programmes. Due to time constraints, the regional and global programmes were excluded from the current review. In most cases the regional and global programmes included a high number of sub-projects, and there was not always documentation available for the sub-projects. The twenty country-level projects included a case study of Fredskorpset Norway (FK Norway). Agriculture and environment/sustainable development were, however, relatively minor in FK's annual portfolio³, and that case study was therefore also excluded from this review⁴. A list of the 19 country-level programmes that were reviewed can be found in Annex 1.

The review was based on the case study reports prepared for each project as part of the global evaluation. As the gender dimension was only partly included in the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the global evaluation, some additional documentation, mainly project proposals, was also reviewed (cf. References in Annex 2).

1. Reviewed programmes

The nineteen country-level programmes were reviewed based on the following six criteria:

1. Alignment with Norwegian plan of action for agriculture in Norwegian development policy
2. Relevance from a gender perspective
3. Gender analysis and project design
4. Objectives/results assessed according to gender
5. Activities targeting women
6. Gender-disaggregated data

¹ The term "gender" refers to "the relations between men and women, both perceptual and material. Gender is not determined biologically, as a result of sexual characteristics of either women or men, but is constructed socially. It is a central organizing principle of societies and often governs the processes of production and reproduction, consumption and distribution" (FAO 2004).

² Throughout the report, the terms "projects" and "programmes" will be used interchangeably.

³ E.g. over 130 projects were supported in 2012, but only nine projects were related to the environment and six to agriculture.

⁴ FK Norway was also excluded from the Evaluation of Norway's Bilateral Agricultural Support to Food Security 2005-2011.

1.1. Alignment with the Norwegian Plan of Action for Agriculture in Norwegian Development Policy

The Norwegian Plan of Action for Agriculture in Norwegian Development Policy from 2004 included a strong focus on gender, as expressed in one of seven priorities: “Strengthening women’s rights and their participation in agricultural development”. More specifically, the Norwegian government should:

- 1) Ensure that women’s rights, interests and participation are secured and incorporated in policy-making, framework conditions and agricultural development measures at country level.
- 2) Give priority to ensuring women’s right and their participation when selecting cooperation partners (including NGOs) and channels for development assistance.
- 3) Intensify its effort to ensure that partner countries carry out the necessary reforms for formalising women’s access to land and other natural resources.

The 2004 Action Plan generally had a strong focus on rights, more specifically the right to food and adequate living⁵. However, this strong focus on rights was not well reflected in the reviewed programmes. Similarly, the strong emphasis on gender (defined as women’s rights and participation in agricultural development) was not well reflected in most of the reviewed 19 programmes. All the programmes we assessed applied a needs-based approach, rather than a rights-based⁶ one, and none of the reviewed programmes aimed to secure women’s rights⁷. No programmes were involved in advocacy at policy level, e.g. in relation to women’s rights to land or other natural resources, except the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) programme in Ethiopia. None of the reviewed programmes included activities aimed at securing women’s rights, interests and participation in policy-making (Plan of Action, Pkt. 1). The second point of the Plan of Action was to give priority to women’s rights and participation when selecting partners. But this point did not seem to have received much attention from the extending agencies, as none of the reviewed programmes had a strong focus on women’s rights and participation. Neither did any of the assessed programmes include measures to influence or bring about reforms for formalising women’s access to land and other natural resources (Plan of Action, pkt.3). The main emphasis for all programmes was realization of women’s immediate and long-term needs at village or household level, and there was generally very little, if any, focus on advocacy for women’s rights at policy level. The only programme referring to “rights” was the Integrated Rural Development Programme, Messanu Areas in Ethiopia. The project proposal called the target group “right holders”; however, rights were not operationalized in the project design.

⁵ In accordance with the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Article 11, as described in the 2004 Plan of Action for Agriculture.

⁶ Applying a rights-based approach would mean influencing the people in charge to ensure women’s rights are fulfilled, while they also support women in learning about and claiming their rights.

⁷ The rights of women are enshrined in the Convention on the elimination of all forms of discrimination against women (CEDAW). So far the Convention has been ratified by 180 states.

1.2. Relevance from a gender perspective

All the reviewed programmes were considered relevant from a gender perspective. Women constitute the major part of the agricultural workforce in the selected countries, and women bear the main responsibility for food security at household level. Therefore, the selected agricultural projects, e.g. Conservation Agriculture (CA)/Conservation Farming (CF)⁸, provision of agro-input, strengthening of agro-marketing, and environmental/climate projects (including pastoral projects) are all highly relevant to women's rights and participation. CA is for instance particularly relevant to women's interests because it reduces and spreads the workload, reduces the dependence on oxen or mechanical tillage equipment, and increases the production and productivity of different crops, including food crops (Norad Report 5/2011 Discussion).

Despite their gender relevance, however, most programmes were not designed so that they sufficiently promoted the interests and participation of women. More will be said about that later. And even if the programmes aimed to promote the interests and participation of women, it was in most cases not clear how it should be done, and it was not based on an analysis of gender relations and roles in the targeted areas.

1.3. Gender analysis and project design

The first thing to do when designing a project, is to conduct an analysis of gender relations in the targeted areas. This will give an understanding of how the project can best support and improve women's position. Gender relations vary in different contexts and according to the local culture (ethnics groups). It is also crucial to distinguish between women's rights in national law and in customary law. It can therefore never be taken for granted that gender relations resemble gender relations in for instance other parts of the country or the region. The assumption that gender relations were well-known and resembled gender relations in other areas, was a common problem in almost all the reviewed programmes. In most cases, the programme documents (project proposals) included only a general and vague reference to women's limited access to resources, etc.

Below, the reviewed programmes are grouped and discussed according to their theme. Several of the programmes included different components; the classification below thus refers to the main components in a programme.

CA/CF has been the flagship of Norwegian support to climate-adapted agriculture for a long time. The Conservation Agriculture Programme I (CAP I) in Zambia was one of the few programmes which provided a thorough gender analysis and described how the programme aimed at bypassing some of the cultural barriers to women's participation. The proposal in the CAP 1 project generally referred to "farmers", but did distinguish between women and men in terms of focus on food crops versus cash crops. The proposal noted that more female-headed households than male-headed households had adopted CF, as the former tend to focus more on food security. With regard to male-headed households, the programme attempted to bypass the male control and emphasis on cash crops by

⁸ The two terms are used interchangeably throughout the report.

promoting “women’s gardens”⁹. The use of CF technology would allow women’s gardens’ to be established and planted before the husbands could demand women’s labour for cash crop production. The gardens were promoted to ensure food security, but they also provide women with some opportunity for economic independence since they can sell food crops cultivated in their garden (Conservation Farming Unit, CFU, Project Proposal 2006). The CAP I gender analysis and the establishment of “women’s gardens” show a good understanding of the gender division of labour as well as the right of disposal/ownership within marriage. The main issue here is how women can bypass the male control in order to obtain food security and some level of economic independence. The programme should also be commended for distinguishing between women in male-headed households and in female-headed households. Unfortunately, (as also noted later), gender aspects were not included at the specific objective level or result level (termed outputs). In contrast, the Conservation Agriculture Scaling Up for Increased Productivity and Production programme (CASPP) in Zambia did not include a gender analysis. The project proposal recognized that farmers have different needs and use different methods according to a number of variables, including gender. However, there was no further indication of how this would be addressed by the programme (CASPP Project Proposal, 2008). The project did not include any gender component or mainstreaming of gender.

Two programmes focused on **provision of agro-input** (hand-out), the multi-donor and government-implemented Farm Inputs Subsidy Programme (FISP) in Malawi and the small NGO programme in Nicaragua, called Prorural. Neither programme was based on or included a gender analysis. The FISP provided agricultural inputs (seeds and fertilizer) and targeted vulnerable households, including female-headed households. In 2010/2011, for instance, 56% of beneficiary households was male-headed whereas 42% were female-headed (the remaining 2% were unidentified)¹⁰. The inputs were provided to the household as an entity. In male-headed households this means that the male farmers most often will control and decide how to use of the agro-inputs. There was no reference to other gender aspects in the annual reports (Logistic Unit 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012). Similarly, the Prorural programme in Nicaragua did not include a gender analysis, but there were references to unequal access to resources throughout the report. Better access to agricultural resources and services for vulnerable groups, including women, was included as one of the cross-cutting goals.

Three programmes focused on **crop marketing** through associations, the National Association of Smallholder Farmers in Malawi (NASFAM), Community Markets for Conservation (COMACO) in Zambia, and the Agricultural Support Programme (ASP) in Tanzania. The NASFAM project proposal did not include a gender analysis, but referred to a number of gender activities which could encourage the participation of women in the organization: e.g. promotion of female crops (crops traditionally grown by women), training of women in leadership, ensuring that services (e.g. radio programmes) could be accessed by both men and women, etc. Promotion of female crops is a commendable initiative, but it did not seem to be based on a solid knowledge or analysis. There was no reference to

⁹ These gardens are called both “women’s gardens” and “food security gardens” in the Project Proposal and the associated log frame.

¹⁰ The division between male and female-headed households was approximately the same in the other annual reports reviewed. However, this division was apparently only mentioned in the 2009/2010 annual report and later.

which crops should be promoted, and how it should be done; and the SWOT¹¹ analysis of all potential crops did not indicate whether the crops were typically “male” or “female”. All the above-mentioned gender activities were referred to as “gender mainstreaming”; yet there was no reference to gender for other components. The budget for gender mainstreaming was 0.15% of the total budget (approximately 31.66 million US dollars), which indicates that it was not a main priority in the programme (Project Proposal 2006). COMACO in Zambia linked small-scale farmers to market-based incentives through a process that encourages environment-friendly livelihood practices. Only the agreement (and project summary) was available for this review. The only reference to gender in the project summary was as a “risk factor” (referring to gender imbalance, i.e. women as the major producers of commodities to COMACO). There is no mention of how the gender imbalance could be rectified in the project. ASP in Tanzania was implemented during the 2003-2008 period, and in general, only limited information was available. According to the End of Programme Report (no date), ASP used several mainstreaming tools. The household approach was regarded as the most important of these tools. The principle was that husband and wife (and children) should participate in all ASP activities; accordingly, this should lead to a common vision for the family. This vision was then transformed into a jointly implemented action plan and monitored by the camp facilitator. According to the report, women’s control over and access to resources and household income increased as result of the programme. It was also concluded that progress within agricultural development and entrepreneurship was greater in households where women had some power, than in households with traditional gender roles. Although the results seem admirable, their sustainability might be questioned. Women’s new power was not based on women’s traditional rights and therefore depended on the goodwill and acceptance of the husband (or the empowered status of women). Moreover, the camp facilitator is not likely to continue monitoring the family action plans once the project is over, and it is therefore questionable whether the changes can be sustained.

The global evaluation included a number of **environmental/climate change** programmes: the Reducing Emission from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD) programme in Tanzania, climate change programmes focusing on lake basin environments and agriculture respectively (Lake Chilwa in Malawi and Lake Managua in Nicaragua), and lastly the UNCCD project that targets pastoral areas in Ethiopia. The absence of a gender analysis and consideration of gender in the project design was common for all the reviewed programmes. Concerning the REDD project in Tanzania, it would have been relevant to include gender aspects in relation to output 4, which focuses on livelihood improvements as well as food production (land management) and collection of firewood. The field visit conducted as part of the global evaluation showed that women’s groups (providing training in agricultural practices) and other community groups had been formed/expanded. But it is not clear to which extent this was part of the project design. The two lake projects equally suffered from lack of a gender analysis as basis for the project design. According to the proposal for the Lake Chilwa project in Malawi, gender was planned to be mainstreamed in this project, and a Gender and Social Development expert was employed. As in many other cases, however, the gender mainstreaming appeared to be an “add-on”, and it could not be seen in the project design. In the case of the Lake Managua programme in Nicaragua, there was a reference to the project’s gender focus in the amplification of the project proposal (this document was not available for the current review). But no methodology was in place

¹¹ SWOT: Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats.

which would allow one to measure the project's gender dimension (case study report). With regard to the UNCCD, the absence (or near absence) of a gender analysis (and gender-disaggregated data) was also noted in the evaluation reports on UNCCD programmes (Development Funds follow-up of evaluation reports).

Two **research programmes** were included in the global evaluation, the Climate Change Impacts, Adaptation and Mitigation (CCIAM) and Enhancing Pro-poor Innovations in Natural Resources (EPINAV) under the Sokoine University of Agriculture (SUA) in Tanzania. The CCIAM project proposal did not include a gender analysis; it only referred to the poor representation of women in training, research and decision-making organs. The programme therefore aimed at ensuring a better representation. The programme moreover aimed at addressing the role of women in land and tree tenure and gender-sensitive benefit sharing mechanisms for values of ecosystem services¹². The other research programme in Tanzania, EPINAV, appeared to have a better developed gender approach. The proposal referred to the need for strengthening women's perspective and expertise in food production and climate change adaptation, as this has been largely overlooked in policy interventions. The programme thus included gender-sensitive research involving e.g. smallholders and gender-specific adaptation to climate change, including CA. It was, unfortunately, too early to see the results of this research at the time of the global evaluation.

The **Public-Private-Partnership (PPP)** programmes included the Tanzanian Agricultural Partnership (TAP), which aims to give trained Tanzanian smallholders better access to credit, input and value chains through public-private partnership and the Norway-Netherlands Delegated Agricultural Support. This consisted of five projects that targeted commercial/private sector agricultural development and associated education/training and technology development. The PPP programmes generally suffered from lack of gender consideration and gender analysis¹³. Addressing gender in this type of programme is however extremely relevant: despite the fact that women in Tanzania do most of the agricultural work, they have unequal access to agricultural inputs and credit. Specific measures to target women farmers (in male-headed and female-headed households) should therefore have been included. The programmes are classic examples of how farmers are considered "male" by agricultural service providers; thus there is a risk that unless women are explicitly considered and targeted, the services will mainly benefit men.

Three programmes could be classified as **livelihood programmes**: the Integrated Rural Development Programme in Messanu areas in Ethiopia, the Development Fund (DF) Rural Livelihood programme and the Malawi Lake programme in Malawi. The livelihood programmes, which were all implemented by NGOs, were generally relatively good at integrating gender, although the project design was not

¹² The term "ecosystem services" refer to the multitude of resources and processes that humans are supplied by ecosystems, e.g. drinking water.

¹³ Documents of the Norway-Netherlands Delegated Agricultural Support programme were not available for this review. However, according to the case study report (prepared as part of the global evaluation) none of the five projects included gender aspects as a specific objective or at the results level. The Appropriation Document from the Norwegian Embassy did not refer to a particular gender focus as a main reason for supporting the five projects.

necessarily based on a gender analysis. With regard to the Messanu programme in Ethiopia¹⁴, the 2004-2006 project proposal did not include a gender analysis, although there was reference to women's legitimate access to land ownership and inheritance in the Tigray society. According to the proposal, gender disparities were generally low due to a favourable political system. The programme targeted women and female-headed households as direct beneficiaries of the different components. The Rural Livelihood programme (2007-2011) in Malawi consisted of eight projects in all. The project proposal did not provide a gender analysis. An indicator focusing on increased participation of women and youth in local, district and national organizations was included; however, there was no indication of how this was expected to be achieved. In 2011, the programme commenced a broader involvement of women. For instance, a target was set for CA: 50% lead farmers (and follow) farmers should be women. The Phase II project proposal (2009) for the Malawi Lake Basin Programme included a gender analysis, which also provided some information on women's role in agriculture and fishery, e.g. division of labour. The project proposal raised a crucial point: women's participation in (other) productive activities might lead to neglect of critical tasks in food production for the household. The proposal rightly promoted saving and loans groups; this type of groups can benefit women as they allow them to gain control of any income that is generated. In 2010 a new project component was included in the programme: "Empowerment of Malawi women through Savings and Credit Cooperatives" (Addendum No. 1)

With regard to the Mngeta rice farm in Tanzania, which is a commercial venture (funded by Norfund), there was no consideration or reference to gender aspects; nor was gender-disaggregated data collected (Case Study report).

1.4. Gender aspects at specific objective/results levels

Gender aspects were included at specific objectives and results levels (outcome level) in five cases only, as outlined below¹⁵.

The DF project (2007-2011) in Malawi was a framework agreement and did not originally include a logical framework. Such a log frame was developed in 2010, and two new outcomes were formulated to express more explicitly the aspects relating to women empowerment and HIV/AIDS. Outcome 5 thus focused on "Increased women participation" (Annual Plan 2010).

The Messanu programme in Ethiopia targeted vulnerable groups, including female-headed households. During the 2008-2010 project period, one out of five specific objectives focused on the gender aspect: "Strengthen community based health care and gender by filling identified gaps in the capacity of the community and health staff through training". The term "gender" was, however, not clearly defined. With regard to expected results, the proposals of both periods included reference to gender aspects: "90

¹⁴In the case of the Messanu programme in Ethiopia, only the 2004-2006 project proposal was assessed. The project proposal for 2008-2010 was not available for the current review; moreover, the objectives in the yearly operational documents varied slightly from year to year, making the assessment more difficult.

¹⁵ The global evaluation referred to two cases. The divergence was due to disparity between some of the project documents.

women trained in income diversification, business skills and awareness creation and sensitization” (Log frame 2004-2006) and “community awareness in harmful traditional practices, HIV/AIDS, nutrition and mainstreaming of gender in development activities” (Project Proposal 2008-2010).

ASP in Tanzania partly addressed gender in the objectives for one of the five components: “Development of a critical mass of self-confident and emerging entrepreneurs, who identify and sustainably exploit business opportunities mainly on their farm, with adequate women-headed household representation”. Under component 5, one of the specific outcomes were “increased gender mainstreaming among support entities”¹⁶ (End of Programme report – no date)

The NASFAM programme in Malawi included as one of the ten expected outputs: “improved gender sensitivity and promotion of female participation” (NASFAM III Proposal 2006).

The UNCCD Programme in Ethiopia included gender aspects as one out of 19 expected results: “Knowledge and understanding of targeted members of the local community specifically women and marginalised groups in productive decision-making is increased and women’s asset holding capacity increased” (Final Log Frame February 2010).

The remaining fourteen programmes reviewed did not include gender aspects at the specific objective or results level.

1.5. Activities targeting women

Even if the main part of the programmes did not include gender aspects at result and specific objective levels, several programmes, mainly those by NGOs (CAP I, Zambia; Lake Chilwa, Malawi and Messanu, Ethiopia), but also the research programme CCIAM in Tanzania, included activities targeting women. For some projects, these activities were not reflected at the results level, which was a missed opportunity.

CCIAM in Tanzania, for instance, included the training of women in planting and grafting fruit trees under the research project: “Promotion and Intensification of fruit trees in agricultural farm lands for improved greener environment”. The project (demonstration plot) was not specifically targeting women, but the majority of the farmers trained (a total of 12 farmers) happened to be women. With regard to CAP I in Zambia, women’s gardens (for food crops) were established, as mentioned earlier. FISP in Malawi, which targeted in total 1.4 million farmers, was also targeting female-headed households as part of the beneficiary group. NASFAM focused on promoting sensitivity to gender and market forces in crop selection under the Key Priority Area: “Member livelihood improved”. However, as earlier mentioned, gender-sensitivity in relation to crop selection was not clearly spelt out. The two Lake programmes in Malawi both targeted women’s groups. In the Lake Chilwa programme, 45 groups of women fish traders were supported with new solar fish dryers and other equipment, and in the Malawi Lake Basin Programme, saving and loan groups for women were supported. Lastly, with regard to the Rural Livelihood programme in Malawi, credit and saving groups were established with a majority of female members.

¹⁶ The ASP log frame is not aligned with the OECD DAC standard log frame. Apart from the overall goal and objective there are objectives and outcomes for each of the five components.

According to the case study reports and project documentation, the remaining programmes did not include activities targeting women. This was for instance the case with the REDD programme and the commercial rice farm in Tanzania.

1.6. Gender-disaggregated data

Gender-disaggregated data was collected in 14 of the reviewed interventions (REDD, EPINAV, TAP in Tanzania; ASP, CASPP, COMACO, CAP I and the Netherlands Delegated Programme (Zambia National Farmers Union, ZNFU and Golden Valley Agricultural Research Trust, GART) in Zambia; the Rural Livelihood programme, FISP and NASFAM in Malawi; UNCCD and Messanu in Ethiopia and Prorural in Nicaragua). In the remaining five programmes (CCIAM and the Mngeta Rice Farm in Tanzania, Lake Chilwa and Malawi Lake Basin in Malawi and Lake Managua in Nicaragua), there was no evidence of gender-disaggregated data.

However, even though the majority of the programmes included gender-disaggregated data, in most cases only a few indicators were gender specific. COMACO in Zambia was for instance only reporting on the number of male and female beneficiaries (participants); the farmers' cards included a number of other data (gender-disaggregated); however, these data were not compiled. TAP in Tanzania only included gender-specific data on the number of trained farmers, and for FISP in Malawi, gender-specific data were collected on how many female-headed versus male-headed households participated.

Further analysis of the programmes also revealed a tendency not to consider gender-specific data collection at the start of programme implementation. In these cases, it apparently became clear to the programme management teams later on that gender data was necessary, and such data were therefore collected during implementation (but with no reference to the initial situation, making it impossible to compare the situation before and after the programme). This was, for example, the case for the Malawi Lake Basin programme (gender data was planned to be collected in future surveys), CASPP in Zambia (the surveys carried out at the end of programme implementation were gender-disaggregated, but gender-disaggregated baseline data were not available), and for TAP in Tanzania (sub-contracted institutions reported data per gender during the programme cycle). In contrast, the EPINAV research programme in Tanzania collected gender-disaggregated data at baseline level.

With regard to CAP I in Zambia, several indicators were gender-disaggregated. However, indicators generally referred to "female farmers" and did not distinguish between female farmers in male-headed households and female farmers heading their own households, although their conditions are quite different. Female-headed households will be concerned with food security, but will also need to grow crops for accumulating cash. It should also be noted that there is no indicator addressing whether women in male-headed household attain economic independence, even though this appeared to be one of the purposes of establishing women's gardens, according to the analysis (Project Proposal 2006).

Conclusion

The following trends were observed in the reviewed programmes:

1). The strong focus on rights and gender in the 2004 Plan of Action, defined as women's rights and participation in agricultural development, was not well reflected in the reviewed programmes. The programmes generally applied a needs-based approach rather than a rights-based approach, and gender was not integrated systematically and consistently. Several projects addressed gender to some extent (activities targeting women, gender-disaggregated indicators, etc.). However, no project was identified which systematically included all the required elements in addressing gender: gender analysis, gender design (mainstreaming/gender component), gender addressed at results/specific objective level, gender activities and gender-disaggregated data.

2). Very few project proposals included an analysis of gender relations. When a gender analysis was available, it commonly referred to a general gender imbalance, but it failed to provide a specific analysis of gender roles in the targeted areas. It appeared that in most cases the gender analysis was based on a general assumption that women have unequal access to resources, rather than on a solid knowledge of gender relations in the specific context.

3). Concerning the project design, many programmes referred to gender at a very general level. They gave the impression of an "add on" which did not receive much attention (if any) when the project was designed. For example, it had an aim of equitable participation without providing specific information on how this should be done in practice. Some programmes (e.g. Lake Chilwa, Malawi) referred to gender mainstreaming (or gender sensitivity) in the project proposals; however, this was most often planned to be handled during implementation, and it was not made part of the project design. If it is not integrated in the project design, there is a risk that the project will unintentionally jeopardize the interests of women. For example, the programme might promote crops and/or livestock which only men have the right to own, and thus the programme will not benefit women. Or the project will promote women's participation in different project activities. Yet it will not give women increased control, but simply add to their workload. Therefore the participation of women should not always be the objective; we need to examine whether women will actually gain from participating.

4). With few exceptions, the reviewed programmes did not distinguish between women in male-headed and female-headed households, even though their conditions, roles and rights are quite different. Programmes commonly referred to female-headed households, as these are often considered particularly vulnerable, but they generally treated male-headed households as a nuclear entity. Intra-household relations were given very limited attention in all the reviewed programmes, despite the fact that households in many parts of the world (e.g. East Africa) consist of different economic spheres for men and women, with gender-specific rights such as disposal/ownership of different crops and types of livestock. The specific intra-household division of labour and decision-making processes is also crucial in determining whether women will benefit from project activities.

5). The reviewed programmes varied slightly with regard to how much gender was addressed in the project design. Public-Private Partnerships (PPP) programmes only addressed gender aspects to a very limited extent (if at all), whereas NGO-implemented livelihood projects performed better in this respect. Another category of programmes where gender issues were only addressed to a very limited extent (if at all), was environmental/climate change programmes (e.g. REDD in Tanzania and Lake Chilwa Climate Change Programme in Malawi). Overall, it seems that there was limited, if any,

recognition of the importance of gender in relation to environment/climate change during the period under study. The only exception was CA programmes.

The new food security strategy launched in 2012, “Food Security in a Climate Perspective”, strongly promotes gender in relation to climate change. One of its core elements is climate-adapted agriculture (climate-smart agriculture) for small-holders in Africa. This is because poor small-holders are particularly vulnerable to the effects of climate changes. With regard to gender, the strategy argues for better gender equality as a necessary precondition for a successful implementation of climate-adapted agriculture which increases productivity and reduces poverty, as women have an important role in agriculture. Gender should therefore be mainstreamed in agricultural policy. It is not known whether the Norwegian-supported agricultural (climate change) programmes that are now being implemented will do better in addressing/mainstreaming gender. However, unless the above-mentioned shortcomings in integrating gender are addressed in the current programmes, there is a risk that the new strategy will fail.

Recommendations

1. Programme staff in Norad and at embassy level should receive training in gender analysis and in how to design programmes with gender in mind.
2. When designing/approving a project, the implementing partners, Norad and the embassies should ensure the following:
 - a) All agricultural project proposals should include an analysis of women’s role in agriculture, including: a) Women’s access and right to (control over) productive assets (land, livestock, family labour, etc.) in national and customary law; b) Access to agricultural inputs and services; c) Intra-household gender relations (division of labour, right of disposal/ownership and decision-making). The analysis should distinguish between women in male-headed and female-headed households. Annex 3 provides a check list of some relevant issues to look into. In a few specific cases, gender might not be relevant; if so, that should be explained and discussed in the proposal.
 - b) Based on the gender analysis, measures which enhance women’s right and access to and control over resources should be integrated in the project design (gender components/mainstreaming). Relevant measures might for instance include: advocacy for women’s right to land and other resources; promotion of crops or animals which women have the right to own/dispose of, enhancing women’s access to agro-inputs and services, including credit; ensuring that women participate equally in training, etc. (provided this will give women extra benefits and not just add to their workload).
 - c) If gender is relevant to the project, gender aspects should be included at least at the result level.

- d) M&E systems for a project should collect gender-disaggregated data based on gender-disaggregated indicators. The M&E systems should also distinguish between women in male-headed and female-headed households.
3. All projects should report on the integration of gender (gender components/gender mainstreaming) as part of the reporting system (annual reports, final reports, etc.).

Annex 1: List of country-level programmes that were reviewed

Country	Extending Agency	Agreement Partner	Agreement title	Project implementation period	Total disbursed until end 2011 (NOK)
In-depth case studies					
Malawi	Embassy	Min.of Finance	Farm Inputs Subsidy Programme (FISP)	2011-2012	67,000,000
Malawi	Norad	DF	Rural Livelihoods Programme	2007-2011	17,017,525
Malawi	Embassy	Swedish Cooperative Centre	Malawi's Lake Basin Programme Phase II	2009-2012	36,330,000
Malawi	Embassy	Min. of Natural Resources and Environ. Affairs	Lake Chilwa Basin Climate Change Programme	2010-2014	21,500,000
Tanzania	Norad	Agricultural Council of Tanzania	Tan. Agricultural Partnership (TAP) – First Phase of a National Rollout 1	2008-2011	23,150,000
Tanzania	Embassy	Min. of Finance	Enhancing Pro-poor Innovations in Natural Resources (EPINAV)	2010-2014	18,381,007
Tanzania	Embassy	Min. of Finance	Climate Change Impacts, Adaptation and Mitigation in Tanzania (CCIAM)	2009-2014	37,798,540
Tanzania	Embassy	AWF	African Wildlife Foundation –Advancing REDD in the Kolo Hills Forests (ARKFor)	2010-2013	7,944,618
Zambia	Embassy	WCS	Community Markets for Conservation (COMACO) Phase II	2009-2014	33,963,552
Zambia	Embassy	SIDA	Norway-Sweden Delegated Agricultural Support: Agriculture Support Programme (ASP)	2003-2008	50,000,000
Zambia	Embassy	Netherlands Ministry for Development Cooperation	Norway-Netherlands Delegated Agricultural Support	2004-2008	40,493,049
Zambia	Embassy	FAO	FAO-MACO Conservation Agriculture (CASPP)	2009-2010	31,024,141
Light case studies					
Ethiopia	Norad	DF	Ethio-Norwegian UNCCD Programme	2007-2011	59,423.102
Ethiopia	Norad	NCA	Integrated Rural Development Programme, Messanu Areas	1998-2011	5,508,000
Nicaragua	Embassy	Min. of External Affairs	Support to Prorural	2006-2009	40,030,778

Country	Extending Agency	Agreement Partner	Agreement title	Project implementation period	Total disbursed until end 2011 (NOK)
Nicaragua	Embassy	ALMA	Lake Managua Sub-Basin III – Environmental Management	2008-2012	22,564,782
PETS case studies					
Malawi	Embassy	NASFAM	NASFAM Phase III – Improving the Livelihoods of Smallholder Farmers	2007-2011	88,000,000
Tanzania	Norfund	Agrica Limited	Mngeta Commercial Rice Farm	2010-2017/2018 (flexible exit)	60,798,010
Zambia	Embassy	ZNFU	Conservation Agricultural Programme I (CAP I)	2006-2011	146,000,000

Annex 2: References

Case Study reports for all 19 programmes

FAO (2004). What is gender? FAO Corporate Document Repository. Prepared by Economic and Social Development Department. www.fao.org/docrep/007/y5608e/y5608e01.htm

Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2004). Fighting Poverty through Agriculture. Norwegian Plan of Action for Agriculture in Norwegian Development Policy.

Norad (2011). Report from a Fact Finding Mission: Women, Gender and Conservation Agriculture in Zambia. Norad Report 5/2011 Discussion.

Udenriksdepartementet (2012). Matsikkerhed i et Klimaperspektiv. I samarbejd med Landbruks-og matdepartementet, Fiskeri-og kystdepartementet og Miljødepartementet. Strategi 2013-2015.

Project Documentation

Zambia

CAP I, Zambia

Conservation Farming Unit, CFU (2006). Reversing Food Insecurity and Environmental Degradation in Zambia through Conservation Agriculture (Project proposal).

CASPP, Zambia

Project Proposal, Zambia. (2008). Conservation Agriculture Scaling Up for increased Productivity and Production (CASPP). January 2009-December 2010.

Norway-Netherlands Delegated Agricultural Support; Zambia

Royal Norwegian Embassy, Lusaka (2004). Appropriation Document (BD). No.Zam 2004/MEG.

ASP, Zambia (Norway-Sweden Delegated Agricultural Support)

Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives. (No date). Agricultural Support Programme 2003-2008. End of Programme Report. SIDA/Rambøll

COMACO, Zambia

Contract between the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Wildlife Conservation Society of Zambia regarding Community Markets for Conservation (COMACO) phase II: Scaling up across Luangwa Valley (including project summary). 2009.

Wildlife Conservation Society of Zambia, WCS (2011). Annual Report 2011.

Malawi

FISP, Malawi

Farm Input Supply Programme, FISP (2011). Agreement between the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Government of the Republic of Malawi regarding 2011/2012 Farm Inputs Subsidy Programme.

Logistic Unit (2009). Final Report. Implementation of Agricultural Input Supply Programme 2008/2009. April 2009.

Logistic Unit (2010). Final Report. Implementation of Agricultural Input Supply Programme 2008/2009. April 2010.

Logistic Unit (2011). Final Report. Implementation of Agricultural Input Supply Programme 2010/2011. May 2011.

Logistic Unit (2012). Final Report. Implementation of Agricultural Input Supply Programme 2011/2012. May 2012.

NASFAM, Malawi

National Smallholder Farmers' Association of Malawi, NASFAM (2006). Improving the Livelihoods of Malawian Smallholder Farmers. A Proposal for continued support to NASFAM . Presented to Government of Norway. Project proposal, originally presented November 2005; last revised 16th October 2006.

Lake Chilwa Climate Change Programme

Lake Chilwa Climate Change Programme (2009). Funding proposal submitted to the RNE. 31 March 2009.

Malawi Lake Basin Programme- Phase II

Malawi's Lake Basin Programme (2009). Livelihood Improvement of Rural Communities in Malawi. Operational Programme Document. February 2009

Addendum No 1 to Contract between the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Swedish Cooperative Centre regarding Malawi's Lake Basin Programme – Phase II. 2010.

DF, Malawi

Programdokument (No date).Udviklingsfondets Søknad for samarbeidsavtale 2007-2011. Project Proposal.

Revised programme outcomes and indicators (2010). Appendix to Annual Plan 2010.

Tanzania

REDD

African Wildlife Foundation (2009). Advancing REDD in the Kolo Hill Forests (ARKFor). Revised November 2009 (Project Proposal).

Logical Framework (no date). Advancing REDD in the Kolo Hill Forests (ARKFor) project.

CCIAM

Climate Change, Impacts, Adaptation and Mitigation in Tanzania (2009). The CCIAM Programme July 2009-June 2014. Sokoine University. July 1, 2009. Project Proposal.

EPINAV

Sokoine University of Agriculture, SUA (2009). Enhancing Pro-poor Innovations in Natural Resources and Agricultural Value-Chains. Proposed Programme Document. July 2010-2014.

TAP

Agricultural Council of Tanzania, ACT (no date). A Proposal to Norad for Support of the Tanzania Agricultural Partnership (TAP) in the First Phase of a National Rollout (NRO). The Agricultural Council of Tanzania.

Ethiopia

Integrated Rural Development Programme, Messanu Areas

Relief Society of Tigray, REST (2004). Integrated Food Security Programme. Messanu and surrounding areas. Project Proposal (2004-2006). Submitted to Norwegian Church Aid (NCA).

UNCCD

Program Proposal (2007). Ethio-Norwegian UNCCD Programme 2007-2011. Version 5, June 21, 2007.

Development Fund's follow-up of evaluation reports on UNCCD programs (October 4, 2012; by Christoffer Ringnes Klyve, Director, International Department).

Revised, final log frame. February 2010

Nicaragua

Prorural

Implementacion del Plan Nacional de Desarrollo Rural Productivo (no date). Project Proposal.

Lake Managua Sub-Basin III-Environmental Management

AMUSCLAM (2008). Documento de Proyecto. Ingenieria Caura de Nicaragua, S.A. Project Proposal.

Annex 3: Abbreviations

AIDS	Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
ALMA	Alcaldia de Managua
ARKFor	Advancing REDD in the Kolo Hill Forests
ASP	Agricultural Support Programme
AWF	African Wildlife Foundation
CA	Conservation Agriculture
CAP	Conservation Agriculture Programme
CASPP	Conservation Agriculture Scaling Up for Increased Productivity and Production
CCIAM	Climate Change Impacts, Adaptation and Mitigation
CF	Conservation Farming
CFU	Conservation Farming Unit
COMACO	Community Markets for Conservation
DF	Development Fund
EPINAV	Enhancing Pro-poor Innovations in Natural Resources
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FISP	Farm Input Support Programme
FK	Fredskorpset
GART	Golden Valley Agricultural Research Trust
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
MACO	Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs

NASFAM	National Association of Smallholder Farmers in Malawi
NCA	Norwegian Church Aid
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NOK	Norwegian Kroner
PPP	Public Private Partnership
REDD	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation
REST	Relief Society of Tigray
SIDA	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
SMART	Specific, Measurable, Accessible, Realistic, Time bound
SUA	Sokoine University of Agriculture
SWOT	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats
TAP	Tanzanian Agricultural Partnership Programme
TOR	Terms of Reference
UNCCD	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
WCS	Wildlife Conservation Society of Zambia
ZNFU	Zambia National Farmers Union

Annex 4: Gender Analysis

The three areas below are important when addressing gender in agriculture (gender analysis and programming). It is crucial to distinguish between women in male-headed households (wives) and women who are heads of households (female-headed households) as their needs and rights of disposal/ownership are not necessarily the same. It is, moreover, important to distinguish between the national law and customary law when discussing women's rights.

- 1) **Women's access and right to (control over) productive assets (land, livestock, family labour, etc.)**
- 2) **Access to agricultural inputs, services and credit**
Policy makers, planners and agricultural service providers often consider farmers to be male, and agricultural inputs such as technology, extension, training and services often target the needs of male farmers and ignore the needs of female farmers.
- 3) **Intra-household gender relations.**
Some key aspects to look into are mentioned below.

Household gender relations: Does the household function as a nuclear family, or is it divided into different economic spheres for husband and wife/wives? In areas where the household economy is divided into different economic spheres for men and women, programmes supporting men's activities will not necessarily benefit the whole family. There is evidence that programmes supporting women's activities to a greater extent will benefit/be used for the general welfare of the family, in particular the children.

Right of disposal/ownership: (to crops and livestock): in many countries men are traditionally entitled to the income from sale of cash crops, whereas women have the right to food crops (which are mostly used for food consumption; in the case of a surplus, women can sell the crops and dispose of the income). This is still the case in some societies; however, in many cases crops function both as cash crops and food crops, or former food crops have been commercialised and men have gained control over them. It is important to understand the function of crops, as this often designates women's and men's right of disposal/ownership.

Division of labour: In most countries, agricultural tasks are strictly divided between men and women – some activities are considered men's work (e.g. ploughing in some areas), whereas other types of work are considered women's work (e.g. weeding in some areas). There can be huge differences between different areas – in most countries with gendered economic spheres (e.g. East Africa and Southern Africa), women will be responsible for cultivating food crops, while they at the same time also assist men with cash crops.

Decision-making: How are household decisions traditionally made? Jointly, or are men traditionally the decision-makers? In which areas are women entitled to make decisions?



Norad

Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation

Postal address:

P.O. Box 8034 Dep, NO-0030 OSLO

Office address:

Ruseløkkveien 26, Oslo, Norway

Tel: +47 23 98 00 00

Fax: +47 23 98 00 99

postmottak@norad.no

www.norad.no

