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## Abbreviations and acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4Ps</td>
<td>Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Programme (Philippines)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCT</td>
<td>Conditional Cash Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTP</td>
<td>Cash Transfer Programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDAW</td>
<td>Convention on All Forms of Discrimination against Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSPVA</td>
<td>Gender-sensitive poverty and vulnerability analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDS</td>
<td>Institute of Development Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>International Labour Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPC–IG</td>
<td>International Policy Centre for Inclusive Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGNREGS</td>
<td>Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (India)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODI</td>
<td>Overseas Development Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSNP</td>
<td>Productive Safety Net Programme (Ethiopia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWP</td>
<td>Public Works Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>Social protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VUP</td>
<td>Vision 2020 Umurenge Programme (Rwanda)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children's Fund</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

Welcome to FAO Technical Guide 2 – Integrating gender into the design of cash transfer and public works programmes. This is the second of three technical guides in the Toolkit on gender-sensitive social protection programmes to combat rural poverty and hunger (see Figure 1).

Figure 1: Overview of technical guides and key issues covered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overview</th>
<th>Themes covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Technical Guide 1: Introduction to gender-sensitive SP programming.** | • Why gender-sensitive approach to social protection matters?  
• How gender inequalities affect rural women’s vulnerability to poverty and crises?  
• How social protection programmes impact gender equality and rural women’s empowerment?  
• Key dimensions of gender-sensitive approach to social protection. |
| **Technical Guide 2: Gender-sensitive design of cash transfers and PWPs.** | • Guidance for undertaking a gender-sensitive poverty and vulnerability analysis  
• How to integrate gender into core features of cash transfers?  
• How to integrate gender into core features of public works programmes  
• Linking social transfers with gender-sensitive complementary interventions |
| **Technical Guide 3: Gender-sensitive programme implementation and M&E.** | • Why gender-sensitive implementation matters?  
• Key dimensions of gender-sensitive programme implementation  
• The role of gender-sensitive M&E and learning systems  
• How to develop a gender-sensitive M&E framework? |

The purpose of the Toolkit

This Toolkit on gender-sensitive social protection programmes to combat rural poverty and hunger is designed to support social protection (SP) practitioners in their efforts to systematically apply a gender lens to SP programmes in ways that are in line with FAO commitments1 to expanding inclusive SP systems for rural populations. The Toolkit is intended to deepen the knowledge and technical skills practitioners require to integrate gender issues effectively into the design, delivery, and monitoring and evaluation of cash transfers and public works programmes (PWPs). The Toolkit has a specific focus on SP’s role in reducing

---

1 Consult the FAO Social Protection Framework (FAO, 2017) for the Organization’s corporate approach and programmatic work in SP.
Toolkit on gender-sensitive social protection programmes to combat rural poverty and hunger

Gender inequalities and rural poverty and hunger. For a detailed discussion of the rationale and scope of the Toolkit, see Technical Guide 1. The Toolkit is designed for government staff involved in SP programme development and implementation. It may also be of use to FAO gender and social protection focal points in regional and country offices, development partners and SP practitioners in general.

Overview of Technical Guide 2

Technical Guide 2, which provides practical advice on how to formulate and design a gender-sensitive cash transfer and PWP, has four parts:

- **Part 1**: A guide to undertaking a gender-sensitive poverty and vulnerability analysis (GSPVA).
- **Part 2**: How to integrate gender considerations into the core design features of cash transfers.
- **Part 3**: How to integrate gender considerations into the core design features of PWPs.
- **Part 4**: Enhancing gender impacts of social transfers through complementary support.

Technical Guide 2 combines conceptual and empirical insights, illustrative examples, and practical tools, such as checklists and exercises (see Annexes 1-5). It is intended for beginners and men and women with an intermediate level of experience in working in SP policy and programming.

How should the technical guides be used?

The technical guides in the Toolkit follow a logical programming sequence: from planning and design to implementation and monitoring and evaluation. Each technical guide can be used as a stand-alone resource or in combination with the other technical guides. Figure 1 indicates the key issues and topics covered in the technical guides. Users can work at their own pace and according to their personal interests and learning objectives, without direct guidance or facilitation.

The technical guides can be adapted for, and used in face-to-face training workshops with a dedicated facilitator to respond to specific country demands and contexts. The combination of techniques used throughout the technical guides is designed to build on the participants’ existing knowledge and experience.
How were the technical guides prepared?

The technical guides are based on:

- a comprehensive review of literature on gender, rural poverty and vulnerability, SP, and gender-sensitive SP programming. The review combined theoretical and conceptual review of literature including impact evaluations and case studies;
- expert consultations with key partners within and outside FAO;
- policy and operational insights into gender-sensitive SP, gathered during a series of webinar events on gender and SP organized by FAO and the IPC-IG; and
- a peer review by external experts, academics and senior FAO staff.

---

PART 1
A guide to undertaking a gender-sensitive poverty and vulnerability analysis (GSPVA)

KEY OBJECTIVES:
To deepen understanding of the importance of gender-sensitive poverty and vulnerability analysis (GSPVA); and gain practical skills to execute the GSPVA and use the findings to inform programme formulation.

IMPORTANT NOTE:
This section is intended as a quick guide to conducting a GSPVA. It should not be considered exhaustive. Readers are encouraged to review other available tools and resources to expand their knowledge and skills on these topics. Links to additional materials are provided in Annex 6.
1.1 Purpose and objectives of the GSPVA

The GSPVA is a starting point for developing gender-sensitive SP programmes. Before formulating programme objectives and design features, it is critical to establish a comprehensive understanding of gender dynamics in a given context and their links to rural poverty. Conducting the GSPVA allows SP programme designers to understand the ways poverty and vulnerability affect women and men differently throughout their lives, and the different needs women and men have for SP. This information can help to identify gender equality programme objectives, and ensure the programme is designed in a manner that is sensitive to these different needs and priorities of men and women. In this way, the SP programme can better satisfy both the practical needs of women and men (e.g. food, housing, employment) and their strategic interests (e.g. education and training, decision-making, political power).

The GSPVA asks questions in four key areas:

i. What are the specific risks and vulnerabilities that rural women and men face? How do gender norms and inequalities affect the vulnerability and poverty of women relative to men?

ii. What are the various potential gender-related factors (e.g. the socio-cultural, economic, financial, political and legal obstacles) that limit the participation of rural women and men in the programme, and hinder their access to and control over benefits?

iii. What are the programme's likely gendered impacts, both positive and negative, and how are different stakeholders likely to affect, or be affected by, the programme activities and outcomes?

iv. What are the potential challenges and opportunities for the SP programmes to promote gender equality and economic empowerment of rural women?

Box 1 provides an example of a GSPVA in action.

Performing the GSPVA allows programme designers to develop SP programmes that help rural women and men to overcome poverty and food insecurity in a more effective and sustainable way by: (i) taking the specific needs, priorities and perspectives of both women and men into account; (ii) not excluding or harming the well-being of women and men; and (iii) addressing gender-specific livelihood constraints.

The GSPVA is particularly relevant during the formulation stage of the SP programme. It enables staff to integrate gender effectively into key elements of SP programming based on evidence and data. The analysis can also be applied during programme implementation to support managers in assessing progress and redressing any shortcomings in programme design. The GSPVA can also generate baseline data that can be used to track the impact of the programme on gender-related issues (see Technical Guide 5 for information on gender-sensitive monitoring and evaluation of SP).
Box 1: A GSPVA in action in Aceh

At the start of the Integrated Development Programme in Aceh, Indonesia, programme staff conducted a baseline survey to understand the employment needs of women. The study indicated that women who were the head of their households occupied the most vulnerable positions in the labour market and therefore were more likely to be at a greater risk of exploitation, especially in post-disaster situations. The study identified gender inequalities in the distribution of benefits between women and men as a potential risk for achieving equitable outcomes, and noted that this situation needed to be addressed by the programme. As a result, guidelines were developed to ensure that the programme’s design promotes and adheres to gender equality during the recruitment of labour for the construction projects, and ensures inclusive community participation and information sharing.

Source: Tanzam and Gutierrez, 2015.

1.2 Key elements of the GSPVA

The GSPVA consists of the following components:

- **Gender-sensitive context and livelihoods analysis**
- **Vulnerability analysis**
- **Poverty analysis**
- **Stakeholder analysis**
- **Programme review**

These five thematic areas build on each other. Depending on the scope of the research, the analysis can collect data across all five thematic areas for a thorough assessment. Alternatively, the research team can focus on selected issues that are in line with the specific needs of the programme and available resources. It is important to note that the GSPVA works best when embedded in the existing overarching poverty and vulnerability assessments employed at the start of the formulation stage of the SP programme. In the following section, we explain the purpose of each thematic area and the key issues they investigate.

i. **Gender and livelihoods analysis**

**Purpose:** Gender and livelihoods analysis can be used to map key gender issues and explore gender inequalities in (i) the roles and responsibilities of men and women, including their economic activities and care activities; (ii) the livelihood strategies and opportunities of women and men; (iii) access to and control over productive resources (e.g. land, equipment, tools, work, credit and household income) and time, as well as access to services and information; and (iv) involvement in, and influence over decision-making processes at household and community levels. The GSPVA can also be used to assess the underlying causes of these gender differences (e.g. socio-cultural norms, practices, rules and policies) and the ways these causes can produce unequal gender outcomes in well-being, livelihood security and poverty. Finally, the analysis can identify the potential barriers (e.g. limited access to information, little free time, restricted mobility and opportunity costs) that may affect the participation of rural women and men in the programme and the benefits they derive from it.
Based on this information gathered in the GSPVA, programme designers can start to map the needs of women and men that require attention, and identify programme features and activities for effectively reaching and benefiting both rural women and men.

Gender and livelihood analysis

Maps gender differences
- Roles and responsibilities, including economic and care activities;
- Access to, ownership and control over productive resources, services and information; and
- Participation in decision-making processes.

Identifies barriers to access SP
Access to information, time availability, mobility, and opportunity costs that may affect rural women and men’s participation and benefits from the programme.

Identifies ‘real’ needs
Programme designers can use the data to begin to map women and men’s needs for support and identify programme features and activities for effectively reaching both rural women and men.

Guiding questions:
- What are the policy and legal frameworks and institutional mechanisms supporting gender equality?
- What are the main roles and activities for women and men regarding productive and reproductive and time use roles?
- What are the gender differences in access to productive resources, land, assets, labour, services and markets?
- What are the main livelihood activities for men and women in the household, including activities related to social transfers?
- What are the gender differences in access to employment opportunities (wage labour, PWP)?
- Who makes decisions regarding expenditures, the crops to plant and cash transfers?
- To what extent are women participating in community-based organizations?
- What are the potential barriers women and men face in participating in the programme and deriving benefits from it?

CHECKLIST: Table 5 in Annex 1 suggests detailed guiding questions and tools for carrying out this type of analysis.

TIMING: The analysis should be conducted at the start of the research. It forms the basis for exploring gender dimensions of poverty and vulnerability.
ii. **Vulnerability analysis**

**Purpose**: The vulnerability analysis assesses the main sources of vulnerabilities faced by rural women and men at the community, household and individual level. These sources of vulnerability include socio-economic, environmental, health and life-cycle risks. The analysis looks at the gender-specific manifestations of this vulnerability and their implications for rural livelihood security and poverty. It also explores the different capacities women and men have to manage risk and withstand crises, and the strategies they adopt to cope with shocks and stresses. This data can be used to identify programming options for strengthening the resilience of women and men to enable them to effectively manage risks. The findings of the vulnerability analysis can also help identify opportunities for beneficiaries to accumulate productive, financial and social assets, and determine the role of SP in this process.

**Guiding questions:**

- What are the main sources of vulnerability in the community/household?
- How do these affect the livelihood systems, assets and well-being of women and men?
- Do men and women experience different types of shocks or stresses?
- What are the gender differences in coping capacities and mechanisms? What are the causes of these differences?
- What are the differences in impacts to disasters and/or climate change on men and women? What are the causes of these differences?
- What are the life-cycle events specific to women that increase their vulnerability?
- What strategies do men and women use to minimize risk and cope with shocks and stresses?
- What are the most important risks and vulnerabilities faced by the community/household from the perspective of women and men?

**CHECKLIST**: Table 6 in Annex 1 suggests detailed guiding questions and tools for carrying out a vulnerability analysis.

**TIMING**: The vulnerability analysis can be conducted after the information from the gender and livelihood analysis has been gathered.
iii. Poverty analysis

**Purpose:** A gender approach to poverty analysis focuses on the identification of gender differences in all phases of the poverty cycle, including: (i) the root causes and factors that push rural women and men into poverty (this phase builds on the results of the vulnerability assessment); (ii) the ways in which poverty is experienced by women and men and its outcomes; and (iii) the options men and women have for escaping poverty (see Technical Guide 1, Part 4 for an analytical framework on the links between gender and rural poverty).

An examination of intrahousehold poverty dynamics and outcomes is the critical dimension of the poverty analysis in the GSPVA. A conventional poverty analysis, which is generally based on household-level information, typically looks at income and consumption indicators. It often fails to acknowledge significant differences between men and women and between generations within households (Chant, ed., 2010). The intrahousehold poverty analysis in the GSPVA explores how gender roles and access to opportunities and entitlements within the household affect men, women, boys and girls as individuals.

The poverty analysis in the GSPVA also explores how gender-related poverty outcomes vary according to household composition (e.g. whether it is a male-headed or female-headed nuclear family, an extended family or polygamous family). It also documents the poverty experience of particularly vulnerable groups of rural women who, in addition to gender inequalities, face other forms of discrimination and disadvantage related to a range of factors, such as ethnicity, religion, occupation, caste and location. This analysis can help to identify a set of gender-sensitive options and actions to address poverty and food insecurity at the individual and household level.

**Guiding questions:**

- What have been the government policy and institutional responses to poverty (e.g. policies, institutions, support mechanisms, safety nets)?
- How is gender equality addressed in policies, institutions, and support mechanisms?
- What are the main characteristics of rural poverty, and how does it differ for men and women?
Are women at a greater risk of income poverty and multidimensional poverty? Why?

What are the main causes of poverty, as perceived by women and men?

What causes these differences (e.g. discriminatory social norms, barriers to economic resources, time use)?

What are the opportunities and mechanisms that women and men view as enabling households and individual household members to escape from poverty and start a process of capital accumulation?

What are the main needs and priorities for support among women and men?

**CHECKLIST:** Table 7 in Annex 1 suggests the detailed guiding questions and tools for carrying out a poverty analysis.

**TIMING:** This is a core activity of the GSPVA. It draws on both secondary data and fieldwork research from the other components of the GSPVA.

**iv. Stakeholder analysis**

**Purpose:** Community members and institutions often have different priorities, interests and needs related to SP, poverty reduction and gender equality. Conflicts of interest are common, particularly concerning culturally sensitive issues, such as changes in gender roles and power relations, and the promotion of women’s empowerment. The stakeholder analysis can be used to identify (i) different types of stakeholders; (ii) their relative stake in a given SP programme and their influence over programme objectives and outcomes; (iii) their potential level of support for or resistance to the proposed initiative; and (iv) the likely impact of the programme on stakeholders and community relations.

Potential stakeholders include intended beneficiaries; government agencies at the national, regional and local levels; donors; front-line government workers and service providers; and community members. Programme planners can use the data from the stakeholder analysis to identify strategies to promote collaboration between stakeholders in order to reach consensus, build commitments towards gender equality goals and gender-sensitive programming features and manage potential risks.
Guiding questions:

- Who are the main stakeholders?
- What are their priorities and interests with regard to poverty reduction, gender equality and SP?
- How supportive are they to the proposed gender-sensitive programming?
- Are there certain groups that stand to gain or lose more than others? Men and women? Rich or poor? Who will be disadvantaged?
- Which stakeholders could influence the success of the proposed programme? How can they be engaged effectively?
- Are there any stakeholders who are likely to be negatively affected and who have not yet been consulted? How can this be addressed?
- Are there any potential allies among the stakeholders who could help to enhance the voice and influence of the weaker stakeholders?

CHECKLIST: Table 8 in Annex 1 suggests the guiding questions and tools for carrying out a stakeholder analysis.

TIMING: The stakeholder analysis can be used at any stage of the programme cycle, including the programme preparation stage and mid-term reviews. It can build upon existing information at each successive phase.

v. Programme review

Purpose: The purpose of the programme review is to assess the level of gender integration within the programme formulation phase and at the same time sharpen the programme’s gender focus and relevance. The programme review examines how gender differences and priorities of rural women and men as identified by the GSPVA, can be (or have been) considered in key aspects of the programme design, implementation and monitoring and evaluation to ensure that women and men benefit equally from the intervention.

An important component of the programme review is an institutional assessment of the capacities to mainstream gender within SP programmes (e.g. in the Ministry of Social Protection, and with gender focal points). Evidence can be collected on a government’s policy commitments to gender equality, the capacity of staff for gender mainstreaming, the existence of gender-sensitive programme implementation arrangements, and budgetary commitments towards gender-sensitive programme activities. Collected data can be used to inform an action plan to strengthen the staff and institutional capacities that are required to achieve gender-related programme objectives.
Programme review

Guiding questions:

- Are gender equality and/or women’s empowerment goals included in programme objectives?
- How is the programme ensuring that benefits accrue equally to both women and men?
- How is the targeting ensuring that women (or men) are preferentially targeted?
- Are women and men facing gender-specific barriers to participation in the programme? What are they? How does the programme plan to address these constraints?
- Do the proposed activities respond to the needs and priorities of women and men identified in the analyses?
- Are there funds earmarked to implement gender-related activities?
- Does the programme team have adequate gender expertise?
- Does the programme integrate gender into monitoring and evaluation frameworks and activities?

CHECKLIST: Table 9 in Annex 1 suggests the detailed guiding questions and tools for carrying out a programme review.

TIMING: The review can commence ex ante to inform programme development. The analysis can also be adapted and used ex post (e.g. mid-term review) to assess the extent to which the findings of the GSPVA have been reflected in the existing programme, and make recommendations to refine programme design and implementation arrangements.
1.3 Main steps in implementing the GSPVA

This section explains the three main steps for undertaking the GSPVA:

- **Step 1** Setting up the research team
- **Step 2** Planning and conducting the GSPVA
- **Step 3** Using the GSPVA findings to inform the programming

IMPORTANT NOTE: Please note that this section provides a brief guide to how to conduct the GSPVA analysis and data collection. It does not provide a detailed guide to undertaking general research on gender or SP. There are more comprehensive resources that can be consulted for these purposes, and they are referenced in this section.

1.3.1 Setting up the research team

A first step in implementing the GSPVA involves identifying and contracting the research team, and securing the resources required to conduct the analysis. It is critical to ensure that the programme staff has the necessary skills, adequate funding and the appropriate amount of time to undertake the work effectively. The GSPVA requires both general expertise in gender concepts, and familiarity with poverty and vulnerability dynamics across a wide range of sectors. The team conducting the assessment needs adequate facilitation skills, and an awareness of, and sensitivity to, gender-related research. In some circumstances where local capacity is particularly weak, the team may need to be supported or mentored by regional or international gender experts. This learning-by-doing approach can also be a useful way to build local capacities in conducting the GSPVA.

1.3.2 Planning and conducting the GSPVA

The research team needs to (i) define the scope of their analysis and (ii) select research methods for collecting the relevant data to answer the key research objectives. This section briefly explores how these two activities can be achieved.

a. **Determining the scope of the GSPVA**

To ensure the GSPVA can be successfully completed and be relevant, it is critical to establish from the outset the focus of the assessment that will guide the analysis. Conducting assessments within the five thematic areas discussed above makes it possible to generate a comprehensive picture of the issues that must be addressed in programming. However, covering every thematic area may be difficult, and perhaps even impossible given time and financial limitations.

The focus and scope of the GSPVA will also be determined by the type of programme (see Box 2), its size, and the availability of skilled staff and resources to undertake the analysis. The more concise and focused the research objectives are from the outset, the more useful the GSPVA will be. For example, one question that could be considered: should the programme address women's and girls' practical needs for food, education and health care, or also aim to empower them? Based on these overarching programme goals and parameters, the next step is to develop specific research objectives, identify the main issues to explore, and then prepare the key questions to guide the assessment.
Box 2: Tailoring analysis to cash transfers and PWPs

- In the case of cash transfers, the GSPVA can focus on understanding intrahousehold decision-making and the control and allocation of income from the cash transfer programme, particularly women’s control over cash. Without such an analysis, it would be challenging to adequately assess whether allocating benefits to women will translate into better gender relations, bring about greater improvements in women’s status, increase women’s contribution to economic decision-making, and have greater impacts on household poverty alleviation than non-targeted allocations of transfers (e.g. those given to the male household head or to any adult household member).

- In the case of PWPs, the GSPVA can focus on understanding the perceptions of men and women about women’s abilities and autonomy with regard to working and earning income outside the household; determining the extent of women’s triple work burden and time poverty; and identifying how the proposed programme may affect these aspects. To ensure that PWPs can adequately respond to women’s employment priorities, the GSPVA can also examine women’s needs relative to men’s with regard to infrastructure and community assets, desirable work conditions and their aspirations and training needs.

b. Selecting data collection methods

Once the scope of the analysis and objectives are determined, the next step is to select appropriate data sources and research methods to gather the necessary information and evidence. A desk-based literature review can be undertaken to identify the existing sources of information including sex- and age-disaggregated data (if available) on gender, poverty and vulnerability. Information can be typically found in poverty reduction strategies and social protection strategies, national statistics and surveys (e.g. living standards measurement studies, demographic and health surveys, time-use surveys), national development plans, country gender assessments and strategies, such as the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) reports, FAO Country Gender Assessments, and employment strategies.

While much of the basic information will be available in these secondary sources, it may also be necessary to undertake primary data collection. Different types of quantitative and qualitative methods are available to gather such information, including:

- household surveys and statistical analysis (quantitative research); and
- key informant interviews, focus group discussions, in-depth interviews and other methods (qualitative research).

FURTHER READING: Refer to Technical Guide 3, Part 2 for more discussion about qualitative and quantitative methods in the context of gender and social protection analysis.
Box 3: Adapting research methods to assess particular gender issues

- Statistical analysis and desk-based research are useful for collecting sex-disaggregated statistics on gender, rural poverty, food security and vulnerability. Large community meetings with frontline staff, government officials and community members are appropriate venues for stakeholder mapping to identify key actors and their reactions to the proposed programme, and for mapping the overall gender and poverty context in which the programme will operate.

- Focus group discussions with poor rural women and men are essential to understand the specific gender, poverty and vulnerability issues affecting the community and individuals, and determine the needs of poor women and their priorities for support. Single-sex focus groups may be more conducive to women’s participation and serve to ensure that women provide input into the discussions.

- Household interviews can enable the research team to explore important issues in greater depth. They can allow the team to interact with groups of rural women and men who may be difficult to reach through community meetings and focus groups because they are too resource-poor to participate or are not confident enough to speak up in public.

- Individual in-depth interviews with household members may allow women to express their own point of view more freely. They are a very useful means of gathering data on intrahousehold gender dynamics and their impact on the position of poor women living in male-headed households, the bargaining power these women have, and the ability of these women to participate in the programme and obtain benefits.

Tips to keep in mind when selecting the data collection methods

Tailor the selection of research methods to the specific issues you wish to capture. Certain research methods are more relevant for particular types of GSPVA (see Box 5).

Combine quantitative and qualitative methods to obtain a more accurate and comprehensive view of the situation. The research team should strive to employ data triangulation, which involves the use of different data collection methods and the comparison of data from different sources. For example, quantitative data can provide robust gender-disaggregated statistics on women’s time use, asset ownership and agricultural production, while qualitative methods may be needed to investigate more elusive issues related to women’s empowerment, including women’s bargaining power and agency, and/or their influence over key decisions in the household, which are difficult to capture with statistics or surveys.

Use participatory tools to understand gender and poverty dynamics at the household level. When collecting data, the use of participatory tools is recommended for engaging with intended beneficiaries, especially groups who are illiterate, and/or socially marginalized. However, applying participatory tools and methods in a group setting with vulnerable groups may not lead to better participation. Good facilitation skills are needed to make sure that these groups participate meaningfully and their voices are heard. Before selecting participants in a group discussion, the research team should identify the various groups of people in the community to ensure that the sample includes gender-sensitive categories, such as households headed by women or unpaid women farmers.
Once the data is collected, the information must be analysed and the findings synthesized in an easy-to-read document. A technical paper or a brief can be written to communicate the main findings and recommendations to various stakeholders. This document can be used to guide programme formulation.

**FURTHER READING:** For a further discussion of different types of research methods and examples of their application, there are many excellent guides that can be consulted. See for example the FAO Social Analysis for Agriculture and Rural Investment Projects: Field Guide, for a discussion on participatory tools.\(^3\) Other references are provided in Annex 6.

1.3.3 Using the GSPVA to inform programme features

The ultimate purpose of the GSPVA is to use the results to influence the SP programming processes and outcomes. Two final steps need to be undertaken to ensure this happens.

a. Disseminating the findings of the GSPVA

To promote the uptake of the GSPVA results, it is important to share the findings with a wide range of stakeholders at the national and community level. This is needed to (i) validate conclusions and recommendations; (ii) build consensus for prioritizing the issues to be taken forward in SP programming; and (iii) agree on a vision that reflects this consensus and supports the promotion of gender equality and women’s empowerment. Community representatives and potential beneficiaries should be involved in this process.

b. Using the findings to inform programming

At this point, the task is to package the key findings from the GSPVA so that they clearly identify and articulate how gender can be integrated in each stage of the programme cycle. A planning workshop can be organized with the main actors involved in programme design and implementation to begin developing the structure of the programme. This involves defining the key goals and objectives of the intervention, and deciding how these objectives can be achieved through specific design and implementation features, activities and inputs (see Table 1). These outputs would then inform the development of a logical framework that would guide gender-sensitive programme design and monitoring and evaluation.

---

Table 1: Gender-sensitive programme formulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme elements</th>
<th>Key actions</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>Define clear and explicit gender-sensitive programme objectives to promote equitable outcomes. If poverty has a greater impact on rural women than on men, ensure that programme outcomes, outputs and activities are defined to address the specific constraints and needs of women, as identified by the GSPVA.</td>
<td>A cash transfer programme can include women’s empowerment as one of its key objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target group</td>
<td>Establish the target group and apply appropriate targeting criteria and mechanisms to reach poor women and other groups that are facing socio-economic disadvantages. If women experience greater poverty and vulnerability than men, proactive targeting can be applied to overcome gender inequalities.</td>
<td>A PWP can define job quotas for targeting poor women who are heads of households to ensure their access to employment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme components</td>
<td>Define design features and specific activities to achieve gender equality objectives. Design features include the type and size of benefits, payment modalities and programme conditionalities. Specific activities may include development of communication and awareness-raising campaigns. A risk mitigation strategy can be developed to reduce potentially negative effects or backlashes in response to initiatives promoting gender equality and women’s empowerment.</td>
<td>A communication strategy can be developed to explain to the recipient households the reasons why cash transfers should be delivered to women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional capacity</td>
<td>Develop staff capacities at all levels and establish the institutional arrangements that are required to achieve the objectives and carry out gender-sensitive activities.</td>
<td>Develop guidelines to help staff to implement gender design provisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgetary commitments</td>
<td>Identify the necessary budget allocations required to achieve the objectives and carry out gender-sensitive activities.</td>
<td>Earmark funds for specific women’s empowerment activities (e.g. the provision of child care in public works, literacy classes).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td>Assess the progress and impacts experienced by both men and women beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries.</td>
<td>Formulate gender-sensitive indicators to assess the aforementioned changes and what works in a given context.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary questions

- What are the objectives of the GSPVA?
- What types of analysis can be undertaken?
- What are the key activities necessary to plan and implement the GSPVA?

Exercise 1: Developing a road map to conduct the GSPVA

(SEE ANNEX 5)
In-depth case study 1: Samuel Hall gender research in Afghanistan

In 2013, the World Bank engaged Samuel Hall to conduct a pilot study for the Afghanistan Social Protection Programme, which was to be implemented in four poor provinces across the country. The programme, which was intended to target women household members, was based on the premise that women’s spending decisions were better aligned with the World Bank’s poverty reduction goals than decisions made by the men in the household. Samuel Hall was commissioned to assess the potential for such a programme, gather new evidence on the gender implications of the design and delivery of the programme, and make recommendations to maximize its impact.

The objectives of the research were to:

▶ identify the key practical and socio-cultural constraints that limit women’s ability to access social safety net programmes as direct beneficiaries;
▶ explore the status of women in the household and determine the extent of their decision-making power; and
▶ delineate the various implications for the women or men directly receiving cash transfers through a social safety net programme.

The following research questions guided the assessment:

▶ How much decision-making power would women have over spending any cash benefits received?
▶ What are the impediments women might face in receiving information on a social safety net programme and enrolling in it?
▶ What obstacles would women face in receiving payments?
▶ If mothers and other women were to be direct beneficiaries of such a scheme, what impact would this have on household spending patterns?
▶ What are the community attitudes and potential risks in targeting women as beneficiaries of cash benefits?

To collect the data, 45 focus group discussions were undertaken in Bamyan and Kunar provinces. Women’s focus group discussions were used to gain an understanding of women’s activities and responsibilities, and grasp the dynamics of household spending and general decision-making from their perspectives. Men’s focus group discussions were held to ascertain the perceptions of male community members regarding the challenges their households face in sustaining their livelihoods and dealing with poverty, and how these challenges are addressed in household decision-making processes. Focus group discussions were organized with community elders including Maliks (local leaders), Wakils (representatives) and members of the Shura (council or committee) to gauge potential reactions regarding the challenges and benefits of women becoming direct beneficiaries of a cash transfer.

The analysis identified a number of hurdles to the proposed approach of directing payments to mothers/women.

▶ Restrictive socio-cultural norms may pose a challenge for women to engage in household decision-making and travel to registration centres and banks to collect the payment without a male chaperone.
▶ Significant security concerns (especially in Kunar province) risk making traveling to payment distribution points and markets (where women might make spending decisions) prohibitive.
Both women and men reported that any income received by anyone in the household would immediately be pooled, and that disputes over spending decisions may result in domestic violence.

Based on research findings, four recommendations were proposed to programme designers and staff implementing the intervention.

1. Carefully weigh the trade-offs involved in the targeting approach and criteria, and ensure community support when targeting married women, particularly in traditionalist areas.

2. Inform communities and leaders of the exact nature of the programme and its beneficiary selection process.

3. Utilize local, trusted money distribution mechanisms, such as the Hawala system, to distribute cash effectively and securely to beneficiaries. Use simple processes for obtaining ID cards.

4. Establish and closely monitor a grievance mechanism to address potential gender inequities.

Source: Hall, 2015.
PART 2
How to integrate gender considerations into the design of cash transfers

KEY OBJECTIVES:
To gain practical guidance on mainstreaming gender into the core design features of cash transfer programmes (CTPs) with a focus on both conditional and unconditional instruments.
2.1 Overview

As shown in Technical Guide 1, cash transfers can be a powerful tool for reducing rural gender inequalities in access to health, food and education. They can also facilitate women’s accumulation of productive assets, which can have positive impacts on their capacity to earn income and improve their social status (Waring and de la O Campos, 2016). Even so, these positive outcomes are neither guaranteed nor automatic. Concerted efforts are needed to address gender systematically in the design of CTPs to maximize their positive outcomes on gender equality and poverty reduction.

This section discusses how gender can be mainstreamed into the four core design features of CTPs:

Feature 1: Programme objectives
Feature 2: Targeting of beneficiaries
Feature 3: Transfer size
Feature 4: Programme conditions

Each subsection discusses the key operational issues related to these design features and proposes options for enhancing their gender focus.

2.2 Programme objectives

One of the key tasks of gender-sensitive programme design is to define clear and explicit gender objectives and expected outcomes. By helping to clarify the expected outcomes and specific activities needed to achieve those objectives, well defined programme objectives set the direction of the programme. Clearly stated objectives also allow staff to track and measure progress on gender equality and women’s empowerment through monitoring and evaluation activities. This section discusses the extent to which existing CTPs promote gender equality and women’s empowerment in their objectives, and offers suggestions for improving gender sensitivity in this crucial aspect of programme design.

KEY POINTS

CTPs can integrate gender in their objectives in different ways and to varying degrees.

CTPs can incorporate gender equality and/or women’s empowerment in some dimension as one of their objectives. They can focus on addressing a specific and often narrow range of gender issues, as part of their overall poverty reduction goals. For example, programmes can promote girls’ rights to education, or women’s access to maternal health care. They can also address the specific vulnerabilities faced by elderly women (e.g. social pensions) or pregnant and nursing mothers (e.g. maternity allowances). While these programmes support women’s practical needs, they do not necessarily seek to transform the discriminatory gender norms and relations that underpin women and girls’ vulnerabilities to deprivation. Consequently, they can fall short of achieving transformative gender outcomes (Molyneux and Thomson, 2012).

4 See Technical Guide 1 for a detailed discussion of the importance of cash transfers for gender equality.
Although it may not be the main area of focus, some programmes also aim (often implicitly) to empower rural women by providing transfers directly to them instead of the male heads of households. These programmes can play an important role in increasing women’s access to and control over resources, and improving their financial autonomy and bargaining power within the family. These programmes often assume that by simply providing cash to women, the interventions will contribute to their empowerment.

A small number of programmes systematically and comprehensively promote gender-specific objectives as their main focus. Such programmes are deliberately designed to address both the practical and strategic needs of rural women in a synergistic way through a number of design components. The Chapéu de Palha Mulher Programme in Brazil follows such an approach (see Box 4). These programmes are quite rare, since most SP programmes are typically designed to address household poverty and stop poverty from being perpetuated from one generation to the next.

Box 4: Cash transfer design with a strong gender focus: The Chapéu de Palha Mulher Programme in Brazil

The Chapéu de Palha Mulher Programme was launched in 2007 to channel cash to poor rural households as a means of combating hunger between sugar cane harvests. It also sought to directly support the economic empowerment of rural women by providing training to women to enable them to take up non-traditional jobs in the Pernambuco region in Brazil. The Programme builds on conventional aspects of cash transfers to respond to women’s immediate needs, but also addresses the traditional structures and gender stereotypes that limit women’s access to employment and social rights. It adopts several specific measures to achieve these ends.

(i) Stipends are tied to vocational training, which is intended to make it easier for women to gain access to better-paid employment in non-traditional jobs in the construction industry (e.g. welding, soldering, electrical work) and taxi driving.

(ii) The Programme holds a mandatory three-month course, designed by feminist organizations, to raise women’s awareness of their citizenship rights and provide a space for critical reflection on various gender issues, such as domestic violence, anti-discriminatory legislation and access to social services. The Programme also works to strengthen local women’s secretariats in the most patriarchal rural districts.

(iii) Complementary child care services, transport and meals are provided to allow women to participate in the various activities.

So far, the Programme has trained more than 50,000 women and is expanding to other regions. According to a mixed methods evaluation, women felt that the Programme not only brought them income and training that could lead to employment, it also made them more aware of their rights and entitlements and brought them a sense of personal transformation. For some women, the regular income increased their autonomy and ability to escape insecure, violent and exploitative relations at home and work.

Source: Cornwall, 2016; UN Women, 2015.

Programmes can have ‘gender-neutral’ objectives. Most CTPs are not designed with the explicit goal of addressing gender inequality or empowering rural women. This lack of attention to gender is not surprising, given that cash transfers generally address household poverty, food insecurity and/or welfare of particularly vulnerable groups, such as children, people with disabilities and the elderly.
Table 2 provides examples of programmes with different types of gender objectives.

**Table 2: How cash transfers programmes incorporate gender into objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology of objectives</th>
<th>Examples of programmes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender equality is included as one of the objectives</strong></td>
<td>• The Prospera Programme, Mexico; the Zomba Cash Transfer Programme, Malawi (girls education, early marriage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Juntos Programme, Peru (maternal health)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bolsa Familia, Brazil (women's empowerment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bolsa de Mae Programme, Timor-Leste (maternity allowance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Indira Gandhi Widows Pension Scheme, India (social pension)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender-specific objectives are promoted systematically and as the main focus</strong></td>
<td>• The Chapéu de Palha Mulher Programme, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The Ain-El-Sira programme, Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programmes adopt gender-neutral objectives</strong></td>
<td>• Familias en Accion, Colombia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Child Support Grant, South Africa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY ACTIONS TO STRENGTHEN THE GENDER FOCUS**

The specific ways to integrate gender into CTP objectives are determined by various factors, such as the nature of gender issues that affect women’s and men’s poverty outcomes, the level of gender awareness among staff, and the context in which the programme is implemented.

As a general rule, gender equality principles should be built into the programme objectives from the outset to ensure that the priorities and needs of men and women are properly addressed and that benefits are equally distributed. This applies to CTPs that do necessarily aim to reduce gender inequalities or empower rural women, and to CTPs that specifically adopt these goals.

There are a number of actions and considerations programme designers need to keep in mind.

- Ensure that programme objectives are linked to equitable outcomes for all members of the household. For example, if the overarching aim of the programme is to reduce household food insecurity and hunger, the cash transfer scheme should develop objectives and define expected outcomes to ensure that women and men, and girls and boys, have equal access to income to purchase and consume quality food.

- Programmes combining multiple objectives (e.g. child development, nutrition, maternal health, women’s economic empowerment) must carefully navigate any trade-offs related to the different objectives to prevent suboptimal results arising from poor implementation.
Ensure the objectives address the challenges faced by rural women and men, and the gender barriers to their participation in the programmes, as identified in the GSPVA. For example, if a primary goal is to increase women’s access to antenatal health care and family planning services, the programme needs to identify the barriers rural women face in attending and using these services, and articulate specific objectives and strategies to address these barriers. For example, if a lack of permission from male partners is identified as a barrier to women’s participation in programmes, an objective that could be stated would be to increase men’s involvement and support for women’s utilisation of health services and making these services friendly to men.

If the goal of the programme is to empower rural women, define explicitly the areas of empowerment to focus on, and the specific pathways and mechanisms best suited to achieve these objectives. For example, if the programme aims to increase women’s bargaining power in household resource allocation, it should clearly articulate a theory of change and include specific sub-objectives and activities to promote women’s participation and their stake in joint decision-making over the use of the transfer.

Explore the feasibility of explicitly supporting rural women’s productive roles and economic empowerment as a broader strategy for achieving poverty reduction and food security outcomes for the entire household. See Part 4 for a discussion on the programme complementarities that may be required for achieving these objectives.

Promote gender equality and more equitable relationships through messaging and awareness-raising activities. This could be done through information-sharing sessions with family members, community leaders and elders that focus on the importance of ensuring that both men and women have equitable access to, and can benefit from, the programme (see Part 4).

Summary questions

- To what extent are gender equality principles integrated into CTPs?
- Provide examples as to how programme objectives can be more gender-sensitive.
- Provide examples of the challenges involved in integrating gender into programme objectives, and how these can be overcome.
2.3 Targeting of beneficiaries

Direct targeting can ensure that poor and particularly disadvantaged women and men have access to CTPs. However, targeting by itself will not automatically yield positive gender outcomes (UN Women, 2015; Bonilla et al., 2017).

In this section, we explore the ways in which gender is considered (or not) within targeting criteria of CTPs, and whether or not women are being preferentially targeted (section 2.3.1). We then discuss the gender implications of the different targeting methods and procedures used to select beneficiaries for the programmes, and suggest practical actions for enhancing gender equality outcomes in the targeting process (section 2.3.2).

2.3.1 Targeting choices

KEY POINTS

Women are targeted in CTPs in a variety of ways and for different purposes, which have important implications for women’s empowerment. Let’s look briefly at three main approaches.

Women can be explicitly targeted as direct beneficiaries of cash transfers to address gender-specific risks. For example, programmes can target women preferentially on the basis of their perceived greater economic deprivation (e.g. extremely poor female-headed households, unpaid female farm workers), social vulnerability (e.g. widows) and gender-specific life-cycle vulnerabilities (e.g. pregnant and lactating mothers).

Women are often designated within households as direct recipients of cash transfers. For example, some conditional cash transfer (CCT) programmes primarily target poor families with young children and deliver cash benefits directly to women. This approach is particularly prevalent in Latin America, where extremely poor households with ‘younger’ parents of small children are a prevalent demographic group (Davis et al., 2016). This targeting approach primarily serves an instrumental purpose and is driven by the assumption that money in the hands of a responsible female household member will more likely be spent in a ‘family- and child-friendly’ way (Bonilla et al., 2017). This approach is also often used as a strategy to improve women’s access to income and influence over household spending decisions. However, this approach typically neglects to consider the effects on women’s work burden, as discussed below and in section 2.4. Box 5 lists some assumptions underlying this popular approach.

Cash transfers may target poor households as a unit, rather than as individuals. In such instances, cash is provided to the heads of households. They can be women or men, although in most cases it is a man. This approach assumes that cash will ‘automatically’ be shared equally or allocated according to overall household needs. Some programmes in sub-Saharan Africa that focus on orphans and vulnerable children affected by HIV/AIDS deliver transfers to caretakers/heads of the family who are predominantly women. Table 3 provides examples for each of the three types.

Each targeting approach has strengths and weaknesses. The choice of targeting rural women, either as beneficiaries or recipients, provides an important opportunity to meet their practical needs or empower them. However, simply targeting women does not automatically make a given programme gender-sensitive or transformative. Direct payments to women may not be sufficient to ensure their access to, and control over this income, particularly if men feel...
threatened by an increase in women’s status in the household (Bonilla et al., 2017; de la O Campos, 2015). Social norms, the extent of women’s autonomy, and the nature of family decision-making processes can influence and reduce the impacts of these payments. For example, as noted in the case study at the end of Part 1, in rural areas of Afghanistan, cultural norms recognize the husband as the family head and sole provider. Any income received would immediately be collectivized, and disputes over spending decisions might result in domestic violence.

Similarly, the targeting of conditional transfers to mothers as recipients has been criticized for exacerbating women’s workloads, and reinforcing traditional gender stereotypes that assign care responsibilities to women and marginalize the father’s role in this domain (Molyneux and Thomson, 2012; Cookson, 2017). Finally, household-level targeting, may overlook important intrahousehold gender inequalities and their influence over individuals’ access to and control over benefits.

Box 5: Assumptions underpinning the rationale for female transfer recipients

- Women and men benefit from and use cash differently.
- Women’s spending decisions are better aligned with poverty reduction goals, as women are more likely to spend money on children’s well-being and development.
- Women are typically responsible for food security, health and care-related activities in the household as a result of their gender roles.
- Cash increases women’s bargaining power and decision-making.


KEY ACTIONS TO STRENGTHEN THE GENDER FOCUS

As a general rule, the fact that rural women generally experience greater disadvantages than rural men justifies affirmative action through targeting that ensures that poor and particularly disadvantaged women have access to and can benefit from the programmes.

Where programmes aim to deliberately target rural women as beneficiaries, programme staff can undertake a number of actions.

- Carefully assess the implications and conditions under which rural women and girls should be preferentially targeted by cash transfers. The selection of female beneficiaries should be based on evidence and data generated through the GSPVA, rather than basing the selection on common and implicit assumptions that women are always poorer and more disadvantaged than men. This approach should also be validated through community consultations to ensure community support when targeting poor rural women.

- Ensure that a targeting approach does not ignore women in ‘dual adult households’ and/or vulnerable single-parent households headed by men. Targeting criteria should also pay attention to other vulnerable groups of women, such as unpaid family farm workers, women dependent on fisheries or forestry for their livelihoods, widows, and elderly women caring for orphans.
Complement targeting with other measures to ensure that the programme responds to women’s needs and concerns, and leads to more gender-equitable results and greater empowerment for women. Part 4 explores this issue further.

Where programmes target rural women as transfer recipients within poor households, the programme staff can carry out a number of actions.

- Use the GSPVA to assess the feasibility of directing payments to women (or men) to achieve intended programme objectives and avoid potential monetary and social costs, such as intrahousehold conflict.
- Establish a solid understanding of the pathways and mechanisms through which the targeting of transfers can meaningfully contribute to the empowerment of women and men.
- Incorporate measures that empower women economically and socially beyond increasing direct access to ‘income’. For example, measures that help to improve women’s financial inclusion, social status, and financial autonomy include opening individual bank accounts that can enable women to receive cash; providing financial and literacy classes; and promoting women’s engagement in social networks (e.g. village savings and loans schemes, farmer cooperatives). Achieving these outcomes requires that women are explicitly targeted in their productive roles, rather than simply for their caring responsibilities.
- Ensure that regular monitoring processes are tracking the gender impacts of targeting rural women as transfer recipients. This would include an assessment of women’s time poverty and labour supply, the direct and indirect costs imposed by the transfer, and the potential backlash from men and non-beneficiaries.

Where programmes target households as a ‘unit’, the programme staff could engage in a range of actions.

- Explore the feasibility of providing individual benefit entitlements, which can help redress gender inequalities in household resource allocation and spending patterns. Individual entitlements enable women and men to be recognized as rights holders, and claim these entitlements as citizens and individuals rather than solely as caregivers or dependents.
- If individual targeting is not a feasible option, use programme messaging to assist in diffusing potential intrahousehold tensions arising from the allocation of benefits to only one household member. Such messaging could emphasize that the entire family is meant to benefit from the grant, regardless of who the recipient is.
## Table 3: Different targeting approaches and their gender focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targeting approach</th>
<th>Target group</th>
<th>Targeting rationale/objectives</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women targeted as direct beneficiaries</strong></td>
<td>Female-headed households; widows; elderly women; adolescent girls; pregnant and nursing women.</td>
<td>Women are targeted based on their economic impoverishment, social marginalization and/or life-cycle vulnerabilities.</td>
<td>Kikuia Card Cash Transfer Programme, Angola (female-headed households)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tigray Social Cash Transfer Pilot Programme, Ethiopia (female-headed households)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indira Gandhi Widows Pension Scheme, India (widows)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maternity Allowance Programme, Bangladesh (pregnant women)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indira Gandhi Matritva Sahyog Yojana Programme, India (pregnant and nursing women)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zomba Cash Transfer Programme, Malawi (adolescent girls).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women/men targeted as transfer recipients</strong></td>
<td>Poor households and children</td>
<td>The benefits of a cash transfer are provided to the household head, which is usually a man. In single-person headed households, women (elderly women in particular) are predominantly the heads of the households, and as the care providers, become the main cash recipients/beneficiaries by default.</td>
<td>Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Programme (4Ps) Programme, Philippines (women)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Takaful Programme, Egypt (women)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Child Grant Programme, Zambia (women)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Juntos Programme, Peru (women)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cash Transfer Scheme, Mali (men)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tayssir Programme, Morocco (men)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender-neutral targeting</strong></td>
<td>Targeting poor households as a unit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Familias en Accion, Colombia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Programme of Advancement Through Health and Education, Jamaica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tekoporasa Programme, Paraguay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cash Transfers for Orphans and Vulnerable Children, Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Child Grant Programme, Lesotho</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author’s research; Davis et al., 2016; IEG, 2014.
2.3.2 Targeting methods and implementation

KEY POINTS

The targeting methods and procedural measures used to identify, select and enrol potential beneficiaries also have important implications for gender equality and women’s empowerment.

a. Targeting methods

CTPs can adopt a range of targeting methods to select programme beneficiaries: (i) means testing and proxy means testing; (ii) community-based targeting; and (iii) categorical targeting. Each targeting method has its advantages and disadvantages in terms of reaching and benefiting rural women.

Means testing uses rigorous and objective selection processes, such as per capita income and consumption levels in relation to the poverty line. These tests can enhance targeting transparency and efficiency. However, means testing also increases the likelihood of excluding potentially eligible rural women from the assessment process. For example, means tests that link women’s eligibility to a spouse’s income can exclude women who live in households above the income threshold but may have no access to personal income. This is often the case for unpaid female farm workers. Poor rural women who rely heavily on informal sources of income, can face difficulties in verifying their income levels to satisfy eligibility requirements.

Community-based targeting uses local community members to select beneficiaries based on their understanding about who is poor in the community. In this way, the challenges associated with income verification can be avoided, and this can reduce the barriers for women to be selected. However, community-based targeting can be problematic, particularly in communities with entrenched gender inequalities, significant ethnic tension, power struggles, and/or caste issues, which may perpetuate the marginalization of stigmatized groups. If a community does not allow equal participation by rural men and women in community meetings, this may cause some eligible beneficiaries to be excluded.

Categorical targeting selects individuals or households belonging to a given social or age group (e.g. women, elderly, orphans). Since these methods usually entail more easily observable criteria and means of verification, they can be more advantageous to poor and vulnerable rural women, (e.g. women who are the heads of households). However, categorical targeting may expose very poor and socially excluded women to stigma and marginalization within the community and potentially hinder their enrolment in the programme and limit their ability to claim benefits.

For example, evidence from the Bono de Desarrollo Humano Programme in Ecuador shows that cash transfers have advanced the negative stereotypes that the female beneficiaries are lazy or have more children in order to receive benefits. As a result, eligible women have been self-excluding from the programme because they fear facing discriminatory attitudes, harassment and abuse. These potential risks affect both women and men. However, women are likely to suffer stigma and

---

5 Programmes can also use geographical targeting. However, this approach is not explored here given its limited importance for gender. Self-targeting is a method frequently applied in PWP, and is considered in Table 10.
KEY ACTIONS TO STRENGTHEN THE GENDER FOCUS

Several actions can be adopted to ensure targeting methods are gender-sensitive.

- Assess the targeting methods for potential gender biases, and if needed adjust the selection of methodologies and operational procedures for identifying and selecting beneficiaries.

- Explore the potential for using a combination of targeting methods to identify target groups in a transparent, robust and inclusive manner. For example, combining community-based targeting methods with means testing may improve gender-sensitive targeting outcomes (Subbarao et al., 2010).

- Remove or adjust any requirements that may prevent women from applying for benefits (e.g. income verification or men’s co-signatures).

- Organize community-based sensitization activities to ensure that village leaders specifically target poor people and contribute to avoiding any conflict, stigma or social exclusion that may arise from direct targeting.

b. Procedural arrangements

When the procedural arrangements used to identify and enrol potential programme beneficiaries are not gender-sensitive, women, even if they are entitled to benefits, can face barriers to enrolment. For example, the process used to register and assess the eligibility of prospective beneficiaries can impose costs on rural women in terms of the time and money required to travel to the registration centres.

Very poor and socially excluded rural women may experience obstacles in obtaining information on the targeting and enrolment processes. These obstacles may include illiteracy; the lack of necessary identification documents; inadequate funds to obtain the formal documentation required to register; mobility constraints, including poor and inadequate access to rural transportation; work responsibilities; and time poverty (UN Women, 2015).

Finally, cultural norms that restrict women’s mobility and engagement with programme administrators in the public domain may make women less confident to take advantage of SP programmes, or make them unaware of their eligibility (Holmes and Jones, 2015). Programme implementation also needs to take into account informal mechanisms of exclusion, such as self-exclusion and discrimination along social, ethnic or religious lines. For example in Kenya, during public discussions on targeting, divorced women were heavily criticized by community members because of the negative connotations associated with divorce. This criticism forced some of these women to drop out from programme selection (Gelders, 2018).
KEY ACTIONS TO STRENGTHEN THE GENDER FOCUS

Several actions can be adopted to ensure procedural arrangements are gender-sensitive:

- Conduct information and awareness-raising campaigns to provide adequate and clear information to potential beneficiaries about programme admission criteria and the application process. This is critical for women who face barriers in accessing information. Special beneficiary outreach efforts, for example through door-to-door campaigns, radio and other media, may be required to reach those who are most in need of assistance but least able to access information through traditional channels (e.g. female farm workers, young married women and indigenous women).

- Ensure that the language in all publications about the programme’s targeting methods is gender-sensitive, non-discriminatory and sensitive to the cultural norms of indigenous and minority groups.

- Simplify and streamline application procedures and translate the application forms and project documents into the local language. Provide free technical support to assist rural women and men in completing the application forms and registering in programmes. This includes providing support in obtaining identification documents if they are required by the programme.

- Staff must be trained to carry out targeting processes in a gender-sensitive way. In settings where it is difficult for women to interact with male staff, female staff must be recruited to carry out the registration and enrolment procedures.

- Grievance mechanisms must be accessible to all, including groups that may be difficult to reach, such as the very poor, and elderly, illiterate women with limited mobility. Programme implementers must provide dedicated guidance to these women, and clearly explain the nature, purpose and process of the complaint mechanisms.

Box 6: Good practice – gender-sensitive targeting approaches in cash transfers

- In the Lesotho Child Grant Programme, community sensitization has ensured that both men and women understand how the household entitlement is calculated and, in the few cases where men demand a share of the cash, they are only able to receive an allocation for one person (Slater and Mphale, 2008).

- The 4Ps Programme in the Philippines explicitly targets women as benefit recipients. Family development sessions are used to improve women’s knowledge and skills, increase their confidence and participation in public life, and promote savings and investment in productive activities.

- India’s Basic Income Grant Pilot Project provides cash transfer benefits to individuals rather than households. The benefit level was initially set at the equivalent of USD 4.40 for each adult and USD 2.20 per child per month. This approach gave many women and children their first opportunities of having their own money, and did not provoke any backlash from men (Schjoedt, 2016).

- Malawi’s Dowa Emergency Cash Transfer Project is mitigating the risk of domestic violence against beneficiary women by carrying out an awareness-raising programme with women and men.

Source: Holmes and Jones, 2010.
Summary questions

- What are the main approaches for considering gender within targeting eligibility criteria?
- What are the pros and cons of targeting rural women as transfer recipients?
- What are the advantages and disadvantages of different targeting methods with regard to gender equality and rural women's empowerment?

2.4 Transfer size and payment predictability

Setting benefits at the right levels and ensuring the cash transfers are delivered regularly and predictably are critical for achieving CTP objectives. This section explores how these two core design features can also influence the scale and types of gender outcomes.

KEY POINTS

To date, there has been limited research on the correlation between the size of cash transfers and gender-related programme outcomes. However there is some indication that the size of transfers can affect the well-being of rural women and gender dynamics in a number of ways (Samson, van Niekerk and Mac Quene, 2010):

‘Adequate’ transfer size is necessary to ensure that poor rural women can meet their practical daily needs for food and other essential expenditures. An adequate size of transfer may also serve to alleviate household tensions and anxiety generated by financial insecurity, and improve happiness and satisfaction among women and men (Handa and Davis, 2014; Buller et al., 2018). Generous transfers also help families to better manage risks and avoid adopting negative coping strategies to safeguard family consumption and welfare. Negative coping strategies often disproportionately affect rural women and girls (Barca et al., 2015). FAO research in Malawi found that providing a more generous benefit in the Social Cash Transfer Programme eased pressure for rural women to engage in the distress sale of labour to stabilize household income (Barca et al., 2015).

If women already have some control over resources, a larger transfer size may have a positive impact on women’s influence in household decision-making. At the same time, a relatively large transfer carries with it the risk that men (e.g. husbands and older sons) will appropriate the cash, which can exacerbate household conflict (Bastagli et al., 2016). This is an issue that warrants further research.

The size of the transfer can contribute to economic advancement of women and contribute to alleviating household poverty. Larger transfers can increase rural women’s financial independence and allow them to direct more of their finances to productive activities, such as investments, savings and asset accumulation (de la O Campos, 2015; Beazley and Farhat, 2016). An increase in productive capacity benefits the entire household as it improves access to food and generates higher incomes. This increase in productive capacity is particularly significant for rural women who face entrenched gender gaps in access and control over productive resources and assets.
Finally, payment predictability and regularity are critical for smoothing household consumption and making it possible to make plans for income-generating activities (Davis et al., 2016). These are especially important concerns for highly vulnerable female-headed households, who often live in precarious circumstances. Delays in payments and irregular transfers have been found to discourage female beneficiaries from taking part in programmes (Pavanello et al., 2016).

**KEY ACTIONS TO STRENGTHEN THE GENDER FOCUS**

Decisions about transfer size depend on the intervention’s goals, the government and donor’s fiscal capacity, and the potential policy trade-offs between increasing the level of the transfer and expanding the number of programme beneficiaries (Davis, 2014). Programme designers may consider the following gender-sensitive actions to determine the optimal size of the benefit.

- Conduct a GSPVA of spending patterns at the household level, and determine how these patterns vary by gender, the poverty and vulnerability status of household members, and household composition (e.g. labour availability, the sex of the head of the household, the number of dependents).
- If relevant, adjust the transfer size to address specific gender vulnerabilities. For example, to address the potential risk of girls being unable to access secondary school, programmes may target higher cash transfers to school-aged girls or boys to encourage enrolment and regular attendance. This has been done in the Prospera Programme in Mexico and the Programme of Advancement Through Health and Education in Jamaica.
- Adjust the transfer size to support both risk management and productive development. If a cash transfer is intended to facilitate productivity among women, it must be large and predictable enough to enable meaningful agricultural investments, without compromising basic consumption needs (Beazley and Farhat, 2016). A FAO review of cash transfer programmes in sub-Saharan Africa suggests that transfers amounting to over 20 percent of per capita income produced significant results in both household food consumption and productive expenditure (Davis, 2014). Similar research does not yet exist for other regions.
- Where the fiscal situation allows, explore the possibility of complementing regular cash transfers with a larger lump sum payment or asset grant; skills development activities; and measures to improve access to credit and micro-insurance and foster financial literacy. This would help rural women to invest, save and accumulate assets, and improve their livelihoods sustainably over time.
- Monitor the size of transfers and the impact they have on gendered spending patterns, access and control over benefits, and gender relations. Based on the findings of the monitoring activities, adjust the transfer size if needed.

**Summary questions**

- In what ways can transfer size affect (both positively and negatively) gender equality outcomes and women’s empowerment?
- How can transfer size be adjusted to ensure it maximizes positive outcomes on gender equality, poverty reduction and women’s empowerment?
2.5 Programme conditions

Cash benefits can be conditional on fulfilling requirements related to school enrolment, health check-ups, or training classes in nutrition. Conditions can be light and ‘mildly’ imposed, or heavier and enforced through regular monitoring of compliance (Pellerano and Barca, 2016). Women, either as mothers or primary carers, are usually responsible for fulfilling the programme conditions.

This section discusses the effects of programme conditions on various dimensions of gender equality and women’s empowerment. It considers the impact the conditions may have on the programme beneficiaries from a gender perspective and the implications these conditions may have for women who are responsible for meeting them. The section also proposes how the conditions can be designed to be more gender-sensitive.

KEY POINTS

There is mixed evidence regarding the extent to which conditions affect rural women and girls, and it is the subject of lively debate (Newton, 2016; Kidd, 2016).

In settings where programme conditions are properly designed and enforced, and where beneficiaries have adequate access to quality services, the conditions can play an important role in reducing rural gender gaps in access to health, nutrition and schooling (Arnold, Conway and Greenslade, 2011). For example, conditions related to girls’ school attendance can improve girls’ participation and retention in school, and contribute to reduced rates of early marriage and adolescent pregnancy, as was documented in Malawi’s Zomba CTP (Baird, McIntosh, and Ozler, 2010).

For adult women, ‘light’ conditions related to attendance in rights awareness sessions can increase their knowledge, broaden their contacts and social networks, and enhance their confidence and self-esteem. Requirements, such as obtaining identification cards, can improve their access to social services and SP (Newton, 2016).

At the same time, conditions can disempower rural women by violating their rights and harming their welfare. Evidence suggests that particularly heavy conditions can exacerbate the burden of women’s unpaid care work and time poverty, which already disproportionately affect very poor rural women (relative to poor urban women) due to their time-consuming responsibilities in agriculture, food and fuel production, and child care (Holmes and Jones, 2010; Molyneux and Thomson, 2012; Newton, 2016). In some instances, poor rural women can be vulnerable to so-called ‘extra-official’ conditions when they are required to perform a number of tasks that do not actually feature in the design of the programme (see Box 7).

The imposition of conditions may also overlook the inability of many rural women to comply with them due to the distance of social services, high transport costs, mobility constraints and potential exposure to gender-based and sexual violence. Evidence from Mexico and the Plurinational State of Bolivia, for example, suggests that the long distances to health facilities, long waiting times and mistreatment by staff led women to forgo maternal health services, even where conditions encouraged their use (Molyneux and Thomson, 2012). Finally, conditions may perpetuate traditional norms about women’s primary role as caregivers and marginalize men from care responsibilities (Molyneux, 2017).
Box 7: The hidden impacts of the conditionalities in the Juntos Programme, Peru

Ethnographic research in the Cajamarca, Peru, revealed that recipients of Juntos Programme benefits were subjected to extra-official requirements including having hospital births; participating in political parades; and cooking and performing other tasks for the state-run school meals programme Qali Warma. Some of these requirements are potentially dangerous (e.g. trying to access a rural health clinic while in labour with no access to transportation), and others are time-consuming or stigmatizing. The risks of exploitation were exacerbated by the lack of appropriate mechanisms for Juntos Programme recipients to file complaints or obtain correct information on Programme requirements. Regional Juntos offices are located far from where most recipients live, and many recipients are illiterate, which further limits women’s ability to express grievances. Advocates of gender equality have been using this evidence to encourage debates around the justification for including conditions in SP programmes, and ensure measures are in place to reduce their use and monitor potentially negative gender effects.

Source: Cookson, 2017.

KEY ACTIONS TO STRENGTHEN THE GENDER FOCUS

Programme staff can consider the actions listed below to mitigate the negative impacts of conditionalities on gender equality.

Consider the necessity of using conditions:

- Carefully assess the trade-offs embedded in the imposed conditions in terms of the welfare of rural women and girls, and assess the potential constraints faced by rural women in complying with requirements. If there is evidence that conditional transfers may not yield better results than unconditional transfers, or may exacerbate existing rural gender inequalities, then their use should be reconsidered.

- Explore whether the programme can achieve its intended objectives without imposing strict conditions, and instead use positive messaging and soft conditions to influence a desired behavioural change. Early results from ‘labelled cash transfers’ show that simply informing the transfer recipients that funds are intended for specified purposes, without penalties, results in high levels of compliance with programme goals without imposing added burdens on women transfer recipients (Newton, 2016).

Make conditions more gender-sensitive:

- Explore the feasibility of designing conditions that explicitly aim to promote positive behavioural change related to more equitable gender roles, norms and responsibilities (see examples in Box 8).

- Ensure easier access to services and better outreach to reduce the burden of conditions on rural women. For example, mobile health clinics can reduce the distance rural women must travel for health care.

- Promote changes in gender roles by ensuring co-responsibility for conditions by both parents, and making men responsible for fulfilling conditions. Beneficiary households, programme managers and service providers need to be made aware of the importance of involving fathers in the care of their children (see the example from El Salvador in Box 9).
Ensure that women’s social and political rights to transfers are respected and that women are treated with dignity. Women must have access to grievance mechanisms that permit them to lodge complaints in the event of mistreatment by programme managers, including the imposition of ‘extra-official’ conditions.

Monitor the effects of conditions on the direct beneficiaries and the people responsible for programme compliance. This may include assessing gender-related changes in women’s and men’s workloads and time poverty, mistreatment by programme authorities and changes in intrahousehold dynamics.

Box 8: Good practices: gender-sensitive programme conditions

- The Benazir Income Support Programme in Pakistan uses soft conditions to encourage beneficiaries to obtain birth registration certificates and identification documents that can increase their access to public services.
- The Chapéu de Palha Mulher programme in Brazil links its cash stipend to classes in citizenship rights and vocational training for women.
- The Programme of Advancement through Health and Education in Jamaica revised the design of its health-related conditions to relieve pregnant and/or breast feeding mothers from having to comply with conditions.
- The Red Solidaria CCT in El Salvador encourages men to take an active role in fatherhood responsibilities to comply with CCT conditions. It also provides women with information on the process for obtaining birth certificates (a role traditionally left to fathers) and their own identity cards, and provides child care to allow women to attend training sessions.


Summary questions

- What are the potential positive and negative impacts of conditions on rural women and girls’ well-being?
- How can conditions be designed in a more gender-sensitive way?

CHECKLIST: See Table 11 in Annex 3 for a checklist of key strategies for ensuring gender-sensitivity of core design features of cash transfers discussed in this section.

Exercise 2: How to formulate gender-sensitive CTP? (SEE ANNEX 5)
In-depth case study 2: CCT programme with a transformative edge – the Ain El-Sira Programme in Egypt

In addition to improving child development, the key objectives of the Ain El-Sira Programme in Egypt include enhancing women's rights and empowering women. The Ain-El-Sira pilot has sought to strengthen women's productive and economic roles and agency, without undermining their roles as mothers. Various measures were adopted to achieve this.

1. Women were active in programme planning and design. A network of feminist researchers and gender advocates assisted women to engage effectively in the consultation process and freely voice their opinions and suggestions about programme objectives and activities.

2. Women were targeted as transfer recipients in an innovative way. The programme officially stated that its cash transfers would compensate women for their time spent attending programme meetings and social worker visits, as well as provide partial income support. In this way, the cash became an entitlement for reproductive work done by women, which is traditionally unpaid.

3. Women’s participation in paid employment was explicitly encouraged instead of making transfers contingent on proof of unemployment. This measure enabled women to engage in work on better terms, as it provided them with money to fall back on and a degree of agency in their actions.

4. Payments were transferred directly into women's bank accounts to protect the money from possible family demands or theft, and promote the women's financial inclusion.

5. The pilot developed monitoring tools that facilitated accountability between social workers and beneficiaries. Examples of these tools included a written contract with the rights and obligations of each party clearly spelled out; a calendar enabling women to monitor their compliance with conditions; a monthly monitoring checklist for use by the social worker; and a monthly group session for beneficiaries. Self-monitoring tools were used to avert potential abuse over programme compliance and provide evidence in the event of any mistreatment.

6. Monthly group sessions were organized to raise women's awareness on independent voting, microcredit and indebtedness, housing rights, employment and reproductive health. This support helped women to finance their own enterprises and look for employment. The group sessions also fostered collective action with other women, which had positive effects on their psychosocial welfare, strengthened their influence in public forums, and increased their participation in social networks.

The pilot’s transformative CCT design demonstrated that cash transfers can be used not only as a tool to protect vulnerable people, but as a means to establish a relationship of mutual obligation between women and the state. The pilot also improved women’s social status and their experience of citizenship. Based on such positive outcomes, the Programme was expanded from urban to rural areas in 2012.

Source: UN Women, 2015.
PART 3

How to integrate gender considerations into the design of Public Works Programme (PWPs)

KEY OBJECTIVES:
To gain practical guidance on mainstreaming gender into the core design features of PWPs.
3.1 Overview

PWPs are a popular means for offering temporary access to employment and income to large groups of poor or shock-affected rural populations, including vulnerable women who may otherwise face systematic disadvantages in rural labour markets (Tanzarn and Gutierrez, 2015). The participation of poor rural women in PWPs may be hindered by various cultural and practical constraints. PWPs need to be designed in a gender-sensitive way to ensure that rural women can engage in decent work and derive benefits from their labour.

In this section we explore how gender considerations can be mainstreamed into four different core design features of PWPs:

In each subsection, we first discuss the key operational issues related to these design features and then propose options for enhancing their gender sensitivity.

Box 9: Gender focus in programme objectives of PWPs

As with cash transfers, defining explicit gender objectives in PWPs is a critical feature of effective programme formulation. Despite this, most PWPs are not designed with deliberate goals for gender equality. However, PWPs may still implicitly promote women’s rights to employment through preferential targeting. Clearly articulated gender-sensitive programme objectives are necessary to promote equality in decent employment and income-generating opportunities for rural women and men.

Here is an example from Mali’s ‘Support for the Promotion of Employment and Poverty Reduction’ project of how gender was incorporated in the project logical framework in the promotion of public works employment:

- Main objective: Strengthen the national capacity to promote and create decent and productive employment and income opportunities for women and men.
- Expected outcomes: Increased participation of 600,000 women and 400,000 men in road works.
- Activities to achieve results:
  - Identify the training needs of women and men
  - Educate and support women to form cooperatives
  - Train women across the different sectors
  - Support women to access public funds.

It is recommended that readers consult section 2.2. for a discussion on gender-sensitive programme objectives related to cash transfers, as the same issues and guidance provided there also relate to PWPs.
3.2 Targeting of beneficiaries

This section discusses how women are targeted in the PWPs and the extent to which different targeting approaches reach and/or benefit rural women. We then propose practical suggestions for increasing the gender sensitivity of targeting approaches.

IMPORTANT NOTE: It is recommended that readers review section 2.3.2. on targeting methods and procedural measures related to CTPs, as these issues also relate to public works measures, and are not repeated here.

KEY POINTS

A majority of PWPs recognize the importance of active participation of rural women in temporary employment programmes, and this is reflected in their targeting criteria to some degree (see Box 10). The targeting of PWPs addresses gender issues in various ways.

First, programmes may deliberately target rural women through job quotas. Many PWPs specifically include vulnerable women in their targeting criteria, especially female heads of households, due to the higher levels of unemployment and the constraints they face in entering the labour force (IEG, 2014; Tanzam and Gutierrez, 2015; UN Women, 2015).

Using affirmative action to target women is important for maximizing women’s opportunities to engage in work. However, job quotas alone are not able to address the limitations rural women face in obtaining employment. A number of factors, including socio-cultural norms around women’s right to work outside the home, mobility constraints, and care responsibilities, also affect their access to employment. For example, in Rwanda, some eligible female heads of households, particularly those with dependents requiring care, were excluding themselves from the PWP of the Vision 2020 Umurenge Programme (VUP) because they could not balance work with their care responsibilities (Pavanello et al., 2016).

Box 10: Good practice – direct targeting of women in PWPs

- The Cash-based Rural Maintenance Programme in Bangladesh targets divorced, widowed, separated or abandoned women and offers them four years of employment to maintain rural roads.

- The employment code of the Expanded Public Works Programme 2 in South Africa sets an employment quota of 55 percent for women.

- In the Uganda Transport Rehabilitation Project, the contractors are encouraged to ensure that women constitute at least 30 percent of the labour force.

- Single women and female-headed households have been given priority in the recruitment of labourers in the PWP in Madagascar and The Vision 2020 Umurenge Programme PWP in Rwanda.

Source: Tanzam and Gutierrez, 2015.
Second, programmes can adopt ‘full family’ targeting. In this case, the head of poor household is targeted, but all the adult members of the household are listed as public works clients. Household members are given the choice of deciding who actually works on sites and can rotate their participation (e.g. among spouses). This approach is potentially ‘female-friendly’, as it provides women with legitimate access to employment, even though they are not directly targeted through affirmative action (Holmes and Jones, 2010). However, even where rural women are the primary labourers in public works sites, they may not be able to control their own wages if payments are deposited into their husbands’ bank accounts.

Finally, programmes can adopt ‘partial family’ targeting in which only a household head is registered as a beneficiary. In male-headed households it is typically a man (i.e. a husband) who gets awarded access to a job. Partial family targeting may overlook intrahousehold gender inequalities, which can prevent women from taking up employment. Likewise, second wives living in polygamous households may also be restricted from exercising the right to obtain employment and independently access entitlements.

Box 11: Good practice – ensuring targeting provisions actually benefit women

Targeting guidelines adopted in the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (MGNREGS) in India stipulate that when opening bank accounts for labourers, the bank or Panchayat must consider either providing individual accounts for each worker or a joint account (one for each job card holder). It also recommends that if joint accounts are used, the different household members (e.g. husband and wife) should be co-signatories. Additionally, special care should be taken to avoid crediting individual earnings into household accounts held by the men heads of household, as this would leave women without control over their earnings.

Source: Holmes and Jones, 2010

KEY ACTIONS TO STRENGTHEN THE GENDER FOCUS

We identify two potential scenarios for integrating gender effectively in the targeting of PWPs.

Where programmes use female-friendly job quotas, the programme staff could:

▶ Ensure that in addition to reserving spots for women, programmes also include complementary measures (e.g. flexible work conditions and child care services) to facilitate the registration and participation of rural women (see section 5.3).
▶ Sensitize men in the households and community about the importance of job quotas, and ensure their support for women’s employment.
▶ Strengthen the awareness and skills of staff to ensure they can execute job quotas effectively.
▶ Closely monitor quota implementation to ensure that any barriers to women accessing jobs are addressed and removed.
Where programmes target poor households through ‘full’ or ‘partial family’ targeting, the programme staff could:

- Develop targeting criteria that reflect the diversity of households. For example, targeting modalities should ensure that women in male-headed households, including women living in polygamous households, are also entitled to and have access to employment.

- Consider recognizing single persons as a ‘household’, which would make it possible for single women, including widows, to access work.

- Consider ‘full family’ targeting in which all adult members (both men and women) of eligible households are listed as clients. In this case, efforts must be made to ensure household members understand the rationale for this targeting, and increase their awareness of eligibility.

- Create awareness and encourage each worker to open individual bank accounts to increase control over benefits (see Box 11).

- Engage with groups that can be easily accepted by women and other vulnerable groups to disseminate information about different aspects of the programme (e.g. registration and enrolment criteria). In contexts where gender segregation is prevalent, programmes may consider engaging female extension workers to select and register potential beneficiaries and provide support throughout the targeting process. For example, in Mozambique, special teams, composed of female recruiters, were established to promote gender awareness in communities about women’s participation in projects. Sometimes innovative sensitization and outreach campaigns are needed to encourage female participants to attend targeting meetings and register for selection (see Box 12). This is also relevant for quota-based targeting measures.

Box 12: Good practice – using innovative strategies to register beneficiaries

India’s MGNREGS sent drummers to different villages to announce the opening of new public works sites and their recruitment for workers. In state of Kerala, women’s self-help groups register beneficiaries and manage the programme. As a result, female participation is at 68 percent, which is higher than the programme quota.

Source: Holmes and Jones, 2010

Summary questions

- What are the main approaches to considering gender within targeting eligibility criteria?
- What are the pros and cons of including quotas to attract female participants in PWPs?
- Provide examples of different options for ensuring the targeting is gender-sensitive.
3.3 Type of transfer

PWPs can deliver wages to participants in cash and in-kind transfers, including food and farm inputs. The choice of transfer in terms of how wages are paid is usually selected in accordance with the programme objectives. The type of the transfer can have important gender implications.

IMPORTANT NOTE: Readers are encouraged to review section 2.4 for a discussion of the linkages between the size of the transfer and gender, as this design feature is also relevant for PWPs.

KEY POINTS

While robust research on this topic is still limited, the available evidence shows that the types of payment can be used strategically to promote gender equality and rural women’s empowerment.

Paying wages in cash, for example, enables household members to allocate their resources in accordance to their needs. Cash is seen as more empowering and effective than in-kind transfers (Samson, van Niekerk and Mac Quene, 2010). If women have access to benefits and equal influence over their allocation, cash can address various practical and strategic needs of women, including improved access to food and basic services, and increased intrahousehold bargaining power (see Technical Guide 1, section 6.4).

Providing farm inputs to female farmers in exchange for their services can promote women’s productive capacity and livelihood diversification, and directly reduce gender gaps in access to productive resources (UN Women, 2015).

In some contexts, payments of wages in food can be more gender-sensitive than cash as women may have greater control over the distribution of food than cash in the household.

In some contexts, payments of wages in food can be more gender-sensitive than cash as women may have greater control over the distribution of food in the household. Cash is more likely to be controlled by men (Gentilini, 2016; Subbarao et al., 2010). In times of heightened food costs, rural women may prefer food assistance rather than cash, as it directly eases their responsibility to provide household food security and nutrition (Gentilini, 2016). In Ethiopia, for example, in times of acute food insecurity due to soaring food prices, rural women involved in the Productive Safety Net Programme (PSNP) largely preferred to receive payments in food (e.g. pulses and oil) rather than cash payments, as the drop in real value of cash payments was dramatic, and food was not readily available in the local market (Devereux, 2009).

Predictable payment of wages and guarantees of job availability are also critically important for ultra-poor rural women. Irregular employment and late payment of benefits disproportionately affects poor female-headed households, as they rely more heavily on immediate income to ensure family survival. For example, single mothers in the MGNREGS programme in India were negatively affected by delayed payments. In some case, they were forced to leave the programme and take up less-preferred types of employment to cover the income gap (Holmes and Jones, 2010).
KEY ACTIONS TO STRENGTHEN THE GENDER FOCUS

The selection of the type of transfer may be informed by an analysis of local preferences at the household and community level, local market dynamics, the financial context, and the government’s administrative and fiscal capacity to deliver the preferred transfer. Programme designers may consider the following actions to determine which type of the benefit will promote better gender outcomes.

- Undertake an analysis of differences in preference among men and women with regards to benefit types. It is very important to directly consult men and women about their preferences. This can be done through the GSPVA.

- Raise the awareness of the staff and build their capacity to understand and monitor the impacts the local context (e.g. local trade markets, humanitarian versus developmental setting) has on women and men's preferences for different types of benefits. In light of the understanding that has been gained, adjust the choice of transfer accordingly.

- To ensure income predictability, provide consistent employment and regular payment of wages, and make sure that workers are adequately informed about their rights and wage entitlements. For example, the MGNREGS entitles poor rural households to 100 days of employment, and a legal guarantee states that requested work must be provided within 15 days. If not, the state must provide an unemployment allowance of one-quarter of the wage for each day without employment.

Summary questions

- What are the pros and cons of different types of wages in terms of gender preferences and gender relations?

- Can you provide examples of rural women and men having different preferences for the type of wages? What caused these differences and how were these addressed in the programme?

3.4 Working conditions

As mentioned already, rural women face various gender-related constraints that hinder their engagement in public works employment schemes. Programmes that do not explicitly acknowledge these constraints may inadvertently exclude women from employment. In this section, we discuss what types of work conditions can attract rural women's participation in the programmes and contribute to their empowerment.

KEY POINTS

Women need to have access to fair, equal and flexible work conditions that meet their specific needs and priorities.

Women need a female-friendly work environment that can allow them to balance their productive and reproductive responsibilities, and where they can feel respected and secure. Providing a flexible work schedule, in terms of workdays and hours, and ensuring the work sites are an appropriate distance from their home and offer child care facilities can enable rural women to better manage their competing work responsibilities. In Botswana’s Ipelegeng PWP, female participation was
The commitment to pay women and men equal wages for similar tasks is critical to ensuring women have access to decent jobs.

particularly high because women were allowed time off to breastfeed without any loss of pay (Holmes and Jones, 2013).

Programmes also need to recognize and understand how traditional gender norms regarding work may restrict rural women's participation in public employment. For example, in the Second Public Employment for Sustainable Agriculture and Water Management Project in Tajikistan, the reluctance of some Tajik men to allow women to engage in public works, and the reluctance of some Tajik women to work near men, led to a revision in the programme design. Separate working groups for women were created, and family members were allowed to work in particular areas (IEG, 2014).

The commitment to pay women and men equal wages for similar tasks is critical to ensuring women have access to decent jobs. Wage equality can also facilitate strategic shifts in women's positions. In India, for example, the MGNREGS states that equal wages must be paid to men and women workers under the Equal Remuneration Act of 1976 (Chopra, 2014).

KEY ACTIONS TO STRENGTHEN THE GENDER FOCUS

A combination of measures can be adopted to ensure a female-friendly work environment.

- Provide mandatory on-site or community-based child care support and maternity leave, and ensure that this support is monitored and properly enforced. For example, the MGNREGS legislates that a day nursery should be established at a work site where there are more than five children under the age of six.

- Establish decent work conditions that include flexible working hours; work locations close to the beneficiaries’ homes; the provision of drinking water and shade; separate toilet facilities; and zero tolerance for sexual harassment and violence at work. See Box 13 on how this has been addressed in the PSNP in Ethiopia).

- Consider life-cycle vulnerabilities and labour constraints in families, and adjust the work conditions accordingly. For example, provide direct support (or light jobs) to pregnant and lactating women and to elderly women who cannot engage in productive work activities. In the Cash-for-Work Programme in Somalia, lactating and pregnant women were allowed to nominate family members to work on their behalf, but they continued to be the principal cash recipients.

- Put awareness-raising strategies in place, and train staff to address the gender stereotypes regarding women’s engagement in labour and the cultural constraints that may restrict women’s mobility and their ability to work in the public domain. In the PSNP in Ethiopia, employees working on public works schemes are allowed to work on the private land-holdings of female-headed households, to help them in cases where the women heading the households are restricted from ploughing due to socio-cultural norms.

- Make formal commitments to pay equal wages to men and women who perform similar tasks, and sensitize staff and beneficiaries as to the importance of this design feature and monitor implementation accordingly.
Establish local community spaces to enhance women’s participation in social networks and public life. These include public work sites where female beneficiaries can come together to discuss employment-related problems, familiarize themselves with their rights, and establish social and economic networks (e.g. women’s groups and producer cooperatives) that are needed for employment development.

Box 13: Good practice – example of gender-sensitive working conditions in the PSNP in Ethiopia

The PSNP design reflects a relatively strong focus on women’s role in agriculture and food security. It is based on a solid analysis of the gender-specific vulnerabilities that women face in participating in employment (Holmes and Jones, 2013). A number of design features directly address these challenges, including work exemptions for women more than six months pregnant or nursing an infant, flexibility to structure work hours around family obligations, and the provision of staffed child care facilities. Women are also encouraged to participate in programme governance and take part in the ‘Women Development Package’ training activities on women’s rights, which include ‘community conversations’ on gender-based violence.

Source: Jones, Tafere and Woldehanna, 2010.

Summary questions

- What are some of the gender-related barriers to female participation in PWPs?
- Provide examples of gender-sensitive working conditions.

3.5 Selection of assets and the type of work

The selection of assets to be built and the type of work to be carried out are the final two design features of PWPs that we consider from a gender-sensitive angle.

**KEY POINTS**

**a. Selection of community assets**

Decisions regarding the type of community assets to create within the PWP can be made in a gender-sensitive way. For example, PWPs can develop community assets, such as schools and health care facilities, that provide access to social services for women and girls, or assets, such as community water points and fuel sources, that reduce their work burdens. The conceptualization of community assets can also be expanded to meet rural women’s economic and productive needs. The PSNP in Ethiopia used public labour to build farmer training centres in each project location, which reduced the distance rural women needed to travel. This has enhanced women’s access to agricultural extension services and non-farm adult education (Jones, Tafere and Woldehanna, 2010).
b. Type of work

The type of work usually selected in PWP is usually connected to infrastructure and rural development, and generally involves labour that is physically demanding and requires few skills (Holmes and Jones, 2010). This tends to exclude some adult women (particularly before and after childbirth), elderly women, and households headed by single adults. To attract more women as beneficiaries, some PWP have started to broaden the scope of their work categories to include care work and social work (Tebaldi, 2016).

**KEY ACTIONS TO STRENGTHEN THE GENDER FOCUS**

The following strategies can be used to ensure the type of work and selection of assets are gender-sensitive.

Selection of community assets:

- Consult with women and men to understand the specific type of assets they prefer to be developed in the PWP. The GSPVA is a good starting point for this.
- Ensure women participate in programme planning, including the selection of job activities and/or assets to be developed. In many PWP, the assets are often integral to official, decentralized community development planning processes. Where this is the case, programme designers must ensure that rural women have a voice and influence in these processes and outcomes.
- PWP can prioritize the development of assets (e.g. water conservation projects, land terracing, land management and climate-smart farm infrastructure) that reduce women’s burdens and increase their agricultural productivity, and/or build their resilience in the face of risks related to the environment, climate change and food insecurity.

Type of work:

- PWP can adopt a broad definition of what constitutes a public work assignment, and provide appropriate types of jobs that are in line with men’s and women’s skill sets and work experience. For example, jobs for rural women may need to be less physically demanding. However, it is important not to reinforce gender stereotypes about women as a weaker sex.
- PWP can also be used to compensate for household labour shortages. Public works labour can be utilized to support agricultural work on farms cultivated by female-headed households, and/or provide a range of services, such as child care or support for the elderly (see Box 14 for an example of South Africa).
- PWP can provide on-the-job skills development and training to increase the future employability of rural women workers in ‘higher-value’ agriculture production and non-traditional, non-farm work in sectors where women already have some skills.
- PWP can train women participants for management and supervisory roles within public works, which can build women’s functional and professional skills and improve their confidence, leadership capacity and social status.
Box 14: Good practice – gender-sensitive Expanded Public Works Programme in South Africa

South Africa’s Expanded Public Works Programme was revised to include home care, community-based care and early childhood development as job opportunities for programme participants (mostly women) working in these sectors. Jobs included the home-based care of young children and people living with HIV/AIDS. This strategy supports gender equality in two ways: (i) it benefits women directly, as many of the social sector work opportunities were allocated to them; and (ii) it benefits women and girls indirectly by alleviating the burden on unpaid family caregivers.

Source: Newton, 2016.

Summary questions

- What types of assets address the needs and priorities of rural women and men?
- What types of public works jobs are well aligned with the skill sets, capabilities and life-cycle stages of rural women and men?

CHECKLIST: See Table 12 in Annex 4 for a checklist of key strategies for ensuring gender-sensitivity of the core design features of PWPs discussed in this section.
In-depth case study 3: Improving gender-sensitivity of Rwanda’s Vision 2020 Umurenge Programme (VUP)

The VUP, which is Rwanda’s flagship SP programme, has four components: public works, cash transfers (direct support), financial services and sensitization. Through the public works component, the government offers temporary employment to safeguard income security for extremely poor households that have at least one adult member able to work.

In 2014, the Government of Rwanda received support from UNICEF to improve the VUP’s gender- and child-sensitivity, and respond more effectively to the needs of labour-constrained households. The proposal for redesign was partly informed by a FAO assessment of VUP’s impact on rural women’s socio-economic empowerment (Pavanello et al., 2016). The redesign included the following innovative features.

1. **Less intensive work schedules:** Flexible days and working hours were adopted to enable rural women to better manage the competing demands of their paid work and their domestic and care responsibilities.

2. **Support for child care:** To enable women with children to participate in the scheme, UNICEF began piloting the implementation of mobile crèches at public work sites for children aged 0–24 months. The children receive meals, and women can rotate between road terracing and contribution activities and working in the crèches as care providers.

3. **Expansion of public works job categories:** A new range of public works that provided benefits for women were selected for development. These new types of work improved the quality of basic local services (e.g. early childhood development, home-based care, and water and sanitation services).

4. **Improved regularity of employment:** Provisions were made to ensure participants were offered year-round employment with regular payments that were high enough to alleviate extreme poverty. Participants work approximately 100 days per year. Fixed monthly payments worth approximately USD 12 in Rwandan francs were deposited directly into the bank account of each participant.

5. **Engagement of caseworkers to:** (i) ensure all household members know about and are able to access their entitlements, and are aware of the appeals processes for expanded PWPs and other programmes; (ii) assess and monitor the particular social and livelihood constraints and opportunities faced by each household; (iii) inform the design of the graduation package and monitor its the implementation. Caseworkers can also provide guidance regarding the complementary services and programmes (e.g. business development advisers, farmer field schools, rural advisory services, and community health workers) that participants need to facilitate their exit out of poverty. The cadre of caseworkers should be balanced by gender to provide effective support for both men and women.

Source: Ayliffe, 2015; Pavanello et al., 2016.
PART 4
Enhancing impacts of social transfers through complementary support

KEY OBJECTIVES:
To understand the role and importance of combining cash transfers or public works with complementary support measures as a means of promoting gender equality and the empowerment of rural women; and become familiar with practical approaches to strengthening these linkages.
Overview

Neither cash transfers nor PWP's on their own are able to tackle all the multidimensional aspects of poverty and vulnerability in rural settings. Basic income support must be matched with complementary programmes and services to address the various needs of rural women, improve their prospects for empowerment and achieve a sustainable exit from poverty (FAO, 2016). This process is not automatic, however, as CTPs and PWP's are often delivered as single interventions. The deliberate promotion of linkages between the two is required. In this final section, we explore how this can be done effectively.

KEY POINTS

There are two key issues that programme designers need to bear in mind when designing gender-sensitive ‘Social Protection Plus’ interventions.

a. Selecting the options for complementary support

The first task is to decide on the types of complementary support that should be provided to beneficiaries in addition to cash transfers or PWP's. Complementary benefits can take many forms. We propose three broad options that can address different needs of rural women. These options are not mutually exclusive and can be combined in various ways depending on the programme’s scope and objectives.

- **Measures to boost rural women’s employment and income:** Transfers can be linked with skills training, job placements and child care support to improve women's employability and diversify their income. Incentives can be provided to enrol women in social security schemes, including health insurance, to reduce the life-cycle vulnerabilities that may threaten their income security. Access to credit schemes and economic literacy training can assist women with running small enterprises and managing household budgets.

- **Measures to improve rural women’s agricultural productivity and food security and nutrition:** Social transfers can be linked to services that promote women’s agricultural production, the accumulation of assets and the generation of income. These may include access to improved farm inputs (e.g. quality seeds and organic fertilizer); access to rural advisory services and credit and savings; and support in engaging with local and regional markets (e.g. the formation of producer groups and cooperatives). Access to climate-smart technologies and crop insurance that meet rural women’s needs may also help mitigate the risks associated with climate change. Women benefiting from social transfers can also have access to complementary seeds and nutrition training, to help them establish home
gardens and improve dietary diversity. Access to labour-saving technologies for productive activities (e.g. water conservation, mulching) and domestic tasks (e.g. water and fuel supply, food processing) can alleviate rural women's heavy workloads and time poverty, and at the same time improve food security and nutrition outcomes.

**Measures to empower rural women:** Women can be informed of their rights and entitlements, and supported in obtaining legal and political literacy, and leadership skills. Linking core transfers with broader equity and social inclusion measures (e.g. anti-discrimination legislation regarding inheritance and property ownership, and protection from harmful traditional gender customs and practices, including gender-based violence) can reduce women's social vulnerabilities and promote gender equality more broadly.

Table 4 provides examples of different types of complementarities promoted by cash transfer and PWPs.

**Table 4: Programmatic options to link social transfers to complementary measures for women’s empowerment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Types of complementary support</th>
<th>Examples of programmatic linkages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Improve agricultural productivity and income generation** | • Productive inputs.  
• Agricultural, crop, health insurance.  
• Rural advisory services (e.g. climate-smart farming technologies).  
• Marketing support and public procurement policies. | • The Child Grant benefits in Lesotho are combined with farm seeds and training in nutrition and climate-smart agriculture to enhance women’s capacity to grow more nutritious food and increase cash income from the sale of vegetables.  
• In Malawi, beneficiaries of the Local Development Fund’s PWP are granted preferential access to the Farm Input Subsidy Programme. |
| **Support enterprise development and livelihood diversification** | • Business development training.  
• Credit and savings schemes, inexpensive loans and bank accounts through local banks, or rural cooperatives.  
• Economic literacy and financial management skills. | • Transfer recipients of the Bono de Desarrollo Humano in Ecuador are provided with access to microcredit and bank services to help women to establish small-scale street enterprises (e.g. sale and preparation of food, and sewing).  
• In the Zimbabwe’s Protracted Relief Programme, the participation in the ISAL groups improved access to credit for agricultural inputs, cash flow in lean times, or opportunity to diversify livelihoods by starting a small business. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Types of complementary support</th>
<th>Examples of programmatic linkages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address women’s work burden and time poverty</td>
<td>• Infrastructure development. • Access to basic social services: care support services, education, energy, health care, water and sanitation.</td>
<td>• Bolsa Familia and Mexico’s Prospera CCTs offer complementary crèche schemes to beneficiaries. • The Chapéu de Palha Mulher CCT programme in Brazil provides free transport and meals to enable women to participate in the training courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote the social empowerment and address risks of gender-based exclusion</td>
<td>• Laws related to property inheritance, land ownership and gender-based violence • Employment legislation and social security benefits to protect rural workers in both formal and casual employment. • Legal literacy trainings (e.g. birth registration, voting in elections)</td>
<td>• In South Africa, employment legislation was passed to safeguard the employment rights of domestic workers (e.g. maternity and paternity leave, breastfeeding policies, minimum wages and equal pay). • In Viet Nam, the National Targeted Programme for Poverty Reduction, explicitly targets the delivery of legal aid regarding land ownership to poor and female-headed households. • FAO’s activities in Rwanda support the VUP beneficiaries to form female cooperatives to strengthen women’s access to food markets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Jones and Stavropolou, 2013; UN Women, 2015; Pavanello et al., 2016.

b. Deciding on modalities for linking social transfers and complementary measures

Linkages between social transfers and complementary components can be made through two different programme modalities.

i. Integral programme components

Complementary measures can be provided as integral elements of the cash transfer or public works intervention. This may include providing additional benefits and in-kind transfers (e.g. lump-sum payments, asset transfers, training on feeding, seeds).

Many programmes have started adding sensitization and behaviour change communication components and psychosocial support to CTPs and PWP (Molyneux, Jones and Samuel, 2016). Relatively simple and cost-effective activities can be used to raise awareness of the ways in which gender norms associated with a number of labour and economic roles (e.g. ownership of assets and domestic work) contribute to and perpetuate rural poverty among women and rural households. These activities can also promote support for the programme’s goals related to gender equality and women’s empowerment (see Box 15).
Box 15: Examples of awareness-raising activities for promoting gender equality and women’s empowerment

Sensitization and awareness-raising activities can be used for various gender-related objectives and purposes.

1. Encouraging men and boys to support women’s empowerment; building their support for a more equal division of labour and care work; and reducing household tension and spousal violence. The Juntos Programme in Peru applies this an approach in its programming (Molyneux and Thomson, 2012).

2. Increasing women’s and girl’s knowledge of their rights, including their rights to SP entitlements, reproductive healthcare, and ownership and inheritance of land and property. In the 4Ps programme in the Philippines, family sessions encourage the community to support girls’ education and women’s access to employment, productive markets and family planning (Holmes and Jones, 2013).

3. Promoting the concept that part of the cash transfer and/or wage income (if they are of adequate size) can be used for carrying out women’s economic and productive activities and accumulating savings and assets.

Source: Newton, 2016.

Programme implementers can capitalize on regular community interactions to tailor awareness-raising initiatives to community needs and the specific socio-cultural context. Information can be delivered at ‘pay’ points, or through community-level training sessions and home visits by programme staff, community volunteers or social workers. Case managers and their strong interpersonal relationships with participants are crucial for the ensuring the uptake of messages and bringing about positive behavioural change (see Box 16) (Newton, 2016; Roelen et al, 2017).

Box 16: Fostering men’s support for gender equality in the Promundo Programme

In 2013, Promundo Programme introduced gender-transformative training as a companion to Brazil's Bolsa Familia Programme to address harmful traditional cultural norms and promote women’s autonomy. Case management staff engaged with men and encouraged their critical reflection on their female partners’ empowerment and their prospects for joining or rejoining the labour market, and on the redistribution of household labour and child care. Men trainers served as role models, and the active participation of couples (rather than individuals) was promoted in each session. By the end of the campaign, there was evidence of changes in the perceptions men and women had of their traditional roles in family relations. This led to a deeper understanding of the importance of women’s rights to emotional and financial independence, and cooperative household decision-making and the division of care work.

Source: Newton, 2016.
ii. **Linkages to external support**

Programmes can offer linkages to complementary benefits and services that are external to the intervention. This can be done by granting the beneficiaries preferential or automatic access to livelihood programmes, insurance or microcredit schemes, or waiving tuition fees for health care and education (Roelen et. al, 2017). For example, the Operations Manual for the Livelihood Empowerment Against Poverty (LEAP) Programme in Ghana, published in 2012 by the Ministry of Employment and Social Welfare, notes that the participants of the programme, in which female-headed households and pregnant women constitute a large beneficiary group, are offered direct access to the free National Health Insurance Scheme and livelihood support as a way of helping them ‘leap out’ of extreme poverty (cited in Roelen et. al, 2017).

For individuals to successfully graduate from the SP programme, some interventions combine various measures into a comprehensive support package to address the multidimensional aspects poverty. Case management has also been used to help identify the needs of programme participants and facilitate linkages to corresponding services, as illustrated by the Chile Solidario Programme (see case study 4).

### KEY ACTIONS TO STRENGTHEN THE GENDER FOCUS

The process for selecting the types of complementary programmes and the operational modalities for establishing links to them is determined by the programme objectives, the availability of resources and the capacity to deliver different components, and the availability and quality of complementary services and programmes. Programme designers can consider the following actions when considering the ways core transfers can be linked, and the type of complementary support they can be linked to.

- Use the GSPVA to assess different pathways to sustainable livelihoods and women’s empowerment, and inform the selection of complementary interventions and modalities through which linkages to these pathways can be promoted.

- Map the availability and quality of complementary programmes and services, and the degree of their gender-sensitivity; and explore the scope for embedding components of these complementary programmes and services into the core programmes.

- Ensure that a functional unified/single registry is in place to link beneficiaries to external programmes and services. To support the gender-sensitive coordination of linked programmes, ensure that sex-disaggregated data is collected and used in the planning.

- Monitor the access of the beneficiaries to the complementary programmes, the coordination across the linked programmes, and the impacts they have on livelihood capacities of rural women and men. Ensure that participation in multiple programmes does not overburden women in terms of their time and/or finances, or create resistance from male household members or non-beneficiaries due to a perceived exclusion from benefits.
Provide access to appropriate child care arrangements to free women’s time for training and other self-improvement activities.

Work with the community and service providers to address barriers to equal access to complementary services among rural women and men. In many settings, there is a widespread assumption that farmers are primarily male and women play an ancillary role at best. Consequently, agricultural support measures may be designed with only male needs and priorities taken into account. It is important therefore to ensure that complementary measures (e.g. agricultural rural advisory services, productive inputs, credit) are designed in a culturally and gender-sensitive way.

Summary questions

- What are the objectives of linking core transfers with complementary interventions?
- What type of linkages can be established, and for what purpose?
- How can gender-sensitive complementarities be promoted in your daily work?

Exercise 4: Developing a road map to link social transfers to complementary support for better gender equality results (SEE ANNEX 5)
In-depth case study 4: Integrated programming in the Chile Solidario Programme, Chile

The Chile Solidario Programme, which was implemented from 2002 to 2012 as an integrated anti-poverty intervention, adopted a gender and life-cycle approach to addressing social and economic exclusion. The Programme focused on three overarching interventions: psychosocial family support, monetary transfers and priority access to social services.

The Programme consisted of two years of psychosocial support for beneficiary families, during which a social worker engaged regularly with the adult women in particular, to draft a work plan to achieve a set of 53 minimum conditions for quality of life. These conditions were grouped into seven categories: health, education, housing conditions, employment, income, family dynamics and identification. Social workers help to link households and individuals to a range of services from different public programmes, based on the specific needs of the beneficiaries (e.g. birth registration, conflict counselling and productive inclusion).7

The subsidies/cash transfers that Chile Solidario provided include the Bono de Protección Social (a cash transfer provided during the two first years of the programme) and the Bono de Egreso (a cash transfer for those leaving the programme who completed two years of the psychosocial counselling). Families also qualify for other types of subsidies, such as the Subsidio Único Familiar (a family allowance targeted at poor families with children under 18 years and pregnant women) and a water subsidy.

Beneficiaries also gain access to complementary social programmes in a number of areas.

- Employment and income: preferential access to training and skills building, job placement programmes, income generation programmes, and rural development. There are also special income-generation programmes for women in rural areas.
- Family dynamics: preferential access to social development programmes to curb domestic violence and strengthen bonds between parents and children in situations of risk.
- Identification: partial exemption from the cost of applying for ID cards and birth registrations.

The evidence highlights that the Programme was able to facilitate access to health and education services and social programmes. The programme’s impact evaluations also emphasized three potential ‘women’s empowerment’ outcomes that might be attributed to the family support that was provided through the interactions with social workers who are primarily women: (i) an increase in confidence that allowed women to see themselves as individuals in addition to wives and/or mothers; (ii) the possibility of women entering into the public sphere and the labour market as a result of skills training and microfinance interventions; and (iii) an altered sense of self, linked to women’s realization that they can be proactive and change their life circumstances. Recently, the Programme has also broadened its scope to work with men as a way of fostering sustainable changes in household gender relations.


7 Productive inclusion comprises programmes that aim to boost the productivity and incomes of the poor (e.g. training, productive grants, self-employment schemes).
ANNEX 1
Checklist for undertaking the GSPVA

In this section we provide examples of guiding questions for each thematic area of inquiry in section 1.2. These are intended to assist the research team in formulating a more detailed, context- and programme-specific set of questions for the analysis.

Table 5: Guiding questions and tools for the gender and livelihoods analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustrative guiding questions</th>
<th>Data sources/methods/tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area of inquiry: Gender and livelihoods analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What are the gender differences in livelihood strategies?</strong></td>
<td>• FAO Country Gender Assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. What are the main livelihood activities for men and women in the household?</td>
<td>• Community meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. What are the roles and responsibilities of men and women as providers of food and non-food items for family members?</td>
<td>• Focus group discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. What are the factors contributing to these differences (socio-cultural norms, traditions, economic factors, reproductive factors)?</td>
<td>• Household interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. How is the programme likely to affect these gender roles and responsibilities?</td>
<td>• Livelihoods analysis matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Seasonal food calendar and gender division of labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Daily activity schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Farming system diagrams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Decision-making matrix</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **What are the gender differences in income earning opportunities?**                         |                                                                 |
| i. What are the main sources of income for women and men, including social transfers?      |                                                                 |
| ii. Are there any gender differences in income sources? Why?                              |                                                                 |
| iii. Are there gender differences access to and control over these income sources, including wages derived from their work and SP benefits? |                                                                 |
| iv. What are the factors contributing to these differences?                                |                                                                 |
| v. How is the programme likely to affect differences in income earning opportunities?     |                                                                 |

<p>| <strong>Do women and men have equal access to employment opportunities (e.g. wage labour, public works schemes)?</strong> |                                                                 |
| i. Are there gender disparities in labour force participation rates in farm and off-farm work? |                                                                 |
| ii. Are there significant differences in wages between men and women?                      |                                                                 |
| iii. What factors drive these disparities? (e.g. education, labour market segmentation, discrimination and absence of affirmative measures, self-exclusion, lack of child care, cultural traditions.) |                                                                 |
| iv. How is the programme likely to affect access to employment opportunities?              |                                                                 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustrative guiding questions</th>
<th>Data sources/methods/tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area of inquiry: Gender and livelihoods analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What are the gender differences in the reproductive/care economy?</strong> What are the main roles and activities for women and men regarding unpaid care and domestic work (e.g. water and fuel collection, child care, food preparation)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. What are the patterns of time use between men and women, and boys and girls?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. How do women’s roles in unpaid care and domestic duties affect their ability to engage in economic activities, training events and leisure activities, relative to men?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Can women/men participate in the SP programme? How can time constraints be addressed through the programme?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What are the gender differences in access to:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• productive resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• economic resources (e.g. income, wages, food produce)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• labour availability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• services (e.g. rural advisory services, labour-saving technologies, skills and training, processing and storage facilities)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• markets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What causes these differences?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What are the gender differences in decision-making?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Are there gender-specific preferences in how money is allocated and spent?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Are there differences in the main expenditure items purchased by women and men?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Who decides how to use income earned and cash and how is this decision made? Why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Who decides how much income is saved? How is the decision made regarding when and how to use the savings?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Is cash/credit from the SP transfers used or treated differently from cash obtained through other sources?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. How is the cash from SP transfers used (e.g. investing in livestock, investing in non-farm small businesses, food, education materials for children, enhancing status)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. Who in the household makes decisions on how income from the SP transfers is allocated?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. Who in the household uses and/or benefits most from the SP transfers?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix. How is the programme likely to impact these dynamics?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Illustrative guiding questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of inquiry: Gender and livelihoods analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women’s membership and participation in community-based organizations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Do women/men have access to social networks, such as women’s groups, producer organizations, farmer cooperatives, village savings and loan associations, microfinance groups?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. What factors hinder their participation in these groups?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. To what extent are women represented in local political or community structures, including project committees? Do they influence decision-making and hold leadership roles?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. How is the programme likely to impact these dynamics?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What are the potential barriers for women and men in participating and benefiting from the programmes?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g. socio-cultural norms, traditions, economic factors, time, literacy, civic documentation, distance, opportunity costs, and mobility.) How can the programme overcome these barriers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender differences in needs and priorities for support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. What are the most important livelihood challenges, opportunities and priorities for women and men in the household/community?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. How can the programme respond to these? What other type of support, beyond SP transfers, is needed to contribute to these outcomes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. What are the key opportunities and challenges for promoting gender equality and women’s empowerment goals within the programme?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What are government policy and institutional responses, including affirmative measures, to address gender inequalities and empower women?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. What are the legal frameworks, policies, plans of action and institutions for gender equality?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. How can the programme contribute to making policies address gender equality and women’s empowerment?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data sources/methods/tools</th>
<th>Illustrative guiding questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area of inquiry: Gender and livelihoods analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Women’s membership and participation in community-based organizations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. Do women/men have access to social networks, such as women’s groups, producer organizations, farmer cooperatives, village savings and loan associations, microfinance groups?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. What factors hinder their participation in these groups?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. To what extent are women represented in local political or community structures, including project committees? Do they influence decision-making and hold leadership roles?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv. How is the programme likely to impact these dynamics?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>What are the potential barriers for women and men in participating and benefiting from the programmes?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e.g. socio-cultural norms, traditions, economic factors, time, literacy, civic documentation, distance, opportunity costs, and mobility.) How can the programme overcome these barriers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Gender differences in needs and priorities for support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. What are the most important livelihood challenges, opportunities and priorities for women and men in the household/community?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. How can the programme respond to these? What other type of support, beyond SP transfers, is needed to contribute to these outcomes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. What are the key opportunities and challenges for promoting gender equality and women’s empowerment goals within the programme?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>What are government policy and institutional responses, including affirmative measures, to address gender inequalities and empower women?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. What are the legal frameworks, policies, plans of action and institutions for gender equality?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. How can the programme contribute to making policies address gender equality and women’s empowerment?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6: Guiding questions and tools for the vulnerability analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustrative guiding questions</th>
<th>Data sources/methods/tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area of inquiry: Vulnerability analysis</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vulnerability context: type of shocks/stresses in the community</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. What are the main sources of vulnerability in the community/household?</td>
<td>• Desk reviews and statistical analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Which are the most common shocks affecting households/community? How often do shocks and stresses affect the community/household?</td>
<td>• Community meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Health shocks</td>
<td>• Focus group discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Natural disasters/climate change</td>
<td>• Household interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Crop failures</td>
<td>• Historical timeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Food crises</td>
<td>• Natural and livelihoods resource map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Civil unrest</td>
<td>• Problem analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Health shocks</td>
<td>• Pairwise ranking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Natural disasters/climate change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Crop failures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Food crises</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Civil unrest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Do women and girls experience shocks and stresses, including climate change differently than men and boys?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are women more likely to be affected by these risks compared with men?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Do men and women experience different types of shocks?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. What are the differences between men and women in access to and types of coping mechanisms?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. What are the differential impacts of disasters and/or climate change on men and women? Why do these differences occur?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. How do life-cycle events specific to women increase women’s vulnerability?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pregnancy and nursing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maternal health problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Old age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Widowhood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Marriage and dowry expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. What are the key social risks and vulnerabilities that women face?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. What are the key drivers of the social risks and vulnerabilities that women and girls face?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix. What are the factors (e.g. poverty, discrimination, socio-cultural norms) that cause and perpetuate this vulnerability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the gender differences in coping capacities and mechanisms?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. What strategies do men and women use to minimize risk (e.g. diversifying livelihoods) and cope with shocks and stresses?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Is there a difference in how women and men cope with shocks and stresses?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. What is the impact of these coping strategies on women compared with men (e.g. on asset endowments, human capital investments, income, physical security, psychosocial well-being)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Illustrative guiding questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of inquiry: Vulnerability analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender differences in priorities, needs and opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. What are the most important risks and vulnerabilities faced by the community/household?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. How could a programme help address these vulnerabilities? What other type of support is needed to contribute to these outcomes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. What are the main needs and priorities for resilience building for women and men?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. How can the programme respond to these? What other type of support is needed to contribute to these outcomes?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7: Guiding questions and tools for the poverty analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of inquiry: Poverty analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poverty context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. What are the main characteristics of rural poverty, and how does they differ for men and women?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. What are the main causes of rural poverty?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. What have been government policy and institutional responses to poverty (e.g. policies, institutions, support mechanisms, safety nets)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Gender differences in the exposure to and experience of poverty |
| i. Are women at a greater risk of income and multidimensional poverty? Why? |
| ii. What are the main causes of poverty from the perspectives of women and men? |
| iii. What causes these differences (e.g. discriminatory social norms, barriers to economic resources and livelihoods, time use)? |

| Gender differences in priorities, needs and opportunities |
| i. How can the programme help address these problems? What other type of support is needed to contribute to these outcomes? |
| ii. What are the opportunities and mechanisms that enable households/individual household members to escape from poverty and start a process of capital accumulation, as seen by women and men? |
| iii. What are the main needs and priorities for SP, as perceived by women and men? |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data sources/methods/tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desk reviews and statistical analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank poverty assessments, Poverty Reduction Strategies, National Development Strategies, CEDAW progress reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus group discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth ranking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural and livelihoods resource map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Illustrative guiding questions**

**Data sources/methods/tools**
### Table 8: Guiding questions and tools for the stakeholder analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustrative guiding questions</th>
<th>Data sources/methods/tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area of inquiry: Stakeholder analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholder mapping</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Who are the main stakeholders?</td>
<td>• Community meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. What are their priorities/interests with regard to poverty reduction, gender equality and SP?</td>
<td>• Key informant interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Are there certain groups that stand to gain or lose more than others? Men and women? Rich or poor? Who will be disadvantaged?</td>
<td>• Stakeholder mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Who are the gatekeepers who control the approval and success of the proposed programme? How can they be engaged effectively?</td>
<td>• Net maps: <a href="https://netmap.wordpress.com/about/">https://netmap.wordpress.com/about/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Are there any stakeholders who are likely to be negatively affected, who have not yet been consulted and who lack the power and voice to influence the programme impact on their lives and livelihoods? How can this be addressed?</td>
<td>• Force field analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. Are there any potential allies among the stakeholders who share common interests with less powerful groups? Could a coalition be built to enhance the voice and influence of the weaker ones?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. How can the programme best promote progressive social change?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9: Guiding questions and tools for the programme review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustrative guiding questions</th>
<th>Data sources/methods/tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area of inquiry: Programme review</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programme objectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. How does programme address gender equality and/or women’s empowerment in the objectives?</td>
<td>• Desk-based research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Do the programme objectives reflect the needs, priorities and challenges of men and women as identified in the GSPVA?</td>
<td>• Programme design documents,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. How is the programme ensuring that benefits accrue equally to both women and men?</td>
<td>• Logframes,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Targeting and participation in the programmes</strong></td>
<td>• Monitoring reports,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. How is the targeting ensuring that women (or men) are preferentially targeted?</td>
<td>• Appraisal reports,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Are women and men facing gender-specific barriers to participate in the programme? Which ones?</td>
<td>• Programme reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Are there specific measures defined to address and overcome these constraints and ensure both have equal access to programmes and benefits?</td>
<td>• Key informant interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Focus group discussions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Illustrative guiding questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of inquiry: Programme review</th>
<th>Data sources/methods/tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programme components, subcomponents and activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Do the proposed activities respond to the needs and priorities of women and men identified in the analyses?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. What strategies will be used to ensure that women will have the opportunity to benefit equally with men in the programme’s economic activities?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. What strategies will be used to reach women and men and ensure their active participation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. What are the potential implications of programme activities on women and men (e.g. access to resources and employment, workloads and time use, bargaining power and social status, intrahousehold dynamics)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Are women and men provided with equal opportunities to plan, participate and monitor the programme’s activities?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. What are the different preferences of men and women with regards to types of transfers/support and payment delivery systems?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risks and opportunities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. What risks could affect programme outcomes and the achievement of objectives related to gender equality and rural women economic empowerment?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. How can programme activities and implementation modalities maximize positive effects and minimize gender risks?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Which mitigation measures been proposed, and are in place?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programme inputs: budgets, capacity, and implementation arrangements</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Does the programme include provisions for gender-sensitive indicators to monitor gender-related changes and impacts?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Are there funds earmarked to implement gender-related activities?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Does the programme team have adequate gender expertise?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Does the programme provide for gender capacity development of implementing staff and/or gender expertise?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Does the programme integrate gender into monitoring and evaluations frameworks and activities?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional capacity assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Which are the designated design and implementation institutions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. What is the extent of political commitments towards promotion of gender equality and women’s empowerment among these institutions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Do institutions have technical gender expertise?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. What capacity gaps exist to design gender-sensitive programme provisions, in terms of resources, knowledge, skills, time and budgets?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. How can these be most effectively established/built, and by whom (e.g. the government, donors, civil society)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## ANNEX 2

**Targeting methods and their gender implications**

Table 10: Pros and cons of different targeting methods for rural women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of targeting methods</th>
<th>Advantages for women</th>
<th>Disadvantages for women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Means testing:</strong> Eligibility is based on income assessment (salary or tax records).</td>
<td>• The rigorous and objective selection process leads to low inclusion errors.</td>
<td>• Can exclude certain vulnerable groups (e.g. informal female workers and unpaid family farmers), who cannot supply evidence of income.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Can exclude certain vulnerable groups (e.g. informal female workers and unpaid family farmers), who cannot supply evidence of income.</td>
<td>• It can also exclude economically and socially vulnerable women living in households above the poverty threshold.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proxy means testing:</strong> A score is generated based on easily observable poverty characteristics, such as quality of housing, ownership of assets, demographic structure of household, and education and occupation of members.</td>
<td>• The score is derived from a multidimensional measurement of poverty, including its social dimensions (e.g. reproductive care burdens, education and health deprivation), which are particularly relevant for women.</td>
<td>• The community may refute the targeting results if they view the scoring system as unfair and not based on local specificities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Such data can be easier to collect and verify than income data, which facilitates the application process for potential beneficiaries who face challenges in supplying documents and evidence of income.</td>
<td>• It may incur significant exclusion errors if it fails to consider comprehensively different aspects of gender-related vulnerabilities (e.g. time poverty and life-cycle vulnerabilities).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community-based targeting</strong> Allows community members to select beneficiaries on the assumption that they are familiar with community poverty characteristics and may have insider knowledge.</td>
<td>• Community participation may increase selection transparency.</td>
<td>• There is a risk of bias or manipulation due to uneven power relations within a community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• It does not require high technical capacity</td>
<td>• There is a potential risk of exclusion among highly marginalized and vulnerable women and men due to corruption or elite capture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Clear selection criteria and sufficient training of community members (particularly regarding gender awareness) is needed to avoid tension and resistance resulting from the prioritization of a particular gender in the selection and targeting process.</td>
<td>• It may perpetuate gender inequalities and the marginalization of stigmatized groups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 2: Targeting methods and their gender implications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of targeting methods</th>
<th>Advantages for women</th>
<th>Disadvantages for women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Categorical targeting</strong> (Eligibility is defined based on broad social categories and/or groups such as age, physical ability, gender, ethnicity and social status.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Simple and easily communicated criteria may create greater transparency and make eligibility less prone to manipulation.</td>
<td>• Verification of status (e.g. birth certificates and identification documents) may be a challenge, and is a constraint often faced by rural women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Women more likely to be targeted on the basis of their socio-economic and life-cycle vulnerabilities (e.g. child care role, labour constraints, social marginalization).</td>
<td>• This method may exclude particularly vulnerable individuals and families that are not strongly associated with the selected categories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Verification of status (e.g. birth certificates and identification documents) may be a challenge, and is a constraint often faced by rural women.</td>
<td>• There may be stigma associated with targeting particular groups (e.g. elderly women caring for orphans and vulnerable children, widows, teen mothers and girl children), leading to self-exclusion from participation in the programme.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Self-selection** (relevant for PWPs) (Programme design components (e.g. size or type of transfer) make the programme attractive only to specific groups who self-select to participate.) |  |  |
|  | • Can lead to low exclusion errors, which can encourage very poor women to apply and participate in the programme. | • Certain self-selection criteria can be stigmatizing and/or impose heavy costs on participants, such as provision of very low and irregular payments, inadequate work conditions, or physically demanding work. |

Source: Adapted from Winder and Yablonski, 2012.
**ANNEX 3**

**Checklist for ensuring gender-sensitivity of cash transfers**

Table 11: Checklist for promoting gender-sensitive design of CTPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of design feature</th>
<th>Strategies for ensuring gender sensitivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Programme objectives                      | • Screen programme objectives to ensure alignment with women’s and men’s rights, as articulated in Article 14 of CEDAW.  
• Where programmes aim to reduce gender inequalities, and/or rural women’s empowerment, they must clearly and explicitly define gender-sensitive objectives and expected outcomes.  
• Define specific dimensions of women’s empowerment to focus on, and the pathways and mechanisms required to achieve this through cash transfers.  
• Include awareness-raising events to sensitize beneficiaries and the community about gender-related programme goals and objectives.  
• Raise awareness among women and girls about their social, economic and political rights as citizens.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| Programme targeting: criteria, methods and procedures | • Use the GSPVA to assess whether women and girls should be preferentially targeted by cash transfers and under what conditions.  
• Pay careful attention to enrolment of particularly vulnerable and excluded groups of rural women/men.  
• Complement targeting with other measures, such as sensitization, access to additional services and support to maximize impacts.  
• Deliver local communication campaigns to ensure community support for targeting rural women as beneficiaries. Programme messaging can be employed to diffuse potential intrahousehold tensions arising from the allocation of benefits to only one member.  
• Where households are targeted as individual units, put strategies in place to ensure all household members have equal access to and control over benefits.  
• Monitor the effects of targeting women as transfer recipients, including an assessment of mothers’ time poverty and labour supply, direct and indirect costs imposed by the transfer, and potential backlash from men and non-beneficiaries.  
• Review targeting methods and procedural arrangements for their potential gender impacts, and adjust them accordingly.  
• Provide potential beneficiaries with clear information about programme admission criteria and application processes.  
• Provide access to grievance mechanisms tailored to women’s needs. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of design feature</th>
<th>Strategies for ensuring gender sensitivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Transfer size and predictability** | • Where feasible, adjust the transfer size to address specific gender vulnerabilities.  
• If possible, adjust the transfer size to enable both risk management and the development of productive functions.  
• Explore the possibility of complementing regular cash transfers with a one-off lump sum payment, and/or asset grant with complementary support to enhance the impacts on production and livelihoods.  
• Monitor the transfer size and its impacts on gender, particularly the gender differences in spending patterns and gender relations. |
| **Programme conditionalities**  | • Consider the pros and cons of conditionalities in terms of welfare of rural women and girls.  
• Assess existing constraints faced by rural women in complying with programme conditions.  
• Explore whether the programme could achieve its intended objectives through positive messaging as opposed to strict conditions.  
• Where possible design conditions that explicitly to support positive changes in gender roles and address vulnerabilities faced by women and girls.  
• Promote co-responsibility for fulfilment of programme conditions between parents.  
• Ensure that women responsible for conditions receive respectful and dignified treatment.  
• Provide culturally appropriate information on programme conditions and access to grievance mechanisms.  
• Monitor the effects of conditions on those responsible for complying with them.  
• Ensure easier access and better outreach of services to reduce the burden of conditionalities on rural women. |
ANNEX 4

Checklist for ensuring gender-sensitivity of PWP
ts

Table 12: Checklist for promoting the gender-sensitive design of PWP
ts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of design feature</th>
<th>Strategies for embedding gender sensitivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Programme targeting** | • Use quotas or reserve spots for women to ensure their participation.  
• Include measures to encourage female heads of households to register and participate.  
• Closely monitor the implementation of quotas to ensure that barriers to women assuming jobs are acknowledged, well understood, and removed.  
• Organize awareness-raising events to ensure community buy-in for gender-sensitive employment quotas.  
• Targeting modalities should ensure that women in male-headed households (including extended and polygamous households) have rights and access to employment. ‘Full family’ targeting could be considered, in which all members of eligible households are listed as clients.  
• Encourage the opening of separate bank accounts for each worker to ensure that women have access to wages.  
• Where polygamous households are prevalent, they can be treated as separate households eligible for transfers, with provisions to allow second or third wives to claim their own access-to-work schemes as a separate family unit.  
• Ensure services and information about targeting are accessible |
| **Type of benefit** | • Assess differences in preference between men and women with regard to types of benefit types.  
• Encourage male and female beneficiaries to participate actively in consultations and provide input to select the best type of benefit.  
• Raise awareness among programme staff regarding the differences in preference for various transfers among men and women. |
## Checklist for ensuring gender-sensitivity of PWPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of design feature</th>
<th>Strategies for embedding gender sensitivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Working conditions** | • Provide regular employment and payment of wages, and ensure that workers are adequately informed about their rights and entitlements.  
• Provide mandatory, on-site child care and/or community-based care support.  
• Design gender-sensitive working conditions (e.g. flexible working hours, reduced work times, work locations close to beneficiary homes, provision of drinking water and shade, and separate toilet facilities) to attract more women to the programme.  
• Women-only projects or components of larger projects can help to overcome socio-cultural barriers.  
• Commit to paying equal wages between men and women performing similar tasks and sensitize staff and beneficiaries of the importance of this design feature, and monitor implementation. |
| **Types of assets and jobs/projects** | • The selection of assets must be informed by gender-sensitive criteria in order to benefit both women and men.  
• Prioritize asset development that reduces women’s work burden and promotes their agricultural productivity and/or resilience in the face of environmental and climate-change risks.  
• Ensure participation of women in programme planning, and the selection of assets and job types to be implemented within PWPs.  
• Participating communities can be provided with a monetary incentive (through reduced contributions) when they prioritize infrastructure projects that address the priorities of women’s groups.  
• Explore the feasibility of adopting a broader definition of what constitutes a public work assignment, and provide appropriate jobs in accordance with men’s and women’s skill sets and work experience.  
• Compensate for household labour shortages, which are characteristic of female-headed households, by utilizing public works labour to support agricultural work on farms cultivated by female-headed households, or by implementing other measures, such as providing village crèches, and/or support for the elderly.  
• Consider providing direct support or light jobs to pregnant and lactating women and elderly women who cannot engage in productive work activities.  
• Provide on-the-job skills development and training to increase the future employability of rural female workers. Establish local community spaces to enhance women’s participation in social networks and public life. |
ANNEX 5
Learning tools

Exercise 1:
Developing a road map to conduct the gender-sensitive poverty and vulnerability analysis (breakout groups and plenary)

LEARNING OBJECTIVE: To provide an opportunity for learners to apply the knowledge and guidance they have acquired, and develop their own assessment tool.

Timing indication

60 minutes (group breakout discussions and development of posters)
20 minutes (presentation of findings)
20 minutes (plenary discussions)

Notes to the facilitator

- Divide trainees into small teams to work on the following tasks and develop posters to present the main findings of consultations:
  - Task 1: Drawing on the conceptual entry points and guiding questions presented in section 1.2, discuss which of these analytical elements would be relevant to include in your analysis. What other broad dimensions/issues are missing?
  - Task 2: Once the broad scope of the inquiry is agreed upon, develop a more detailed/disaggregated list of questions to use in the analysis.
  - Task 3: What research approach and methods would be suitable to use in collecting data/information and responding to questions in the analysis? Determine the most relevant actors to lead/engage in the analysis process. Provide a broad outline of roles and responsibilities.
  - Task 4: What opportunities and challenges might you encounter in this process? How can you overcome these challenges? How can you prepare the budget for the assessment?
- Ask participants to use Tables 5-9 in Annex 1 to guide their discussion.

Exercise 2:
Formulating gender-sensitive CTPs (breakout groups and plenary)

LEARNING OBJECTIVE: To encourage learners to reflect on the relevance and gender implications of core design features of cash transfers discussed in Part 2, and formulate recommendations on how to integrate gender into each dimension of the programme design.

Timing indication

60 minutes (group breakout discussions)
20 minutes (presentation of findings)
20 minutes (plenary discussions)
Notes to the facilitator

- Divide trainees into small teams and provide them with a summary of the programme design document of the real-life CTP. Structure the activities and guide reflection and discussion around programme design features, such as programme objectives and targeting, transfer size and programme conditionalities. For each feature, participants will discuss the following questions:
  - Is gender of relevance to this design feature? Why/why not?
  - How can gender considerations be integrated most effectively into this feature of the programme?
  - What are the potential challenges to making this feature gender-sensitive? How can these challenges be overcome?

- At the end of the discussion, groups are invited to share insights and results from their conversations in plenary discussion.

Exercise 3:
Formulating gender-sensitive PWPs (breakout groups and plenary)

LEARNING OBJECTIVE: To encourage learners to reflect on the relevance and gender implications of core design features of PWPs discussed in Part 3, and formulate recommendations on how to integrate gender into each dimension of the programme design.

Timing indication

60 minutes (group breakout discussions)
20 minutes (presentation of findings)
20 minutes (plenary discussions)

Notes to the facilitator

- Divide trainees into small teams and provide them with a summary of the programme design document of the real-life public works programme. Structure the activities and guide reflection and discussion around programme design features, such as programme targeting, transfer type, working conditions and type of assets/projects. For each feature, participants will discuss the following questions:
  - Is gender of relevance to this design feature? Why/why not?
  - How can gender considerations be integrated most effectively into this feature of the programme?
  - What are the potential challenges to making this feature gender-sensitive? How can these challenges be overcome?

- At the end of the discussion, groups are invited to share insights and results from their conversations in plenary discussion.
Exercise 4:
Developing a road map to link social transfers to complementary measures for better gender equality results

LEARNING OBJECTIVE: To provide an opportunity for learners to apply the knowledge and guidance they acquired in Part 4, and develop a plan to promote linkages between core transfers and complementary interventions.

Timing indication

40 minutes (group breakout discussions)
20 minutes (presentation of findings)
20 minutes (plenary discussions)

Notes to the facilitator

> Divide trainees into small teams to identify potential pathways to promoting links between cash transfers and public works with complementary measures. The participants may add to or modify types of objectives listed in the table to suit their circumstances.

Table 13: Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Type of links</th>
<th>Operational approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve rural women’s agricultural productivity and income generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support rural women’s enterprise development and livelihoods diversification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address women’s double work burden and time poverty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote social empowerment of women and address risks of gender-based exclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... add another objective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 6

Key resources

Resources on gender and poverty analysis


FAO resources on social protection and gender

From Protection to Production (PtoP) project research publications on social protection: www.fao.org/economic/ptop/publications/reports/en/

**FAO Gender publications**


See in particular:


The Transfer Project publications on cash transfer impact evaluations

https://transfer.cpc.unc.edu/?page_id=310

See in particular:


International Labour Organization (ILO) resources on social protection


See in particular:


World Bank resources on social protection and gender


See in particular:


https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/4391)


https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/22101)

Institute of Development Studies (IDS) resources on social protection and gender

www.ids.ac.uk/idsresearch/centre-for-social-protection

ODI resources on social protection and gender

https://wwwodi.org/search/site?f[0]=im_field_programme%5A38&f[1]=bundle%5Aresource&solrsort=ds_sort_date%20desc

Social Protection and Human Rights platform

http://socialprotection-humanrights.org
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This three-part Toolkit focuses on the role of social protection in reducing rural gender inequalities, rural poverty and hunger. The Toolkit is composed of three technical guides. The first technical guide is an introduction to gender-sensitive social protection programming to combat rural poverty. The second, provides practical guidance on a gender-sensitive design of cash transfer and public works programmes. The third and last guide is dedicated to integrating gender into implementation, and monitoring and evaluation of cash transfer and public works programmes.

The Toolkit on gender-sensitive social protection programmes to combat rural poverty and hunger is designed to support social protection and gender policy-makers and practitioners in their efforts to systematically apply a gender lens to social protection programmes in ways that are in line with global agreements and FAO commitments in order to expand social protection systems to rural women and rural populations more broadly.