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Executive Summary

Gender issues have been mainstreamed by the Regional Fisheries Livelihoods Programme (RFLP) and considered as crosscutting issues. The present assessment looked at how the interventions have changed the roles of beneficiaries in domestic, productive and community management roles. In addition the assessment also covered the degree of participation of women in the conducted activities. Focus group discussions with selected beneficiaries, who represent the five national level outputs of RFLP, were conducted in the areas of interventions in Kupang District, Kupang Municipality, Rote Ndao and Alor districts.

The assessment shows the extent to which the participation of women in the projects varied depending on the activities. For the activities that specifically target women, the involvement is high although thus far it has not necessarily contributed to changes in the participation of women at the community level. For activities that should have targeted both men and women (e.g. co-management activities), women’s participation has had only limited impact on their contribution to the decision making process. The level of women’s participations varied considerably for co-management activities and depended primarily on the willingness of the group leader to promote gender concerns and on how the implementing partners implemented activities while under contract to RFLP.

The upgrading strategies and introduction of new income generating activities in post harvest and alternative livelihood activities has empowered women’s position in domestic and productive role. It has also improved their material wellbeing. However, it has less impact to date at the community role, and there has been only limited involvement of women in the public decision making process. Meanwhile, the interventions under the RFLP co-management output provide an opportunity to enable women as well men to access and participate in public domain.

It is realized that the achievement of a change in gender roles in society is complex and the empowerment of women in public decision making has to be a long term process.
Therefore, the RFLP interventions should be more integrated and holistic by combining both practical and strategic approaches. The activities of all RFLP outputs should be focused at fewer selected locations to provide synergism, greater impact and lessons learned, rather than separate large numbers of activities scattered across many places.
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1. Introduction

Background

Despite the extensive gender mainstreaming movement worldwide, gender inequality persists across all societies and all sectors, including in the fishery sector. Worldwide, gender issue in fishery sector is being increasingly recognized but more work remains to be done to fully mainstream gender in this sector (Williams 2008; Arenas and Lentisco 2011). In Indonesia, women participate in a range of activities related to fishery as paid and unpaid job that contributes to individual, family and community wellbeing, but their roles are poorly recognized (Fitriana and Stacey 2012). Therefore, gender concerns require special attention in order to increase the ability of women conducting fishing related activities to gain better access to and control over management of natural fisheries resources and services. Such problems are being addressed by the four year Regional Fisheries Livelihoods Programme (RFLP).

The Regional Fisheries Livelihood Programme for South and Southeast Asia is a partnership project between the Kingdom of Spain which is the donor, the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations which is the executing agency and the governments of the six participating countries namely Cambodia, Indonesia, The Philippines, Sri Lanka, Timor Leste, and Viet Nam. The RFLP objective is to improve the livelihoods of small-scale coastal fisheries communities while contributing to sustainable management of aquatic resources. The RFLP understands that it is necessary to address gender concerns throughout the entire project life cycle, as this is crucial to the improvement of livelihoods and the reduction of vulnerability of fishing communities. The RFLP has gender mainstreaming as an important cross cutting issue in its implementation in all its six countries and regional interventions.

In Indonesia the project is implemented in three districts and one municipality in the province of Nusa Tenggara Timur (NTT) (see Figure 1).
RFLP has the following five national level outputs, each with a set of specific activities:
1. Co-management mechanisms for sustainable utilization of fishery resources;
2. Improved safety and reduced vulnerability for fisher communities;
3. Improved quality of fishery products and market chains;
4. Strengthened existing and diversified alternative income opportunities for fishing households;
5. Facilitated access to micro-finance services for fishers, processors and vendors, and

Additionally RFLP has a sixth output at the regional level on sharing of knowledge.

Gender has been mainstreaming in all RFLP activity implementation over the program life. It is necessary to ensure that when gender mainstreaming is addressed, that both the reproductive and productive roles of women are considered and valued by the family, society; and the programme; and it is ensured that implemented activities create a positive impact towards the relationship of women in a family and at community level.

was conducted to assess how RFLP interventions have impacted (negative or positive) on the relationships and roles on women within target coastal fishing communities and to provide recommendations for improvement.
As outlined in the ToR, the specific objectives of this assessment are to:

- Assess the effects of RFLP interventions at household level, identifying possible changes of gender roles and relations, and relevant issues on gender equity and equality;
- Assess women’s participation in decision making;
- Identify any potential negative side effects (e.g. increase in domestic violence, double burden, etc.);
- Identify the existence (or not) of double burden as a result of RFLP activities, and how women are dealing with it; and,
- Identify and document specific examples through change stories or case studies (template to be provided) to illustrate women’s empowerment as a result of project interventions.
2. The basic concepts

2.1 Gender Concept

Gender is defined by FAO (1997) as ‘the relations between men and women, both perceptual and material’. Gender is not determined biologically, as a result of sexual characteristics of either women or men, but is constructed culturally and socially (Reeves and Baden 2000). It is a central organizing principle of societies, and often governs the processes of production and reproduction, consumption and distribution (FAO, 1997). It varies across culture, ethnic, community’s class, and places. Refer to this definition, the term ‘gender’ is related with the different roles of women and men in society.

The definition of gender is often misunderstood with the definition of ‘sex’. The term ‘sex’ refers to the biological characteristics of a woman or a man. The biological ‘sex’ of a person is determined at birth. It is essentially unchangeable. It refers to physical attributes pertaining to a person’s body contours, features, genitals, hormones, genes, chromosomes and reproductive organs (Fisheries administration of Kingdom of Cambodia, 2010). Several examples of sex and gender are in Box 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box 1 Examples of sex and gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biologically determined:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Only women can give birth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Only women can give breast feeding to the baby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender behaviour:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Biology does not determine who will raise the children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Women and men can work as nurse, pilots, ojeq (motorbike taxi) riders, catch fish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Women and men can prepare foods and care for family members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Women and men can wear skirt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Discussions with Training of Trainers (ToT) Alumnae
Different ideas, customs, cultures and practices mould and determine the typical roles and positions that man and woman take on and occupy within society. There are several roles which woman fulfills in a society (Razavi and Miller, 1997):

- Reproductive: child bearing and rearing responsibilities; caring for other family members, and domestic tasks for the maintenance and well-being of household members;
- Productive: refer to market production and subsistence production; and,
- Community management roles: the activities taken to ensure the provision of resources at the community level.

In order to conduct and function in these roles, women and men need to interact and relate to each other. In Bravo-Baumann’s (2000) term, the ways in which a culture or society defines rights, responsibilities, and the identities of men and women in relation to one another is called gender relation. The relationship between men and women is not only within a household, it also includes at the community, market and state institutions. This relationship determines who has power and influence access to and control over resources (Reeves and Baden 2000). Understanding the dynamic gender relations in different context helps in understanding how gender issues are shaped in a society.

In addition, the different roles that a man or woman takes on in a society also affect the different interests and needs. These needs cover practical and strategic needs. Practical needs address concrete living conditions such as fulfillment of basic needs (access to safe water, health facilities, housing and sanitation conditions). Strategic needs relate to address issue of imbalance of power and control, and participation in decision making (Moser 1993). Although it is a strategic need, women may not always recognize or prioritize their strategic needs particularly if it threatens their immediate practical needs (Reeves and Baden 2000). An understanding of these issues is needed to analyze gender differences and social relations in society.

**Gender equality and equity**

Different roles of men and women in a society shape the constraints to participation and receipt of benefits. Since Rio-Agenda 21, there has been a commitment to overcome
these inequality and inequity. Gender equality refers to the equal rights, responsibilities and opportunities of women and men, girls and boys. Equality does not mean that women and men will become the same, but that women’s and men’s rights, responsibilities and opportunities will not depend on whether they are born male or female. It implies that the interests, needs and priorities of both women and men are taken into consideration, recognizing the diversity of different groups of women and men (UNEG 2011). This also means that women have the same opportunities in life as men to develop their personal abilities and make choices without the limitations set by strict gender roles. This includes participation in the public sphere.

Gender equity is a fairness of treatment for women and men, according to their respective needs, interests and that equality of outcomes (Fisheries administration of Kingdom of Cambodia 2010). It is needed to ensure the equivalence in life outcomes for women and men. Due to social and historical disadvantages that prevent women and men from participating, redistribution of power and resources are sometimes needed (Reeves and Baden, 2000).

2.2 Gender Impact Assessment

Impact assessment
The most widely shared definition of impact assessment is

‘Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended’ OECD-DAC (2002).

This definition stresses positive and negative impact of an intervention. It acknowledges unintended consequences and uncertainty over the long term. This definition also considers a cause and effect relationship between an intervention and the result of the intervention on beneficiaries. Stern et al (2012) highlights that a clausal claim of an intervention that results in a positive or negative effect on beneficiaries might also be affected by other variables. This is true especially in a place and intervention where other
factors (such as culture) are important, therefore considering the contribution of other factors is important when conducting impact assessment.

As impact assessment emphasizes the logic of contribution of an intervention to a result in a positive or negative effect, Stern *et al* (2012) argue how well the intervention works toward producing the intended result. If the intervention does not work as planned, then it is almost impossible to get an intended result unless other supporting variables are high. The process of the intervention is crucial to assess the intended result. Therefore, this assessment also considers the beneficiaries perspective on how well the activities were conducted.

This definition focuses on long term effects. For the purpose of this assessment intermediate effect is also considered as a step along the way, as at this stage it is too early to determine any likely long term impact of RFLP interventions.

**Gender Impact Assessment**

Gender impact assessment means to assess, according to gender relevant criteria, the differential impact if any with the expected development resulting from the intervention (Schultz *et al* 2001). The RFLP gender impact assessment is meant to study how project intervention can help women to achieve a better functional position in a family and society.

Several gender-related issues were taken into account for the purpose of this assessment:

- The degree of women participation in the project. The assessment covered not only the numbers of women participating in RFLP activities but it also covered the extent to which women participated in the project. The assessment also covered the challenge for women to participate in the activities. This included constraints and how they dealt with them. In addition, this part also assessed how they perceived the projects brought benefit to them; how satisfied they were with project implementation. These factors were meant to assess how effective and well the project were conducted to help women to achieve a better position and result in a change.
- Changes of roles. The changes of roles of men and women at different times and their relations and if there was any increased participation of women in community management roles as a result of the intervention. Time burden also assessed as it is crucial for gender sensitive development interventions. This also includes changes in mobility
- Gender equality and equity. If there was any changing in access and control over resources, and power relations in a household and at the community level.

3. Methodology and Sites selection

3.1 Assessment framework

This assessment was designed to assess the cause and effect relationship of project interventions in relation to gender related issues. The causal effect explanation provides an account of why the result of interventions turns out as it does (George and Bennett 2005; Pawson 2007). In addition, the assessment explores causation via a number of combined attributes that together bring about an outcome. Stern et al (2012) consider two events are causally connected when and only when, there is a mechanism connecting them. Therefore this assessment aimed at better understanding of how specific interventions contributed to bringing about intended impacts in combination with other causal factors in relation to gender concerns.

It is realized that one intervention might cause single outcome or multiple outcomes. In different situation, several interventions might cause one outcome or multiple outcomes (Pawson 2007). Interventions can be multiple or single, interdependent rather than independent (Stern et al 2012). Therefore, this assessment considered multiple causations of interventions and considered the contexts where the effects were resulted in.
3.2 Methods

The assessment consisted of four steps:

1. Review of secondary data. A wide range of literature was reviewed such as project document, socio-economic reports, back to office report from national consultants of every RFLP output, statistical reports, published and unpublished material, and maps.

2. Site selection. The national consultants who are responsible for each RFLP output recommended sites to be visited in consultation with the National Project Manager (NPM) and the Monitoring & Evaluation Office (MEO)/The Gender Focal Point (GFP).

3. Data gathering, analysis and interpretation. 15 villages and/or group of beneficiaries were selected as case studies for this assessment. This involved 21 group discussions. (Details of the group composition, management and facilitation are given in Table 1 below).

4. Production of a report which covers the result of the gender impact assessment (lessons learned and good practices) and provides recommendation on how to improve the implementation of the RFLP gender mainstreaming strategy in NTT province of Indonesia.

Data collection

A qualitative data collection was used, involving a combination of participatory rural appraisal (Pretty et al 1995) and focus groups discussion. A list of questions was used to lead the discussion of a topic during the discussions (See Appendix B). This provided focus for the conversations and all the information collected was consistent across all the groups.

A participatory approach was used to gain data and information from the perspective of the beneficiaries. This exploration allowed the beneficiaries to reflect more closely how they viewed the result(s) of the intervention and ensured they had a voice to clarify problems, constraints and verify validity.
The focus group discussions helped the participants to express their thought in a more relaxed manner when they saw others who had the same or similar experiences. Participants may not all actively participate in group discussion and can find the discussion tiring particularly if the discussion period is overly long and it raises time concerns (Liamputtong, 2009. Therefore, the discussion was conducted in informal settings and kept to less than two hours on average. The participants who were reluctant to speak were individually asked to share their views, and specifically asked whether they too agreed or otherwise with the outcomes of the discussions. The use of several qualitative methods helps to clarify various concepts used and to define the different variables.

Purposive sites sampling was used to ensure that the sampled sites represented the RFLP five outputs and the interventions that were and have been conducted (Table 1). The selected interventions mostly targeted women for the activities of post harvesting, alternative livelihoods and facilitated linkages to micro finance services. Although co-management and safety at sea do not specifically target women, it is assumed that women will also benefit from these interventions, considering that women should participate and achieved the targeted empowerment effects.

A total of 21 group discussions were conducted the three districts namely Rote Ndao, Kupang and Alor districts and Kupang Municipality which are the RFLP area of geographic coverage. This involved 203 people, 62 men and 141 women. The participants of the discussions were beneficiaries, family of the beneficiaries, or persons who knew about the interventions of RFLP.

The participants of this assessment were selected based on several criteria. The first criterion was that RFLP activities had been conducted in that area. The second condition was the beneficiaries or people who were involved in the activities. The third was people who knew how the project were started and implemented. The last criterion was the siblings of the beneficiaries of the project, for example husband or elder son. These
criteria, along with the plan, were told to the implementing partners or village/group leaders in advance. Thus, the group or village leaders called their relevant community to attend the meeting.

Whenever possible, men and women group discussions were conducted separately, thus the result of men or women group discussions were verified to the group (Figure 2). Except discussion in Alor where the men were part of the beneficiaries of groups that had received the equipment for fish trading at Kadelang market and were food processors. There were several cases where men group discussions were not conducted. For example, in Kuanheum-Kupang District due to limited time, Oelua and Tesabela in Rote Ndao District due to unavailability of the family to be interviewed. In some cases, women’ group discussions were not conducted, and only one or two women was consulted informally because the main beneficiaries were men, such as motor bike fish traders in Rote Ndao District and the fishers who were given RFLP cool-boxes in Batu Tua-Rote Ndao District. The specific number and sex of the focus groups at each sampling site are detailed in Table 1 below.

Table 1. The number of participants of the discussions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>#of discussions</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabupaten Kupang:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Noelbaki</td>
<td>- Post harvesting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Micro finance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- alternative livelihoods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kuanheum</td>
<td>Co management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pitay</td>
<td>Co management</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sulamau</td>
<td>- Post harvesting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- safety at sea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- alternative livelihoods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kota Kupang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pasir Panjang</td>
<td>- Post harvest</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- alternative livelihoods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Oesapa</td>
<td>Co management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Probur Utara</td>
<td>Co management</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Food processors</td>
<td>Post harvest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Fish trader at Kadelang Market</td>
<td>Post harvest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rote Ndao</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Namodale</td>
<td>alternative livelihoods</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Oelua</td>
<td>alternative livelihoods</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Oeseli</td>
<td>-alternative livelihoods</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Sites</td>
<td>Outputs</td>
<td>#of discussions</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Tesabela</td>
<td>Post harvest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Batu tua</td>
<td>Post harvest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Motor bike fish traders in Rote Ndao</td>
<td>Post harvest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>203</strong></td>
<td><strong>62</strong></td>
<td><strong>141</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the purpose of this assessment, data and information were organised and presented based on the gender related issues as discussed in the previous section. Accordingly, the exploration of causal conditions and the relationship between interventions and impacts of the intervention focusing on gender concerns were analyzed. This assessment was conducted between 13 June and 15 July 2012.

![Image of focus group discussions](image)

Figure 2. Focus group discussions with women and men were conducted separately in Oeseli, Rote Ndao District. Photo by Agoes Hekso

**Limitations of this study**

There are a number of limitations which constrained the assessment. Some were as a result of time and primarily because of the limited time available to conduct the assessment. There was a case where the beneficiaries were unavailable due to conflict with their other activities, either their own domestic and productive activities, social activities, or activities from other project/institutions. In addition, due to time constraints and limited access of communication for organizing the meeting, the invitation to the participants of group discussions was shared by local leaders to their members with little notice for most of the meetings. A key person who involved in the activities might not be available. For example, the only woman participant for the catfish rearing activity in Kuanheum could not attend the assessment meeting, consequently the information on
catfish rearing was explored in little depth. In different cases, the siblings of women beneficiaries could not be consulted. To get a better result, therefore, organizing the schedule of meetings well in advance is key to the success of the assessment, especially for this kind of rapid assessment.

Another limitation was that several the RFLP interventions had only recently been conducted therefore too short a time period had elapsed to reliably detect any impact.

### 3.3 The location context

The RFLP is conducted in three districts of Nusa Tenggara (NTT) Province: namely Kupang District, Alor District and Rote Ndao District and also Kupang Municipality. The total number of people in these four districts is 991,478 people (Table 2). The most populated area is in Kupang Municipality. In contrast to the rest of Indonesia, the predominant religion of NTT province is Christianity and Protestant, although some parts of the area are also populated by Muslims, such as in Alor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Districts</th>
<th>Area (hectares)</th>
<th>Population 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kupang</td>
<td>5,895.30</td>
<td>394,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kupang Municipality</td>
<td>26.18</td>
<td>299,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alor</td>
<td>2,864.60</td>
<td>181,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rote Ndao</td>
<td>1,280.00</td>
<td>115,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>991,478</td>
<td>500,387</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: BPS NTT 2010

The percentage of women at productive age (15-55 years old) in 2009 was 52% of the total population (BPS NTT 2010). However, how many of them were involved in the fisheries sector was not clear. As elsewhere in Indonesia, there is no statistical data on how women contribute to and are involved in fishing related activities, although the roles of women in productive activities in NTT are significant in the fishing households (Fitriana and Stacey 2012).
The RFLP conducts activities across four widely dispersed areas including three different islands. For this assessment, time allowed only a limited number of sites to be selected. The following section briefly describes the activities conducted at each of the targeted sample sites for this assessment.

**Kupang District**

Four sites were selected for this assessment: Noelbaki, Kuanheum, Pitay and Sulamu (Table 1). These four sites cover a wide range of RFLP activities under the different programme outputs. In Noelbaki, all members of the Kelompok Wanita Tani/KWT (Women farmers group) attended basic cooperative system training. Five people attended a bio-gas energy training in their home village and one household received a bio-gas stove set. Four people attended a catfish rearing training and received culture equipment and catfish fingerlings. Three people from the group were involved in post harvesting processing activities with catfish. In Kuanheum, the RFLP co-management activities have included formulating a village regulation and strengthening of a community based surveillance group at the village level. One woman was also involved in catfish training. In Pitay, co management activities have included mangrove re-plantation and one community awareness activity was organized in the church. The villagers received plastic bags for mangrove seedlings and every family had to plant and maintain the trees. This work was conducted in collaboration with the United Nations World Food Programme (WFP) through its Food for Asset assistance with rice distribution to the villagers. In Sulamu, one women group was involved in post harvesting processing of farmed seaweed. This group made and sold seaweed-cookies. Other activities are 65 people received materials to build a base for sun-drying seaweed (para-para), 15 young people receiving materials and seedlings for seaweed farming and three people receiving equipment for catfish culture and catfish fingerlings for stocking.

**Kupang Municipality**

Two sites were selected for this assessment: Pasir Panjang and Oesapa (Table 1). In Pasir Panjang, two women groups were involved in post harvesting output activities. The “Setia Kawan” Group has been supported to process shredded Tuna. Group members
attended shredding food process training and received a set of cooking utensils. The leader of the group also attended a basic accounting and marketing training course. RFLP Indonesia also helped in improving the packaging and helped this group to register for a trading permit. The second “Bunga rumput” have had RFLP support for processing seaweed into snacks. They also attended a food making technique training course and were supplied with a set of cooking utensils. At Oesapa. RFLP, through Bengkel APPeK as the implementing partner, has supported a women’s group to draft a village regulation on marine resource management

**Alor District**

Four sites were selected. In Probur Utara, RFLP supported co-management activities have included the drafting of village regulation for marine resource management. Three groups in Alor city joined post harvesting activities: the “Al Ansar” group which processes seaweed into snacks, “Sartika” which processes fish into fish-balls, and “Mawar Sejati” makes shredded tuna and round scad stick snacks. The activities started with training, and improving the packaging. RFLP has also supported linkages of their products to wider markets in Kupang. Another group selected for the assessment included a group of 40 fish traders at Kadelang market who received a set of RFLP supplied equipment for selling fish, including cool-boxes, tables, baskets, and glass jugs for waste water.

**Rote Ndao District**

There were five sampling sites covering a variety of different RFLP intervention for this assessment. One hand-woven women’s producer group in Namodale village, with 21 people, attended a training course on organic dyes. In Oeluva village, two people had been involved in RFLP supported seaweed food processing activities. They attended a training course to improve the quality of the product, were supported to improve their product packaging and to obtain a household industry license, and RFLP also supported linkages for their products to wider markets in Kupang. In Oeseli village, a women’s group of seaweed farmers received a set of farming equipments: ropes, and shoes. Meanwhile in Batu tua village a group of fishers who had a motorized boat were provided with an
RFLP funded cool-box. Finally, motorbike fish traders from Rote Ndao which had received a cool-box for the back of their motorbike were also involved in the group discussions.

4. Gender related Impact

This section describes the key gender concerned impact assessed as a result of RFLP interventions. The description is divided into three sections:
1. Degree of participation, which also includes the challenge of women to participate in RFLP activities, changes in mobility if any due to interventions, the beneficiaries’ perspectives on how the project was implemented and brought benefit to them.
2. Change of roles if any.
3. Changes in access and control over resources.

4.1 Degree of women participation

Participation has been promoted as one way to enable people to participate in, share control over resource and decisions, and access information relating to decision making process that affect their lives (Chambers 2005). For gender context, participation allows men and women to take part in the planning, setting targets and activities developed. The degree and quality of participation can vary, from passive to self-mobilization where people participate by taking initiatives independent of external institutions to change system (Arnstein, 1969). Considering this, for the purpose of this assessment, the degree of participation was considered by asking the beneficiaries any RFLP activities they involved in and the way that they were involved in the activity.

Table 3. Participation of women during RFLP interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Villages/group of activities</th>
<th>Intervention stages</th>
<th>Major decision makers</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Idea</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kupang District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noelbaki</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part of the activities
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Villages/group of activities</th>
<th>Intervention stages</th>
<th>Major decision makers</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Idea</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuanheum</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Village regulation: x Pokmaswas: x Catfish: x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>secretery in their homevillage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitay</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>All villagers planted mangrove. -participants for community awareness were selected by village leaders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulamu</td>
<td>Group leader</td>
<td>Seaweed: v Post harvest: v catfish: x</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group leader=mama fons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Kupang Municipality**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pasir Panjang</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>Pots harvest: all Accounting: group leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oesapa</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Alor District**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probur Utara</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>As participants during public hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food processing</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish traders at Kadelang market</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rote Ndao District**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Namodale</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oelua</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oeseli</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tesabela</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorbike fish trader</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishers in Batu Tua</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: group discussions
Most of the intervention activities were proposed by RFLP staff to the village leaders (Table 3). For six activities, the ideas came from the community: in Sulamu, Pasir Panjang, fish traders from Kadelang market in Alor, Oelu, Oeseli and Tesabela. Where ideas came from the community, it was not automatic that they were involved in the planning stage. For example, fish traders from Kadelang market and community groups in Oeseli. In different cases, the idea come from the implementing partners but the women groups were involved during the planning process such as in Oesapa. The major decision makers in most of the activities were RFLP or implementing partners or village leaders. It is quite common for the implementing agencies play a significant role to drive project work. The participants of the discussions stated they were the executor and beneficiaries of the activities.

**The beneficiaries’ perceptions of the interventions**

This section presents the perceptions of women beneficiaries to RFLP interventions. This is particularly important to assess if people have a positive evaluation towards the intervention, including pleasant emotions, fulfillment and their level of satisfactions (Diener and Biswas-Diener 2005). Positive perceptions towards a development intervention lead to a more engaged activity, people are likely to feel empowered and to gain self confidence; and they are more likely to pursue the goals in active way (Diener and Biswas-Diener 2005). This question is crucial when assessing how well an intervention has produced the intended impacts and how well the intervention has led to positive drivers for the beneficiaries. Therefore this assessment looked at how people perceived of the RFLP implemented activities.

Participants of group discussions were asked how they felt about the project. A perception line with a smile face picture at the edge of right side of the line and sad face at the left side of the line were drawn. The participants were asked to point where on the line they felt about the project. The author facilitated the discussions and asked questions to verify and to check reasons behind each point. Consensus was gathered to get the point
of group’s satisfaction. Following section describes how the participants felt about the project (Figure 3).

**Figure 3.** The degree of satisfaction of the beneficiaries of the interventions

**Kupang District**

In Noelbaki, the participants of group discussion considered they were 80% happy with the activities implemented (Figure 3). The reasons were all group members had attended the training on basic accounting for cooperative management but they were also interested to have been involved in income generation activities too. This statement was also mentioned by the group discussion which was conducted separately with men. Meanwhile RFLP post harvest and alternative livelihoods activities only involved three people from the group. Other members of the women farmers group (*KWT*) had heard that several other people were involved in other activities but they had no clear idea how they themselves could get involved.

In Pitay, the participants of the discussion were 100% happy with the mangrove rehabilitation. All villagers were involved in the activities, although the level of participation varied. They felt they were responsible for the mangrove re-plantation. They were satisfied with the project because they had been able to conserve the mangrove and at the same time had received rice for their time as this sub-project was conducted in collaboration with the WFP. Only one participant from this group discussion had attended the public awareness about mangroves. She told the other participants of group
discussion that she had had to go home early from the meeting as she could only spend a limited amount of time away from home and domestic work. In Kuanheum, the participants of the discussion, women, stated that they were not involved in drafting the village regulation.

In Sulamu, the participants of group discussion felt fully satisfy with RFLP activity implementation, although the group leader was extremely dominant. They stated that the criteria were clear and fair for deciding who could be involved in RFLP activities and who received RFLP supported materials. However, the participants of group discussion felt that they needed someone to discuss technical problems with when they arose, i.e. they wanted technical backstopping support.

**Kupang Municipality**

The degree of happiness of the group discussions participants in Kupang municipality varied (Figure 3). Participants of group discussions in Pasir Panjang were 100% happy with the training and the materials provisions. However, when they considered other activities organized by the RFLP, the “setia kawan” group was 80% happy with RFLP because of unstable supply of fish as the raw material for shredded fish. During the low fishing season, they were unable to produce shredded fish. Meanwhile the “Bunga rumput” group, also in Pasir Panjang, only felt 50% satisfied with RFLP activities due to their difficulties in selling and marketing their products.

The women group in Oesapa felt 50% happy about the drafting of village regulation for coastal resource management. They felt less satisfied because the draft of village regulation had not been legalized by the government. As a result of this delay, the village regulation has not yet been executed. However, they felt they were involved in the planning process. In addition the women’s group leader was very active in promoting the draft village regulation at the community level. This had resulted in an increased awareness of coastal community members of the need to take care their coastal environment and neighborhood.
**Alor District**

The group discussion participants in Probur Utara pointed at 25% satisfied with the activities (Figure 3). They stated that they had no idea about the drafting process for the village regulation. They attended a public consultation meeting but they were not informed how the resources should be managed. This might have resulted from their low participation in the discussion at the meeting and because the information was not shared properly to wider community.

The group discussion participants from the processing groups in Kalabahi Alor felt fully satisfied with the implementation of RFLP activities as they have now a wider market for their products and the quality of their products has improved. Meanwhile fish traders at Kadelang market were also fully satisfied with the activities. They appreciated the cool-box the most as it was particularly useful. They asked why the provision of tables and other equipments were not discussed with them, as they were less useful. For example the height of the table was not appropriate for them, because while waiting for customers they have to keep a stick moving to scare flies away (Figure 4).

![Figure 4 A woman trader in Kadelang Market, Alor. The blue tables at the back were donated by RFLP. Photo by Agoes Hekso.](image)

**Rote Ndao District**

The food processor from Oeluia felt 100% satisfied with RFLP activities as they were able to package their product quickly and neatly because of the sealing machine provided by RFLP, and because their product had wider market in Kupang and demand for their product was stable. While processors in Tesabela were less happy, only 50% (Figure 4),
and had participated since the beginning of RFLP, they were still facing quality and packaging problems. The supplied packaging did not match their request which had been made following prior consultation with traders (buyers) in Kupang. Meanwhile the group discussion participants in Namodale stated that they were happy to receive new knowledge about organic dyes but they were not applying what they learned on the training course. The reasons for this were that there was no demand as yet for this particular hand-woven textile, the longer time required for processing the textiles and because more firewood were needed than when producing cloth using non organic dyes. No women were given RFLP supplied cool-boxes for fish traders and fishers.

**Challenges to participation**

During group discussions with beneficiaries and training of trainer (ToT) alumnae, several factors were identified that limit the ability of women to participate in RFLP activities:

- The time of the activities are conducted clash with their domestic work;
- The duration of a meeting/training was too long. It was tiring and the women also feel responsible for and concerned about their domestic work;
- The venue was conducted too far from home, e.g. in Kupang, which required an overnight stay;
- Women were not invited and especially for community level activities such as the drafting of the coastal resource regulation. Generally village leaders invite the family in the name of the husband. As a result in reality the husband or the eldest son attends any meeting, rather than the wife or daughter; and,
- Village leaders assumed women were busier with their domestic work. If women were invited they would not come. The village leader in Pitay admitted that he didn’t think that women would attend a meeting for mangrove management. In fact when the assumption was examined in the group discussion, the women groups argued they would have joined the meeting if the time had been arranged when they had spare time or if the meeting was announced several days in advance so they could re-arrange their work schedule.
- Representative systems.
Due to commonality of the activities, several activities were conducted at all four sites in one place. For example, catfish training and food processing training were conducted in Kupang. A representative from a group was selected to attend these activities. This type of activity is useful and practical not only for the organizer but for the participants who were also able to learn and share experiences through networking.

However, several concerns need to be considered, such as the selection process in the district and at the group levels, and the implication of the selection of other group members as questions by group member of KWT in Noelbaki, Kabupaten Kupang highlighted. In addition, some people questioned whether the one activity fits all approach, because local context, problems and strengths have to be taken into consideration. Furthermore, there is a risk in conducting one activity that fits all sites.
As discussed earlier, women play domestic, productive, and community roles that are fashioned and determined largely by society (Razavi and Miller 1997). This section discusses any changes in roles as a result of RFLP intervention. The participants of group discussions at all places described how they perceived benefits of the RFLP project.

Individually, women who join the activities for post harvest and alternative livelihoods activities, felt that the benefits included making more friends with common and shared experiences; being able to meet with people with similar interests; and sharing knowledge and skills. They also had an opportunity see other products that had been developed, were able to see and gain wider market opportunities, and were able to meet with buyers. In addition, the post harvesting and alternative livelihoods activities resulted in additional

### Box 2 Challenges for women to participate and ways to address the issues

In line with this assessment, a discussion about gender in the fishery sector with the RFLP training of trainers (ToT) alumnae was conducted in the four districts. Most of the ToT alumnae were mainly government officers from the Marine Affairs and Fisheries Department, the Department of Industry, Trade and Cooperatives; teachers; and NGO staff. The participants of the ToT alumnae were expected to support the RFLP activities on the ground.

During the discussions with ToT alumnae, several topics were discussed including the definition of gender and sex; analysis of the participation and constraints to women participating in RFLP activities; gender equity and equality; and the use of gender analysis tool. One of the most interesting parts during the discussion was on how they encouraged women to participate in RFLP activities and ways to address the issues. Several concerns limit the participation of women in RFLP activities including meetings and training courses:

1. The time of the event does not match when women are available and have free time;
2. Invitation did not specifically target women;
3. Women prioritize domestic and productive works in the family before other activities;
4. Traditionally in coastal fisher communities, men are involved in discussion meetings while women are more involved in logistics of the meeting, like preparing the food; and
5. Several women feel inferior to get involved in discussion in the public domain.

Ways to encourage women participation:

1. Clearly ask village leaders/group leaders to invite women to participate;
2. Specifically invite women to participate;
3. Invitation should be delivered several days in advance so women could re-arrange their domestic work schedules and attend the meeting or training;
4. To uncover that several women do not use to discuss or involve in public domain, specific target women activities will help to empower women confidence at first start then wider audience meeting or activities would be the second goals; and
5. More relaxed or informal activities.

### 4.2. Change of roles if any

As discussed earlier, women play domestic, productive, and community roles that are fashioned and determined largely by society (Razavi and Miller 1997). This section discusses any changes in roles as a result of RFLP intervention. The participants of group discussions at all places described how they perceived benefits of the RFLP project.
household income. Meanwhile in micro-finance activities, the basic accounting training enabled them to record their business and home finances properly as a requirement to access credit from banks or other loan mechanism systems.

However, the increased knowledge and skills in productive roles have not really changed the domestic roles of women. When women have been able to attend RFLP arranged meetings or trainings, they have had to re-organize their domestic work in advance. If they have a baby or pre-school infants, they have to ask their grandparents, older children or other family members to assist with child care. Mothers are able to order other family members to assist with the domestic work, but this only applies for female family members and boys under the age of 12 years old. Similarly, women will also re-schedule productive work in advance if they plan to attend RFLP activity. When women attend RFLP activities, they still have to fulfill their domestic and productive roles, as well as attending the RFLP meetings or joining other RFLP activities such as training.

**Roles in Community**

The change in the position of women at the community level was assessed by how the women perceived about themselves and by looking at society‘s perspective on the women who joined the RFLP activities. All group discussions participants mentioned that they ignored what their neighbors said behind their backs at the beginning of the project. After the neighbours began to see the results, the neighbours stopped gossiping and some were interested to join.

Wider society also has a better perspective to the women who joined the activities. They have become more recognized and invited to join the community meetings. The “Setia Kawan” group in Pasir Panjang village Kota Kupang were invited to village meetings called to draft village plan, while previously they had never been invited to such community meetings before (Box 3). Different groups in Kota Kupang Oesapa said that nowadays their village was always appointed to be visited by guests due to their improved awareness of the need to conserve coastal resource and group members were now invited to represent their village for activities at the District level. These two groups,
“Bunga rumput” group and Oesapa in Kota Kupang, experienced changes in their role at the community level.

**Box 3 From shredded tuna to village meetings**

A group of women entrepreneurs in Pasir Panjang village, Kota Kupang is more recognized in the village government office nowadays. They were invited to attend several village meetings to assist in drafting the annual village activity plan and budget. The leader of the group described how sometimes a group member was assigned to represent their village at the district level.

This group, which was established in 2010, consists of 11 women who produces shredded tuna as a group business. They have drafted and approved group regulations which have set the group fee rate, and have elected a group leader to present the ideas of the group which makes decisions by consensus agreement. For example, the production time, work hours, the shared profit system, and producing place are agreed by the group members.

When the group was being established, their neighbours upset them by saying their efforts and activities would not give any benefits. Now, the neighbours have stopped talking, and some of them are even interested to join the group.

They are supported by women’s micro-enterprise network (JarPPUK) for business development and Bengkel APPeK for women empowerment in the public domain. RFLP has provided support to develop the shredded Tuna, to upgrade their product packaging and to expand their market network.

Individually, this women’s group has gained more incomes and increased knowledge and skills. They are also supported by their families. At the community level, they are now more involved in community decision making process. The integration of productive interventions and empowering them in public domain has resulted in significant changes to the role of the women group members within their community and their households.

During RFLP interventions, there are activities specifically targeted at women, such as the activities under the RFLP post harvest and alternative livelihoods outputs. The activities under these outputs use a practical approach to empower women individually in productive roles, but they do not really or specifically address the power structures and institutional constraints within society. There is an opportunity to further strengthen the role of women in society in co-management activities.

In co-management activities, RFLP did not specifically targeted women. Village meetings have been arranged to draft a village regulation that decree who, what and where is allowed access and benefits from coastal resources. The drafting process was/is an opportunity to enable women to play an increased role in the wider community. In addition, women have very specific knowledge of the inter-tidal fishing areas, and so
they should be consulted and their perspectives should be considered within the draft village regulation. Therefore, this activity should provide an equal opportunity for both women and men to contribute ideas on how the coastal resources should be managed.

From the discussion in the villages that conducted RFLP supported co-management activities, only the women’s group in Oesapa-Kupang Municipality was actively involved in the process (Box 4). At other sites visited, women were far less involved in the process of drafting village regulation.

**Box 4 Women’s empowerment by drafting of village regulation in Oesapa, Kota Kupang**

The RFLP intervention, through Bengkel APPeK, supported the formulation of coastal regulation in Oesapa. The involvement of women in Oesapa in coastal resource management started with a beach clean up activity. They became aware how important their coast was. When a series of meetings was held to formulate the village regulation and the establishment of surveillance group women participated fully. They became a motor to push the activities forward. Thus this group became a champion for their environment and the conservation of coastal resources.

The secretary of the group is particularly active in promoting the process with her neighbours. For example, after she attended a meeting in the village government offices, she then spread the news of what was discussed with her neighbours so that information was shared properly.

The lessons learned from this process are that if we want to see the role of women within the community strengthened, the intervention should specifically target women, and people who control the process, such as government officers at the village level. In this case, Bengkel APPeK, as an implementing partner, targeted women at the beginning of the project and also advocated women’s empowerment to the village authorities. This approach increased women’s self confidence and also improved the village leaders’ awareness of the importance of involving women in village activities.

**Mobility**

This section discusses if there was any change in the mobility or ability of women to move or visit other areas and the scope of the areas visited. Before the RFLP, all participants of group discussions stated that they had no difficulties going from one place to another. They could go on foot or by *ojeg* (motorbike taxi) or public transport. So there has been no change in mobility as women still have the ability to travel on foot, by motorbike taxi or public transport.

Regarding with the scope of the area, women stated that they travel freely within their village and visit the nearest market place or even visit Kupang Municipality. Women in
Pitay said they no problems with mobility. They sold firewood in the market: walking at dusk and sleeping at the market, waiting for market to be open and then returning home after selling their firewood. Similarly, the women in Sulamu used to visit Kupang Municipality. In general most women respondents stated they had no constraints to travel to other places.

**Double burden**

This section discusses if there was any double burden as a result of the RFLP interventions. All group discussion participants stated that they no double burden occurred as a result of their involvement in the RFLP activities. They were able to re-schedule their domestic and productive works in order to join the RFLP activities and what they considered more positive benefits because of their involvement in the activities.

**The perceived benefits**

In general, group discussion participants that were involved in post harvest and alternative livelihoods activities described the main benefits gained in terms of income, increased skills and wider networking. In addition, during assessment discussions, women participants who were involved in post harvest and alternative livelihoods activities mentioned that they felt more confident in raising their ideas and selecting their favorite options because of their group activities. This shows that group development could be used as one way to empower women to give their opinions, as a first step to getting them involved in public domain.

The participants of group discussion from the “Sartika” group in Alor described how the post harvest activities had changed their lives. The members of the groups were the wives of husbands who labored in the seaport or in the local market and some of their husbands did not have really reliable income sources. The group leader stated that domestic violence and fights among neighbors happened in their village as earnings were insufficient for daily household consumption needs while the women had spare time and were doing nothing. She with other four people established a women’s group to process
fishballs using fish as raw material. The members were all married women some with no other productive activities and some were fish traders so the latter members were able to ensure a steady supply of raw materials. The intervention of RFLP upgraded the quality of the fish processed products and introduced their product more widely to buyers. This resulted in better income. Now, there is less domestic violence in this area and women are busier with income generating activities. In discussions, their husbands described how they supported the activities as it generated incomes and positive activities. The husbands said that they also helped to deliver the products of the women’s group.

In another illustration on how RFLP intervention has brought benefits, the members of women’s group in Oeluwa, Rote Ndao who produced seaweed snacks compared their activities with their previous seaweed farming activities. They felt they had now become entrepreneurs as they create their own products, sell and determine their own prices. They can do the work at home while doing other domestic work. Previously when growing seaweed they were exposed to the hot sun and had to leave their house and children. Furthermore, the price of farmed seaweed was determined by the buyers. The seaweed processing activities have resulted in increased income and a better, safer, and happier work environment for women.

**Some examples of negative effects of RFLP interventions**

The activities conducted in Namodale Rote Ndao were intended to upgrade the quality of hand-woven textiles by using organic dyes. The main coloring substances used were from the leaves of locally available trees in their neighborhood but other inputs for the dying process were only available from Kupang Municipality. The process of organic dyes takes longer and needs more firewood because the boiling and coloring process has to be done several times. The non organic dying process takes one hour, while organic dyes take three hours. For organic dying the cost of firewood is double at US$ 3. The final organic colour is less bright and thus far the group has been unable to market this type of product. The group therefore is not using this process.
Another example of negative impact resulting from a project intervention was when conflict arose within a food processing group in Alor after they received a set of equipment for cooking their product. This was mainly caused by a lack of clarity and rules for the use of the utensils and how the earnings would be shared amongst the group. Group regulations have to be discussed openly and clearly and agreement made and ideally recorded in writing if possible, on who can access, equipment and when, where equipment will be stored and how and when group profits will be shared.

4.3. Access and control over resources

The discussion about access and control over resource was divided into discussions about who controls cash money which also includes family’s asset (house, land, jewelry) and productive assets.

Participants considered cash money, land and their house as their most important household assets. Group discussion participants at all sampled sites mentioned that the wives held and controlled the use of cash money for daily expenditure and jewelry as a means of saving. Meanwhile big expenditures such as expenses for cultural/party needs, buying motor bikes or land were discussed and agreed between the husband and wife. The house and land belong to the husband and wife jointly unless it is inherited from their parents, in which case it belongs to the extended family.

There was no limitation on how family members used equipment for productive work. Women had the same access to tools and equipments as any other member of family. However, motorbike was used predominantly by the husband or male children. Mothers and women do not ride motorbike so they usually have to use public transportation to travel about, if the husband or son is unable to take them by the family motorbike.

For the equipments donated by RFLP, the participants stated that if it was distributed individually, there were no constraints on how it could be used. However, where RFLP equipment has been given to a group, then specific rules were needed so that every
member can access the equipment. All group discussion participants (with the one exception in Alor cited earlier) said they had no difficulties in accessing the donated RFLP equipments.
5. Capacity building for RFLP stakeholder groups on gender issues

The sequential activities of this assessment were also meant to increase the capacity of relevant RFLP stakeholder groups in NTT through discussions and a workshop. Discussions with RFLP stakeholder groups in NTT were conducted in the four districts. The participants were RFLP training of trainers (ToT) alumnae. They are the field staff who conduct RFLP activities on the ground, and have direct discussions and interaction with beneficiaries. The discussions explored the definition of gender and sex, equality and equity, access and control over resources by gender, women’s participation in the project and how to use gender analysis tools during the activity (Boxes 3 and 4).

In addition, a workshop, titled “Strengthening Gender Issues in Fisheries Sectors” was conducted in Kupang Municipality. The workshop was formally opened by Liliek Suprijadi, a representative from Directorate of PUPI/DJPT of Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries (MMAF). He appreciated the initiatives to empower women through RFLP interventions which were also aligned with the MMAF initiatives. He expected that the initiatives would bring more prosperity to coastal communities. The MMAF representative agreed that more women involved in fishery sector should be involved in the intervention. This workshop highlighted for the MMAF on the importance gender in the fishery sector in Indonesia.

The workshop was divided into two days. The first day targeted wider audiences: people from universities, fishers’ association, NGOs, communities groups, representatives from beneficiary groups, government staffs from the Department of Marine Affairs and Fisheries at provincial and district levels. The discussions were mainly about why gender is needed in the fishery sector; how policy inhibits women from participating if any, and challenges to incorporate gender in the program of the participants.

All participants stated that they encouraged the participation of women but they needed to do better to encourage women’s involvement as women were usually the busiest household members because of both domestic and productive roles in a family.
A session about policy revealed there was no policy which specifically inhibited women from participating in activities. However, as the project has already outlined: activities could be designed, timed, located and specific invitations could be sent which would encourage more women to participate. The government officers from the Department of Marine Affairs and Fisheries added their department was a technical department which the implemented activities that were outlined during the district level government planning.

The workshop was also an opportunity for participants to share their projects related to women in fishery. The representative from fishers association (Himpunan Nelayan Seluruh Indonesia/HNSI) surprised that the NTT government had designated one staff in the Department of Marine Affairs and Fishery at provincial and district levels to ensure that all programs were more gender sensitive.

The representatives from a network of women in micro enterprise (JARPPUK), Yayasan Suara Flobamora (NGO) and HNSI also raised concerns. They explained that most of the interventions that target women in the fishery sector were related to food processing but there were few interventions conducted to empower women’s voice in decision making processes, and especially in the fishery sector. The representatives from beneficiaries of Oesapa and Sulamu also agreed with this statement.

In the final statement of the first day of the workshop, the participants agreed that women contributed significantly in fishery sector but this contribution was not well acknowledged. Therefore, more efforts were needed to strengthen women’s participation, not only for to facilitate women as beneficiaries but also to increase their involvement as decision makers.

The second day specifically targeted for the RFLP output specific national consultants and core stakeholder groups such as staff from the Department of Marine Affairs and Fisheries. This workshop was meant to increase the capacity of the participants to use
gender analytical tools when executing their activities. A simulation of activities was conducted. During feedback sessions, this simulation brought about positive comments from the participants (Box 5). The participants agreed to reflect and to bring up the issue of gender in fishery sector when they returned to their daily work. More work was needed to encourage women’s participation in the fishery sector, and especially to strengthen their participation at the decision making level. All RFLP national consultants agreed to incorporate gender analysis tools in their work plans. RFLP management team needs to remind the national consultants of this commitment, to ensure that all RFLP activities are gender sensitive.

**Box 5 Gender in the fisheries sector workshop**

As part of this assessment, a gender in fisheries workshop was conducted in Kupang, 16-17 July 2012. The participants were from RFLP stakeholder groups including government officers, NGOs, community organizations and representatives from the beneficiaries.

Participants shared their knowledge about gender in the fisheries sectors, policy that would enable and limit the participation of women and how to encourage women to participate in the public domain. The participants considered this workshop was the first workshop they had attended that discussed the role and contribution of women in the fishery sector.

At the second day of the workshop, the participants were asked to reflect on gender in their work. An interesting comment was from a representative of the Department of Marine affairs and Fisheries of Kupang District was that although she was the gender focal point in her office, she did not know to use gender analysis tools. She considered the workshop and other discussions about gender organized by RFLP had really opened up her mind on how to use gender analysis tools and this would provide benefits by the incorporation of gender concerns into the marine and fisheries sector.

This shows that the workshop and discussions about gender in the fishery sectors are ways to increase the capacity of the government staff who will continue providing services even after the RFLP is finalized.
6. Conclusions and recommendations

This assessment shows gender related impacts as a result of RFLP interventions were varied, even though gender issues have been mainstreamed in the project. Some RFLP interventions do not focus and specifically target women as their main target. Therefore the impacts varied depending upon the degree of women’s participation, the group leader’s willingness to promote gender concerns and how the implementing partners implemented the activities on the ground.

Gender concerns were given less consideration during the implementation of RFLP output 1 activities on co-management. The different approaches used by the implementing partners show that no clear guidance was given to encourage the participation of women. The different levels of women’s participation in several villages with co-management activities in the targeted areas were entirely dependent on the initiatives of the implementing partners. For example, the degree of participation of women in Oesapa Kupang was high as a result of the high concerns given by the facilitators to women’s activities, and yet by contrast the participation of women in Kuanheum was low, even though it was implemented by the same organization. Similarly in Probur Utara in Alor, the participation of women was almost zero. This was a missed opportunity for RFLP because activities under the co-management output were one way to promote women’s participation at the community level, even though co-management activities do not touch on either the productive or domestic roles of women. Clearer guidance should have been given to the implementing partners to encourage the full participation of women in all RFLP activities conducted in the field.

The upgrading of strategies and the introduction of new income generating activities under the post harvest and alternative livelihood outputs supports producer groups and marketing. This empowers women’s position in both their domestic and productive roles. It improves the material wellbeing of the household: women have gained benefits in terms of increased income, skills and wider networking. Empowering women as entrepreneurs increases the confidence of women to raise their ideas in public and to
select their preferred options. The most positive activities conducted were also supported by the husbands and led to better family happiness. This shows that group development has brought positive changes to women in both their productive and domestic roles, although to date it has had less impact on the role of women within the community, and there has been limited involvement of women in public decision making processes.

However, there was a case where the achievements of beneficiaries of post harvesting activities, a shredded tuna group in Pasir Panjang, Kupang Municipality, were also acknowledged by the government at village level and group member were playing a significant role in the village decision making process. This group received increased attention as a result of combination interventions from the RFLP supported post harvesting activities and empowerment by a Bengkel Appek and Jarpuk through their activities empowering women in the village decision making process.

The lessons learned from the varied participation levels of women and particularly in co-management are: firstly, there is a need to provide clear guidance to encourage women’s participation in all RFLP activities. A standardized procedure for executors and external service providers engaged under RFLP funded contracts is needed when implementing activities and especially for those activities that do not specifically target women. In addition, activities or meetings that particularly target women are considered as one way to enable women to participate in the activities. Secondly, the beneficiaries, women and men, have varied interests and needs. This should be considered during the process of developing participation models, women have their different needs and interests from those of other groups. Thirdly, interventions at each location should be conducted with a more integrated approach. For example RFLP should have conducted activities under the co-management output in combination with activities under post harvest and alternative livelihoods in the same location. This would have resulted in synergies and more significant impact and changes in the role of women across domestic, and productive areas and at both the household and community levels.
In relation to mobility, there was no significant change as a result of RFLP interventions. Women have been able to travel anywhere before the project started and still can. However since women do not normally drive motorbikes and it is more difficult for women to stay away from home at night, they generally have less mobility than men.

There has been no RFLP impact on access and control over the resources. Traditionally women hold and control the money for daily household expenditures while a discussion with the husband is needed for big expenditure items. This situation is still unchanged. With regard to assets distributed to groups by RFLP, rules are needed to avoid conflicts within groups and to ensure fair access and control over the distributed cooking utensils. This shows that RFLP group interventions should not only increase and improve food processing capacity, but should also build the organizational and management capacity of the supported groups.

It is realized that the empowerment of women in the public decision making process is a long term process. The difficulty of opening the door for women’s empowerment and enhancing their participation in development is extremely challenging to implement. The RFLP intervention shows a development project which has been able to encourage women’s participation in the project and to consequently improve the capacity of women, which must ultimately contribute to household and community well being and resilience.

**Recommendations**

1. Integrate several activities of several RFLP outputs and focus in one place for synergies, greater impact and lesson learning. The involvement of women in post harvesting and alternative livelihoods activities brings positive benefits to the women individually and enhances their productive roles. This practical intervention addresses daily family problems. However, it has not really changed the role of women at the village level which is more strategic. Therefore, there is a need to combine both practical approaches and strategic approaches. For example, post harvest and alternative livelihoods activities should be integrated with co-management activities at the same site. Co-management activities are
mostly approached at the macro level (e.g. through the local authorizes and government at village and district levels, and the wider public) while post harvest and alternative livelihoods directly target individuals and the family. This integration will empower the community individually and improve the awareness of government people during the intervention. The beneficiaries will feel secure that the activities are agreed by the government leaders at the village level. As described by group discussion participants, in both men and women groups in Sulamu-Kupang District, village leaders were so curious about the RFLP activity that they wondered why the village authorities were not involved. The integration of all outputs at one location is needed to better empower coastal communities, while also at the same time increasing the confidence and self assurance of the beneficiaries to execute the activities.

2. Clear guidance should be given to implementing partners to encourage women’s participation across all RFLP activities. A clear set of rules will help the implementing partners to incorporate gender concerns.

3. There is also a need to improve the awareness of core stakeholder groups at the village level about the importance of gender issues in RFLP activities. For example the government officers in the village. Some men use the perception that women are too busy with domestic and productive roles as an excuse for not encouraging their participation in development. Activities have to be designed to fit the work schedules and the mobility range of women so that the other half of society can fully contribute for the betterment of society as a whole.
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Appendix A Terms of Reference

Food and Agriculture organization of the United Nations
Terms of Reference for Consultant/PSA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>National consultant - RFLP INS Gender Consultant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Division/Department</td>
<td>FAO Indonesia RFLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme/Project Number</td>
<td>Regional Fisheries Livelihoods Programme – GCP/RAS/237/SPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Kupang, FAO RFLP INS Office, with field visits to RFLP project sites as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Start Date of Assignment</td>
<td>June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>40 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports to</td>
<td>Aminudin Salka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>RFLP INS National Project Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Job Title: National consultant - RFLP INS Gender Consultant
Division/Department: FAO Indonesia RFLP
Programme/Project Number: Regional Fisheries Livelihoods Programme – GCP/RAS/237/SPA
Location: Kupang, FAO RFLP INS Office, with field visits to RFLP project sites as required
Expected Start Date of Assignment: June 2012
Duration: 40 days
Reports to: Aminudin Salka
Title: RFLP INS National Project Manager

Background:
The FAO Regional Fisheries Livelihoods Programme (RFLP) which is funded by Spain is operating in Cambodia, Indonesia, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, Timor-Leste and Viet Nam. The main focus of RFLP is on:

a) Co-management mechanisms for sustainable utilization of fishery resources;
b) Mechanisms to improve safety and reduce vulnerability for fishery communities;
c) Improved quality of fishery products and market chains;
d) Diversified income opportunities for fisher families;
e) Access to microfinance services; and,
f) Region wide dissemination and sharing of information.

Description of Duties:
Under the overall administrative supervision of the FAO Representative in Indonesia, under the direction of the Regional Programme Manager in FAO Regional Office in Bangkok, under the technical guidance of the Chief Technical Advisor and the RFLP Gender and M&E Advisor, and under the direct supervision the National Project Manager, the National Consultant (NC) will undertake the following tasks:

- Undertake a gender assessment of the RFLP impact, that will include a gender analysis and assessment of:
  ▪ the effects of RFLP interventions at household level, identifying possible changes of gender roles and relations, and relevant issues on gender equity and equality
  ▪ women’s participation in decision making
  ▪ identify any potential negative side effects (e.g. increase in domestic violence, double burden, etc)
  ▪ identify the existence (or not) of double burden as a result of RFLP activities, and how women are dealing with it
  ▪ identify and document specific examples through change stories or case studies (template to be provided) to illustrate women’s empowerment as a result of project interventions

  o The assessment will be delivered as a consultancy report, and will also include:
     ▪ Conclusions of the gender assessment, with identification of lessons learned and good practices.
     ▪ Recommendations and follow up actions to improve the implementation of the RFLP gender mainstreaming strategy in Indonesia

  o The outline of the report, as well as the methodology to carry out the gender assessment (including field work), will be prepared by the NC and submitted to RFLP RAP and RFLP INS management offices for their agreement previous to start the work.

- Provide on the job training and guidance to the National Project Manager, M&E officer (also RFLP gender focal point) and national consultants to develop capacity for use of gender analytic tools and gender analysis and to ensure the implementation of RFLP gender mainstreaming strategy during project implementation.

- Work closely with local and national authorities and provide on the job training to effectively mainstream gender in the context of fishing communities in practical and strategic needs, enhancing their ability to assess the gender impact of fisheries projects, especially during planning, monitoring and evaluation.
### Expected Outputs:

- A report containing the main findings of the gender assessment. The report will be written in MS-Word compatible format. A draft outline with the main contents and specifications of the report, as well as the methodology to be used at field level, will be provided within 3 weeks after signing the contract for the agreement of the NC, RAP RFLP management, and RFLP INS.
- Change stories and/or case studies illustrating women’s empowerment as a result of project interventions, with photographs
- Back to office reports for all field missions.

### Required Completion Date:

- June 2012
- Within 2 weeks of each mission

---

### Required Competencies

**Academic Qualifications**

- University degree in a field relevant to fisheries livelihoods and gender mainstreaming in fishing communities

**Technical Competencies and Experience Requirements**

- Demonstrated ability to work as technical coordinator of project activities
- Experience in mainstreaming gender in the project cycle, specially during monitoring and evaluation
- Experience in carrying out gender impact assessments and gender analysis
- Experience providing on the job gender training to project staff and government counterparts
- Work experience with fishing communities in Indonesia (especially in NTT) would be an advantage
- Experience of working for, or in cooperation with, government institutions and NGOs
- Excellent oral and written communication skills in English
- Computer literate.
Appendix B

Guidelines in organizing focus group discussions with beneficiaries.

Gender Impact Assessment of RFLP in NTT, Indonesia

The gender impact assessment of RFLP project is designed to ensure the gender equality concerns are reviewed and mainstreamed into planning, implementation and monitoring of the program. The target group of this assessment is the beneficiaries of RFLP project in Kupang, Kupang District, Rote Ndao and Alor. The selected target group will be discussed in detail with RFLP staffs in Kupang.

The assessment will be conducted in an interactive discussion using several PRA methods. The participants of the discussions will be men and women groups. The discussion between men and women group will be conducted in different time and group. Several methods are used to ensure the data accurate. First, the data collections are also complemented with observation to identify community’s social and economic activity, resource use pattern and assets. Second, to get detailed and verified information, individual discussion with relevant people will also be conducted. Third, if time allows, a report back discussion will be conducted in a mixed group of men and women (plenary discussion).

The participants will be briefly introduced and overviewed about the session. The participants voluntarily join the discussion. The discussion will be conducted in a relaxed manner, respect each other and if the participants need a break during the discussion, the discussion will be continued some other times.

There are five main questions used for the discussion. The same questions will be used for men or women groups. The detail questions and process are discussed as follows:

1. What activities conducted in a day?

   Method: pie chart analysis.
   Objective: to understand the pattern of activities conducted by men, women, and children of the beneficiary group in 24 hours
   Material needed: Paper size A0, markers with different colour
   Process:
   a) The participants are asked about their daily activities and normal time the activities conducted
   b) The facilitator draws or asks someone in a group to draw a circle, and put hours.
   c) Discuss if there is different perspective/results from different groups about the activities conducted by men and women
2. What types of source of livelihoods activities conducted by men and women?

Method: table of livelihoods
Objective: To understand varied livelihoods conducted by men and women
Material needed: Paper size A0, markers with different colour

Process:
Several questions are used to lead the discussion. Then a table is drawn from these questions. The questions are:

a) What is the source of livelihoods?
b) When the activities are conducted? (what month/season?)
c) Who conducted? Men or women or children
   i. How many men or women conducted this activity?
   ii. How does the load of women compare to men or to children?
   iii. Do women involve in decision making or decide what sort of activities conducted by other members of family?
d) Is there any equipment used for the livelihood activities?
   i. Do women have access to use the equipments?
   ii. Discuss the reason if women do not have access to use the resource
   iii. Do women involve in decision making to utilize the resources needed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Livelihood activities</th>
<th>Labour</th>
<th>Load of women compare to men (%)</th>
<th>Who decide who should do what?</th>
<th>Equipment needed</th>
<th>Women have access?</th>
<th>Who control the access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Men | Women

Seasonal calendar of the activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List of activities</th>
<th>Months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. What is the use of livelihoods activities conducted?

Method: discussion through table of livelihoods
Objective: To understand the use of varied livelihoods conducted by men and women and who control the results of the livelihood.
Material needed: Paper size A0, markers with different colour
Process: the lists of livelihood activities conducted as a result from the activity 2 are written on the paper. Then, several leading questions are used to discuss about the use of livelihood activities and who control the result.

a) List of activities conducted as a result of Question 2
b) What is the result/use of the activities?
c) Who control the use? (men/father of women)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>List of activities</th>
<th>Food</th>
<th>Sold (cash/barter)</th>
<th>firewood</th>
<th>Cattle food</th>
<th>House construction</th>
<th>others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Assessing the gender impact of RFLP project on the beneficiaries?
   Method: table of activities and discussions
   Objective: To understand the gender impact of every activities implemented

   Material needed: Paper size A0, markers with different colour
   Process: Several leading questions are used to discuss about the impact of RFLP project in a group. Then a table is drawn from these questions.
   The questions are:
   a) Please list activities implemented in your group
   b) Who participate? Men/women?
   c) Who decide the participants?
   d) Who decide within a family to join the activities?
   e) At the planning stage of the project,
      i. Who were involved at the planning stage?
      ii. How was the project planned?
      iii. Who made a decision about the proposed activities?
   f) At the implementing stage:
      i. How were the implemented activities organised?
      ii. How was the decision made?
      iii. Who decide the participants?
      iv. Who can access the resource from the implemented activities of the project?
      v. Who control the resource from the implemented activities of the project?
      vi. Is there any challenge in implementing the activities in a family? (is there anything that made you sad in conducting the activities?)
      vii. Is there any challenge in implementing the activities in a society?
      viii. Is there are any gender position/condition change in a family or society after implementing this project? (Things that made the beneficiaries are happier)
         For example:
         - The participants are more able to control the cash money in a family.
         - The society has better/positive perspective on women who join the group.
5. How do participants feel about this activity (project) in general?  
Method: Discussions. 
Several leading questions are 
a) Do you feel happy about this project? 

| Not happy…😊 | Happy…😊 |

b) Could you provide examples of effort(s) applied by the project to improve women’s participation in project interventions?  
c) Could you provide examples of effort(s) applied by the project to improve women’s participation in decision making mechanisms?  
d) Are women more involved now in community actions, including decision-making?
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The assessment timetable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finalization of TOR</td>
<td>7-13 June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and logistic arrangements to travel to Kupang</td>
<td>9 June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefing of project activities</td>
<td>13-14 June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites selection</td>
<td>15 June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize methodology and site visit plan</td>
<td>15 June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data gathering in kota Kupang and Kabupaten Kupang</td>
<td>16-28 June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training in Kupang</td>
<td>26 June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data compilation and preparation of interim report</td>
<td>29 June-3 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trip to Alor</td>
<td>5-8 July 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trip to Rote Ndao</td>
<td>9-13 July 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop in Kupang</td>
<td>16-17 July 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTOR preparations and travel back to Jakarta</td>
<td>18 July 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report submissions and Finalization of the report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>