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1. Introduction

1 Promoting gender equality is recognized by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) as central to the Organization’s mandate, including to the Strategic Objective 4 (SO4) – Enable inclusive and efficient agricultural and food systems. FAO has a long history of activities and interventions seeking to promote greater gender equality in Member Countries.

2 This annex responds to a request by the Programme Committee during its 120th session (November 2016) that an annex be dedicated to gender in all Strategic Objective evaluations, using “the FAO gender policy standards as a baseline”1. The evaluation has thus conducted an analysis of FAO’s global and country-level activities and contributions under Strategic Programme 4 (SP4) directed to achieve the minimum standards and objectives of the FAO Policy on Gender Equality.2

---

2. Methodology

2.1 Purpose and scope

The purpose of this annex is to present a review of the consideration given to the minimum standards for gender mainstreaming in the design of Strategic Programme 4, and an analysis of the SP4-related global- and country-level contributions towards the achievement of the gender equality objectives of the FAO gender equality policy.

Since the minimum standards apply to FAO as a whole, the evaluation has selected the most pertinent issues for Strategic Programmes (SP) on the basis of the criteria included in the corporate gender equality implementation plan (see Appendix 1). This report includes an analysis of those minimum standards in which SPs have a role and/or responsibility in their implementation (Table 1), namely Minimum Standards 3, 5, 7, 14 and 15.

Table 1: Selection of minimum standards for gender mainstreaming in SP4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards – Applicable to FAO</th>
<th>Level of SP4’s role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. All major FAO statistical databases incorporate sex-disaggregated data where relevant and available.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the short term, this will involve mining existing data sources – particularly household surveys – for sex-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disaggregated statistics; in the longer term, efforts will be made to collect and disseminate additional sex-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disaggregated data.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. FAO invests in strengthening member countries’ capacity to develop, analyse and use sex-disaggregated</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>data in policy analysis and programme and project planning and evaluation. In particular, technical support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to in-country data collection activities, such as agricultural censuses and surveys, will promote the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mainstreaming of gender issues, as indicated in the Global Strategy to Improve Agricultural and Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. For all strategic objectives, a gender analysis is carried out and a gender action plan developed; progress</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on gender equality is measured for all corporate outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A financial target for resource allocation to the FAO Policy on Gender Equality is set and met.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A country gender assessment is undertaken as part of country programming.</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. A gender equality stock-taking exercise is conducted for all services, to provide a basis for better</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation of gender mainstreaming, including progress and performance measurement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Gender analysis is incorporated in the formulation of all field programmes and projects, and gender-</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>related issues are taken into account in project approval and implementation processes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. All programme reviews and evaluations fully integrate gender analysis, and report on gender-related</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impacts in the areas they are reviewing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. A mandatory gender equality capacity development programme is developed and implemented for all professional</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff and managers. This programme will be tailored to the specific needs of different units in FAO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headquarters (HQ) and at the regional and country level offices, and will be conducted by trainers with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expertise in the subject matters relevant to those units.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Minimum competencies in gender analysis are specified, and all managers and professional staff are</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>required to meet them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Each technical department establishes a gender equality screening process for all normative work,</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programmes and knowledge products.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. An assessment of the contribution to achieving FAO’s gender equality objectives is included in the</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Evaluation and Management System (PEMS) of all professional staff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Human and financial resources and normative and operational results related to gender equality from the</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ to the country level are systematically tracked and reported to FAO governing bodies and to the UN system.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. 30 percent of FAO’s operational work and budget at the country and regional levels is allocated to</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>women-specific targeted interventions. Priority will be given to supporting organizations and activities that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advance women’s access to nutritious food and women’s access to and control over land and other productive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resources; strengthening rural women’s organizations and networks; increasing women’s participation and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leadership in rural institutions; incorporating women’s knowledge of agriculture into programmes and projects;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and ensuring the development of technologies and services that reduce women’s work burden.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The share of the Technical Cooperation Programme’s (TCP’s) total portfolio allocated to programmes and</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>projects related to gender equality is increased from 9 to 30 percent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Evaluation team’s analysis based on discussions with the FAO gender team
Beyond the minimum standards described in Table 1, FAO’s gender policy also articulates gender equality objectives to guide FAO’s work in advancing equality of voice and access to resources and services between women and men. These include:

i. Women participate equally with men as decision-makers in rural institutions and in shaping laws, policies and programmes.

ii. Women and men have equal access to and control over decent employment and income, land and other productive resources.

iii. Women and men have equal access to goods and services for agricultural development, and to markets.

iv. Women’s work burden is reduced by 20 percent through improved technologies, services and infrastructure.

v. The share of total agricultural aid committed to projects related to women and gender equality is increased to 30 percent.

The Policy also states that progress against these high-order objectives is to be achieved through FAO’s collaboration “with countries, other UN agencies, civil society organizations (CSOs) and bilateral and private sector partners”, and a set of implementation mechanisms aligned to FAO core functions.

In summary, this analysis intends to answer the following questions:

i. What is the level of progress in the implementation of FAO’s gender mainstreaming minimum standards in SP4?

ii. What have been the contributions of SP4 to FAO gender equality objectives at both global and national levels?

### 2.2 Methods and data sources

This analysis is based on an extensive desk review and field observations in the countries visited by the evaluation team. The level of implementation of the gender mainstreaming minimum standards in SP4 was analysed by studying reports on policy implementation and triangulating the information with FAO staff and other internal sources.

Concerning the contributions at global level, the evaluation team conducted a qualitative analysis. Information on global products supporting SO4 goals were identified by conducting an exhaustive desk review of FAO documents and, when feasible, validated with FAO staff and other internal sources.

For the contributions at country level the evaluation team carried out a quantitative analysis based on data reported by 113 country offices in 2015 and 2016 against the FAO gender policy objectives and core functions.

To validate these results, an online survey was sent to all the regional and national gender focal points available. In total, 68 countries received the survey and 52 responded. Further information on the survey is available in Appendix 3.

The evaluation team also reviewed a sample of 59 SP4-tagged projects to verify findings emerging from the analysis of contributions. However, at the review stage it was found that four of the projects tagged SO4 were in fact from another SO, and were eliminated (though this in itself is an interesting finding), and for one project there was no project document or reports available. Consequently the total number reviewed was 54. This sample was chosen from all new projects tagged as contributing to SO4 in FAO’s Field
13 To exemplify the types of contributions identified at country level, the evaluation team validated the results in countries visited by the team and/or those covered in recent evaluation reports. These case studies are reflected in the boxes along the document.

2.3 Limitations

14 This exercise depended partly on self-reported data that was not always reported as a key contribution to SP4, which made it difficult to focus on their validation while in the field. Also, some contributions were erroneously reported as being linked to SP4. When it was possible to identify such issues, the inaccurate information was not included in the analysis.

15 This exercise did not aim to review the uptake of global knowledge products or country gender assessments, nor the application of gender markers. Also, many of the SP4-related knowledge products and services identified in this review are new and require some time to permeate FAO operations before producing significant impact. The analysis on contributions is mostly based on information of results tagged to SP4, which were reported using corporate mechanisms that this study did not assess for appropriateness. The forthcoming evaluation of FAO’s contribution to gender equality should cover these aspects in a comprehensive way.

---

6 Gender markers were introduced in FAO’s internal project management system in July 2015.
3. FAO’s institutional commitments to gender equality

FAO has a long history of supporting gender equality. While FAO has always included women among its beneficiaries, the development model that it advocated and supported in the first two to three decades of its existence was one where women were seen as beneficiaries of support in the areas of nutrition and home economics exclusively. Following the UN commitment to the Nairobi Forward-looking Strategies (NFLS), the first Plan of Action for the Integration of Women in Development (WID-PoA), for the period 1990-1995 was approved. The FAO Socio-Economic and Gender Analysis (SEAGA) programme was first developed during this period. Gender mainstreaming in FAO has since been addressed through a number of different mechanisms and structures, including elaboration of a “Strategic Objective K in the FAO Strategic Framework 2010-2019”.

A high point was the publication of The State of Food and Agriculture 2010-2011 (SOFA): Women in Agriculture, which noted that gender inequalities were at the core of the underperformance of the agriculture sector, and that the goals for poverty reduction and food security could only be achieved if gender was fully and adequately considered. The argument is based on the observation that women farmers have on average less education and less access to agricultural information and extension services than men, use less credit and other financial services and are much less likely than men to purchase inputs such as fertilizers, improved seeds and mechanical equipment. The report concludes that female farmers produce less food on average than male farmers, and that “if women had the same access to productive resources as men, they could increase yields on their farms by 20-30 percent [and thus] raise total agricultural output in developing countries by 2.5-4 percent”.

The FAO Policy on Gender Equality launched in 2012 represented a major step in institutionalizing gender equality across the Organization. This policy, which is the current framework for “guiding FAO’s effort to achieve gender equality in all its technical work”, introduced 15 minimum standards to ensure the incorporation of gender equality, and defined five gender equality objectives to guide FAO’s work. Responsibility for coordinating implementation of the plan was given to the gender team, which is currently located within the Social Policies and Rural Institution Division (ESP) at FAO headquarters. In addition, FAO has a network of gender officers at the regional offices, and has identified gender focal points in Strategic Programmes, technical divisions and country offices. They all have supported the production of relevant guidelines, assessments, training materials and other resources and measures to facilitate gender mainstreaming. All SPs, Divisions and Offices have a responsibility to address and implement the different minimum standards or use the different tools and mechanisms that are put in place, such as the gender markers.

In 2013, FAO’s Reviewed Strategic Framework 2010-2019 was introduced. It outlined five new Strategic Objectives that represent areas of work on which FAO would focus in support of Member Nations. These are: Contribute to the eradication of hunger, food insecurity and malnutrition (SO1); Increase and improve provision of goods and services from agriculture, forestry and fisheries in a sustainable manner (SO2); Reduce rural poverty (SO3); Enable more inclusive and efficient agricultural and food systems at local, national and international level (SO4); and Increase the resilience of livelihoods to threats and crises (SO5). The Framework considers gender as a cross-cutting priority for all the Strategic Objectives and as a specific corporate area of work under Objective 6 (technical quality, knowledge and services). More recently, the adoption of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) in 2016, and particularly SDG5: Achieve Gender Equality and Empower all Women and Girls, adds to the urgency of ensuring improved gender mainstreaming and women’s economic empowerment in value chains and agricultural and food systems.

---

8 State of Food and Agriculture 2010-11 Women in Agriculture: Closing the Gender Gap. FAO.
9 A summary of FAO main contributions to gender equality within the framework of the Strategic Framework and in light of SDG5 has been included in the document “Meeting our goals: FAO’s programme for gender equality in agriculture and rural development” (December 2016).
4. The case for gender mainstreaming in value chains and food systems

20 Women make up a large proportion of the agricultural and agribusiness workforce, yet often struggle to benefit from the value chain in an equitable fashion, due to different power relations and cultural definitions of roles. Yet closing the “gender gap” could result in major economic gains.10

21 Crops are often gendered, with men making decisions on crops grown and marketed; and women having the responsibility for ensuring food security at the household level, hence focusing more on basic food crops. Women also tend to manage smaller livestock while men manage large, higher value livestock such as cattle, though naturally this varies in different cultures.11

22 There is a difference in many societies regarding the types of jobs that are available to men and women at each point in the value chain. There are also significant differences in remuneration and the qualitative nature of individuals’ productive roles in the value chain (e.g. time use, adoption of labour-saving technologies, ability to travel and deal with clients, and participation in decision-making).12 Access to productive resources (land and other assets, agricultural extension and financial services) and power and agency (capabilities, self-confidence and decision-making power) are indispensable for participating and benefitting from value chain development.

23 Women also commonly have less access to membership or leadership roles within cooperative or commodity groups, which could improve their access to markets and potentially increase incomes. In the move to more commercial processing, for local and global value chains, women may be held back in low skill, low waged jobs, while men replace them in higher value, skilled or capital intensive activities. This leads to a wage gap and fewer opportunities for women.13 With trade liberalization, women often bear the brunt of changes. For instance, women are less able to compete when cheap food imports depress the price of their agricultural produce. Smallholder farmers and processors face significant challenges when trying to compete in international markets and comply with sanitary and phytosanitary standards. However, men often have more education and training, and easier access to authorities, while women are more likely to lack the necessary technical expertise to meet various product and process standards.14 Women make up a significant proportion of traders involved in informal, cross-border trade, but also face gendered disadvantages. For instance, weak literacy and knowledge of the regulations and taxes, combined with limited confidence, can make them vulnerable to coercion and harassment by customs officials.15

24 When considering the agricultural and food system more broadly, there is also a gendered difference regarding who is buying and preparing food; and there may be impacts on other value chains sharing the same environment and resources. Improved nutrition and developing good food consumption habits are important for all, and women typically play a key role. Changes in women’s and men’s productive roles and earning capacity may change the balance of decision-making power at household and community levels. While this may be a positive change it also runs the risk of discord and gender-based violence.

25 Sustainable agri-food value chains are the basis of SO4 and must consider economic, environmental and social sustainability aspects (which encompass gender). The even more

10 World Bank, IFAD (International Fund for Agricultural Development) and FAO. 2009. Gender in agriculture sourcebook. Washington, DC, World Bank
A comprehensive agricultural and food systems concept brings in new and diverse partners and issues, and works at global, national, local and household levels. At a minimum, FAO must ensure that commercialization in the agricultural sector does not lead to further disempowerment of women and girls. Instead, inclusive value chains should include gender analysis at all points of the chain, and identify gender-based constraints. By developing activities that address these constraints – for instance, providing child-care during training sessions, access to small-scale processing equipment for women, or facilitating meetings between women traders and customs officials – women can more effectively participate in value chains, achieving better incomes and more efficient systems.

Food loss and waste are also an important area for gender mainstreaming and improving efficiency in the agricultural and food system. Women often play the key role in household food security, as well as controlling waste at retail and household level. Decreased availability due to food losses can make it more difficult for women to source food. Inadequate access of women to information, markets or the right tools for processing and storage can lead to unnecessary losses (e.g., in cassava, fish or groundnut post-harvest handling). Capacity building and awareness raising must be targeted for the best results, bearing in mind the different roles, literacy rates and access to resources of men and women.
5. Gender equality in the SP4 framework (2014–2017)

SO4 aims to ‘enable more inclusive and efficient agricultural and food systems at local, national and international levels’. SO4 is rooted in the context of trade, globalization and competitiveness, aiming to move from subsistence agriculture to improved processing, commercialization and global trade. At the same time, SO4 aims to ensure that agriculture and food systems become more inclusive by including smallholders, women and youth, and giving them equitable access to growth opportunities and more profitable markets.

For the period 2014–2017, SO4 will be achieved via three outcome areas:

- **Outcome 4.1.** International agreements, mechanisms and standards that promote more efficient and inclusive trade and markets are formulated and implemented by countries – support for international frameworks for trade and food safety, plant and animal health, and global data collection.
- **Outcome 4.2.** Agribusinesses and agri-food chains that are more inclusive and efficient are developed and implemented by the public and private sectors – this includes activities to reduce food losses and wastes, value chain implementation and supportive policies and strategies.
- **Outcome 4.3.** Policies, financial instruments and investment that improve the inclusiveness and efficiency of agri-food systems are developed and implemented by the public and private sectors – essentially to support governments and private sector institutions to design and implement financial instruments and services, and to monitor the impact of policies on agri-food systems.

Under SP4, the inclusiveness dimension of its programme objective implies that work to address the barriers faced by women, youth, indigenous peoples and other marginalized groups should be an integral element of its programme. Perhaps in view of this, the SP4 results framework does not explicitly mention gender equality in its outcome and output statements. Not having an explicit focus perhaps weakens SP4’s attention to gender considerations given its potential and the relevance of the various outputs to the gender equality objectives.

When the SP framework began, the FAO Policy on Gender Equality was already endorsed. The gender team of FAO mapped the policy objectives against the SPs and made decisions as to what should be addressed to fulfil policy objectives (according to interviews and documents from the gender team, such as the SO4 Gender Strategy).

A number of SP4 outputs have been tagged as gender neutral – in particular the global products within 401, such as CODEX, and animal and plant health standards setting. This is not to say that these are not gendered aspects – it could be argued that food safety has a particular relevance for women due to their role in family feeding and health. Further, addressing barriers to accessing finance could be a focus under Outcome 403. However, based on a gender analysis of SP4 and the financial constraints within FAO, an overall gender strategy and a gender action plan was developed. This emphasised a focus in particular on value chain activities, cross-border trade and food loss and waste activities, as these were the areas with the most potential, within the resources available. In addition, minor work was planned for large land-based investments.

Gender equality and women’s economic empowerment objectives are being addressed mainly through Outcome 402, which deals with support for the design and implementation of policies, regulatory frameworks and institutional arrangements, and the actions to promote capacities for inclusive agro-enterprises, value chain development and food loss and waste reduction strategies.

Linkages exist with other parts of the Strategic Framework. For instance, SP2, dealing with production, is a natural pair for SP4, as they work together as elements of the value chain.
SP3, dealing with poverty reduction and social protection, is often considered the SP for work for women’s empowerment and inclusion. Consequently many projects contribute to multiple SOs, and the SO4 evaluation has dealt with some activities tagged under another SO, that logically also contribute to SO4. For example, the project *Fostering Women’s Entrepreneurship in the Agro-Food Sector* in the United Arab Emirates was tagged SO2, however it fed into the *Women’s Agricultural Entrepreneurship Programme* which is related to SO4. This involved awareness raising and capacity building specifically for women entrepreneurs in nine training sessions, to make them aware of the opportunities in SMEs.

34 FAO has undertaken several initiatives and developed knowledge products and services to support the work on gender equality under SP4 (see Appendix 5). This includes work from headquarters and in the regions, and at country level. In particular, the work from headquarters has focused on managing the FMM-funded gender project in eight countries in Africa. Within headquarters, the gender team works with other divisions to provide technical inputs on gender. The SP4 gender team participate in the SP4 coordination, including in strategic and programming decisions. In their quality assurance role they review new programmes to decide whether gender should be addressed specifically; and review reports. Country offices report annually on gender, and project reports should also report on gender. This is done to a varying degree.

35 FAO gender support is provided via the headquarters gender team for SP4; gender officers in each region; and gender focal points in most subregional and country offices (other than the smallest) and in the different units within headquarters. There are some 114 gender focal points in decentralized offices. In addition, national colleagues are involved in implementation in each country. Sometimes there are gender focal points within the Ministry of Agriculture or other partners. The numbers, as of March 2017, are shown in Table 2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total Focal Points</th>
<th>Alternates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headquarters</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia Pacific</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe and Central Asia</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near East and North Africa</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America and the Caribbean</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: FAO gender team

36 Capacity building for both FAO staff and also at the national and community levels is an important part of the work. This includes webinars, and face-to-face training, conducted by the gender team at headquarters and the regional gender officers. FAO has also produced a broad range of guidelines, webinars and studies on gender within policies, food losses and wastes, and gender analyses of specific value chains. The guidelines on *Developing gender-sensitive value chains* are based on FAO’s guiding principles for sustainable value chains, and specifically emphasize the importance of social sustainability. They provide excellent analysis of gender issues and constraints, as well as examples of how to consider gender at all levels of the value chain, both in a written guideline and shared in a webinar and meetings.
6. Progress achieved under SO4 against the minimum standards

37 This section provides an overview of FAO’s efforts and commitments towards the five minimum standards (3, 5, 7, 14 and 15) that are most relevant to SP4 over the period evaluated (2014-2016).

Minimum Standard 3. For all strategic objectives, a gender analysis is carried out and a gender action plan developed; progress on gender equality is measured for all corporate outcomes.

38 The implementation plan of the FAO Policy on Gender Equality includes the following as key activities under this minimum standard: (i) conduct a gender analysis on each SO as basis for identifying gender-related work in SO action plans; and (ii) identify gender-related products, services and activities in each SO that contribute to gender equality.

39 As mentioned in the previous section, in 2013, the SP4 gender team conducted an analysis to identify gender-related areas of work in consultation with both external and in-house gender experts. They developed an overall gender strategy and a gender action plan, which provided guiding principles to mainstream gender issues across SP4, and identified potential actions under key SP4 areas of work. Based on this analysis, and the list of gender-related initiatives included in Appendix 5, the evaluation analysed the potential contributions of each output to the FAO gender equality policy objectives. Among the SP4 outputs, Output 4.2.3 may contribute to all of the objectives.

40 In addition to the headquarters level strategy and action plan, the regions have prepared gender strategies, which define the actions they will take with regard to the different SOs.

41 For instance, in the Regional Office for the Near East and North Africa (RNE), the Regional Gender Strategy for the Near East and North Africa Region Gender Equality in Agriculture and Rural Development (Feb 2016), identified activities to be taken within each SO. For SO4, the main activities were preparation of a Gender Monitoring Report, including a review of TCPs to identify gender markers. In addition, it listed planned studies, such as the gender sensitive value chain analysis of cactus, and upcoming projects, such as the One Stop Shop for Sustainable Business activities in the West Bank and Gaza.

Minimum Standard 5. A country gender assessment is undertaken as part of country programming.

42 Since 2013, FAO has supported the conduct of Country Gender Assessments (CGA) as preliminary steps to the preparation of CPFs - usually together with the local Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Gender. The CGAs are relevant for all the SPs (not specifically SP4). Through December 2016, 45 CGAs had been conducted (though not all have been published). Four were prepared in the Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (RAP), eight in the Regional Office for Europe and central Asia (REU), and the majority – 33 – in the Regional office for Africa (RAF).

43 Although country gender assessments were carried out in several countries studied by the evaluation team (including Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Rwanda, Tajikistan and Zimbabwe), the process has mainly been undertaken only during the last year, hence it is difficult to analyse the impact in the projects. In addition, FAO has not yet developed a new CPF after the CGAs were prepared in these countries.

44 Based on the experience of the regional gender staff (for instance, the REU FAO gender team), the absence of a gender assessment of the agricultural and rural sector at country

---

16 Social Policies and Rural Institutions Division (ESP) document ‘Integrating a Gender Equality Perspective to SO4’.
17 The whole of SP4 contributes to Objective 5: “the share of total agricultural aid committed to projects related to women and gender equality is increased to 30 percent”; therefore, it is not included in the breakdown by SP4 output.
level hinders effective and substantial gender mainstreaming in technical projects and programmes (due to a lack of baseline gender-related information on the sectors of FAO’s competence). Consequently, regional staff have been supporting gender assessments in eight countries in the region. FAO Tajikistan, for example developed a Gender Profile. The starting point for this profile was a review of the core set of 18 gender indicators pertaining to agriculture and rural areas, which was developed by the FAO Regional Office for Europe and Central Asia to standardize data collection and comparison in the region. Initial analysis revealed that in Tajikistan there were partial data for almost half of the indicators, and no data for ten of the indicators, making it difficult to use the core set as a template for this gender profile. As part of the study there were discussions on existing indicators and data sources that could be used to generate gender statistics, as well as critical data gaps relevant to gender and agriculture.¹⁸

FAO in Gambia carried out a Country Gender Assessment of the Agriculture and Rural Sector (CGA-ARS).¹⁹ The objective of the assessment was to analyse the agricultural and rural sector of Gambia from a gender perspective at the macro (policy), meso (institutional) and micro (community and household) levels in order to identify gender inequalities in access to critical productive resources, assets, services and opportunities. In particular, the assessment identified needs and constraints of both women and men in selected FAO areas of competence as well as priorities and gaps. It also provided recommendations and guidance to promote gender sensitivity of future programming and projects. Notably, the office will soon be implementing large European Union-funded projects on value chains, which specifically focus on women’s activities and women’s inclusion in value chains.

Minimum Standard 7. Gender analysis is incorporated in the formulation of all field programmes and projects, and gender-related issues are taken into account in project approval and implementation processes.

The implementation plan of the FAO Policy on Gender Equality includes as a key activity under this minimum standard that a gender analysis be undertaken for the formulation of field projects and programmes following the project cycle guidelines.

In the project analysis carried out by the evaluation, 26 projects of the sampled 54 – or 48 percent - were found to have carried out a gender analysis. Since July 2015, all projects are required to conduct a gender analysis at the formulation stage. However, despite this requirement, many projects that began after July 2015 were lacking gender markers (see below, in Minimum Standard 15).

Gender-sensitive value chain analysis has been implemented in some countries. For example studies of gender in the dairy value chains in Afghanistan, Ethiopia Kenya, Rwanda and have been implemented. The findings have been published as well as used to guide the subsequent design and implementation of dairy value chain projects in Ethiopia, Kenya and Rwanda. This was a good process, ensuring practical roll-out of gender focused actions, rather than only staying on paper.

Another example is the Gender Sensitive Value Chain Analysis for Medicinal and Aromatic Plants in Egypt, which has demonstrated the potential to support inclusion of women. However it is unclear how these studies will be used. Further support is needed to translate this good beginning into an action plan for policy change or improved value chain development.

However, consideration of gender within some projects is weak. For instance, the recent Mid-term Evaluation of the Capacity Development for Agricultural Innovation Systems project (implemented in eight pilot countries) found that there was no gender perspective in the project design; no gender analysis; no specific gender indicators, targets or activities; no gender perspective in the country framework or consideration during the country needs assessments; and no gender tool in the toolbox.²⁰ Burkina Faso was an exception, where

---

it is aiming to be gender transformative. Despite these deficiencies, the evaluation team found fairly balanced participation of women, and some positive aspects. For instance, some gender issues were considered in the selection of the niches (at least one selection criteria was related to gender equality) and some of the niches were in areas traditionally dominated by women, therefore it was assumed that women would benefit. Nevertheless, the project does not sufficiently consider how and why women will benefit from these activities.

Another example of a project which has made some progress on gender and women’s empowerment is the Roots and Tubers Project - *Strengthening linkages between small actors and buyers in the Roots and Tubers sector in Africa* (for instance, giving preference to support business models with SMEs owned by women and female traders in some countries - or focusing on cassava in some countries, the processing and commercialization of which is dominated by women). However, it still shows gaps in gender analysis and implementation. In Rwanda for instance, it was noted that even if women carry their produce to the collection centre for sale, the payment is made to the head of the household, which in many cases is the man.

Minimum Standard 14. 30 percent of FAO’s operational work and budget at the country and regional levels is allocated to women-specific targeted interventions.

The implementation plan of the FAO Policy on Gender Equality includes the following as key activity under this minimum standard: all projects are marked in FAO Field Programme Management Information System with gender markers. Gender markers were introduced in July 2015 and have been under implementation since then. They were established on a one to four scale and are included at the time of project formulation. The Social Policies and Rural Institutions Division prepared a set of guidelines on integrating gender into project identification and formulation to facilitate the application of gender markers.

The mid-term review in 2016 reported that the share of all FAO projects marked G2b (where gender is the main objective of the activity) was 7 percent, while the vast majority (59.5 percent) of FAO projects fall under the marker G2a (the project addresses gender equality in a systematic way, but this is not one of its main objectives). The assessment of the gender markers within the SO4 project sample for this review showed that of the tagged projects, most were G1 (27 percent) or G2a (29 percent). Only one was rated G2b (2 percent). Against this background, it is evident that the SO4 projects in the sample are much less gender responsive than the pool of FAO projects approved. Moreover, it was notable in the project review that many projects beginning from July 2015 did not have any gender markers (17 out of a total of 45, or 38 percent). Even when only the projects beginning in 2016 were considered, there were ten projects without gender markers. This demonstrates the need for identifying the reasons why programme designers are not marking projects in line with requirements.

Minimum Standard 15. The share of the Technical Cooperation Programme’s (TCP’s) total portfolio allocated to programmes and projects related to gender equality is increased from 9 to 30 percent.

Out of 54 SO4 projects sampled, 27 were TCPs, which corresponded to 50 percent of the projects. These TCPs received a gender marker as follows: 3.7 percent were G0, 33 percent as G1, 3.7 percent as G2a and 0 percent as G2b. Assuming that the TCP projects tagged with gender markers G2a and G2b were intended to address gender equality, the share of SO4-tagged TCPs with markers related to gender equality would be about 3.7 percent. Considering that in 2016, 59 percent of all active FAO TCP projects were reported to address gender equality, this is certainly an issue to be addressed by the SP4 team.

---

21 Gender markers are: G0. project does not address gender equality; G1. Project addresses gender equality only in some dimensions; G2a. project addresses gender equality in a systematic way, but this is not one of its main objectives; and G2b. project addresses gender equality and/or women’s empowerment as its main focus.

22 Available at: http://intranet.fao.org/faohandbook/area/projects/support_to_users/guidelines/


24 59 percent of the TCPs had no gender marker.

7. Contributions to gender equality

As already mentioned in the methodology and limitations sections, the evaluation could not assess the actual contribution of SO4/SP4 to gender equality in terms of impact. Consequently, this section limits itself to an examination of FAO’s efforts towards the Gender Equality Objectives under SO4. It analyses the profile of the gender work recently developed under SO4 according to FAO core functions (e.g. policy support, capacity development, guidelines and knowledge product), SP4 Outcome and gender equality objectives. For each topic, a few examples are given to illustrate the findings.

7.1 SP4 contributions to gender equality by core functions

This section provides an overview of products, activities and interventions tagged to or supporting SP4 that contribute to FAO’s gender equality objectives. These contributions are categorized according to the following core functions: i) guidelines, methods and toolkits; ii) research and case studies; iii) capacity development at national level; iv) capacity development at community level; v) provision of inputs; and vi) partnerships.

a. Guidelines, methods and toolkits

FAO has developed toolkits, methods and guidelines to provide practical guidance to member countries in order to effectively integrate gender into different types of activities and policy decisions regarding SP4. Among these, and in the context of FAO’s Global Initiative on Food Loss and Waste Reduction (SAVE FOOD), the gender team contributed to mainstream gender issues in the methodology to assess food losses along the food supply chain (i.e. Food Loss Analysis: Causes and Solutions - Case studies in the Small-scale Agriculture and Fisheries Subsectors). Case studies applying the methodology have been carried out in Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Ghana and India.

Box 1: Application of gender mainstreaming in Food Loss Analysis methodology in India

Within the SAVE FOOD Initiative in India, FAO has supported the preparation of a series of case studies in the small-scale agriculture and fisheries sub-sectors in the state of Andhra Pradesh. The case studies in “Food Loss Analysis: Causes and Solutions” covered the milk, chick pea, rice and mango value chains. The case study methodology developed by SAVE FOOD was used in the research process. It focuses on identifying the symptoms and causes of food loss and finding relevant solutions, using a phased approach consisting of Screening (secondary research from documents, reports, and expert consultations), Survey, Sampling, and Synthesis (root cause analysis and solution finding). The process includes a gender-sensitive value chain assessment, including issues such as women and men’s roles in production, processing, land ownership, salary differentials and the potential impacts of changes.

Under the FAO Regional Gender Equality Strategy for Europe and Central Asia 2016-2017 approved in January 2016, and in line with the ERC/ECA recommendations, a regional network of experts convened in Minsk in February 2016, which resulted in the publication Gender, Social Protection and Rural Development. The Agri-Gender Statistical Toolkit was published in Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Turkey; a study on gender and forestry was conducted and recommendations were provided to the Government of Kosovo; FAO facilitated the empowerment of more than 1 500 rural women through capacity development under the UNJP on Rural Women’s Economic Empowerment in Kyrgyzstan; Country Gender Assessments were conducted for Albania, Armenia, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Turkey. A webinar on working with gender was delivered in Russian.

The Regional Office for the Near East and North Africa has recently completed a Regional Gender Strategy, which includes a value chain focus. A number of country gender assessments (Algeria, Lebanon, and Sudan) have been completed and are being used to

---

26 FAO, 2017. Milk Value Chain Food Loss Analysis: Causes and Solutions. Case studies in the small-scale agriculture and fisheries sub-sectors, in the state of Andhra Pradesh, India (also Rice, Chickpea and Mango value chain analyses).
mainstream gender in the respective CPFs. A gender-sensitive value chain analysis study on medicinal and aromatic plants was conducted in Egypt. In addition, an exercise to map sex-disaggregated data in Iraq, Lebanon and Sudan was completed in 2015 and 2016 (in addition to one conducted in 2014 in Mauritania, Morocco and Tunisia), and more recently in Egypt and Jordan at the end of 2016. These will form the basis for capacity building at the country level and for policy formulation. Additionally, an assessment of small-scale fishery and aquaculture livelihoods along the Nile River in Sudan was carried out; gender-disaggregated data was collected, and strong, practical gender-focused recommendations based on efficiently developing the value chain, capacity development, decent employment opportunities, secure sustainable livelihoods and household food security were obtained and included in the Sudan Fisheries Work Programme.

In 2016, a guiding framework on developing gender-sensitive value chains was published by FAO headquarters. Dissemination took place via a webinar, a published article on the guiding framework on gender sensitive value chains and six training workshops in Burkina Faso, Côte d’Ivoire, Ethiopia, Ghana, Tunisia. An article was published on: “Sustainable value chains for sustainable food systems”.

A guiding note on the gender and food loss nexus was produced to provide an insight into current good practices, and to offer guidance to policy makers, field practitioners and project designers by combining aspects of different methodologies for food loss reduction interventions.

Additional examples include:

- Developing gender-sensitive value chains – a guiding framework;
- FAO’s Global Initiative on Food Loss and Waste Reduction;
- Food Loss Analysis: Causes and Solutions - Case studies in the Small-scale Agriculture and Fisheries Subsectors;
- Gender and Food Loss in the Context of Sustainable Food Value Chain Development: a guiding note.

b. Research and studies

FAO has developed and/or supported several studies meant to serve as a basis for technical advice in areas relevant for SP4, especially to gather evidence on value chain development. These include:

- A background paper produced in 2017 on Informal Cross-border Trade and Gender Implications - Formalization of informal trade in Africa - Trends, experiences and socio-economic impacts.
- "Empowering women in Afghanistan – Reducing gender gaps through integrated dairy schemes".
- Another three reports were published in 2016 under the FMM Sida Programme.
- "Gender assessment of dairy value chains: evidence from Ethiopia".
- "Gender assessment of dairy value chains: evidence from Rwanda".
- "Mujeres de Algodón: roles de género y participación en las cadenas de valor en Argentina, Bolivia, Colombia, Paraguay y Perú (Women in Cotton: Gender Roles and Participation in Value Chains in Argentina, Bolivia, Colombia, Paraguay and Peru)”, 2017.
• Gender assessment of the Cactus Value Chain from Tunisia, 2016.
• Gender assessment of medicinal and aromatic plants, Egypt, 2015-2016.
• Socio-economic and gender analysis of the dairy value chain in Panama, 2016.
• Género y Sistemas Agroalimentarios Sostenibles - Estudios de Caso: Yuca, Quinua, Maíz y Algodón, Santiago, 2016 ('Gender assessment of value chains of quinoa and camelids (Bolivia), Cassava (Belize), maize (Guatemala), Cotton (regional)).
• Gender-sensitive value chain analyses of silk products in Azerbaijan, 2016.
• "Assessment of the possibilities for Income diversification through rural crafts development (in support of the small business and job creation for women and men in rural communities in the Republic of Uzbekistan)", 2016.

Box 2: Gender analysis of the quinoa value chain in Bolivia - a chapter in the study Gender and Sustainable Agri-food Systems

This study sets the scene within the policy, institutional and social framework in Bolivia. It describes two groups of women working with camelids and quinoa, and identifies some of the bottlenecks they face in the quinoa value chain. The issues faced specifically by women (which are also opportunities for interventions) include: availability of time, given the unequal division of household tasks; respiratory problems due to the involvement of women in toasting the quinoa; access to productive resources (such as processing tools adapted for women’s use) and basic services (public transport is dominated by men working in the mines, making it difficult for women to get to market); insufficient business and marketing capacities or information about financing opportunities; inadequate technical training in production or processing; and insufficient levels of association of women, which could assist them in business development.

64 The Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (RAP) Regional Gender Workshop was held in 2015 bringing together FAO gender focal points and those of the regional governments and representatives from civil society and farmers’ organizations. The workshop highlighted the ways that social and traditional norms, culture and institutions, governing frameworks and markets explicitly or implicitly constrain women in Asia and the Pacific. The Regional Gender Strategy outlines plans to work with the gender dimension of key production and value chain systems, particularly aquaculture and fisheries and rice, and identify key areas that could contribute to women’s economic empowerment.

c. Capacity development

Capacity development at institutional level

65 There has been some work conducted of relevance in the countries visited by the evaluation team regarding the other minimum standards, though this is not specifically an element tied to SP4 – we consider here Minimum Standard 6 - A gender equality stock-taking exercise is conducted for all services, to provide a basis for better implementation of gender mainstreaming, including progress and performance measurement.

66 From 2013 until December 2016, 33 gender stocktaking exercises have been conducted. Eight were conducted at headquarters, four in the regional or subregional offices (Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (RAP), Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean (RLC), Subregional Office for the Caribbean(SLC) and Regional Office for the Near East and North Africa (RNE)), and 21 at country level (Argentina, Brazil, Benin, Cambodia, Chile, Colombia, Ethiopia, Gambia, Guatemala, Guyana, Liberia, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Sri Lanka, Senegal, Somalia, Rwanda, and Uganda, Uruguay and Zambia). These exercises were used to identify strengths and weaknesses in staff capacities and then plan further staff training. See the examples of the Subregional office for the Caribbean in Barbados (SLC), and of Rwanda in Boxes 3 and 4 respectively.

Box 3: Gender stocktaking at the Subregional office for the Caribbean in Barbados (SLC)

A gender stocktaking took place at the Subregional office for the Caribbean in Barbados (SLC) in 2016. This took place following training given to the gender focal points from the region by the gender team of the Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean (RLC). The main objectives were to obtain a baseline from a review of the current and past work in the promotion of gender equality; identify lessons learned to formulate recommendations for improving gender equality; and use the results as the basis for developing strategies and plans for mainstreaming gender in the work of the Subregional Office for the Caribbean. The findings were that most of the technical staff members need more skills, experience and resources (technical, human and financial) in order to mainstream gender effectively. The stocktaking will be used to develop further staff training. The country offices will also work to increase the understanding of gender in the local ministries of agriculture (as they often don’t have a gender focal point). During 2017, FAO is assessing the status of gender-related issues in each country with the subregional office. This will include a gender stocktaking of Jamaica.

Box 4: Gender stocktaking at FAO Rwanda

In Rwanda, a gender stocktaking was carried out at the FAO office in 2016. Major findings were: limited capacity of staff, lack of gender sensitive baselines and lack of tools and guidelines to facilitate gender mainstreaming at all stages of designing, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. The evaluation team noted that as Rwanda is considered quite advanced in terms of gender mainstreaming (for instance, with a large proportion of women parliamentarians, regular gender budgeting, gender machinery in government, land titling that ensures the inclusion of women, etc.), development partners met by the team indicated that they are not particularly focused on promoting gender issues. However, it cannot be assumed that there is no work to be done. Under SP3, FAO carried out a study using Women’s Empowerment in Agriculture Index (WEIA) methodology of women’s empowerment. It found that “women tend to have a significantly lower probability of being empowered (measured by 5DE) as opposed to men; and are less likely to achieve adequacy in speaking in public, in their ownership of assets and in achieving adequate workloads as opposed to men” (p.28). There is an opportunity to do more on market access and value addition, and to better advocate on gender issues as FAO facilitates the new Agriculture Strategy planning.

Findings from some stocktaking exercises have reinforced the understanding that there are insufficient staff and time to mainstream gender effectively. They show that project documents and reports usually recognize gender as a cross-cutting issue but fail to translate the concept of gender equality into action, which leads to the policy evaporation phenomenon. Additionally it was found that recruitment of implementing partners does not consider their capacity in gender mainstreaming.

FAO is supporting capacity development via training sessions and discussions online, in person and via publications. Given the limited resources available, webinars are a useful way to share information. However, the follow-up at the country level is also very important. This can take place via headquarters or regional gender staff visits, or within the country office. For example, a webinar: “Developing gender-sensitive value chains” was run from headquarters in February 2017, and followed up with national level training sessions on gender-sensitive value chains (e.g. in Cambodia in 2017, with national government stakeholders and FAO).

A technical discussion on gender assessment in dairy value chains was held in April 2015. This supported the rollout of these assessments in several countries (see Box 5).

Box 5: Training on gender in value chains

“Enable women to benefit more equally from agrifood value chains’ is a programme supported by Sweden through the FAO Multipartner Programme Support Mechanism (FMM) to focus specifically on women. The three-year programme, started in February 2015, targets eight countries in Africa (Burkina Faso, Côte d’Ivoire, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Morocco, Rwanda and Tunisia) and focuses on three main food value chains: fisheries, dairy, and roots and tubers. The programme also supports small initiatives including, among others, horticulture, argan oil value chains and cross-border trade.

In 2017, national level training in gender in value chains was provided in Côte d’Ivoire, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Rwanda and Tunisia. This was undertaken in partnership with AgriProFocus (a multi-stakeholder network, with 34 Dutch member organizations, in the agri-food sector consisting of farmer entrepreneurs, private sector enterprises, government, knowledge institutions and civil society organizations). This is an innovative partnership for FAO. The aim is to develop the expertise of FAO’s country level staff in order to build a pool of experts who combine gender and value chain expertise, as well as to strengthen their coaching skills. The targeted participants were service providers (e.g. government institutions at regional and local level, non-governmental organizations and private sector advisory services) as well as experts/practitioners supporting agribusiness and gender mainstreaming in value chain development within the FMM at country level.

Capacity development at community level

Capacity building at community level is a significant area of work within the gender component of SP4. The analysis of the projects and the survey indicate that approximately 60 percent of the activities were community level capacity building. As part of the evaluation, activities were assessed by interviews, document reviews and field visits, which acknowledged FAO’s expertise in capacity building. Two examples include:

- In the Joint Programme for the Improvement of the Nutritional Status of Children via the strengthening of local productive systems in Bolivia, FAO and United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) have worked across the agricultural and food system in an integrated way. Activities include production, processing, marketing and consumption. The project ensures active participation of women via provision of childcare during activities. Training on nutrition and food processing is provided to all members of the family, including men via farmer field schools (in fact, in one group visited, a young man was the leader of the nutrition group – a role more typically filled by women). A total of 1 149 families have received training on production and nutrition in the farmer field schools (including 40-45 percent women). The project has supported development of seven enterprises (with participation of 150 families), of which three are led by women. Support includes construction of fruit drying and milling facilities, which provide employment for predominantly female workers (including two men and 18 women in one facility visited during the evaluation), markets for fruit and vegetables from smallholder producers, less food losses, and a linkage to the municipalities and school meal buying system.

- The FMM-funded Dairy Cooperative Support in Rwanda began with a gender-sensitive value chain assessment of the dairy industry. The focus is on the role of women – how do we enable women to benefit the most? The project was built on this, with a focus on improving hygiene and clean milk production, processing and enhancing the business capacity of dairy cooperatives. The study showed that “participation of women (and therefore their ability to earn profits) is concentrated on the production node and is systematically challenged by their lack of knowledge and skills, particularly in terms of animal health (as training is often channelled through men) and access to technology inputs. Women may also participate in retail just as men, however they rarely own retail enterprises. In other nodes, including transportation, they are almost invisible” (Project Strategy, p.8).

Training has been provided in the community for mainly women on animal feeding, hygienic production, gender and group formation. Women leaders from more established coops were brought in to do training. The evaluation team visited a livestock feed preparation training during the field visit, and the team observed very enthusiastic participation by women farmers, in both theory and practice. The development has been
rapid, as production increased significantly after the cow nutrition training was provided. While the initial focus was on consumption of the milk at home, farmers are now moving into processing the milk into ghee or selling it to the milk collection centres.

71 The evaluation notes however that the active involvement of women and men in capacity building varies according to the region. The evaluators were able to see very active involvement of young and old women in training events and participation in meetings in some projects in Bolivia and Rwanda. This is partly due to the changes in these societies in general, but also reflects active encouragement by the FAO project staff. However, in other cases it appears that women are either passive participants in training, or not visible at all (as evident from the sex-disaggregation of trainees, where reported). A critical issue is whether women are participating actively or passively in capacity development (for instance, not just to increase the count of female participants at training sessions). FAO staff need to be very aware of gender issues in the community where they work in, and actively facilitate inclusion of all – women, youth, elderly and disadvantaged participants. Furthermore, in some cases, there may be constraints on women’s participation in capacity building events due to cultural issues or time availability. For instance, the report from the evaluation in the West Bank and Gaza found it was difficult at times for women to leave their homes. In Pakistan, the Australia-Balochistan Agribusiness Programme (AusABBA) struggled with cultural and security issues inhibiting movement (especially of women). Consequently, project staff need to make efforts to organize the training in such a way (considering issues such as awareness raising, location, participants, trainers, literacy, child care or timing) to ensure that women can, and do, participate. One option may be women-only groups – for instance, in the AusABBA, FAO established female farmer field schools. In Bolivia the Joint Programme used project funds to pay for child care during training events, to ensure women and men could participate.

d. Provision of inputs

72 Inputs are provided in many projects. This can be a benefit to the empowerment of women, who are often unable to participate in value chains due to their lack of inputs (see the analysis below of the projects and the survey findings). Two examples of such work include:

- **Support to small-scale inland fisheries: Dissemination of post-harvest techniques in the North-West of Angola.** In this project, with capacity building, study tours and introduction of new technologies, fish loss was reduced from 40 percent to 15 percent. An underlying assumption was that, if empowered, women could play a decisive role in achieving the objective of sustainable natural resources management. Technical interventions were brought in for fish processing (improved smoking, packaging and handling). In addition, alternative income generating activities were developed to reduce pressure on fish resources. 50 fishers (30 fishermen and 20 women fish processors) trained as blacksmiths, painters, in carpentry, masonry, electricity and cooling systems, bakery, dressmaking and art crafting/home decoration. The approach of the project was very successful, and is now being upscaled and expanded into new projects. The Government planned to replicate in 15 provinces from the original one, though they are first focusing on two provinces.

- **Support to Women Small Traders involved in Cross Border Trade of Agricultural Produce** is a joint project with FAO, UN Women and Catholic Relief Services. The majority of informal small cross-border traders in the Great Lakes region (including Rwanda) are women (74 percent), only 10 percent of which are members of traders associations or cooperatives. The project is aiming to reduce specific barriers that prevent women value chain actors to access and benefit from participating in markets, by developing their capacities and fostering an enabling institutional environment. The project is working with five cooperatives or unions, two of which have membership of only women, and three are mainly women (500 women, 35 men). They are working with several value chains – fish, tomatoes, milk, maize and cassava. Along with providing institutional development support, training in business management and facilitation of meetings with customs officials, support has been provided as inputs to improve storage and transport in the agricultural and food chain. For instance, each fish cooperative will receive fish packing equipment, storage equipment, refrigerators, cool boxes, motorbikes with transport boxes, boats and outboard engines, lifejackets, plastic crates and other items.

---

e. Partnerships

73 The gender team at headquarters reported a range of partnerships. The most obvious was the joint work of the Rome based agencies – FAO, International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and World Food Programme (WFP). Gender staff of each agency meet regularly, and they implement projects together. As an example, the joint programme funded by FAO, IFAD, WFP and UN Women, Norway and Sweden – the Rural Women’s Economic Empowerment Project – is working with women in seven countries. While the project is tagged SO3, the activities regarding business training, agro-processing and SME development seem to fit within SO4.

74 FAO has regular collaboration with research or agriculture institutes (e.g. International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) in general, Caribbean Agricultural Research and Development Institute (CARDI), Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA)), which can also include collaboration on gender topics. An example is the proposal for a new regional TCP under consideration with UN Women and IICA in Barbados.

75 A survey of FAO’s gender focal points indicated the range of partnerships engaged in, with the government as the predominant partner, but also a significant percentage of partnerships with non-governmental organizations and other international organizations, including UN system agencies (see Figure 1).

Figure 1: Types of partnerships in support of gender activities

![Diagram showing the distribution of partnerships]

Source: Office of Evaluation (OED) survey of FAO gender focal points, 2017

76 Notably, it was reported that as well as working on gender assessments with ministries of agriculture, FAO has worked with the African economic communities to develop their draft policies for gender and agricultural development and action plans – making them more specific to agriculture and adding data from country gender assessments and building action plans. Each subregion is developing joint gender publications with the Economic Community of West African States (e.g. gender and agri-food processes in the Economic Community of West African State (ECOWAS) region). This includes gender information which is taken from country reports and aggregated to regional levels.
Box 6: Partnerships in support of women’s economic empowerment in Ethiopia

FAO is working with the Organization for Women in Self Employment (WISE) in Ethiopia, which is an NGO aimed at addressing urban poverty and the realization of sustainable livelihoods among poor women. Together with WISE, FAO is enhancing food security of women farmer groups in Tigray through introducing innovative tomato processing machines that can be easily managed by women farmer groups. The project is part of the FMM-supported ‘Enabling women to benefit more equally from agrifood value chains’ project, and it intends to increase production of tomatoes for the processed market, in order to generate more income than current levels via stable and reliable markets. WISE is providing trainings on basic business skills and refresher trainings to women beneficiaries.

Also in Tigray, FAO is supporting a women’s cooperative to produce cactus pear marmalade for export to Italy in partnership with an Italian gourmet food retailer, Eataly. The cooperative has benefited from Eataly’s knowledge sharing on best practices for packaging and marketing. Nonetheless, it has been challenging to upscale the production and to meet Ethiopian and European food safety standards. Also, there were some challenges to the business model: the packaging was not available locally to meet with Italian standards, so it had to be imported from Rome, along with the labelling. Furthermore, women didn’t have access to packing equipment. This means the sustainability of the initiative and the scalability are somewhat limited.

Finally, FAO has signed a memorandum of understanding with the Indian Self-Employed Women’s Association (SEWA). This partnership will promote and exchange good practices and know-how gathered over time by SEWA in its various areas of expertise, across selected FAO Member Countries. The main focus will be on women’s socio-economic empowerment and entrepreneurship. Ethiopia is one of the countries involved in this initiative. FAO’s gender team and SEWA representatives will participate in a joint visit to Ethiopia in October 2017 to share experiences and collaborate on gender-sensitive service provision and capacity development to foster women’s entrepreneurship skills in FAO projects (with participation from WISE). It is too early to comment on the effectiveness or sustainability of this method of capacity building, but this form of cross-learning is promising.

7.2. Gender contributions to SP4 outcomes

The 2013 gender strategy and a gender action plan for SO4 emphasised a focus on value chain activities, cross-border trade and food loss and waste activities. As such, gender equality and women’s economic empowerment objectives have been addressed mainly within Outcome 402. Good results have been achieved, particularly at the community levels; however, in some instances there was a lack of analysis of gender and market opportunities and barriers, while other initiatives offered limited scope for scaling up.

In Pakistan, the Balochistan Agriculture Project (funded by USAID) and the Australia Balochistan Agribusiness Program (AusABBA) worked to organize men and women (separately) in product-specific Farmer Marketing Collectives and Mutual Marketing Organizations in order to carry out value chain assessments and link them to markets. This project provided capacity building and training, and ensured that women were empowered and felt equally part of the development process (including having increased income and financial decision-making at the household level). Women’s Farmer Marketing Collectives were supported to develop markets for vegetables, poultry, dairy and wool products. Approximately 4,604 (or 41 percent) of the AusABBA beneficiaries organized in groups were women. Travel outside the home is very restricted, making market linkages difficult. However, female famers were supported by AusABBA to display and sell their wool products (embroidery and Baloch carpets) and dried fruit and vegetable products in the World Women’s Day event in Islamabad. A study identified which of the typical activities carried out by women are profitable and might also fit in the very busy daily work schedules of women. The next phase of AusABBA proposes to develop women’s enterprises further, with value chains for seven product lines (sheep fattening, seedling production, wool processing, egg and poultry production, fruit and vegetable drying, milk production and saffron).

43 http://www.wise.org.et/
45 Social Policies and Rural Institutions Division (ESP) document ‘Integrating a Gender Equality Perspective to SO4’.
79. In Bolivia, the Urban and Peri-urban Agriculture Project has included establishment of greenhouses and rainwater harvesting, training of group members (mainly women migrants to urban areas), links to organic restaurants, ecotourism, market sales (with provision of crates to decrease FLW), SGP organic production certification, credit access through banks, investments by municipal and departmental governments, working on associations of mainly women, economic and social empowerment. Women’s confidence has increased considerably, and housing and incomes have improved. Nutrition has improved, and the status of women in the family is raised. The women visited during the evaluation in Sucre also commented on how enjoyable it was to have the tourists come to their farms and talk with them. It has built their confidence, knowing that they have something to teach – and they get to talk with the visitors and learn about their lives. The urban project has finished in Sucre and the members are running the activities themselves, together with municipal and departmental technicians, and the project activities are now being replicated in another two districts.

80. There have been some noteworthy contributions in the area of value chain finance under Outcome 403, such as the Zimbabwe Livelihood and Food Security Project that so far has mobilized and is mentoring over 4,000 savings and loan groups, with about 44,000 members of whom 78 percent are female. Through this project, banks have been incentivized to provide loans to women entrepreneurs who are now expanding their farm-based enterprises. Meanwhile, the FAO Rural Finance team has produced working papers such as “Women smallholders – the next frontier in financial inclusion”, and “Gender differences in financial habits and constraints (Mozambique/Tanzania)”.

81. However, gender and market analysis has yet to be adequately mainstreamed throughout FAO’s activities under Outcome 402. For example, a recent evaluation in West Bank and Gaza observed limited evidence of gender mainstreaming across FAO’s activities, and the number of women who directly benefited is minimal. Although some activities aim at addressing women to strengthen their business capacities and increase their access to market, there is no evidence of any market assessment that identifies the specific gender-related institutional and market constraints, nor an analysis of the opportunities of economic integration and empowerment. Partly as a consequence they do not appropriately address the issues of workload, unpaid labour and how they affect women’s ability to earn an income, nor the role of women in the informal sector.

82. Similarly, an evaluation of the project: “Fortalecimiento de Agrocadenas seleccionadas con un enfoque empresarial en El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras y Nicaragua” observed that the project did not have a gender focus in the design phase, nor was there a specific gender-focused component. No gender analysis was undertaken, nor were disaggregated indicators identified or used for monitoring to assess the impact on women. Despite this, the evaluation team noted that there were attempts to ensure balanced participation of women in activities such as participation in fairs or roundtables. In Nicaragua, there were some activities targeted specifically to women, such as training in cassava-based recipes. However they required expensive equipment that the women didn’t own, and tended to perpetuate their traditional roles in the informal market, rather than incorporating them in the formal value chain.

7.3. SP4 contributions to gender equality objectives

7.3.1 Analysis of reports from country offices

83. Country offices are required to report annually on contributions to gender objectives. An analysis was conducted on the Office of Strategy, Planning and Resources Management (OSP) databases of 2015 and 2016, which found that in total there were almost 2,000 different entries; however, after excluding obvious non-SO4 activities and reports focused only on the percentage of female participants in activities (e.g. 50 percent of the farmer field school beneficiaries were women), there were less than 200 activities/achievements reported with relation to gender equality by over 100 countries.
Of these, there were 88 countries self-reporting contributions to gender equality under SO4: 35 in Africa, 17 in Latin America and the Caribbean, 16 in Asia and the Pacific, 12 in the Near East and North Africa, and eight in Europe and Central Asia.

There are 139 activities in total. Eighty three of them involve capacity development at community level (such as farmer field schools) and are mainly in the area of value chains, with some specific to food loss or access to markets. Only 18 of these activities provide policy support or technical advice, and they are mainly related to value chains and financial support. There are also a number of activities on provision of inputs, mainly related to technology (see Figure 2).

Figure 2: Types of contributions towards gender objectives as reported by country offices

![Diagram showing types of contributions towards gender objectives](source)

Most activities (84) are tagged to Output 40203, though a significant number relate to 40202 (12) and 40301 (15). Five activities are related to 40104 and one to 40303. Regarding the type of activity, 47 percent are marked as value chain-related activities and 15 percent are marked as rural finance and investment.

Concerning the gender equality objectives, a significant majority of the reported contributions (85 percent) are under Objective 3 (access to goods, services and markets), with 18 percent reported under Objective 2 (equal access to decent employment, income and productive resources) and 13 percent under Objective 4 (reduction of women’s work burden through improved technologies, services and infrastructure). Only 8 percent were recorded under Objective 1 (equal participation and decision making).

### 7.3.2 Review of project design

In half the projects within the sample of 54 projects reviewed, a gender analysis was incorporated in the project document, while the participation of women in project activities was the only gender consideration in 19 projects. 13 projects (24 percent) included gendered activities on capacity development, while ten projects (19 percent) included policy support related to gender and 19 percent demonstrated gender considerations in monitoring. The policy support activities spanned the various areas of SP4 work, except for trade.

Most of the activities were conducted in agribusiness, food safety and the agricultural and food areas (see Figure 3). The number of activities under food safety (14 of the 54 projects sampled) is quite surprising, given that this was not an area of work emphasised in the SO4 Gender Strategy. On the other hand, the number of food loss activities (four of the 54 projects sampled) is low given that this is a focus area of work for gender under SO4.
With regard to the gender equality objectives, the findings from the project sample review differed from that of the self-reporting done by the country offices, with a more even spread of reported contributions. The majority of the activities (36 percent) were still under Objective 3 (access to goods, services and markets), but there were also many activities (29 percent) under Objective 1 (equal participation and decision making) and Objective 2 (25 percent - equal access and control to decent employment and income, land and other productive resources). A lower percentage (11 percent) was recorded under Objective 4 (reduction of women’s work burden through improved technologies, services and infrastructure); these projects were in the areas of food loss, food safety, trade and agribusiness.

### 7.3.3 Online Survey of FAO Staff

From the survey of FAO staff, 65 percent of respondents identified as being gender focal points. 53 percent said that a country gender assessment had been conducted in their country, and when asked to what degree gender is mainstreamed in the activities of SO4 in their office they responded predominantly: “In most activities” (47 percent), while 7 percent of respondents said that gender was mainstreamed in all activities.

The respondents were asked which type of intervention their office had developed or implemented to mainstream gender under SO4, and which themes they covered. Activities in the agri-food chain (provision of agricultural inputs and equipment to women) or policy support related to linkages to market were the most common responses. More capacity development at government level (as compared to capacity development at community levels) was reported in the areas of trade, food safety, food loss and finance and investment.

A follow-up question asked to which gender equality objective(s) these gender-related activities correspond (Figure 4 below). As can be seen, the themes vary according to the intervention type, but “equal access to goods, services and markets” rates as the most important theme in the perception of respondents, and “Access to technologies, services and infrastructure to reduce women’s work burden” as the second most important.
Respondents were satisfied with the backstopping from Regional offices and headquarters, with 46 percent of respondents noting that colleagues were very responsive to their requests for support. This is corroborated by interviews with respondents in the field offices, who were generally positive regarding the support they receive from the regional offices and headquarters. For instance, several gender focal points mentioned that they had received capacity building from regional gender officers, or had participated in online gender courses and webinars with FAO. However, it was not always evident that this training is trickling outwards to the other staff in the country offices. When the respondents were asked what had prevented their office from developing/implementing further gender-related activities under SO4 so far, the responses reflect what the evaluation team heard in the field (See Figure 5). Issues revolving around insufficient budget and capacity were highlighted. However there was also some uncertainty of how to go about mainstreaming gender in SO4 (31 percent of respondents).

Figure 5: Constraints to developing and implementing more gender-related activities under SO4

Source: Office of Evaluation (OED) survey of FAO gender focal points, 2017
7.4 Collaborations among SOs towards gender equality

The findings from analyses of the project documents and reports, and from interviews and field visits are that there is considerable cross-SO collaboration. In particular, SO4 is found to be a natural partner of SO2, forming two ends of the value chain activities. Particularly within the country offices, the division between SOs is considered quite artificial. There should also be a continuum between activities of social protection, supporting women or disadvantaged groups to cover their basic needs, and then with the improvement in their capacities and access to inputs, moving up into value chain work. Consequently the link also exists with SO3 and SO4. For instance, in Rwanda the creation of the Support to Youth and Women Employment through value chain development is equally SO3 and 4, taking products of women and youth groups through to value addition and sale. In Africa, Regional Initiative 2 was originally focused on SO2, but has expanded to encompass SO3 and 4.
8. Conclusions

FAO has made progress against the minimum standards relevant to SO4 (minimum standards 3, 5, 7, 14 and 15). Although it is too early to see the effects of the new guidance on country programmes and projects, from the analysis of newly-formulated projects it appears that FAO, and SP4 in particular, should focus more on strengthening gender analysis in its programmes and projects. It is notable that gender markers are missing from many projects, even those developed well after the introduction of this as a mandatory element. As noted in the evaluation of SO3, a more robust analysis of the implications of FAO’s interventions on gender inequality would help to identify and understand what type of interventions, and under which context, would lead to greater equality gains.

Analysis of country-level contributions against the gender equality objectives shows that the majority of SP4-tagged interventions and results reported were in support of Objective 3 (access to goods, services and markets). In the project sample of newly-formulated SP4 projects there was a much more even spread of planned contributions to the gender equality objectives.

In the survey of gender focal points, Objective 3 (equal access to goods, services and markets) rates as the most important theme in the perception of respondents, and Objective 4 (access to technologies, services and infrastructure to reduce women’s work burden) as the second most important. Gender mainstreaming was most commonly reported in activities in the agri-food chain or linkages to market. Support was predominantly given in the form of capacity building, followed by policy support and provision of agricultural inputs or equipment. The major barriers to gender mainstreaming related to insufficient budget and capacity, and uncertainty of how to go about mainstreaming gender in SO4.

At the global level, FAO has developed several guidelines and learning products, which serve as a basis for policy support, capacity building and implementation of programmes addressing gender equality. At country level, the majority of activities and results reported aimed to support community level interventions and capacity building.

These are aligned with FAO’s strengths as a knowledge-based institution – all normative work brings on board analyses and know-how – and targeting the technical experts with a mixture of technical and gender information is a useful way to raise gender considerations.

The support, training and advice provided by the SP4 gender team at headquarters and the regional gender officers was appreciated. Headquarters has provided support via programmes (in particular, via FMM and RWEE). In addition there has been support to gender activities at regional and country level.

The structured rollout of gender assessments and stocktaking, while not specific to SP4, are valuable. Weaknesses in knowledge have been highlighted, and will inform staff training in the future.

Despite the existing Gender Focal Point Network, there is insufficient capacity in many of the country offices and amongst staff in general to ensure gender is mainstreamed in all activities. Furthermore, as most of the staff work on short-term, project-related contracts, this limits institutional memory and capacity development. While staff may have a theoretical understanding of gender issues, the practical application is problematic. Partnerships and joint programming with other organizations could help to increase this expertise at the country level.
## 9. Appendices

### Appendix 1. Implementation Plan of FAO Policy on Gender Equality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAO Minimum Standards for Gender Mainstreaming</th>
<th>Key activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. All major FAO statistical databases incorporate sex-disaggregated data where relevant and available</td>
<td>Screen which databases are relevant for sex-disaggregation. Assess extent of sex disaggregation within relevant databases. Add sex-disaggregated data to relevant databases and/or develop new databases with sex-disaggregated data. Disseminate food security sex-disaggregated data through FAOSTAT and/or undertake new gender-focused analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. FAO invests in strengthening the capacity of member countries’ to develop, analyse and use sex-disaggregated data in policy analysis and programme and project planning and evaluation</td>
<td>Identify learning events/areas of work where it is relevant to include a session on sex-disaggregated data. Assess the inclusion of sessions on sex-disaggregated data in the relevant learning events/areas of work. Develop and deliver sessions on sex-disaggregated data in the relevant learning events. Identify areas of work where the production of knowledge products (e.g., methodological guidelines, etc.) on sex-disaggregated data is relevant. Assess the inclusion of gender issues in the knowledge products in the relevant areas of work. Develop knowledge products on sex-disaggregated data. Lesson prepared on gender and sex-disaggregated data for e-learning on gender and food security.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. For all strategic objectives, a gender analysis is carried out and a gender action plan developed; progress on gender equality is measured for all corporate outcomes</td>
<td>Conduct gender analysis in each SO as basis for identifying gender-related work in SO Action plans. Identify gender-related Products/Services and/or activities in each SO. Establish and apply gender markers to indicate the level of relevance to gender mainstreaming for each Product/Service and activity. Develop gender-sensitive qualifiers for relevant outcome and output indicators in the SO monitoring framework and use sex-disaggregated data where available. Monitor progress based on the gender markers and the qualifiers within the SO monitoring framework every year end.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A financial target for resource allocation to the FAO Policy on Gender Equality is set and met</td>
<td>Ring-fence budget related to gender as a cross-cutting issue. Year end reporting on cross-cutting theme on gender (CCTG) budget is carried out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A country gender assessment is undertaken as part of country programming</td>
<td>Quality support and assurance process: Provide briefing and advice to decentralized offices (FAORs and GFPs) on their role during key stages of the CPF formulation process (Concept Note, Priority setting, Programming for results) and implementation reviews. Quality support and assurance process: Gender relevance within the planning of the CPF highlighted in virtual briefing of the consultants/staff engaged in the CPF formulation process or facilitators of the consultation workshops to be organized on request basis. CPF guidance and learning materials: Review of the CPF guidelines, Quality assurance procedure and reporting requirements; tools and technical guidance notes; and the related learning materials to further enhance integration of gender principles. Review of gender equality inclusion in the Office of Support to Decentralized Offices' (OSD’s) guidance materials and processes (CPF and Project cycle guide). Yearly CPFs reviewed for quality assurance and feedback provided to the Office of Support to Decentralized Offices (OSD). Gender country assessment carried out to assure gender integration within planning process at country level (CPF).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO Minimum Standards for Gender Mainstreaming</td>
<td>Key activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. A gender equality stock-taking exercise is conducted for all services, to provide a basis for better implementation of gender mainstreaming, including progress and performance measurement</td>
<td>Division/Unit stocktaking exercise carried out and shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Gender analysis is incorporated in the formulation of all field programs and projects, and gender-related issues are taken into account in project approval and implementation processes</td>
<td>Gender equality mainstreamed throughout the project cycle guide: from project conception identification and formulation (project concept note and document) to Project Appraisal (Quality Assurance Checklist) and implementation and monitoring (mid-term assessment and terminal report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project cycle supported with web-based tools to support corporate monitoring of the implementation of the Policy on Gender Equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A corporate e-learning course developed on the programming principles, including Gender Equality, throughout the project cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A gender analysis is undertaken for the formulation of field projects and programmes following the Project Cycle Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. All programme reviews and evaluations fully integrate gender analysis, and report on gender-related impacts in the area they are reviewing</td>
<td>Launching of the internal gender peer review mechanism Section in the Programme Evaluation Report 2013, on gender mainstreaming in FAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organization and conduct of the Validation process of the Follow-up Report to the Management Response to the Evaluation of FAO’s role and work in Gender and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality assurance of gender equality mainstreaming into FAO evaluations, continuation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section in the Programme Evaluation Report 2015, on gender mainstreaming in FAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. A mandatory gender mainstreaming capacity development programme is developed and implemented for all professional staff and managers. This programme will be tailored to the specific needs of different units in FAO Headquarters (HQ) and at the regional and country levels offices, and will be conducted by trainers with expertise in the subject matters relevant to those units.</td>
<td>Contribution to IANGWE/UNU system-wide mandatory gender training course for UN staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UN-Wide CD Programme (when available) made mandatory to all staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Briefing of new FAO Representatives and heads of decentralized offices including information on diversity in the workplace (online course) and gender parity (once guidelines are approved)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender equality is included as part of the orientation e-learning (Welcome to FAO) to be launched for all employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender resources packaged for the FAOR Programme and Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordination/technical review of 13 training modules for FAO’s Gender and Food Security e-learning programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dissemination of FAO’s Gender and Food Security e-learning programme – different modules targeted at different staff functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preparation of Gender and Food Security training course contents with ITC/ILO and training workshop delivered to two cohorts of headquarters and decentralized office Gender and Food Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preparation and dissemination of Guidelines on Gender Policy Implementation for FAOR orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preparation and dissemination of Gender and Food Security Handbook for gender policy implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Minimum competencies in gender analysis are specified, and all managers and professional staff are required to meet them</td>
<td>FAQ’s corporate competency framework includes gender as a core value (“respect for all”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Each technical department establishes a gender equality screening process for all normative work, programmes and knowledge products</td>
<td>Terms of Reference for Gender and Food Security at headquarters and in decentralized offices include a role in screening unit/office’s outputs on gender equality (normative, programme and knowledge products)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender and Food Security review their office’s key outputs (normative work; knowledge products; projects and programmes) and advise on make recommendations for improved gender inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO Minimum Standards for Gender Mainstreaming</td>
<td>Key activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12.</strong> An assessment of the contribution to achieving FAO’s gender equality objectives is included in the Performance Evaluation and Management System (PEMS) of all professional staff</td>
<td>No activities reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **13.** Human and financial resources and normative and operational results related to gender equality from the HQs to the country level are systematically tracked and reported to FAO governing bodies and to the UN system | Review/Update of HR Strategic Action Plan on Gender Equality for 2014-2016 period  
Issuance of gender parity and equality guidelines  
Regular reporting on staffing to governing bodies and UN-SWAP  
CCTG gender budget is ring fenced  
Ring fenced budget is reported to FAO governing bodies  
SO Monitoring Framework designed  
Outcome level SO monitoring results reported to FAO governing bodies |
| **14.** 30 percent of FAO’s operational work and budget at the country and regional levels is allocated to women-specific targeted interventions | All projects are marked in Field Programme Management Information System (FPMIS) with gender markers  
Over 40 percent of the gender-related regular programming resources allocated to country, subregional and regional levels |
| **15.** The share of Technical Cooperation Program’s (TCP) total portfolio allocated to programmes and projects related to gender equality is increased from 9 to 30 percent | All projects are marked in FPMIS with gender markers |
Appendix 2. Methodology for project analysis and list of selected projects

1 To complement the gender analysis, a subset of the evaluation team reviewed a sample of newly designed SO4-related projects (i.e. those formulated since the new Project design guidelines were issued)\(^{49}\) in order to validate the preliminary findings coming from (i) interviews; (ii) gender survey; and (iii) Programme Planning, Implementation Reporting and Evaluation Support System/Office of Strategy, Planning and Resources Management (PIRES/OSP) database review.

2 The frame comprises all new projects tagged as contributing to SO4 in Field Programme Management Information System (FPMIS) from 15 March 2015 to December 2016. It includes country, regional and interregional projects funded by FAO (TCP) and donors (TF, UNJP). Projects whose full code was not yet available as well as TeleFood\(^{50}\) (TFD) and TCP facility projects were excluded. In total, the frame contains 145 projects, distributed across five regions plus interregional, as shown in the Table below (Table 3).

Table 1: Breakdown of projects per region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Projects (total number)</th>
<th>Projects (percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>26.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interregional</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near East</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.6 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Evaluation team

2. Defining the sample size and project sample

3 Since the objective was to collect and analyse data in the form of counts or proportions, the calculation was done for a single proportion. To ensure the quality of the sample, the desired confidence interval was 90 percent, the desired margin error was 0.05 percent, and the estimated true proportion was 90 percent. Using a web-based calculator,\(^{51}\) the resulting sample size was 59 projects.

4 Considering that the intention was to assess projects across different regions, a proportional stratified sample was calculated where each region, including interregional, was treated as a stratum.


\(^{51}\) http://epitools.ausvet.com.au/content.php?page=1Proportion&Proportion=0.3&Conf=0.95&Precision=0.05&Population=243
Table 2: Proportional sample size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interregional</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near East</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Evaluation team

5. The projects for analysis were randomly selected using Excel. The complete list is attached below in Appendix 2.1.

3. Project analysis

6. The review of project design focused on the following elements, which were rated from 0 to 1 (0 correspond to “no”, and 1 to “yes”).

   a. Is gender analysis incorporated in the project document?
   b. To which Gender Equality Objective (or Minimum Standard) is this project contributing?
   c. Which core function is mainly represented in this project?

To which SO4 output/core areas is this project intended to contribute?

7. Concept notes were reviewed to collect the gender markers.

4. Reporting format

8. The analysis is presented and summarized in the format included in Appendix 2.2.
## Appendix 2.1. Project list
(Projects marked in aqua were found to be wrongly tagged – or in the last case, missing project document or reports)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region Name</th>
<th>Country Name</th>
<th>Project Symbol</th>
<th>Organization Result</th>
<th>Unit Result</th>
<th>Gender marker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NENA</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>TCP/LEB/3503</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NENA</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>TCP/EGY/3603</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>402 03</td>
<td>G1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NENA</td>
<td>Regional Near East</td>
<td>TCP/SNE/3601/C1</td>
<td>204, 504, 401</td>
<td>20 402, 50 402, 40 104</td>
<td>G1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NENA</td>
<td>Regional Near East</td>
<td>GCP /RNE/004/ITA</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>G2a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NENA</td>
<td>West Bank and Gaza Strip</td>
<td>GCP /GAZ/013/SWI</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>G2a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>TCP/CUB/3501</td>
<td>402, 201</td>
<td>20 101, 40 203, 20 103</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>TCP/BAR/3601/C1</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>40 104</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>TCP/ELS/3503</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>40 201, 40 203</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>MTF /MEX/124/FFD</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>Regional Latin America</td>
<td>TCP/RLA/3510</td>
<td>301, 402</td>
<td>30 103, 40 203, 40 201</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>GCP /CHI/042/GFF</td>
<td>202, 402</td>
<td>20 201, 40 201</td>
<td>G2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>TCP/PAR/3503</td>
<td>102, 501, 401, 301, 201</td>
<td>10 201, 50 101, 40 104, 30 101, 20 103</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>Subregional Office for the Caribbean, Bridgetown</td>
<td>TCP/SLC/3601</td>
<td>201, 402</td>
<td>20 101, 40 203</td>
<td>G1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>TCP/PAN/3502</td>
<td>102, 402</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>St Vincent &amp; Grenadines</td>
<td>TCP/STV/3501</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>Subregional Office for the Caribbean, Bridgetown</td>
<td>GCP /SLC/010/CDB</td>
<td>201, 402</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>Subregional Office for Central America, Panama</td>
<td>TCP/SLM/3604</td>
<td>103, 502, 403, 301</td>
<td>10 302, 50 201, 40 303, 40 201, 30 103</td>
<td>G0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>Regional Latin America</td>
<td>TCP/RLA/3509</td>
<td>101, 403, 401, 201</td>
<td>10 101, 40 303, 40 201, 40 102</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAP</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>TCP/NEP/3503</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>40 203</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAP</td>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>TCP/STI/3501</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>40 203</td>
<td>G1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAP</td>
<td>Regional Asia &amp; Pacific</td>
<td>GCP /RAS/295/JPN</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>40 101</td>
<td>G0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAP</td>
<td>Regional Asia &amp; Pacific</td>
<td>GCP /RAS/296/JPN</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>40 203</td>
<td>G1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAP</td>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td>TCP/TON/3501</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>40 101</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAP</td>
<td>Regional Asia &amp; Pacific</td>
<td>TCP/RAS/3510</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>40 203</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAP</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>TCP/INS/3503</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>40 203</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAP</td>
<td>Korea DPR</td>
<td>TCP/DkR/3504</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>40 203</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REU</td>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>TCP/AZE/3602/C1</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>40 203</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REU</td>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>TCP/TAJ/3602/C2</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>40 302</td>
<td>G1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REU</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>GCP /GEO/007/EC</td>
<td>301, 403</td>
<td>30 105, 40 301</td>
<td>G2b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REU</td>
<td>Regional Europe</td>
<td>TCP/REK/3503</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>40 104</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REU</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>GCP /UKR/001/ NOR</td>
<td>101, 401, 201</td>
<td>10 101, 40 101, 20 101</td>
<td>G2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF</td>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>TCP/BEN/3602</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>40 203</td>
<td>G1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF</td>
<td>Swaziland</td>
<td>TCP/SHA/3501</td>
<td>203, 403, 303</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF</td>
<td>Regional Africa</td>
<td>MTF /RAF/499/IMA</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>G2a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation of SO4 – Annex 1. Analysis of Contributions to Gender Equality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region Name</th>
<th>Country Name</th>
<th>Project Symbol</th>
<th>Organization Result</th>
<th>Unit Result</th>
<th>Gender marker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RAF</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>TCP/UGA/3505</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>101, 503, 402, 301, 204</td>
<td>10 101, 50 302, 40 203, 30 103, 20 403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF</td>
<td>Congo</td>
<td>TCP/PRC/3603/C1</td>
<td>101, 503, 402, 301, 204</td>
<td>201, 402, 301</td>
<td>20 101, 40 203, 30 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF</td>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>TCP/ERI/3502</td>
<td>201, 402, 301</td>
<td>20 103, 40 203</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF</td>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td>GCP /GB5/034/EC</td>
<td>201, 402, 301</td>
<td>20 101, 40 203</td>
<td>G2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>GCP /UGA/046/CPR</td>
<td>201, 402</td>
<td>20 103, 40 203</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>GCP /ETH/088/GER</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>40 202, 40 203</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF</td>
<td>Regional Africa</td>
<td>GCP /RAF/503/RRF</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>40 202</td>
<td>G2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF</td>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>OSRO/BDI/602/BEL</td>
<td>301, 402</td>
<td>30 103, 40 203</td>
<td>G2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF</td>
<td>Regional Africa</td>
<td>GCP /RAF/489/VEN</td>
<td>201, 402, 301</td>
<td>20 101</td>
<td>G2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>TCP/CHD/3603</td>
<td>201, 402</td>
<td>20 101, 40 203</td>
<td>G1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF</td>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>TCP/MAG/3602</td>
<td>203, 401</td>
<td>20 301, 40 102</td>
<td>G1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF</td>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>TCP/TOG/3503</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interregional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>GCP /GLO/625/EC</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>40 103</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interregional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>UNO/GLO/719/UTD</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>40 102</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interregional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>GCP /GLO/710/UK</td>
<td>503, 502, 401</td>
<td>40 101, 50 301, 50 201, 40 104</td>
<td>G2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interregional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>GCP /GLO/721/NOR</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>40 202</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interregional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>GCP /GLO/667/GER(GIZ)</td>
<td>204, 402</td>
<td>20 401, 40 203</td>
<td>G2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interregional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>GCP /GLO/727/MLI</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>40 303</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interregional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>GCP /GLO/623/EC</td>
<td>201, 402</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interregional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>FMM/GLO/117/MUL</td>
<td>101, 402, 301, 201, 102</td>
<td>10 101, 40 203, 40 202, 40 201, 30 101, 20 101, 10201</td>
<td>G2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interregional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>FMM/INT/277/MUL</td>
<td>301, 402</td>
<td>30 102, 40 203, 40 201</td>
<td>G1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interregional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>GCP /GLO/681/EC</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>40 202</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interregional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>MTF /GLO/625/MUL</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interregional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>MTF /GLO/695/MTC</td>
<td>302, 402</td>
<td>30 201, 40 203</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interregional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>GCPA/INT/020/ROK</td>
<td>202, 401, 204</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2.2. Reporting format for analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Gender analysis</th>
<th>Core function</th>
<th>Policy support</th>
<th>Capacity development</th>
<th>Knowledge product</th>
<th>Toolkits and guidelines</th>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>O1</th>
<th>O2</th>
<th>O3</th>
<th>O4</th>
<th>Agribusiness</th>
<th>Agri-food</th>
<th>O3</th>
<th>Agri-food</th>
<th>Links to market</th>
<th>Food safety</th>
<th>Rural finance and investment</th>
<th>Food loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3. Survey methodology

9 This short survey (32 questions) was sent to every decentralized office, and everyone working with gender-related practices was encouraged to respond, especially the gender focal points. Anonymity was guaranteed. The survey combined questions for the evaluations of SO1 and SO4, in order to minimize survey burnout of respondents.

10 The survey was distributed on SurveyMonkey by the FAO Office of Evaluation.

11 In total, 68 countries received the survey and 52 responded. The desired sample size was 55 (considering confidence level of 90 percent, desired precision of 0.05, and estimated true proportion of 0.5). Only 5 out of the 52 responding countries did not finish the survey (however, they answered some of the questions, which can be considered). The representativeness of countries responding the questionnaire was 95 percent, but ending the survey was 83.7 percent. If we consider the number of respondents, 61 of the original 98 who received the survey responded, meaning the individual survey response rate reached 74.3 percent (since the desired sample was 82). Of those, 68.2 percent finished the questionnaire. Since each country office is expected to have only one gender focal point, we can consider the proportion 1:1 – i.e. one country = one answer.

Questions

1. Please indicate your office: ______________

2. Please indicate your position (tick as many boxes as you wish):
   a. FAOR or Assistant FAOR
   b. Programme or project regular staff
   c. Programme or project consultant
   d. Gender focal point
   e. Other: ____________________

3. Has your office mainstreamed gender in the activities developed/implemented under SO4 between 2014 and 2017?
   a. Yes, in all activities
   b. Yes, in the majority of activities
   c. Yes, at least in half of the activities
   d. Yes, but only in few activities
   e. No
   f. I do not know

4. Has your office mainstreamed gender in the activities developed/implemented under SO1 between 2014 and 2017?
   a. Yes, in all activities
   b. Yes, in the majority of activities
   c. Yes, at least in half of the activities
   d. Yes, but only in few activities
   e. No
   f. I do not know

[If “e”, jump to question 20]

5. Which type of gender-related activity has your office developed and/or implemented? (Tick as many boxes as you wish)
   a. Policy advice
   b. Capacity development (government level)
   c. Capacity development (community level)
   d. Toolkit and guideline
   e. Knowledge product (e.g. case studies)
   f. Sex-disaggregated data collection and analysis
   g. Provision of equipment
   h. Gender assessment (of skills or barriers in general, or of a specific theme, like a value chain)
   i. Other(s):_________________________
6. Which particular SO-related theme these activities cover? (Tick as many boxes as you wish)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Agrifood</th>
<th>Agro-industry</th>
<th>Animal or plant health</th>
<th>Linkages to market</th>
<th>Trade</th>
<th>Food safety/ hygiene/ traceability</th>
<th>Food loss</th>
<th>Finance and investment</th>
<th>Other SO4-related theme</th>
<th>Hunger reduction</th>
<th>Food Security</th>
<th>Nutrition</th>
<th>Governance &amp; coordination</th>
<th>Accountability</th>
<th>Other SO1-related theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy advice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity development (government level)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity development (community level)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toolkit and guideline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge product (e.g. case studies)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex-disaggregated data collection and analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. According to your perception and experience, are these activities contributing to the gender equality objectives from the FAO Policy on Gender Equality (equal participation in rural institutions; decision-making; equal access to and control over income, land and other productive resources; equal access to goods, services and markets; access to technologies, services and infrastructure to reduce women’s work burden)?

a. Yes
b. No
c. I do not know

8. [If yes - question 7] Please indicate them, if possible. (Tick as many boxes as you wish)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Equal participation in rural institutions</th>
<th>Decision-making</th>
<th>Equal access to and control over income, land and other productive resources</th>
<th>Equal access to goods, services and markets</th>
<th>Access to technologies, services and infrastructure to reduce women’s work burden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agrifood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agro-industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal or plant health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linkages to market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food safety/ hygiene/ traceability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation of SO4 – Annex 1. Analysis of Contributions to Gender Equality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food loss</th>
<th>Finance and investment</th>
<th>Other SO4-related theme:</th>
<th>Hunger reduction</th>
<th>Food security</th>
<th>Nutrition</th>
<th>Governance &amp; coordination</th>
<th>Accountability</th>
<th>Other SO1-related theme:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. Could you briefly explain your answer to this question?

10. From your perception, did these activities produce any result?
    a. Yes
    b. No

11. [If yes – question 7] Please briefly describe them:

12. Are you aware of challenges occurred during the implementation of these gender-related activities?
    a. Yes
    b. No

13. [If yes – question 11] Please describe the main challenge(s) you know, including those related to the local culture.
    SO4: ___
    SO1: ___

14. [If yes – question 12] What did your office do to overcome these challenges?
    a. Adopted measures actively
    b. Nothing
    c. I do not know

15. [If “a” – question 14] Please give a brief example of the measure(s) adopted.
    SO4: ___
    SO1: ___

16. Did your office count on FAO support to develop and/or implement gender-related activities under SO4?
    a. Yes, from HQ
    b. Yes, from Regional Office
    c. Yes, from another country office
    d. No
    e. I do not know
    f. Other: ________

17. Did your office count on FAO support to develop and/or implement gender-related activities under SO1?
    a. Yes, from HQ
    b. Yes, from Regional Office
    c. Yes, from another country office
    d. No
    e. I do not know
    f. Other: ________
18. Did your office work with partners to develop/implement gender-related activities under SO4?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. I do not know

19. [If yes – question 18] Who are they?
   a. Government
   b. UN agencies
   c. Other international organizations
   d. Private sector
   e. Civil society
   f. Other:________________

20. [If yes – question 18] Could you please describe them?

21. [If yes – question 18] Please give an example on how these partnerships work:

22. Did your office work with partners to develop/implement gender-related activities under SO1?
   d. Yes
   e. No
   f. I do not know

23. [If yes – question 22] Who are they?
   a. Government
   b. UN agencies
   c. Other international organizations
   d. Private sector
   e. Civil society
   f. Other:________________

24. [If yes – question 22] Could you please describe them?

25. [If yes – question 22] Please give an example on how these partnerships work:

26. In your opinion, what prevented your office to develop/implement further gender-related activities under SO4 so far? (thick as many boxes as you wish)
   a. Time constraints
   b. Insufficient budget
   c. Lack of capacity and skills
   d. Insufficient human resources
   e. It is still not very clear how we can mainstream gender in SO4-related activities
   f. Gender is not relevant for SO4
   g. The culture in the country means it isn’t necessary
   h. Nothing, gender was incorporated in all activities
   i. Other:________________

27. In your opinion, what prevented your office to develop/implement further gender-related activities under SO1 so far? (thick as many boxes as you wish)
   a. Time constraints
   b. Insufficient budget
   c. Lack of capacity and skills
   d. Insufficient human resources
   e. It is still not very clear how we can mainstream gender in SO1-related activities
   f. Gender is not relevant for SO1
   g. Nothing, gender was incorporated in all activities
   h. Other:________________

28. Is your office planning to develop/implement any gender-related activities under SO4 or SO1 in the next biennium?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. I do not know
29. [If yes – question 29] What are the planned activities and which particular area will they cover? (Tick as many boxes as you wish)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy advice</th>
<th>Agrifood</th>
<th>Agro-industry</th>
<th>Animal or plant health</th>
<th>Linkages to market</th>
<th>Trade</th>
<th>Food safety/hygiene/traceability</th>
<th>Food loss</th>
<th>Finance and investment</th>
<th>Other SO4-related theme</th>
<th>Hunger reduction</th>
<th>Food Security</th>
<th>Nutrition</th>
<th>Governance &amp; coordination</th>
<th>Accountability</th>
<th>Other SO1-related theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity development (government level)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity development (community level)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toolkit and guideline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge product (e.g. case studies)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex-disaggregated data collection and analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. Would you like to indicate another colleague to answer this survey? (for instance, a colleague working in SO4 or SO1 themes)
   a. Yes
   b. No

[If yes – question 31 Please indicate your colleague’s name, organization and email.]
## Appendix 4. Key entry points for FAO’s interventions in gender equality, by core area of work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core area</th>
<th>Key entry points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| People’s empowerment through strong formal and informal rural institutions | • Analyse good practices and develop policy recommendations for ensuring that rural institutions and organizations enhance the participation of women and enable them to influence decision making processes, and reduce social and gender inequalities in access to land and other productive resources, thereby enhancing their role in building food security and reducing rural poverty at both household and community level.  
• Analyse women and youth participation in decision making processes and leadership positions in FBOs/coops and identify/develop measures for promoting their effective participation.  
• Provide evidence-based policy support on good practices and institutional mechanisms for strengthening women’s leadership and voice in rural institutions and organizations.  
• Generate policy relevant knowledge on actual benefits of gender equality in decision-making and leadership on Rural Organizations’ performance, and on household decision-making. |
| Basic rural infrastructure and rural services            | • Analysis of existing gender inequalities in access to rural services to understand the specific gender-based social, cultural and legal barriers (both from demand and supply side) that poor rural women and men, in particular small-scale producers, face in accessing and using rural services, and to develop targeted, customer-driven models that take into account the gender dynamics in the rural economy and households.  
• Facilitate country-level participatory multi-stakeholder consultations to identify context-specific gender inequalities and gaps and constraints related to the policy and regulatory framework influencing access to rural services in order to be able to identify alternative models and/or reorient existing service systems to guarantee affordable, efficient and quality services to those who are normally excluded from these.  
• Provide evidence-based policy support and advice on integrating gender equality and good governance principles, including accountability, into rural service provision in ways that respond to the needs of poor rural women and men, in particular those of small-scale producers.  
• Develop human and institutional capacities to design and implement innovative and gender-equitable client driven rural service models, including those that provide a pool of services, and support their monitoring and evaluation to enhance accountability and contribute to the development of norms and standards for inclusive and gender equitable rural service delivery. |
| Improved market access and productivity of small holders and processing activities along the value chain, as well as options for agricultural diversification | • Gender sensitive approaches for technology and innovations development and access to inputs that recognize the differentiated needs and constraints faced by women and men are developed and implemented.  
• Programmes and strategies address and monitor the gender gap in access, use and control over productive resources.  
• Provide evidence base for policy process documenting women’s access to productive resources and analysis of how complementarities among key productive assets interplay and constrain women’s productive potential.  
• Provide support to key relevant national institutions (at different levels) so that agricultural policies and strategies address the gender gap in productive resources, and delineate strategies for overcoming the root causes.  
• Gender-sensitive value chain analysis and enterprise selection that takes into account the relative opportunities and constraints, women’s roles and preferences, market development and the potential constraints and benefits with consideration for the intra-household relations and resource flows.  
• Explore how women’s involvement in global agricultural value chains have an effect on their income poverty levels, and how that is correlated with their social power and decision making capacities; what are the transactions cost differences for women and men in engaging in such global value chains.  
• Knowledge generation on understanding the extent to which rural households engage in income diversification, how women are engaged in these activities, and the extent to which they reduce poverty, how they contribute to empowerment, food and nutrition security outcomes, and what are the policies that need to be in place to enhance their poverty reducing effects.  
• Identify differentiated implications on rural women and men of land-related investments in country specific contexts and shed light on good practices and promising approaches that can inform policymakers so that land-related investments are responsible and respect the principles set up in the voluntary guidelines on land tenure governance and principles for responsible agriculture.  
• Contribute to foster partnerships among relevant stakeholders for promoting responsible inclusive and gender equitable land-related investments that can contribute to poverty reduction and strengthen food security by providing evidence on good practices and promising approaches, creating space for dialogue among different stakeholders and proving policy advice and support to countries. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core area</th>
<th>Key entry points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Equitable access to, use and control of land and other productive resources, and sustainable management of these resources | • Support policy, legislative and regulatory frameworks assessments (relevant for land tenure governance) to assess how gender responsive the policy legal and institutional frameworks are, identify key areas where interventions are needed for strengthening rural women’s access to, use of and control over land and other natural resources. The drafting of new policies and laws on tenure, land redistribution, land reform provides an opening toward a more gender equitable policy and legal frameworks.  
• Identify differentiated implications on rural women and men of land-related investments in country specific contexts and shed light on good practices and promising approaches that can inform policymakers so that land related-investments are responsible and respect the principles set up in the voluntary guidelines on land tenure governance and principles for responsible agriculture.  
• Contribute to foster partnerships among relevant stakeholders for promoting responsible inclusive and gender equitable land-related investments that can contribute to poverty reduction and strengthen food security by providing evidence on good practices and promising approaches, creating space for dialogue among different stakeholders and proving policy advice and support to countries.  
• Support the creation of inclusive multi-stakeholder national platforms associated with land tenure governance in which women’s organizations and groups of rural women are adequately represented so that they can meaningful participate in the processes and activities associated with the implementation of the voluntary guidelines, such as formulation of policies and legislations.  
• Advocate for government’s accountability to commitments made on gender equality or women’s economic empowerment and advocate for the importance of formulating objectives and targets for women’s access to land and other productive resources, including the set-up of a monitoring and evaluation system with specific gender sensitive indicators.  
• Raise awareness in dialogue, when a country undertakes legal reform, the need to safeguard women’s de jure rights according to signed international legal frameworks such as the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) and stay clear from contradictions in statutory laws. Laws granting equality in access need to do so irrespective of ownership form e.g. marketing associations, cooperatives, community land.  
• By using the technical guidelines on gender for implementation of the voluntary guidelines support capacity development of policymakers, executive officers and technicians working with land laws and regulations, national land policies, responsible officers for land surveying, distribution and land management to increase the understanding of the importance of equality of access to land and the knowledge of what tools can be used to promote women’s access to land, as well as to strengthening their capacities for promoting gender equitable land tenure. |
| Improved conditions for the creation of decent work opportunities | • Undertake analysis based on gender- and age-disaggregated data to get a better understanding of the nature and magnitude of gender inequalities in rural employment to inform policy makers. This will serve as a policy support tool to better integrate gender equity and decent rural employment in agriculture and rural development policies and programmes.  
• Gender sensitive analysis that sheds light into major constraints and opportunities for promoting decent rural employment for rural women are conducted in specific country context to identify key areas of intervention.  
• Rural employment legislations, policies, strategies and programs are assessed to identify the extent to which they address rural women’s and men’s differentiated needs, opportunities and constraints in accessing decent employment opportunities.  
• Targeted interventions to address women’s care responsibilities, time poverty, reduced mobility and low levels of literacy and education.  
• Programmes and strategies address and monitor gender-based employment disparities (i.e. earnings, job security, job segregation) and promote women’s entry into high return income generating opportunities.  
• Social security services in agriculture employment take into account women’s concerns (i.e. maternity, health care, health insurance).  
• Capacity enhancement for rural women to boost labour productivity and strengthen their business skills. |
| Improved access to social services and social protection | • Social protection programmes are broadened to support diverse policy instruments and innovative schemes to better respond to women’s needs, opportunities and constraints and offer a wide spectrum of options in the areas of agriculture production, employment, trade and transfers.  
• Social protection schemes pay attention to the intra-household roles and responsibilities and power dynamic and adopt transformational approaches so that they do not perpetuate existing gender inequalities.  
• Programmes and strategies need to focus on unleashing poor rural women’s productive potential.  
• Social protection programmes and strategies are designed and implemented in gender-sensitive ways to avoid trade-offs between women’s productive and reproductive roles. |
### Appendix 5. Gender-related initiatives contributing to the SP4 results framework, 2014-17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Planned activities</th>
<th>Actual contributions (global)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Output 40101 - New and revised international standards for food safety and quality and plant health are formulated and agreed by countries and serve as references for international harmonization.</td>
<td>• Carry out a social and poverty analysis of the impact of interregional trade, focusing on East and Southern Africa. This analysis will carry a strong gender component.</td>
<td>• Formalization of informal trade in Africa - Trends, experiences and socio-economic impacts, FAO Regional Office, Accra. 2017. • In 2016 the work on women in informal cross-border trade was taken up in Rwanda. The project on cross-border trade of fisheries and horticulture products, in Rusizi district, is being implemented under the FMM- Sida Programme <a href="http://www.fao.org/3/a-i5417b.pdf">http://www.fao.org/3/a-i5417b.pdf</a>. The project is working on the creation of a platform with UN Women, Catholic Relief Service and the Ministry of Commerce to coordinate activities and formulate interventions to enhance impacts that benefit small informal women traders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Output 40102 - Countries and their Regional Economic Communities are supported to engage effectively in the formulation and implementation of international agreements, regulations, mechanisms and frameworks that promote transparent markets and enhanced global and regional market opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Output 40103 - Governments and national stakeholders are supported to design and implement efficient and inclusive market and trade policies and related support measures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Output 40104 - Public sector institutions are supported to improve their capacity to design and implement better policies and regulatory frameworks, and to provide public services related to plant and animal health, food safety and quality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Output 40201 - Public sector institutions are supported to formulate and implement policies and strategies, and to provide public goods that enhance inclusiveness and efficiency in agri-food chains.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Evaluation of SO4 – Annex 1. Analysis of Contributions to Gender Equality

### Output Planned activities Actual contributions (global)

**Organizational Output 40202** - Support is provided for the development of evidence-based food losses and waste reduction programmes at national, regional and global levels.

- Support the development of gender-sensitive methodologies, tools and indicators to assess food loss.
- Undertake a gender analysis, led by a Gender Expert, in two food value chains where women play an important role, examining the barriers that women face to more efficient production and marketing, and how these impact on food loss. For one of these studies, select a cassava value chain in Africa.
- Design a methodology for integrating a gender analysis into other studies and surveys planned under this Thematic Area.
- Write a set of evidence-based guidelines for how to break down the barriers that women face in food value chains that exacerbate food loss.
- Prepare illustrative material on the particular barriers that women face in food value chains that exacerbate food loss.

- In the context of FAO’s Global Initiative on Food Loss and Waste Reduction, the gender team contributed to mainstream gender issues in the case study methodology to assess food losses along the food supply chain (Food Loss Analysis: Causes and Solutions - Case studies in the Small-scale Agriculture and Fisheries Subsectors).
- Implementation of the methodology includes a sociologist to ensure social and gender issues are adequately addressed.
  - The methodology has been applied in case studies in Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Ghana and India.
- Online discussion on the gender and food loss and waste nexus.
  - During five weeks (Nov-Dec 2016) an online discussion on this thematic area took place. A total of 94 people from 44 countries joined the consultation. This exercise contributed to the development of a guiding note on the gender and food loss nexus.
  - A guiding note on the gender and food loss nexus is being produced to provide an insight in current good practices to offer guidance to policymakers, field practitioners and project designers combining aspects from different methodologies for food loss reduction interventions.

**Organizational Output 40203** - Value chain actors are provided with technical and managerial support to promote inclusive, efficient and sustainable agri-food chains.

- Incorporate guidelines for how to target female owners of small and medium agro-enterprises in capacity building activities for trade compliance.
- Gender analysis study in two food chains, including Cassava in Africa.
- Gender-disaggregated scoping study.
- Extract good practices from selected value chains through case studies (dairy).
- Gender impact assessment of a dairy value chain project in Afghanistan.
- Map out appropriate technologies that have been proved to benefit women in value chain development.
- Develop a set of guidelines for analysing the barriers that rural female entrepreneurs face in value chain development.

- Gender assessment of Dairy Value Chains from Afghanistan, Ethiopia, Kenya and Rwanda were produced. These were used as a basis in the design of the new project documents for Kenya and Rwanda dairy value chains.
  - The other three reports were published in 2016 under the FMM Sida Programme.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Planned activities</th>
<th>Actual contributions (global)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                                            | • Develop a social/gender impact measurement tool, leading to a handbook that identifies upgrading strategies for female entrepreneurs in agricultural value chain.  
• Design business models that integrate small-scale farmers through contract farming, joint ventures or cooperatives with wider markets.  
• Design training courses in entrepreneurial and business skills for rural women who run agro-SMEs.  
• FMM Sida Programme. Starting in July 2015, selected food value chains in the African Region and the Near East Region are targeted and supported increasing agriculture productivity through efficient and inclusive agri-food systems. Focus countries are Burkina Faso, Côte d’Ivoire, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Morocco, Rwanda and Tunisia. The targeted value chains are roots and tubers, fisheries and dairy value chains as well as small initiatives, such as horticulture, tomato, cross-border trade. The project is strengthening the capacities and involvement of women in food value chains to promote their economic empowerment; build institutional capacity at different levels for promoting gender-sensitive value chains, and develop tools and knowledge products for policy formulation and advocacy including women’s entrepreneurship. | - “Gender assessment of dairy value chains: evidence from Rwanda”. http://www.fao.org/3/a-i6845e.pdf  
- Technical support was provided to the international consultant on the regional study on cotton value chain in Argentina, Bolivia, Colombia, Paraguay and Peru.  
- Webinar Agricultural biodiversity, value chains and women’s empowerment. 19 November 2015.  
- Technical discussion on gender assessment in dairy value chains, 15 April 2015.  
- Technical support provided to Latin America – Gender assessment of value chains of Quinoa and camelds (Bolivia), Cassava (Belize), maize (Guatemala)  
- During 2014, in collaboration with the General Women’s Union in United Arab Emirates, the gender team in close collaboration with FAO regional office implemented the Project “Fostering Women’s Entrepreneurship in the Agro-food Sector”.  
- 2016–2017 - Development of gender responsive guidelines specific to livestock value chains.  
- 2016 Gender assessment of Cactus Value Chain from Tunisia.  
- 2016 – Socio-economic and gender analysis of the dairy value chain in Panama – working paper.*  
- 2015–2016 - West Bank and Gaza – 23 women’s cooperatives were supported through capacity development in food processing labelling, packing and marketing.*  
- In the MENA Region the following activities took place:  
  - Economic empowerment of rural women and youth through labelling and unlocking the potential of the fig value chain in Maghreb countries (Algeria, Mauritania, Morocco, Tunisia). |
### Output Planned activities Actual contributions (global)

- Cactus value chain development, in cooperation with ICARDA http://www.cactusnet.org/, various initiatives.
- Adaptation of the Economic approach to support women-led enterprises.
- Developing gender-sensitive value chains – a guiding framework – preparation and publishing of the booklet. Dissemination via webinar, a published article (see below) and six training workshops in Burkina Faso, Côte d’Ivoire, Ethiopia, Ghana, Tunisia and Rwanda.
- An article on the guiding framework on gender sensitive value chains was published on: "Sustainable value chains for sustainable food systems" available online at: http://www.fao.org/3/a-i6511e.pdf Presented in Kenya.
- A complementary publication is being prepared titled: ‘Developing gender-sensitive value chains – guidelines for practitioners’.

#### Organizational Output 40301

- Public and private sector institutions are supported to design and implement financial instruments and services that improve access to capital for efficient and inclusive agricultural and food systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned activities</th>
<th>Actual contributions (global)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Analyse and document innovative financial instruments that provide female small and medium agro-entrepreneurs greater access to financial services, including insurance.</td>
<td>- Two producer-led investments in Malawi were analysed to assess the gender implications in terms of land access and control, as well as income generating opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Develop 'lessons learned' from analysis of financial instruments that provide female small and medium agro-entrepreneurs greater access to financial services, including insurance.</td>
<td>- Under the framework of the CFS-RAI, a technical multi-stakeholder workshop on responsible investment in agriculture took place in Lilongwe, Malawi, on 18 and 19 May 2016. It was organized by the Inter-Agency Working Group (IAWG) comprising FAO, IFAD, UNCTAD and the World Bank, in cooperation with the Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Water Development of Malawi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Develop guidelines for government and private stakeholders on how to provide more accessible financial services for female small and medium agro-entrepreneurs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Develop cutting edge policy and training material, to be disseminated globally, on how governments and private stakeholders can provide better access to financial services (including insurance) for female small and medium agro-entrepreneurs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provide guidelines on how to carry out a gender assessment for an investment programme.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Organizational Output 40302

- Public and private investment institutions are supported to increase responsible investments in efficient and inclusive agri-food systems.

#### Organizational Output 40303

- Systems are established and countries are supported to monitor, analyse and manage the impacts of trade, food, agriculture and natural resources policies on food systems and on price- and market-related risks.