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1. Background

Livestock represent a key asset in rural areas and, as a sector, it is considered as a key component to come out from rural poverty and increase income of rural communities (FAO 2009). Rural women and men rely largely on livestock for their welfare. In the Horn of Africa a big population (60 million people) depends on livestock for their livelihood.

Among this group, the vast majority of the workforce managing small livestock is represented by women, who consider livestock a productive, physical and social asset. In Kenya 55% of household income derives from livestock related activities (52.7% male headed households and 68% female headed household). In Tanzania trends are similar, with livestock contributing to 69% of the household income, 68% and 75% for male and female headed household respectively (Njuki et al, 2011).

The gender issues in the livestock sector vary widely on regional basis. Depending on regional and cultural basis, some general patterns can however be identified. The main constraints that women face in the livestock production/management sector include, but are not limited to:

- Limited access to services, credit, technologies, trainings and information;
- Difficult Access to markets (mobility issue and lack of trading skills);
- Poor Participation in decision making process at the household, community and village level;
- Limited control over income and frequent lost of majority of the income over men, who do not reinvest in the household;
- Poor participation in farmers cooperatives/lack of women farmers cooperatives that would enable them to achieve economic empowerment while connecting to rural finance institutions and markets;

Women and men of different ages often have different and quite specific knowledge about, and responsibilities for, various aspects of animal husbandry and livestock. Depending on the livestock sector, women and men have diverse tasks and responsibilities that, as a result, provide them with quite specific knowledge and skill that are usually not shared across gender lines.

The intra household control over livestock and income coming from selling animals/livestock products it is also an important aspect, albeit often difficult to monitor. The 2010/2011 SOFA report highlight hat women tend to reinvest the vast, majority of her income in the household while men are not likely to do the same. There is evidence that income under the control of women is more likely to be used to improve family welfare women spend upto 90% of their income on their families, while men spend 30-40% (FAO, 2011).
Also, as a result of women’s limited access to training, services and credit, men are more likely to scale up livestock production and management and then use livestock as a business. Women, instead, mainly keep and manage livestock for the immediate welfare of the household. Small livestock products meet the immediate nutritional needs of the children, ensuring a level of food security, while selling of small livestock gives them a small and immediate amount of money to meet special needs of the household (school fees, death of a parent, climate changing shocks).

Despite of all these constraints, women do manage livestock worldwide and are sometimes able to control the entire value chain of a livestock species. There is evidence that generally men are responsible for keeping and marketing large animals, such as cattle, while women tend to control, own and manage smaller animals, such as goats, sheep, and, specially, poultry although this varies widely across regions and cultural contexts (Kristjanson et al, 2010).

Given these gendered patterns of livestock ownership, marketing patterns and income management, and the different constraints faced by men and women in livestock production and marketing, projects aimed at using livestock as pathway out of poverty for rural and urban producers may fail if they do not take these into consideration.

Understanding the importance of and addressing gender issues in livestock projects, activities and strategies is necessary to enhance the quality of project design and implementation in order to achieve the desired impact/result.

2. Rationale for the activity

In 2010, under the supervision of the former Gender focal point of the FAO's Animal Production and Health Division (AGA) a stock taking exercise was carried out on gender mainstreaming in the Division’s work. During the course of the stocktaking, AGA officers in the field as well as at HQ were interviewed and were able to provide feedback as regards needs and constraints of the Division while trying to understand and address gender in their work.

The qualitative survey emerging from the stocktaking exercise highlighted, in its recommendation 3, the urge for an upgrade of the gender analysis skills of AGA staff and livestock focal points in field offices through gender sensitization and specific trainings to enhance and strengthen capacity of staff to include gender in their work.

- Upgrade the gender analysis skills of AGA staff and livestock focal points in field offices. Gender sensitization and training should be organized for more key
staff/mission leaders and consultants (gender workshops, training on the SEAGA with ESW staff) - in an interesting and funny and attractive way, with concrete examples, etc. Strong focus on strengthening the capacities of staff to include gender in their work and to decide where and when (as well as the extent of) socio-anthropological/gender inputs are required to enhance the quality of project design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation and impact. An emphasis should be given to introducing gender issues to newly employed staff and long-term consultants and encouraging them to share what they already know.¹

The stocktaking also pointed out the need for a more active collaboration between AGA and the Gender, Equity and Rural Employment Division (ESW).

In order to address these important issues highlighted in the qualitative survey emerging from the 2010 stock taking exercise, ESW and AGA strengthened their collaboration and, in late 2011, jointly started designing the idea of a training-workshop with a participatory approach, to be implemented in the field and using the Socio Economic and Gender Analysis (SEAGA) approach.

This collaboration is part of the ESW process focused on strengthening the Gender Focal Points Network across FAO through an active collaboration and improved communication between technical divisions and ESW.

The workshop was designed for FAO livestock officers working on the field and livestock experts coming from Ministries of Agriculture and Livestock.

### 3. Purpose of the Activity

The objectives of the four days training workshop were:

a. Strengthen the capacity of FAO staff to address the specifics of livestock management related to gender in their work plan, strategies and activities and to be able to appreciate that social inclusion is required to enhance the quality of project design, implementation, monitoring and impact, thus benefitting both rural women and men.

b. Finalize comprehensive Gender and Livestock Checklist that would provide guidance while designing or implementing livestock projects and activities and help users in identifying and addressing the main gender issues in the livestock production sector.

c. Support and strengthen the creation of regional linkages between FAO offices in the field and Ministries of Livestock in Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania.

¹ “Report on a Qualitative Survey on Gender Issues in the FAO Livestock Programme: a contribution to the FAO Gender Audit” - 2010 - Informal draft
4. Methodology

The workshop was divided into 3 main clusters of activities, specifically designed to give participants the possibility to have a comprehensive increase of their gender knowledge.

1- Identification of baseline knowledge as regards gender; interactive training on key gender issues, concepts and approaches and knowledge of the specific gender issues related to livestock management and production was provided to participants;

2- Intensive training on Socio Economic and Gender Analysis (SEAGA) approach and tools, focusing on livestock management and following the project cycle. The expert trainer, Jemimah Njuki, Team Leader: Poverty, Gender and Impact at the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) adapted the SEAGA introductory manual and the SEAGA and Livestock manual to the purpose and scope of this activity. Participants were introduced to the SEAGA method, and were trained on how to selectively use different SEAGA tools throughout the all project cycle. The raining included an extensive working group session were participants were able to test the SEAGA tools learned;

3- Finalization of Gender and Livestock checklist: a draft was designed from ESW Division and participants were tasked with the responsibility of finishing the product. They provided extensive comments and there was a sense of ownership of the checklists by the workshop participants. The exercise was closed by the working groups presentations of findings, changes and outcome of their work on the assigned checklist. The exercise allowed to test overall acquired knowledge.

5. Logistical aspects and relevant contributions

The training workshop was held at the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, from the 22 to the 25 November 2011. Jemimah Njuki, Team Leader: Poverty Gender and Impact, from ILRI, acted as expert trainer for this activity, providing guidance, material and knowledge to all of the participants.

The activity was entirely funded by the FAO’s AGA Division and implemented under the overall guidance of AGA’s Gender Focal Point, Raffaele Mattioli.

Regina Laub, Team Leader of the Strategic Objective K, and Francesca Distefano, Gender and Development consultant, both from the FAO’s ESW Division, provided consistent and relevant technical support in the formulation, designing and implementation of the activity and its tools.

The workshop was facilitated from the FAO Sub Regional office for East Africa (SFE). Maria Pia Rizzo, Gender Focal Point for SFE, provided logistical support and acted as counterpart in Ethiopia.
6. Sessions

6.1 Day 1

The workshop was opened by Emmanuelle GuerneBleich, Livestock Officer for the FAO Sub regional Office for Easter Africa (SFE), who made the opening address and provided participants with an overview of FAO livestock priorities in the sub-region of Eastern Africa.

The important roles that women play in agriculture in the region was immediately underlined: agriculture growth, a key means of coming out from poverty, relies on improving the production and productivity of women farmers, since women form the majority of farmers and laborers in many rural countries.

Livestock, particularly small stock, are traditionally kept by women in Ethiopia, who are often responsible for milking cattle and managing poultry and small ruminants. Ethiopian rural women produce most of the food that is consumed locally and they are the ones mainly responsible for the household nutritional standards. Their income is known to impact strongly upon poverty: it ensures that children have access to livestock proteins and helps maintaining a separate source of income that they can use to meet immediate households needs. Advancing rural women productivity directly helps to increase household productivity, improve rural livelihoods and leads to a wider economic growth and poverty reduction.

The first session of the workshop focused on giving participants good base of gender knowledge from where to start building up. Key concepts like Gender, Gender Equality and Gender Mainstreaming were clarified, as well as the difference in gender approaches as regards programmes, policies and projects (Gender neutral/blind; Gender aware and Gender transformative). Also the potential gains from reducing gender disparities were underlined. Some data and findings from the FAO’s State of Food and Agriculture 2010/2011 (SOFA) were shared with participants: if women had the same resources as men, they could increase yields on their farms by 20-30%, raise agricultural output by 2.5-4% and reduce hungry people by 100-150 million.

The session continued then with a more specific focus on key gender and livelihood issues in livestock production, management and marketing. Under this topic many points were raised including the importance of livestock as a productive and social assets for rural women.

Men and women’s different role in livestock keeping was highlighted, and the important issue related to the division of labor according to sex was raised. Depending on the livestock value chain, different tasks and responsibilities are assigned only to women or only to men. A good example can be provided from the management of cattle: in this specific livestock sector generally women’s tasks are mainly related to the milking phase and, consequentially, on the dairy value chain; men tend to sell, slaughter and build shelters for this big animals, keeping also the formal ownership on them. Who is doing
what and who should be trained or get the capacity building and trainings, needs to be
determined and assessed in every projects, programmes or policies related to livestock
management and production in rural areas.

The other important issues of women's difficult access to extension services, information,
technologies and knowledge was raised. Due to the fact that women do not have equal
access to different opportunities, they are not able to participate in the decision process
at village or even household level. They have poor participation in farmers organizations
and groups. As a result they have a weaker "voice" when applying for loans and this leads
to low/poor access to business and production trainings. Also the different participation
of women and men in livestock markets represent an issue and a constraints for women's
full economic empowerment. Women are generally not trained as well as men and their
poor access to markets due to illiteracy or lack of knowledge about prices and skills in
trading prevent them to have full control over the income generated from the selling of
the animals or their products.

The last important link highlighted during the first day was, lastly, the fundamental
relation between gender, livestock, food security and health. Women play a key role in
food preparation, dietary quality and intra-household allocation and their role as
housekeepers make them the key link as regards the level of food security and nutritional
choices and standards of the household.

The conclusion of day one was an exercise designed to assess participants' knowledge of
gender livelihood analysis tools and other PRA tools. The exercise was designed in light of
the second day of the workshop that would have been focusing on SEAGA approach and
tools: the scope of this groups activity was to identify and describe which gender,
livelihood and PRA tools participants have used in the past and which kind of advantages
and limitations they had encountered while implementing the tools itself.

6.2 Day 2

The second day of the workshop was opened by Lois Muraguri, Assistant Director: Policy
and External Affairs, from the Global Alliance for Livestock Veterinary Medicines
(GALVmed), who gave an overview of gender related activities and research at GALVmed
Institute.

Working with key partners to make a sustainable difference in providing access to animal
health products for poor livestock keepers is a key aspect in improving rural livelihood.
Working in order to close the gender gap in agriculture has to be a priority for every
organization that works in the developmental sector, especially in rural areas, where
women supply majority of labour and expertise on smallholder farms (66%).

The second cluster of activities of the workshop, the Socio Economic and Gender Analysis
pillar, started with an in depth introduction on the SEAGA approach. A strong emphasis
on livestock was provided throughout all the training, underlining the importance of understanding the key gender and socio-economic issues in the targeted area in order to design project that have real impact on different socio-economic groups in the community. Project identification and preparation should be done after undertaking context analysis, livelihood analysis and stakeholder analysis.

In order to provide participants with the possibility of applying the acquired knowledge as regards the importance of the livelihood and gender analysis, different tools were presented and explained. Specifically:

- **Mapping Tools**: Participatory impact diagrams; Diffusion Maps, Before and After resource /asset maps and Social network analysis.
- **PRA tools**: Transect Walks; Trend lines; Venn diagrams; Seasonal calendars; Focus Group Discussions; Community meetings (Useful for stakeholder analysis, Mapping of different stakeholders and their interrelationships, used for both internal and external stakeholders)
- **Interviews**: Community surveys; Semi-structured interviews; Unstructured interviews; Key informant interviews; Organizational assessment
- **Ethnographic tools**: Case studies; Innovation Histories; Life Histories; Personal diaries.

In order to test the tools learned, participants were organized in working groups in order to work on a case study provided based on the community of Hakuna Matata (see ANNEX C).

The training continued with an overview on how to integrate gender in projects design. The trainer stressed the importance of undertaking a very good context analysis, which allows to identify priorities, setting goals and objectives.

Important key concept related to gender in project implementation were also provided to participants, highlighting the different approaches that can be used:

- **Capacity building**: gender trainings to aware on gender inequalities, on women's status, access to and control over resources
- **Targeting approaches**: levels of targeting, targeting resources, activities or services.
- **Collective action**: governance, leadership, women’s voice
- **Participatory approaches**: involving rural women in the design of any technologies

The last part of the SEAGA intensive training conducted by Jemimah Njuki was then focused on integration of gender in monitoring evaluation and impact assessment. While making a clear point as regards the results chain, the trainer explained how to go from objectives of the planned activities to designing Indicators that are gender sensitive. As regards this matter it was stressed that men and women have different indicators based on their preferences: involving men and women in developing evaluation criteria and
indicators is a key element, but separate evaluation and tools between men and women are needed to take into account their differences.

### 6.4 Day 3

The third day of the workshop was mainly focused on the finalization of Gender and Livestock checklist. A draft was designed from ESW Division and participants were faced with the challenge of finishing the product.

A Gender Checklist is a tool designed to guide users in identifying the main gender issues within agricultural sectors. It helps in designing gender sensitive strategies and indicators to address and respond to gender issues. It enables the Implementation of policies and strategic objectives on gender and development there are gender sensitive and responsive.

FAO's AGA and ESW division felt that a tool such as a gender and livestock comprehensive checklist was needed in order to facilitate FAO's livestock experts in HQ as well as in the field in integrating gender in their everyday work through the use of a simple tool. The checklists aims at providing guidance while designing or implementing livestock projects and activities. It covers the entire project cycle and is meant to help users in identifying the main gender issues in the livestock production sector targeted.

The checklist was designated using as a starting point:

- **Gender, Livestock and Livelihood Indicators;** International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) 2011;
- **The Gender and Social Dimension to Livestock Keeping in Africa: Implications for Animal Health Interventions;** Global Alliance for Livestock Veterinary Medicines (GALVmed) 2011;
- **The gender and Social Dimension to Livestock Keeping in South Asia: Implications for Animal Health Interventions;** Global Alliance for Livestock Veterinary Medicines (GALVmed) 2011;
- **The State of Food and Agriculture 2010-11;** Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) 2011;
- **Gender and Agriculture Sourcebook;** World Bank (WB); International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD and Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) 2009;
- **Gender Impact Strategy for Agricultural Development – Gender Checklist;** Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation 2008;
- **Gender Checklist – Agriculture;** Asian Development bank (ABD) 2006;
- **Socio Economic and Gender Analysis (SEAGA) Livestock Guide: Planning with a gender and HIV/AIDS lens; ** FAO 2005;
The draft checklists presented to participants followed the lessons learned emerging from the material listed above, focusing mainly on those livestock value chains that are mainly managed by women.

Women do not access/manage all species of livestock for different reasons; for example their heavy workload pushes them to prefer management of smaller livestock, like poultry, which can be kept at a backyard level production and does not require women to work outside the house.

As a result the checklists presented focused on:
- Poultry value chain;
- Small ruminants value chain;
- Dairy value chain.

The finalized checklist will provide guidance to users while designing, implementing or monitoring livestock projects and activities, helping them in identifying the main gender issues in the livestock sector. It is a straightforward tool that can be used even from users that have not an extensive or specific gender knowledge.

Participants were divided in groups and worked specifically on 3 different checklists:

- **Group one** – Gender and Dairy production
- **Group two** – Gender and Poultry Production
- **Group three** – Gender and Small Ruminants

Participants developed a sense of ownership, providing extensive comments to the zero draft that FAO’s ESW division provided them and presented findings, changes and outcome of their work on the assigned checklist.

The working groups presented the outcome of their work and delivered as regards consistency of comments provided, accuracy in individuating burning issues and improved knowledge while working on the checklist itself.

### 6.4 Day 4

The last day of the workshop was opened with an in-depth review of the final decisions related to the revise version of the checklists.

According to the participants ideas and suggestion, the outcome was a comprehensive checklist that will have the following structure:

1. Title: Gender, Small Livestock and Dairy Value Chain
2. Section 1 Use and Purpose of the Checklist
3. Section 2: Gender and Livestock: An Introduction
4. Section 3: Gender Issues related to Small Livestock and Dairy Value Chain
5. Section 4: Recommendations on how to integrate Gender in Livestock projects
6. Section 5: Gender Small Livestock and Dairy Value Chain Checklist:
a. Project design  
b. Project appraisal and Implementation  
c. Monitoring and Evaluation

A new version of the checklist is being developed right now. The publication and dissemination of the finalized checklist is planned to take place in February 2012.

7. Main Outcomes

The FAO-ILRI training workshop brought together 4 different relevant international Organization (FAO, ILRI, GALVmed and IFAD) and participants from 2 different levels (FAO and Ministries of Livestock), from 4 different countries (Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania).

As a result from this activity, participants enacted and increased their knowledge as regards gender, gender issues in agriculture and gender issues specifically related to livestock management. They got a better understanding of gender issues designing, implementing and monitoring of livestock projects. They also learned how to select and use gender analysis tools, according to the specific situation they are working on.

Awareness as regards gender issues was raised among participants and relevant partners that attended the training workshop. The importance of social inclusion as one key factor to strengthen the quality of project design, implementation, monitoring and impact was stressed.

The main outcome emerging from the training workshop is a comprehensive “Gender and Livestock” checklist. The draft checklist has been originally designed building on existing literature as regards gender and livestock: participants enriched the checklists with their comments and inputs coming from their personal experiences, backgrounds and constraints faced while trying to understand gender and address it in their work.

8. Recommendations

1) TRAININGS ON GENDER AND GENDER AND LIVESTOCK RELATED ISSUES at different levels

a. There is a need to upgrade the gender knowledge of professionals working in the developmental sector as regards the importance of integrating gender in their work. Specific trainings related to gender and livestock related issues are needed in order to enact capacity of understanding and addressing gender related issues in livestock projects programmes and policies. Tailored trainings should be designed for policy makers within governments in order to
enact their capacity and encourage the formulation of regional gender programme for livestock policies and programmes.

Internalizing gender issue is not achieved through an event but through a process: training must be continuous and cut across all levels, from the top to the bottom. Award certificate to training’s participants could be an encouraging factor.

b. Rural women need to receive extensive trainings on how to improveSCALE up their livestock production. In order to improve women’s livelihood in the livestock sector, providing opportunities for capacity building and facilitate trainings is a key aspect. Participants reported their successful experience in targeting both male and female within the households in trainings programmes. This strategy helped the community in recognizing the important role that women play in the management of livestock and pave the way to make women overcome the cultural limitations and become beneficiary of opportunities. Strengthen women’s skills through inclusion of women in trainings on husbandry practices, milk handling, processing, and marketing is a priority, ensuring that trainings are provided also in villages and small rural communities.

2) USE and SELECTION of TOOLS (SEAGA and other gender, livelihood and PRA tools):

Different tools have been elaborated, through the years, from relevant organizations, therefore many tools that can be used for livelihood and gender analysis. The tool that can be used widely depends on the purpose of the analysis.

Tailored and extensive trainings are needed in order to enact professional’s knowledge of these tools and, most of all, capacity of selecting the most appropriate tool to use according to different situations.

3) AWARENESS RAISING AS REGARDS GENDER at the governmental and institutional level

Many institutions and governments are not gender blind but poor in implementation. A wider dissemination of gender material would be an asset. Most importantly a stronger and more systematic way of collecting and sharing lessons learned should implemented throughout the institutions working in this field. This would provide governments and institutions with the possibility to learn from experiences, and successful stories collected while putting into practice programme, policies and projects that are gender sensitive.
Also a wider collection and dissemination across organizations of technical and practical strategies developed while implementing programme, policies and projects in the field should be encouraged, in order to enhance quality of projects and delivery of tangibles results. A more systematic work on baseline studies and case studies would be an asset for this purpose.

4) DESIGNING OF SIMPLE TOOLS for gender mainstreaming in specific technical agricultural areas of work

Simple tools are needed as regards mainstreaming of gender into projects and programmes. It is has been highlighted that in many situations, in order to mainstream gender, an extensive gender knowledge is requested. When there is lack of gender knowledge, the designing of simple tools is required and should be strongly encouraged in order to guide users in integrating gender in their work.

9. Follow up actions

The use of the Gender and Livestock checklist will be monitored. A questionnaire will be sent out in February 2012 to all participants, in order to collect their feedback, constraints and issues encountered while applying the tool in their every day work.

Also, FAO, GALVmed and ILRI agreed to pursue a longer term cooperation to further promote the role of gender in the livestock sector as a key component to address rural poverty and increase incomes of rural communities. The three organizations agreed to establish a “working group” or a “think tank” (about 7-8 persons) to explore the possibility of establishing/creating a network or a platform on issues and challenges related to Gender and Livestock (and Poverty/Food Security). In order to advance in this initiative FAO, GALVmed and ILRI are planning to meet in Addis or Nairobi in February 2012 to better define the future cooperation, priority activities and identify potential stakeholders and partners.

For the Plan of Work 2012/2013, AGA inserted gender related products and services under the umbrella of the new OO created from ESW under the Strategic Objective K. The planned activities are:

a. Finalization of Gender and Livestock checklist (designing, printing, wide dissemination);

b. Convening 2 regional workshops, one in West Africa and one in South East Asia, replicating this module and, thus, raising awareness and strengthening gender knowledge and skills of FAO staff and relevant partners in the field.
ANNEX B: Agenda

“Gender and Livestock”
Training Workshop
Addis Ababa, 22 – 25 November 2011

Day 1 - Tuesday, 22 November

9.00 – 10.00
• Opening address and “Overview of FAO livestock priorities in the sub-region of Eastern Africa” - Ms. Emmanuelle GuerneBleich, Livestock Officer, FAO SFE

10.00 – 10.30
• Introduction of Participants
• Overview and objective of the workshop - Francesca Distefano, Gender and Development Consultant - Gender, Equity and Rural Employment Division (ESW), FAO

10.30 – 11.00
• Coffee break

11.00 – 12.30
• Video “Livestock, Life and Livelihood among Women and Men in East Africa” - FAO IGAD Livestock Policy Initiative
• Group discussion

12.30 – 14.00
• Lunch

14.00 – 15.30
• Introduction to Gender and Livelihood analysis - Jemimah Njiuki, Team Leader: Poverty Gender and Impact, ILRI
• Key Gender concepts
• Key Livelihood and Gender issues in livestock production

15.30 – 16.00
• Coffee break

16.00 – 17.00
• Learning activity: Knowledge of Gender and livelihood Analysis tools to assess participants experience and knowledge in the use of gender, livelihood and other PRA tools
• Group discussion
• Summary of the day
Day 2 – Wednesday, 23 November

9.00 – 10.00
• Review of day
• “Overview of Gender related activities and research at GALVmed Institute” – Lois Muraguri, Assistant Director: Policy and External Affairs, GALVmed

10.00 – 11.15
• SEAGA for livestock projects: An introduction
• Step 1: Analysis of the context: Gender and Livelihood Analysis tools
  1a. Development Context Analysis
    - An introduction
    - Review of tools for analyzing context: Mapping and Institutional diagrams
  1b. Livelihood Analysis
    - An introduction
    - Review of tools for analyzing livelihoods: Farming Systems Diagram, Resource Picture Cards, Labor analysis and seasonal calendar

11.15 – 11.30
• Coffee break

11.00 – 12.30
• 1c. Stakeholder Analysis
  - An introduction
  - Review of tools: Venn Diagram, Problem Ranking & Problem Analysis Chart, Combined Option & Cost-benefit Assessment Chart
• Case study analysis - Learning activity

12.30 – 14.00
• Lunch

14.00 – 15.30
• Plenary discussion of case study analysis and presentation by working groups
• Step 2: Integrating gender and livelihoods into project design
  2a. Priority setting
  2b. Developing objectives and activities
• Step 3: Integrating Gender and Livelihoods into Project implementation
  3a. Gender and Livelihood Approaches
  3b. Targeting approaches
  3c. Capacity building SEAGA for livestock projects: An introduction

15.30 – 16.00
• Coffee break

16.00 – 17.00
• Step 4: Integrating gender into Monitoring, Evaluation and Impact Assessment
  4a. Developing a theory of change
  4b. Integrating gender into indicators
  4c. Designing gender specific outcomes and indicators
  4d. Collecting gender disaggregated data
• Summary of the day
Day 3 - Thursday, 24 November

9.00 – 10.00
• Review of day 2
• Practicing with SEAGA tools. Group Activity: Developing Gender and Livestock indicators for different types of projects
• Presentation of group activities

10.00 – 10.30
• The contribution of Gender to Livestock productivity, with specific reference to poultry, dairy and small ruminant sectors
• Introduction of draft Gender and Livestock Checklists on Poultry, Small Ruminants and Dairy Production – Francesca Distefano

10.30 – 11.00
• Coffee break

11.00 – 12.30
• Participants organized in working groups to review and finalize draft Gender and Livestock checklists, with special reference to Gender and Poultry, Small Ruminants and Dairy Production

12.30 – 14.00
• Lunch

14.00 – 15.30
• Working group continue elaboration of Gender and Livestock Checklists

15.30 – 16.00
• Coffee break

16.00 – 17.00
• Finalization of Gender and Livestock Checklists
• Summary of the Day
Day 4 - Friday, 25 November

9.00 – 10.00
• Review of day 3
• Video - “The chain of milk production and commercialization” produced within IFAD Project “Small Holder Dairy Commercialization Programme” and presented by Bernard Kimoro - Dairy Production Officer, IFAD
• Presentation of finalized checklists by the working groups
• Plenary discussion on finalized checklists

10.30 – 11.00
• Coffee break

11.00 – 12.30
• Evaluation of the workshop
• Wrap up and Conclusion
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ANNEX C: Case study: The Community of Hakuna Matata

The Community of Hakuna Matata

The village of Hakuna Matata is located in an upland farming area with an average annual rainfall of 900 mm and a distinct dry season of 4 months. There are two distinct livestock production systems, agro-pastoralism and mixed farming systems. Poverty levels in Hakuna Matata are very high due to low productivity, drought and lack of access to markets.

Hakuna Matata has approximately 154 households, of these more than 50 are female headed households. A cluster of households defines a section that is governed by a section leader. The village headman oversees a village. The headman is responsible for carrying out government administrative duties. The headmen are assisted by assistant village headmen who are responsible for administrative local government duties of lesser importance, such as settling community related disputes. The assistant village headman also oversees the work of village section heads.

A group of farmers, researchers from the National Research Organization (NRO) and staff from an NGO called Jenga, have come together for a common purpose: to identify opportunities for improving agriculture and the farmers' livelihoods. The researchers are from the national agricultural research organization working on developing improved agricultural technologies in the areas of livestock management, animal health, new crop technologies.

They start with an analysis of the farmers' local situation, because they are convinced that: "the better our knowledge of the problem, the better our possibilities of finding accurate solutions." As they hold discussions and go on field trips together, the farmers begin to prioritize their objectives, opportunities and constraints to meeting these objectives. They define their constraints as; poor animal health, drought and low prices for both crops and livestock. The animal health situation is bad because the local agrovet shop was closed as the shop owner did not have enough customers and wanted to move to the big city. There is low soil fertility and it seems that the soil is often exposed because plots are burnt accidentally by charcoal burners some of who are from the village and also because farmers do not have money to buy the recommended inputs. Although there are other stockists in the nearby town, the inputs are always in large quantities that the farmers cannot afford to purchase.

"We cannot hire animal traction or rent additional land because we lack money. All this is aggravated by the in-migration of families from other areas and the out migration of young people to the urban areas. The ordinary competition for land has become worse because of the increase in the local population."
"Coupled with the soil infertility problems, we have been growing the same seed year in and year out and the yields that we obtain cannot sustain our families" the farmers say "We do not even have surplus to sell to send our children to school or cover our medical bill".

The farmers keep livestock including cattle, goats, pigs, rabbits and chicken. They however face several constraints, the major ones being death of livestock from diseases and drought. Market access is low as the road to the main markets is badly damaged and farmers have to rely on middle men.

Through discussions with the communities, they identify a diversity of the existing production systems and observe that there are multiple farm enterprises.

They also find out that even though much land seems under-utilized, access to it is restricted because of the tenancy system and lack of income to rent land.

On further analysis, they find that women and children spend about five hours a day looking for water and firewood. There is poor community organization in Hakuna Matata to carry out joint activities although the local chief has made several attempts to organize the community. Some community members seem very marginalized especially women, the elderly and people living with HIV/AIDS.

There are three community-based organizations that are active in Hakuna Matata, a youth group (Kijanas) a church group (Kiroho) and a women group (Atumia women group). Occasionally, the local extension office gives advice to the farmers of Hakuna Matata on how to manage their farms and give recommendations on use of animal health products, fertilizer and pesticides. There is an NGO working with the women group to promote improved water harvesting technologies and small vegetable gardens.

The farmers and the community facilitators discuss alternatives including the use of animal manure to improve the fertility of their soils, community organization to access inputs and sell their produce etc. They then discuss the advantages of these interventions.
**ANNEX D: Working Groups Activities**

**EXERCISE DAY 1:** Exercise designed to assess participants knowledge of gender livelihood analysis tools and other PRA tools: identify and describe which gender, livelihood and PRA tools have you used in the past and which kind of advantages and limitations you encountered while implementing the tools itself.

### Group one

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tools</th>
<th>Description of the tools</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Focus group (women, men and youth) | - Get specific data or information about specific groups  
- To get different types information eg. Type and number of livestock they own or keep, kind of entrepreneurship for youth involve in and what they do for living and other information | - collect specific information  
- produce conducive environment for the participants. Helps the participant speak freely when they are separated.  
- get disaggregated data | - not total information becomes partial because pertaining men alone will make it not holistic  
- lack of consensus because when all the participants discuss together there will be widespread agreement among the members |
| Observation            | -mapping resources  
- endowment of community resources                                                      | -observe accurate information  
- cheap and easy to use  
- time saving                                                              | - not disaggregated by gender  
- requires specialist on the resources available  
- difficult to assess the magnitude of the resource |
| Colander of activity   | -mapping or know what activities take place in the timeframe eg. When they milk their cows or collect the eggs | -easy  
- cheap  
- disaggregation of activities by gender                                      | - limited geographic information application eg activities are different from district to district |
Group two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tools</th>
<th>Description of the tools</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participatory ranking</td>
<td>-men and women participation and prioritizing their needs</td>
<td>-building census of priorities</td>
<td>-opinion of the tools carries the day and not reflect every ones' opinion&lt;br&gt;-time consuming as trying to build consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-use of matrix to score preference</td>
<td>-minimizes biases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-it is participatory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth ranking</td>
<td>Consensus building in the community on what is wealth who is wealthy and who is poor</td>
<td>Targeting with development activities</td>
<td>Agreeing on what is wealth takes time when discussing what is wealth who is wealthy and not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities profile</td>
<td>Identifies who does what, where, when and how?</td>
<td>-helps in targeting&lt;br&gt;-distribution of resources&lt;br&gt;-advocacy&lt;br&gt;-programming design not to load the over worked with more activities</td>
<td>-only works for rural setting where women and men are in different employment&lt;br&gt;-generalization some activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access and control over</td>
<td>Identifies who has access or control over resources and who benefits</td>
<td>-targeting&lt;br&gt;-programmed design and planning&lt;br&gt;-advocacy</td>
<td>Influenced almost by cultural aspects -likely not to get correct information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group three

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tools</th>
<th>Description of the tools</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community action plan</td>
<td>Community direct to set priorities of focus discussion&lt;br&gt;-socio-economic information</td>
<td>-first hand information&lt;br&gt;-community participation&lt;br&gt;-all inclusive man, women and youth&lt;br&gt;observations made</td>
<td>-biased information and emphasized if group is un balanced&lt;br&gt;-exaggerated data if group has high expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender daily colander</td>
<td>-determine how they work&lt;br&gt;-work load&lt;br&gt;-individual and focused group</td>
<td>-collect first hand information&lt;br&gt;-time allocating by the group&lt;br&gt;-ownership of information</td>
<td>-variation may not be captured if discussed in group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools</td>
<td>Description of the tools</td>
<td>Advantages</td>
<td>Limitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource mapping</td>
<td>Identifies resource that are available within the community and those that come from outside i.e. dynamics of resources</td>
<td>-gives real data on resources form primary data collected</td>
<td>-difficult to use over time&lt;br&gt;-varied nature of resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender daily calendar</td>
<td>To document how the different gender make use of the 24hrs for both production and reproduction activities</td>
<td>Exposes both gender to know where responsibility can be shared</td>
<td>-concept of time can be tricky needs patience and not easily conceptualized&lt;br&gt;-biased by opinions given by the group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venn diagram/stakeholder analysis</td>
<td>Identifies and maps the different institutions/organizations that interact with the community</td>
<td>Clarifies the needs and priorities of a community through identifying the various institutions working in the area</td>
<td>Subjective in nature does not indicate the interactions of the different institution clearly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXERCISE DAY 2: In order to test the gender and livelihood analysis tools learned, participants were organized in working groups in order to work on a case study provided based on the community of Akuna Matata.

Group one: Using the HakunaMatata Case study:
- Assume you are the community facilitators in this community and you want to start a project
- Identify all the stakeholders at the external level
- Identify the different stakeholders within the community
- For each stakeholder group, identify some of their constraints to participate (if any)
- Briefly describe the strategies that you would use to ensure their participation

Women and youth
1. Too much work load
2. Women do not effectively participate in decision making
3. Restricted access to land
4. Lack of capital

Elder and HIV people
1. Marginalised in decision making
2. Lack of farming inputs

Strategies for participation
1. Introduction of labour saving technologies (women) eg. – use of animal traction
2. Credit schemes for men and women and youth
3. Sensitization (gender issues) and training (agricultural inputs)
Group two: Using the Hakuna Matata case study

- Identify an issue you would like to explore further using one of the tools
- Use the tool and fill in the relevant information / findings
Group three: using the Hakuna Metata case study
- develop a process for prioritizing the key intervention areas to work on
- select a tool and apply the tools and come up with the priority intervention

Process
1. list of key interventions: low productivity, drought and lack of access to markets
2. identification of the different interest groups: youth, women, church and vulnerable
3. identify the tools to be used to prioritize intervention areas

Community groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention areas</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Youth</th>
<th>Church</th>
<th>Vulnerable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low production</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drought</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to market</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>