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## FOREWORD

Agriculture Census enables compilation of data at community-level and ensure that issues affecting farmers, farm communities and agricultural operations are included when decisions are made on matters that affect them and their livelihood. It increases the quality of evidence based policy making, guide development of Agricultural Statistics in Fiji and address unprecedented data demand to monitor national targets and Sustainable Development Goals.

Timely and Reliable Statistical information is crucial for the benefit of society and the economy as a whole - not only in policy making and the evaluation of performance, but also in directing economic and social activities and providing valuable data and evidence for analysts, researchers, civil societies and the general public.

On that note, I would like to take this time to sincerely thank Government for the allocation of $\mathrm{F} \$ 4.5 \mathrm{~m}$, which enable the Ministry to undertake the 2020 Fiji Agriculture Census - the 5th in a series of Agriculture Censuses conducted in Fiji. I also acknowledge UNFAO for their continuous technical guidance to our Statistics Team and the Ministry in ensuring that we successfully achieve expected targets of this Operation.

I hope that other stakeholders and users such as Academics, Tertiary Students, and Consultants etc. will use these reports as basis of any future research and analysis on Fiji's Agriculture Sector.

To my team and all our immediate Stakeholders from Government whose hard work and commitment enables the compilation of these Publications - Thank you so much for your continuous support and I look forward to more future collaboration. It is indeed an honour to be part of this Team and present the 2020 Fiji Agriculture Census Report Volume 1, 2, 3 \& 4.

Vinaka Vakalevu.


I am delighted to present the first Gender Report prepared by the Ministry of Agriculture examining the gender landscape in the agriculture sector using the 2020 Fiji Agriculture Census data.

This Gender Report culminates from the consensus that gender needs to be included across sectoral policies as outlined in Sustainable Development Goal 5, the National Development Plan, the Strategic Development Plan of the Ministry of Agriculture and the National Gender Policy. It attempts to highlight some of the gender gaps identified through the analysis of the Agriculture Census data and confirms some of the observed trends for which we now have evidence.

The result from this analysis showed that most farmers are unpaid family workers, which suggests a predominance of subsistence agriculture at the national level. Female farmers are behind male farmers in all education categories, and more male famers have savings accounts and mobile phones. In terms of land ownership, the bigger the land area, the less the female owners there are, and more female-headed households are exposed to the risk of food insecurity.

The Ministry of Agriculture will use these findings to support gender in agriculture sector policies as it progresses towards bridging the gender inequality gap.

I wish to express my appreciation to the FAO FIRST Programme for its technical input for this report, and to Agriculture Gender Committee members, who assisted in providing information throughout the writing process.

Lastly, thank you to my Census Team for the tremendous and tireless effort in providing the data for this report.
Detailed agriculture census information is available online at http://www.agriculture.org.ff. If you would like more information, you can also call our help desk on phone no. (679) 3384233 or e-mail agrihelp@govnet.gov.f.

Vinaka Vakalevu

Mr. Ritesh Dass
2020 Fiji Agriculture Census Commissioner

## ACRONYMS

| ADB | Asian Development Bank |
| :---: | :---: |
| AMA | Agricultural Marketing Authority of Fiji |
| BPA | Beijing Plan of Action |
| BSP | Bank South Pacific |
| CEDAW | Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women |
| DFAT | Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (Australia) |
| EVAWG | Ending Violence Against all Women and Girls |
| FAC | Fiji Agriculture Census |
| FAO | Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations |
| FDB | Fiji Development Bank |
| FIRST | Food and Nutrition Security, Impact, Resilience, Sustainability and Transformation |
| FJC | Fiji Junior Certificate |
| FNPF | Fiji National Provident Fund |
| FSFE | Fiji Seventh Form Examination |
| FSLC | Fiji School Leaving Certificate |
| GRPB | Gender Responsive Planning and Budgeting initiative (Ministry of Economy) |
| ICPD | International Conference on Population Development |
| IFAD | International Fund for Agriculture Development |
| MoA | Ministry of Agriculture |
| MWCPA | Ministry of Women, Children and Poverty Alleviation |
| NDP | National Development Plan of Fiji |
| NGO | Non-government organization |
| NSC | National Steering Committee |
| PS | Permanent Secretary |
| SDGs | Sustainable Development Goals |
| SDP | Strategic Development Plan of the Ministry of Agriculture |
| SGF | Sugar Growers Fund |
| SPC | Pacific Community |
| UN | United Nations |
| UNDP | United Nations Development Programme |
| UNFPA | United Nations Fund for Population Activities |
| VNR | Voluntary National Review |
| WEE | Women's Economic Empowerment |

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report undertakes an in-depth analysis of the information, disaggregated by sex, collected within the 2020 Fiji Agriculture Census (FAC), including a review of the data collected through a gender lens and the analysis with a gender perspective, which considers other available related reports and sources.

Chapter 1 provides an introduction to the subject of gender in agriculture in Fiji, including the current national gender policy framework and its linkages with the international context, and outlines some limitations to the study. Chapter 2 frames the report in the wider context of the 2020FAC with a summary of the objectives, methodology and tools that have been used. In Chapter 3, the theoretical framework used as the structure and guidance for the analysis in the report is briefly explained. Chapter 4 is the main part of the report, with the presentation and analysis of the data collect during the census disaggregated by sex and other key variables and referring to the theoretical framework. Chapter 5 highlights some of the main findings from the analysis, and Chapter 6 provides some recommendations to be considered as a way forward for the future.

The report found that 76.6 percent of the total 246,373 agricultural household members of 10 years old and above were performing tasks related to crops, and that 47 percent of these people are women. The farmer population is 83,395 people, of which 85.6 percent are men and 14.4 percent are women. Evidence suggests that the more professional an agricultural activity becomes, the smaller the share of women's participation becomes. Most of the female and male farmers are unpaid family workers ( 59.4 percent) and self-employed ( 39.5 percent), showing a predominance of subsistence agriculture at the national level.

Male-headed farm households dominate agricultural activity, with much higher absolute numbers than for femaleheaded farm households for all crops. By type of crop, women are more involved in vegetable farming while men cultivate the same products but also cultivate other more profitable or export-related crops, such as kava and sugar cane. By type of livestock, data shows that women are mostly involved in poultry farming, a typical back-yard activity and common alternative for feeding the family.

In terms of education, female farmers are considerably behind male farmers for all the categories. For technical agriculture education, the figures show that not many farmers attend trainings related to their primary or secondary occupation, and that female farmers barely attend any of them.

Gender gaps are found concerning all the key agriculture services, including finance, where only 12.7 percent of the borrowers are women. Of interest is that number changes with farm size: the smaller the farm, the more likely that women are the ones borrowing. This suggests that more women are involved in decision-making processes related to subsistence farming rather than commercial agriculture.

Assistance provided in the last 12 months only reached 8 percent for female-headed farm households for market access, with relevant data showing that male-headed households reached further locations for selling their products and thus, may obtain better market opportunities.

Users of machinery are mostly men. Female farmers make up 6.2 percent of users of small machinery and 6.8 percent of users for heavy machinery, making evident the gender gap in terms of use of any kind of machinery. In terms of ownership of banking accounts for the farmer population, 53.2 percent of all male farmers and 40 percent of all female farmers own a savings account, showing a gender gap. This has implications for the savings capacity and resilience at the household level. For female farmers, 45.5 percent do not own a mobile phone, a key barrier for accessing the internet and other related key agriculture services, such as price information, market opportunities on-line trainings and banking.

Land, a key asset for any agriculture-related activity is in male hands. Male-headed farm households own 67.5 percent of land whilst 9.8 percent are female-headed households, and 23.7 percent of land is owned by institutions (nonhouseholds). The bigger the land area is, the smaller the number of female owners is, with 26.5 percent of all landless households being female-headed. Given the importance of having access to land and the size of the land for the food security of farming households, the existent gender gap means that female-headed households may be exposed to a higher risk of food insecurity.

As a way forward, the report recommends the promotion of female farmer's professionalization in agriculture, through the support of activities in which women are already engaged. In addition, education and technical assistance should be strengthened for both male and female farmers, upgrading their skills related to technology, management, marketing, transport and developing networks. Access to finance and digital services are specifically emphasized. In the case of
women, it is essential to consider their special needs regarding time for training, the availability of childcare and the proximity of the training venues. Many agriculture institutions and units within the sector need to be involved in order to bring about change and close gender gaps. Awareness sessions and gender mainstreaming in programme formulation and implementation, and monitoring and evaluation should be available for all programmes and trainings. Other key recommendations are related to policies, considering that the aim of generating gender evidence is to inform and contribute to closing the gaps between men and women in the agriculture and rural sector.
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## CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

### 1.1. Context of Gender in Agriculture

Fiji's 2013 Constitution reflects the Government's commitment towards achieving equality of women and girls in Fiji, which is a fundamental right and social and economic imperative (Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) Report, 2016). CEDAW recognizes the differences between rural and urban women and girls, and requires State Parties to take into account problems faced by rural women and the significant roles which they play in the economic survival of their families. This is especially relevant in Fiji where agriculture is the main source of income and employment in rural areas.

According to the Country Gender Assessment of Agriculture and the Rural Sector in Fiji, (FAO/SPC, 2019), employment opportunities are very limited in rural Fiji and informality prevails, accounting for two thirds of all informal workers in the country. Rural women earn a quarter less than their male peers and seem to be dedicated to physically strenuous and time-intensive agriculture tasks that add to their reproductive role responsibilities (linked to caring for her families, household chores and needs).

In line with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), achieving sustainable food systems, which are able to provide all Fijians with affordable and healthy diets and opportunities for better livelihoods, can only be possible if both men and women are actively involved and can equally benefit. The State of Food and Agriculture 2010-2011 report referred to persisting gender inequalities in rural societies as one of the reasons for the underperforming of the agriculture sector. If women had the same access to productive resources and services as men, they could increase yields on their farms by 20-30 percent globally and could raise the total agricultural output in developing countries by $2.5-4$ percent (FAO, 2011a).

Therefore, the best way to start bringing about this change is to acknowledge the important role that women play in agriculture and increase their access to productive resources and services. Country-specific studies suggest a gender gap in agriculture, especially with regard to ownership and control of land, inputs, assets and services; decision-making; and labour conditions.

However, as mentioned in the FAO/SPC Country Gender Assessment, data are scarce and frequently incomparable. An essential starting point to address these inequalities is to gather information and analyse the actual contributions to agriculture and roles that women are playing in Fiji, including those related to crops, livestock, forestry and fisheries. It is also key to find out more about the access that men and women have to different agriculture inputs and services, in order to identify main gender gaps, and opportunities to close them through policy-level recommendations in light of the current agriculture sector transformation.

The 2020 Fiji's Agriculture Census (FAC) has made an important effort in this regard, collecting for the first time disaggregated data on women and men in agriculture, and analysing this data in a way that gives evidence of the many aspects related to the existing gender gaps. As this is the first time that such an endeavour was undertaken, the analysis presented some limitations, including those related to the coverage of some aspects beyond the scope of an agriculture census and that would have required additional separate interviews. However, special efforts have been made to cover as many relevant questions as possible, and further research will be conducted in next endeavours that will consider the strengthening of gender knowledge and expertise of the technical teams. Another challenge related to the scope of the FAC has been to obtain disaggregated data in all cases. To overcome this difficulty, data have been collected at the household level, focusing on key aspects of female/male-headed households.

### 1.2. Linkages to SDG 5, the National Development Plan, <br> the MoA Strategic Development Plan and Other Relevant Policies and Plans

The work on gender in agriculture draws direct linkages to SDG 5 on Gender Equality, CEDAW and the Beijing Plan of Action (BPA), National Development Plan (NDP) of Fiji, National Gender Policy, Women's Plan of Action and Strategic Development Plan (SDP) of the Ministry of Agriculture (MoA).


### 1.2.1. International Obligations towards Gender Equality and the Empowerment of all Women and Girls in Fiji

Gender equality and the empowerment of all women and girls are integral to the achievement of the SDGs. The Fijian Government has emphasized and recognized that gender equality is a key component of national development and economic growth.

In alignment with the 2013 Fiji Constitution, NDP, National Gender Policy (2014) and Ministry of Women, Children and Poverty Alleviation (MWCPA) Strategic Development Plan (2018-2022), this principle guides the work of the Department for Women and is aligned to other relevant international treaties and regional commitments. This includes CEDAW, BPA, and the Pacific Platform for Action, the Pacific Leaders Gender Equality Declaration and the successive International Conferences on Population Development (ICPD).

In terms of SDG 5, Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls, the Voluntary National Review (VNR) of Fiji 2019 acknowledges the progress of the adoption and implementation of various legislations, policies, national plans, legal frameworks, structures and strategic initiatives to accelerate and promote positive change for women and girls. These efforts have decreased some forms of discrimination against women and girls in Fiji, however, gender inequality continues to hold many women and girls back, limiting their participation in decision-making spheres (VNR, 2019).

### 1.2.2. Gender Responsive Planning and Budgeting initiative of the Ministry of Economy 2021-2022

In the foreword of the Country Gender Assessment Report for Fiji (ADB, 2015), the Permanent Secretary for Economy stated that, "Gender equality is a priority for Fiji and is embedded in national and international commitments and legislation that direct all ministries and sectors to share the responsibility for achieving gender equality".

A few important steps have been taken in this regard. In 2021, the Ministry of Economy launched its Gender Responsive Planning and Budgeting (GRPB) initiative, aimed at ensuring that national budgets in Fiji contribute to a more equal society and do not perpetuate gender inequalities. It encourages the different government institutions to undertake gender analyses on the impacts on women, men, boys and girls of their different policies, programmes, initiatives or services to determine whether there is any potential gender issue within them and to report relevant findings in their budget submissions.

For the upcoming 2021-2022 budget submission, the Ministry of Economy has designed a specific budget template for this purpose, which guides the different ministries when conducting the analysis, identifying gender gaps and challenges, and proposing strategies or recommendations to address them. Budget allocation and monitoring of the interventions are two aspects to which special attention is conceded.

### 1.2.3. Institutional Sectoral Framework

The Department for Women, identified as the National Women's Machinery, is the central policy, advocacy, technical and coordinating unit within government for the advancement of gender equality and empowerment of all women and girls in Fiji.

## In the forthcoming Strategic Development Plan (2021-2026) of the Department of Women, the three (3) Thematic Priorities will focus on:

1. Ending Violence Against all Women and Girls (EVAWG)
2. Women's Economic Empowerment (WEE)
3. Protection from and Resilience to Disaster and Climate Change Risks

These priorities are complemented with four cross-cutting areas, including (i) Gender Transformative Institutional Capacity Development, (ii) Women and Girls Leadership, (iii) Sexual Reproductive Health and Rights and (iv) Gender Statistics.

To accelerate the realization of gender equality and empowerment of all women and girls, the Department's transformative efforts and investments are focused around seven (7) strategic objectives:

1. Strengthened coordination, effectiveness and accountability for gender equality and empowerment of all women and girls;
2. Improved implementation of national, regional and international gender equality commitments;
3. Reduced tolerance and acceptance of violence against all women and girls;
4. Improved access to safe and quality services for all women and girls;
5. Improved access and control over resources, assets, markets, descent and safe work individually or collectively for all women and girls;
6. Improved enabling environment for entrepreneurship for all women and girls;
7. Enhanced protection and resilience to disasters for all women and girls.

These objectives will be achieved through the implementation of the National Gender Policy, with emphasis on comprehensive gender transformative institutional capacity development across government institutions and improvement on availability and access to quality sex-disaggregated data and gender analysis.
In addition, in January 2021, the MWCPA launched the Government Gender Transformative Institutional Capacity Development Initiative in Fiji. The initiative aims to create an enabling environment to ensure integration of women and girl's needs, interests, concerns, contributions and perspectives into policies, strategies, programmes and budgets with the establishment of effective coordination mechanisms as well as enhancing technical knowledge and resources across government institutions. The training of concerned officers to participate in the GRPB from the Ministry of Economy is part of the envisaged actions within this initiative. The ministries of agriculture, fisheries and forestry are included in the GRPB pilot phase.

### 1.2.4. Strategic Development Plan of the MoA

The SDP of the MoA is a document set to achieve the national agriculture priorities for the next four years and establishes direct linkages with the NDP and the SDG framework.

There are five Strategic Priorities in this four-year plan (2019-2023):

1. Improve food and nutrition security for all Fijians
2. Increase farmer household income for sustainable livelihoods
3. Increase adoption of sustainable resource management and climate smart agriculture
4. Establish and improve commercial agriculture
5. Improve quality public sector performance and service delivery.

The SDP follows a "women in development approach", actively seeking to increase the low rate of female farmers registered in the country. Despite gender aspects not being mainstreamed as an integral part of the SDP, differences in roles are acknowledged and aspects related to improving access to markets, technology and training are included as well.

Strategic Priority 2 includes women and youth in agriculture, encouraging their participation in the crops and livestock sector. Three targets have been set for the four years: (i) increase in registered provincial women's groups benefitting from crop and livestock programmes, (ii) increase in number of women's groups in all geographical divisions and (iii) support women in agriculture policy developed and support increased participation of women in the workforce and in the agriculture sector.

### 1.3. Gender Analysis Committee

A technical working group, with technical input from the Principal Research Officer and Senior Women Interest Officer from MWCPA; and the Chief Economist and Census Team from MoA, and technical support from the Policy Officers of the FAO FIRST programme, has been established to complete this report.

Findings and recommendations are to be presented and approved by the National Steering Committee (NSC) and the Technical Working Group of the 2020 Fiji Agriculture Census (FAC). A complete list of members is included in annexes 2 and 3 of this document.


# CHAPTER 2: <br> THE 2020 FIJI <br> AGRICULTURE CENSUS METHODOLOGY 

### 2.1 Scope

The 2020 Fiji Agriculture Census (FAC) aims to determine the structure of the agricultural production industry. The agricultural production industry can be interpreted very broadly to cover not only crop and livestock production activities, but also to cover forestry and fisheries production activities, as well as other food- and agriculture-related activities.

The 2020FAC set a new scope of coverage when compared to the previous four agriculture censuses, as it became the first-ever integrated census of all four agriculture sub-sectors: crop, livestock, fisheries and forest in Fiji.

The questions used in the 2020FAC were based on previous census questions to facilitate comparisons and on internationally recommended questions (FAO) addressing the issues of globalization of markets, food security, poverty and gender equality. Data was collected at household and institutional (holding) levels. More details of this section can be found in the General Table \& Descriptive Analysis Report (Volume 1).

### 2.2 Objectives

The objectives of 2020FAC were:

- To provide baseline data on the structure of Fiji's agriculture sector.
- To improve and update Fiji's agriculture and rural statistics system capacity to generate quality agricultural data.
- To provide evidence for planning and policy decision-making in the agriculture sector and national development.
- To provide an updated listing frame for future agriculture census and surveys.
- To provide basic data to help monitor progress of the sector towards national, regional and global development targets, in particular the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).


### 2.3 Coverage

For the 2020FAC, 71,631 households were interviewed from which 99.1 percent ( 70,991 households) were involved in agricultural activities. These households are from the 197 districts and 4,178 localities in the rural areas and some of the peri-urban areas of Fiji.

### 2.4 Survey Tools

The 2020FAC was conducted using Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI) methodology as opposed to Pen and Paper Interviewing (PAPI), which was used in conduction previous census. Using the CAPI methodology, all interviewers are equipped with an android tablet that they use to interview respondents by reading questions from the screen and inputting answers. The application used for 2020FAC was Survey Solutions, which was developed by the World Bank. Survey Solutions was selected over other similar applications because it offers an intuitive layout for interviewers and, importantly, two levels of case validations.

MoA, through the Fiji Agriculture and Rural Statistics Unit, formulated and designed two questionnaires that were used for data collection in the 2020FAC for households and non-households (institutions), with technical assistance and guidance from FAO consultants, a Technical Working Group and technical staff of three sub-sectors: crop and livestock, fisheries and forestry.

### 2.5 Census reference period

The main census reference period covers the last 12 months from 10 February 2020. For better recall of information and accurate reporting during interviews, shorter reference periods were used and simple calculations were recommended to capture the last 12 months data. For example, for fishing activities, questions were referenced at a weekly basis and for milk production they were referenced for three months. For climate change impact, reference was made to a 10 -year period.

The census enumeration period lasted from 10 to 29 February 2020, as approved by Cabinet on 17 May 2019.

### 2.6 Data Processing and Evaluation of Census Results

The data processing started with the receipt and scrutiny of questionnaires submitted by the enumerators from the field. Checks were carried out, and two update reports were produced and distributed to the MoA management team on a daily basis. The first report produced was a daily monitoring report showing survey progress on key metrics such
as farmers, agricultural activities, number of land parcels, land tenure and size, count of key crops and area planted. The second report interviewers produced was for quality control, monitoring the number of rejected cases and errors per interviewer.

The next step was to check for incompleteness. Those questionnaires that were found incomplete during the census fieldwork period were returned to enumerators for farm revisits and verifications. Incomplete cases found afterward were addressed using historic, administrative data and phone interviews.

Data cleaning was conducted upon completion of the fieldwork and exported into a software package for statistical analysis (SPSS) for tabulation. The tabulations covered all questions in the questionnaire and were run during fieldwork on interim data for quality control checks and modifications. Once data cleaning was completed the tabulations were run again and checked before publication.

Evaluation of the 2020FAC demographic data was performed using 2017 population demographic data and 2018 farmers' socio-economic demographic data. In addition, land and production data were evaluated using the database from the Committee of Better Utilization of Land (CBUL), the Annual Production Report, the Livestock Commodity Report and other alternative sectoral reports.


## CHAPTER 3:

GENDER
ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

In order to analyse the information collected in the 2020 Fiji Agriculture Census from a gender perspective, the report has adopted a gender framework based on the framework developed by Jhpiego and adjusted to the scope and available information of the 2020FAC. Hence, the framework considers the aspects that are key for the analysis and for which enough disaggregated information has been gathered.

### 3.1 Practices and Participation

This chapter explores how gender, understood as the culturally based expectations of the roles and behaviours of women and men, different from the biologically determined aspects of being female and male (IFAD, 2017), shape the actual actions and participation of men and women across the food system.

This affects to their involvement in different agriculture jobs (farming, livestock, fishing or forestry), their participation in the different tasks within each category, their memberships in different associations and contribution to other activities.

### 3.2 Access to Assets

The chapter looks into how gender relations, or the personal and social relations through which women and men gain access to power and material resources or are allocated status within society (IFAD, 2017), affect people's ability to use and control the necessary resources, including inputs, services, knowledge and information, to reach their productive potential in an active way. Important assets in an agricultural context include land, information and extension services, farming equipment and education.

### 3.3 Laws, Policies and Institutions

This section assesses how the existing legal and policy frameworks affect the capacity of each gender to access support services, such as finance or training, which in turn affect their opportunities to fully/actively participate in the agriculture sector.


# CHAPTER 4: GENDER TABLE, ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF 2020FAC 

The 2020 Fiji Agriculture Census identifies the number of members by sex and age in rural households of Fiji, part of peri-urban areas where agriculture is commonly practised and selected urban villages. In addition, this census was conducted on complete enumeration of the four agriculture sub-sectors: crops (including sugar cane), livestock, fisheries and forestry.
A farm household includes the people who share living accommodation, contribute to the household's income and wealth to acquire certain goods and services, and share same eating arrangement.

### 4.1.1. Agriculture household member demographics

The total number of agriculture household members is $\mathbf{3 0 0 , 8 6 1}$ at the national level, of which 51.7 percent are men and 48.3 percent women (Table 1.1 of the 2020 Fiji Agriculture Census: Volume 1: General Table Report, which has the complete data tables supporting this Gender Report). A total of 246,373 agricultural household members are $\mathbf{1 0}$ years old and above.

### 4.1.2. Farmer demographics

Just 83,395 people over 10 years old ( 33.85 percent) indicated that farming was their primary or secondary occupation (Table A) and are identified in this report as farmers. From this group of people 85.6 and 14.4 percent were men and women, respectively. These percentages remain in all the age ranges. From these women, 31.4 percent stated farming as their primary occupation and 68.5 as secondary occupation; for men the numbers were the other way around with a majority of them ( 70 percent) declaring farming as their primary occupation and 30 percent as their secondary occupation.

A total of $\mathbf{1 4 , 0 9 4}$ agriculture household members identified forestry as primary or secondary occupation, 5.7 percent of the total agriculture household members (Table A). From these 48.8 and 51.2 percent were men and women respectively. This number does not add to the previous 83,395 people, since some of them would have already considered as farmers/fishers in the other questions. For example, that would be the case for someone answering farming as primary and forestry as secondary occupation.
From these numbers seems that both men and women are equally engaged in forestry, but 30.3 percent of the women in this group and 5 percent of the men stated it as their primary occupation; 95 percent of the men and 69.7 percent of the women said that forestry was their secondary occupation. It seems that forestry is more a secondary occupation for men and women, especially for men. Farming is the primary occupation for most of them.

A total 4,513 agriculture household members identified fisheries as primary or secondary occupation, 1.8 percent of the total agriculture household members (Table A). From these 66.6 and 33.4 percent were men and women respectively. Again, this number does not add to the previous 83,395 people declaring farming as their primary or secondary occupation.

From this group 52 percent of the women and 48 percent of the men considered fisheries as their primary occupation; 52 percent of the men and 47 percent of the women said this was their secondary occupation. It seems that being a fisher is a male predominated occupation but for those men and women involved in it, it is equally a primary and secondary occupation.

Table A. Number and percentage distribution of farmers, foresters and fishers (primary and secondary occupations)

| Indicators |
| ---: |
| Total |
| \% of total farmers |
| Primary occupation |
| Secondary occupation |
| Indicators |
| Total |


| Male farmers |
| ---: |
| $\mathbf{7 1 , 4 2 4}$ |
| $85.65 \%$ |
| $70.23 \%$ |
| $29.77 \%$ |
| $100 \%$ |
| Male foresters |
| $\mathbf{6 , 8 8 0}$ |


| Female farmers | Total | \% of total agriculture <br> household members |
| ---: | ---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 1 , 9 7 1}$ | $\mathbf{8 3 , 3 9 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 3 . 7} \%$ |
| $14.35 \%$ | $100 \%$ |  |
| $31.46 \%$ |  |  |
| $68.54 \%$ |  |  |
| $100 \%$ |  |  |
| Female foresters | Total |  |
| $\mathbf{7 , 2 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 , 0 9 4}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 7} \%$ |


| Indicators | Male farmers | Female farmers | Total | \% of total agriculture household members |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% of total foresters | 48.82\% | 51.18\% | 100\% |  |
| Primary occupation | 5.03\% | 30.34\% |  |  |
| Secondary occupation | 94.97\% | 69.66\% |  |  |
|  | 100\% | 100\% |  |  |
| Indicators | Male fishers | Female fishers | Total |  |
| Total | 3,007 | 1,506 | 4,513 | 1.8 \% |
| \% of total fishers | 66.63\% | 33.37\% | 100\% |  |
| Primary occupation | 48.02\% | 52.59\% |  |  |
| Secondary occupation | 51.98\% | 47.41\% |  |  |
|  | 100\% | 100\% |  |  |

Table A. 1 shows farmers by divisions and provinces. The data shows that the highest number of female farmers in the country comes from the Central Division followed by women from the Northern Division.

Segregating the data further by provinces, Naitasiri and Namosi women from the Central Division in the interior of Viti Levu are more involved in farming activities since this is a farming area for root crops (dalo and cassava) and ginger, which are aimed at both local and overseas markets. Data on agriculture tasks for these provinces show that women are significantly involved in strenuous activities, including land preparation, planting, harvesting and marketing of crops.

Interestingly, numbers show that in the province of Macuata, in the Northern Division, has a significant number of women involved in farming. This could be explained by vibrant crop farming activities for rice, dalo and some fruits, particularly watermelon and pineapple, in that province.

Table A.1. Number and percentage distribution of farmers (primary and secondary occupations) by geographical division

| Division | Province | Primary and secondary occupations |  |  | Within division/province |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Male | Female | Total | Male (\%) | Female (\%) |
| FIJI | Total | 71,424 | 11,971 | 83,395 | 85.65 | 14.35 |
| Central | Total | 18,939 | 4,123 | 23,062 | 82.12 | 17.88 |
|  | Naitasiri | 5,397 | 1,566 | 6,963 | 77.51 | 22.49 |
|  | Namosi | 1,465 | 514 | 1,979 | 74.03 | 25.97 |
|  | Rewa | 2,821 | 561 | 3,382 | 83.41 | 16.59 |
|  | Serua | 1,847 | 450 | 2,297 | 80.41 | 19.59 |
|  | Tailevu | 7,409 | 1,032 | 8,441 | 87.77 | 12.23 |
| Eastern | Total | 7,142 | 563 | 7,705 | 92.69 | 7.31 |
|  | Kadavu | 2,330 | 95 | 2,425 | 96.08 | 3.92 |
|  | Lau | 2,031 | 113 | 2,144 | 94.73 | 5.27 |
|  | Lomaiviti | 2,387 | 306 | 2,693 | 88.64 | 11.36 |
|  | Rotuma | 394 | 49 | 443 | 88.94 | 11.06 |
| Western | Total | 22,694 | 3,023 | 25,717 | 88.25 | 11.75 |
|  | Ba | 11,529 | 1,682 | 13,211 | 87.27 | 12.73 |
|  | Nadroga/Navosa | 7,099 | 717 | 7,816 | 90.83 | 9.17 |
|  | Ra | 4,066 | 624 | 4,690 | 86.70 | 13.30 |


| Division | Province |  | Primary and secondary occupations |  | Within division/province |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | Male | Female | Total | Male (\%) | Female (\%) |
| Northern | Total | $\mathbf{2 2 , 6 4 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 , 2 6 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 , 9 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{8 4 . 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 . 8 4}$ |
|  | Bua | 3,821 | 671 | 4,492 | 85.06 | 14.94 |
|  | Cakaudrove | 10035 | 1379 | 11414 | 87.9 | 12.1 |
|  | Macuata | 8793 | 2212 | 11005 | 79.9 | 20.1 |

In fishing (Table A.2.), the Eastern Division, composed by many small islands, is where most of the women fishers live (49.7 percent) in comparison to the other three divisions. In Kadavu Province, female fishers are even more numerous than their male colleagues, making up 65 percent of the total fishers. Fresh fish is the main source of protein ${ }^{1}$ in these provinces, and women are usually expected to fish and provide meals for their families daily.

Apart from the Eastern Division provinces, Naitasiri and Namosi (inland of Viti Levu) from the Central Division also showed similar trends as reported for farmers in Table A.1. A high percentage of women from these two provinces go out for fresh water fishing, as they live far from the sea. Traditionally, fresh water fish is one of the main sources of protein in the highlands where there is limited access to other protein foods. Having fish in a meal is a welcome change in the diet where local green leafy vegetables (rourou, ota and bele) are consumed daily.

Table A.2. Number and percentage distribution of fishers (primary and secondary occupations) by geographical divisions

| Division | Province | Primary and secondary occupations |  |  | Within division/province |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Male | Female | Total | Male (\%) | Female (\%) |
| FIJI | Total | 3,007 | 1,506 | 4,513 | 66.6 | 33.4 |
| Central | Total | 610 | 367 | 977 | 62.4 | 37.6 |
|  | Naitasiri | 51 | 54 | 105 | 48.6 | 51.4 |
|  | Namosi | 65 | 46 | 111 | 58.6 | 41.4 |
|  | Rewa | 122 | 67 | 189 | 64.6 | 35.4 |
|  | Serua | 115 | 45 | 160 | 71.9 | 28.1 |
|  | Tailevu | 257 | 155 | 412 | 62.4 | 37.6 |
| Eastern | Total | 373 | 368 | 741 | 50.3 | 49.7 |
|  | Kadavu | 94 | 179 | 273 | 34.4 | 65.6 |
|  | Lau | 124 | 105 | 229 | 54.1 | 45.9 |
|  | Lomaiviti | 144 | 80 | 224 | 64.3 | 35.7 |
|  | Rotuma | 11 | 4 | 15 | 73.3 | 26.7 |
| Western | Total | 574 | 214 | 788 | 72.8 | 27.2 |
|  | Ba | 354 | 79 | 433 | 81.8 | 18.2 |
|  | Nadroga/Navosa | 83 | 44 | 127 | 65.4 | 34.6 |
|  | Ra | 137 | 91 | 228 | 60.1 | 39.9 |
| Northern | Total | 1450 | 557 | 2007 | 72.2 | 27.8 |
|  | Bua | 619 | 277 | 896 | 69.1 | 30.9 |
|  | Cakaudrove | 516 | 244 | 760 | 67.9 | 32.1 |
|  | Macuata | 315 | 36 | 351 | 89.7 | 10.3 |

### 4.1.3. Farmers' occupational status

When looking at the 83,395 people 10 years old and above that indicated that farming was their primary or secondary occupation (Table B), most of these people are unpaid family workers ( 59.8 percent) and self-employed ( 39.5 percent).

When looking at the figures disaggregated by sex we see that 50.8 percent of total female farmers and 61.3 percent of

[^0]total male farmers are unpaid family workers, and that 48.4 percent of female farmers in comparison with 38.0 percent of male farmers are self-employed. These percentages refer to each of the female/male farmer populations, but in absolute numbers, self-employed male farmers are more numerous than self-employed female farmers for both the national level and by division. Averages for other categories, such as employers and paid family workers are very low ( 0.3 and 0.4 percent, respectively) for both men and women, with no significant difference in terms of sex.

This shows that people working in agriculture are mostly unpaid family workers and self-employed. In terms of gender for unpaid work, the difference in absolute numbers between men and women is small, although more men than women are unpaid family workers.

These numbers suggest a predominance of subsistence agriculture at the national level.
Table B. Number and percentage distribution farmers ( 10 years old and older) by occupational status

|  | Employer | Self-em- <br> ployed | Family worker, <br> paid or in kind | Unpaid family <br> worker | Volunteer/ <br> Community worker | TOTAL |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Men | 183 | 27,157 | 253 | 43,779 |  |  |
| $\%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $38.0 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $61.3 \%$ | 52 | 71,424 |
| Women | 39 | 5,792 | 43 | 6,087 | $0.1 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| $\%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $48.4 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $50.8 \%$ | 10 | 11,971 |
| Total | 222 | 32,949 | 296 | 49,866 | $0.1 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| $\%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $39.5 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $59.8 \%$ | 62 | 83,395 |
|  |  |  |  |  | $0.1 \%$ | 100 |

By division, the Northern Division has the highest number of farmers with unpaid family workers ( 72.9 percent), closely followed by the Western Division ( 61.5 percent). The Eastern Division recorded the lowest rate ( 27.2 percent) of unpaid family workers but it has more self-employed farmers ( 72.6 percent), especially in the province of Kadavu. Subsistence farming could explain the high rate of unpaid family workers outside of the Central Division.

Division data follow the same pattern as national figures, with the exception of the Eastern Division, where percentages for unpaid family workers are higher for female farmers, and numbers for female self-employed farmers are lower than for their peer male farmers. Still, as the number of female farmers is much smaller, the absolute numbers show more self-employed male farmers.

Table B.1. Number and percentage distribution of farmers ( 10 years old and older) by occupational status and location

| Division | Province | Sex | Employer | Self- em- <br> ployed | Paid family <br> worker | Unpaid family <br> worker | Volunteer/ <br> Community <br> worker |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| FIJI | Total | Male | 183 | 27,157 | 253 | 43,779 | 52 |
|  |  |  | 0.3 | 38.0 | 0.4 | 61.3 | 0.1 |
|  |  | Female | 39 | 5,792 | 43 | 6,087 | 10 |
|  |  |  | 0.3 | 48.4 | 0.4 | 50.8 | 0.1 |
|  |  | Total | 222 | 32,949 | 296 | 49,866 | 62 |


| Division | Province | Sex | Employer | Self- employed | Paid family worker | Unpaid family worker | Volunteer/ Community worker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Central | Total | Male | 0.4 | 33.9 | 0.2 | 65.3 | 0.1 |
|  |  | Female | 0.3 | 54.4 | 0.3 | 45.0 | 0.1 |
|  |  | Total | 0.4 | 38.5 | 0.2 | 60.7 | 0.1 |
|  | Naitasiri | Male | 0.5 | 38.2 | 1.0 | 60.1 | 0.1 |
|  |  | Female | 0.4 | 54.3 | 0.2 | 45.1 | 0.0 |
|  |  | Total | 0.5 | 42.4 | 0.8 | 56.2 | 0.1 |
|  | Namosi | Male | 0.3 | 47.3 | 0.5 | 51.9 | 0.1 |
|  |  | Female | 0.5 | 61.9 | 0.7 | 36.9 | 0.0 |
|  |  | Total | 0.3 | 49.7 | 0.5 | 49.4 | 0.1 |
|  | Rewa | Male | 0.3 | 49.5 | 0.2 | 50.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | Female | 0.0 | 66.7 | 0.2 | 32.9 | 0.2 |
|  |  | Total | 0.3 | 52.9 | 0.2 | 46.6 | 0.0 |
|  | Serua | Male | 0.3 | 46.8 | 0.5 | 52.0 | 0.3 |
|  |  | Female | 0.3 | 54.7 | 0.3 | 44.5 | 0.2 |
|  |  | Total | 0.3 | 47.8 | 0.5 | 51.1 | 0.3 |
|  | Tailevu | Male | 0.1 | 61.8 | 0.1 | 37.9 | 0.1 |
|  |  | Female | 0.4 | 52.0 | 0.4 | 47.2 | 0.0 |
|  |  | Total | 0.1 | 61.1 | 0.1 | 38.6 | 0.1 |
| Eastern | Total | Male | 0.1 | 72.4 | 0.0 | 27.5 | 0.0 |
|  |  | Female | 1.1 | 77.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | Total | 0.1 | 72.6 | 0.0 | 27.2 | 0.0 |
|  | Kadavu | Male | 0.1 | 48.0 | 0.1 | 51.8 | 0.0 |
|  |  | Female | 0.0 | 58.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | Total | 0.1 | 48.5 | 0.1 | 51.3 | 0.0 |
|  | Lau | Male | 0.2 | 63.3 | 0.1 | 36.3 | 0.0 |
|  |  | Female | 0.3 | 40.8 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | Total | 0.2 | 60.8 | 0.1 | 38.8 | 0.0 |
|  | Lomaiviti | Male | 0.0 | 61.7 | 0.0 | 37.1 | 1.3 |
|  |  | Female | 0.0 | 57.1 | 2.0 | 40.8 | 0.0 |
|  |  | Total | 0.0 | 61.2 | 0.2 | 37.5 | 1.1 |
|  | Rotuma | Male | 0.2 | 34.2 | 0.4 | 65.2 | 0.0 |
|  |  | Female | 0.3 | 36.7 | 0.2 | 62.8 | 0.1 |
|  |  | Total | 0.2 | 34.5 | 0.4 | 64.9 | 0.0 |


| Division | Province | Sex | Employer | Self- employed | Paid family worker | Unpaid family worker | Volunteer/ Community worker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Western | Total | Male | 0.2 | 37.8 | 0.5 | 61.5 | 0.0 |
|  |  | Female | 0.4 | 37.9 | 0.4 | 61.2 | 0.1 |
|  |  | Total | 0.2 | 37.8 | 0.5 | 61.5 | 0.0 |
|  | Ba | Male | 0.2 | 34.4 | 0.3 | 65.1 | 0.0 |
|  |  | Female | 0.1 | 45.0 | 0.0 | 54.8 | 0.0 |
|  |  | Total | 0.2 | 35.3 | 0.3 | 64.2 | 0.0 |
|  | Nadroga/ <br> Navosa | Male | 0.2 | 23.6 | 0.3 | 75.9 | 0.0 |
|  |  | Female | 0.2 | 23.6 | 0.0 | 76.0 | 0.3 |
|  |  | Total | 0.2 | 23.6 | 0.3 | 75.9 | 0.0 |
|  | Ra | Male | 0.3 | 30.4 | 0.3 | 69.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | Female | 0.4 | 48.1 | 0.5 | 51.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | Total | 0.3 | 33.2 | 0.4 | 66.1 | 0.0 |
| Northern | Total | Male | 0.2 | 22.9 | 0.2 | 76.7 | 0.0 |
|  |  | Female | 0.6 | 47.7 | 0.7 | 51.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | Total | 0.2 | 26.6 | 0.2 | 72.9 | 0.0 |
|  | Bua | Male | 0.2 | 26.1 | 0.4 | 73.3 | 0.0 |
|  |  | Female | 0.3 | 40.8 | 0.6 | 58.2 | 0.1 |
|  |  | Total | 0.2 | 27.9 | 0.4 | 71.5 | 0.1 |
|  | Cakaudrove | Male | 0.3 | 38.5 | 0.3 | 60.7 | 0.0 |
|  |  | Female | 0.4 | 52.7 | 0.4 | 46.5 | 0.0 |
|  |  | Total | 0.3 | 41.4 | 0.4 | 57.9 | 0.0 |
|  | Macuata | Male | 0.4 | 33.9 | 0.2 | 65.3 | 0.1 |
|  |  | Female | 0.3 | 54.4 | 0.3 | 45.0 | 0.1 |
|  |  | Total | 0.4 | 38.5 | 0.2 | 60.7 | 0.1 |

4.1.4. Farmers by sex, age group and geographic location

At both the national and divisional levels, the most populated group of farmers is in the age range from 30-39 years ( 22 percent for both female and male farmers). However, Table C shows many youth (age range from 20-29 years or $\mathrm{x}>19 \mathrm{yrs} \leq 29 \mathrm{yrs}$ ) are also engaged in farming, especially in the province of Cakaudrove ( 23.8 percent) and Bua ( 22.4 percent) from the Northern Division. This may be related to kava activity that has attracted farmers from these areas in the past few years due to the crop's high economic value. The youngest female farmers are found in the province of Kadavu in the Eastern Division, where 27.4 percent of female farmers are within the youth age range of $20-29$ years ( $\mathrm{x}>19 \mathrm{yrs} \leq 29 \mathrm{yrs}$ ).

Similar to national data, most female farmers by division are in the age group from 30-39 years ( $\mathbf{x}>29 \mathrm{yrs} \leq \mathbf{3 9}$ $\mathbf{y r s})$. The Western Division presents the oldest group of female farmers, with 25.3 percent of them in the age range from $50-59$ years ( $x>49 \mathrm{yrs} \leq 59 \mathrm{yrs}$ ) from the provinces of Nadroga/Navosa ( 26.9 percent) and Ba ( 25.7 percent).

Table C: Percentage distribution of farmers by sex, age group and location

| $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | Province | Sex | Age group |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} \mathrm{x} & \geq 10 \mathrm{yrs} . \\ & \leq 19 \mathrm{yrs} . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{x}>19 \mathrm{yrs} \leq 29 \\ \mathrm{yrs} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{x}>29 \mathrm{yrs} \leq 39 \\ \mathrm{yrs} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{x}>39 \mathrm{yrs} \leq 49 \\ \mathrm{yrs} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{x}>49 \mathrm{yrs} \leq 59 \\ \mathrm{yrs} \end{array}$ | $\mathrm{x}>59 \mathrm{yrs}$ |
| 奈 | Total | Male | 3.1 | 17.7 | 22.4 | 21.1 | 20.4 | 15.3 |
|  |  | Female | 1.8 | 15.9 | 22.3 | 21.9 | 22.0 | 16.2 |
|  |  | Total | 2.9 | 17.4 | 22.4 | 21.2 | 20.7 | 15.4 |


| $\begin{aligned} & \frac{5}{0} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | Province | Sex | Age group |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} \mathrm{x} & \geq 10 \mathrm{yrs} . \\ & \leq 19 \mathrm{yrs} . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{x}>19 \mathrm{yrs} \leq 29 \\ \mathrm{yrs} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} x>29 y r s \leq 39 \\ y r s \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} x>39 y r s \leq 49 \\ y r s \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{x}>49 \mathrm{yrs} \leq 59 \\ \mathrm{yrs} \end{array}$ | $\mathrm{x}>59 \mathrm{yrs}$ |
| ت | Total | Male | 3.2 | 17.9 | 22.4 | 20.5 | 19.4 | 16.5 |
|  |  | Female | 2.0 | 16.9 | 23.7 | 21.9 | 21.2 | 14.4 |
|  |  | Total | 3.0 | 17.8 | 22.6 | 20.8 | 19.7 | 16.2 |
|  | Naitasiri | Male | 2.9 | 18.7 | 23.4 | 20.0 | 18.5 | 16.4 |
|  |  | Female | 1.7 | 19.8 | 24.5 | 20.9 | 20.4 | 12.6 |
|  |  | Total | 2.7 | 18.9 | 23.6 | 20.2 | 18.9 | 15.6 |
|  | Namosi | Male | 3.1 | 20.5 | 24.0 | 19.6 | 18.4 | 14.5 |
|  |  | Female | 2.3 | 18.7 | 25.3 | 24.3 | 20.8 | 8.6 |
|  |  | Total | 2.9 | 20.0 | 24.3 | 20.8 | 19.0 | 13.0 |
|  | Rewa | Male | 4.4 | 18.5 | 20.5 | 20.4 | 19.0 | 17.2 |
|  |  | Female | 3.9 | 16.8 | 21.4 | 20.3 | 20.0 | 17.6 |
|  |  | Total | 4.3 | 18.2 | 20.6 | 20.4 | 19.1 | 17.2 |
|  | Serua | Male | 2.7 | 15.9 | 22.5 | 21.9 | 21.2 | 15.8 |
|  |  | Female | 1.1 | 13.3 | 24.4 | 22.2 | 25.3 | 13.6 |
|  |  | Total | 2.4 | 15.4 | 22.9 | 22.0 | 22.0 | 15.3 |
|  | Tailevu | Male | 3.0 | 17.2 | 22.0 | 20.7 | 20.0 | 17.0 |
|  |  | Female | 1.6 | 13.4 | 22.5 | 22.8 | 21.3 | 18.5 |
|  |  | Total | 2.8 | 16.7 | 22.1 | 21.0 | 20.2 | 17.2 |
|  | Total | Male | 3.9 | 18.3 | 22.2 | 19.3 | 20.0 | 16.3 |
|  |  | Female | 2.1 | 16.7 | 25.2 | 19.7 | 21.0 | 15.3 |
|  |  | Total | 3.7 | 18.2 | 22.5 | 19.3 | 20.1 | 16.2 |
|  | Kadavu | Male | 3.9 | 22.1 | 24.2 | 18.2 | 17.9 | 13.7 |
|  |  | Female | 4.2 | 27.4 | 22.1 | 17.9 | 20.0 | 8.4 |
|  |  | Total | 3.9 | 22.3 | 24.1 | 18.2 | 18.0 | 13.5 |
|  | Lau | Male | 4.4 | 14.5 | 21.3 | 19.4 | 21.7 | 18.7 |
|  |  | Female | 2.7 | 23.0 | 19.5 | 17.7 | 21.2 | 15.9 |
|  |  | Total | 4.3 | 14.9 | 21.2 | 19.3 | 21.7 | 18.6 |
|  | Lomaiviti | Male | 3.6 | 18.9 | 21.9 | 19.6 | 19.9 | 16.1 |
|  |  | Female | 1.6 | 11.8 | 28.8 | 20.3 | 21.6 | 16.0 |
|  |  | Total | 3.4 | 18.1 | 22.7 | 19.6 | 20.1 | 16.1 |
|  | Rotuma | Male | 2.0 | 12.2 | 17.5 | 23.4 | 24.9 | 20.1 |
|  |  | Female | 0.0 | 12.2 | 22.4 | 24.5 | 18.4 | 22.4 |
|  |  | Total | 1.8 | 12.2 | 18.1 | 23.5 | 24.2 | 20.3 |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 合 } \\ & \frac{0}{\omega} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | Province | Sex | Age group |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} \mathrm{x} & \geq 10 \mathrm{yrs} . \\ & \leq 19 \mathrm{yrs} . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{x}>19 \mathrm{yrs} \leq 29 \\ \mathrm{yrs} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} x>29 \mathrm{yrs} \leq 39 \\ \mathrm{yrs} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{x}>39 \mathrm{yrs} \leq 49 \\ \mathrm{yrs} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{x}>49 \mathrm{yrs} \leq 59 \\ \mathrm{yrs} \end{array}$ | $\mathrm{x}>59 \mathrm{yrs}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { E } \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & 3 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | Total | Male | 2.1 | 14.5 | 22.6 | 22.0 | 22.5 | 16.4 |
|  |  | Female | 1.2 | 11.7 | 20.3 | 20.0 | 25.3 | 21.5 |
|  |  | Total | 2.0 | 14.2 | 22.3 | 21.7 | 22.8 | 17.0 |
|  | Ba | Male | 1.8 | 13.1 | 22.8 | 21.9 | 23.7 | 16.7 |
|  |  | Female | 1.1 | 11.5 | 20.4 | 21.0 | 25.7 | 20.2 |
|  |  | Total | 1.7 | 12.9 | 22.5 | 21.8 | 23.9 | 17.2 |
|  | Nadroga/ <br> Navosa | Male | 1.9 | 14.8 | 21.9 | 22.8 | 22.5 | 16.1 |
|  |  | Female | 1.3 | 9.2 | 17.6 | 19.0 | 26.9 | 26.1 |
|  |  | Total | 1.8 | 14.3 | 21.5 | 22.5 | 22.9 | 17.0 |
|  | Ra | Male | 3.2 | 17.8 | 23.1 | 20.6 | 19.2 | 16.0 |
|  |  | Female | 1.3 | 14.9 | 23.2 | 18.6 | 22.1 | 19.9 |
|  |  | Total | 3.0 | 17.4 | 23.1 | 20.4 | 19.6 | 16.5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { I } \\ & \text { I } \\ & \text { ID } \\ & \text { Z } \end{aligned}$ | Total | Male | 3.8 | 20.4 | 22.2 | 21.4 | 19.4 | 12.8 |
|  |  | Female | 2.1 | 17.7 | 21.9 | 23.4 | 20.6 | 14.2 |
|  |  | Total | 3.5 | 20.0 | 22.1 | 21.7 | 19.6 | 13.0 |
|  | Bua | Male | 4.7 | 22.6 | 23.5 | 19.7 | 17.1 | 12.4 |
|  |  | Female | 2.8 | 21.6 | 23.0 | 22.5 | 17.9 | 12.2 |
|  |  | Total | 4.4 | 22.4 | 23.4 | 20.1 | 17.2 | 12.4 |
|  | Cakaudrove | Male | 4.3 | 24.1 | 23.1 | 20.1 | 16.7 | 11.8 |
|  |  | Female | 2.4 | 21.8 | 26.3 | 21.5 | 15.7 | 12.4 |
|  |  | Total | 4.0 | 23.8 | 23.5 | 20.2 | 16.5 | 11.8 |
|  | Macuata | Male | 2.9 | 15.3 | 20.5 | 23.7 | 23.5 | 14.1 |
|  |  | Female | 1.8 | 13.9 | 18.8 | 24.9 | 24.6 | 16.0 |
|  |  | Total | 2.7 | 15.0 | 20.2 | 23.9 | 23.7 | 14.5 |

### 4.2. Practices and Participation

This section analyses data and draws conclusions on how aspects non-related to biology influence the different roles that men and women perform in the agriculture sector.

### 4.2.1. Agriculture household members performing agriculture tasks

In addition to the 83,395 people that declared farming as their primary or secondary occupation, many other agricultural household members perform agricultural tasks.

At least 188,768 people ( $\mathbf{7 6 . 6}$ percent) of the total agriculture household members 10 years old and above were performing tasks related to crops (Table D). Of this total, 53.3 percent and 46.6 percent were men and women respectively.

For livestock, a total 28,719 people perform some task related to this sub-sector, representing $\mathbf{1 1 . 7}$ percent of the total agriculture household members of $\mathbf{1 0}$ years old and above, from which 84 and 16 percent are men and women, respectively.

Although just 14.4 percent of women declared agriculture as primary or secondary occupation, at least a 74.1 percent of all female members of agricultural households above 10 years old ( 88,034 women) perform some kind of agriculture task. The percentage and absolute number are actually higher than these figures reflect when considering additional tasks including working on livestock, fisheries, aquaculture and other agriculture-related tasks.

This suggests that although just 83,395 people declared agriculture as their primary or secondary occupation, most of the household members, 188,768 people (or the majority of the agriculture household members) are involved in agricultural tasks some way.

In the case of forestry, although 14,094 people ( 5.7 percent of the total agriculture household members) declared it as primary or secondary occupation, at least 74.3 percent of the total members and 73.7 percent of all female members 10 years old and above ( 87,537 women) are engaged in forestry to a certain extent.

For fisheries and aquaculture the trend is similar, although just 4,513 people ( 1.8 percent of the total agriculture household members) declared it as primary or secondary occupation, up to 27.9 percent of the total agriculture household members ( 69,836 people), 29.5 percent of all farm household male members and 27.1 percent of all farm household female members above 10 years old ( 32,234 women) perform tasks related to fisheries and aquaculture. Participation in aquaculture is still minimal and mostly performed by men.

These differences suggest that agriculture (including crops, livestock, fisheries and forestry) may be underrated/ unrecognized as a formal occupation, specifically for women but also for men. A number of causes could explain this, including the lack of monetary income associated with farming, forestry and fisheries, and their association with the prevalence of subsistence agriculture, along with the existence of other primary and secondary occupations.

Table D. Number and percentage distribution of members of agricultural households by sex and agricultural tasks

| Sub-sector | Male | Female | Total | Percentage of total agriculture household members older than 10 years old | Percentage of male agriculture household members older than 10 years old | Percentage of women agriculture household members older than 10 years old |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Crops | 100,734 | 88,034 | 188,768 | 76.6\% | 79.0 \% | 74.1 \% |
|  | 53.4\% | 46.6\% | 100\% |  |  |  |
| Livestock | 24,118 | 4,601 | 28,719 | 11.7\% | 18.9 \% | 3.9\% |
|  | 84.0\% | 16.0\% | 100\% |  |  |  |
| Forestry | 95,592 | 87,537 | 183,129 | 74.3\% | 75.0 \% | 73.7 \% |
|  | 52.2\% | 47.8\% | 100\% |  |  |  |
| Fishing | 37,602 | 32,234 | 69,836 | 27.9\% | 29.5 \% | 27.1\% |
|  | 53.8\% | 46.2\% | 100\% |  |  |  |
| None | 15,810 | 19,494 | 35,304 | 14.3 \% | 12.4\% | 16.4\% |
|  | 44.8\% | 55.2\% | 100\% |  |  |  |

* Total agricultural households members older than 10 years old: 246,373 people


### 4.2.2. Roles of agricultural household members

When looking at the table of Agricultural Tasks by gender for agricultural households members for crops livestock, forestry and fisheries (Table 1.2b of the 2020 Fiji Agriculture Census: Volume 1: General Table \& Descriptive Analysis Report), we can infer the following distribution of tasks.

Crops
Tasks performed by the majority (over 79 percent) of farm household male members include land preparation, planting crop trees, overseeing nurseries for annual crops, transplanting annual crops, applying fertilizer and pesticides, buying farming inputs, irrigation and water management, delivery of produce and marketing of crops. These tasks seem to be related to commercial/profitable types of agriculture activity, involving some degree of technical knowledge and access to agricultural inputs and equipment.

Although a minority when compared with their male peers, in absolute terms, there are tasks where women are involved in relevant numbers, such as in land preparation ( 20,159 women); planting crop trees (11,992 women), transplanting annual crops ( 12,061 women), applying fertilizer and pesticides ( 12,542 women), irrigation and water management ( 12,240 women) and marketing of crops ( 13,501 women).

Tasks equally performed by male and female agriculture household members are planting temporary crops, weeding, harvesting crops, all tasks related to coconut crops (gathering coconuts, cutting copra, husking; drying and cleaning, washing and peeling) and floriculture farming.

Women are mainly responsible for the processing of home produce for sale ( 87.6 percent of performers are women). This may be explained by the connection that those tasks have with other skills and household chores, such as cooking, usually performed by women.

Table E.1. Number and percentage distribution of members of agricultural households by crop task and sex

| Crop Tasks | Men | Women | Total | Men | Women |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Preparation (such as, land clearing, slash and amp; burning, ploughing) | 76,145 | 20,159 | 96,304 | 79.1\% | 20.9\% |
| Planting crop tree seedlings | 69,655 | 11,992 | 81,647 | 85.3\% | 14.7\% |
| Planting temporary crops/seeds | 100,309 | 87,638 | 187,947 | 53.4\% | 46.6\% |
| Pollinating of vanilla flowers | 116 | 30 | 146 | 79.5\% | 20.5\% |
| Oversee nursery for annual crops | 195 | 44 | 239 | 81.6\% | 18.4\% |
| Transplanting annual crops | 71,250 | 12,061 | 83,311 | 85.5\% | 14.5\% |
| Applying fertilizer/pesticides or other pest control | 71,892 | 12,542 | 84,434 | 85.1\% | 14.9\% |
| Weeding | 100,517 | 87,804 | 188,321 | 53.4\% | 46.6\% |
| Irrigation/Water management | 71,451 | 12,240 | 83,691 | 85.4\% | 14.6\% |
| Delivery of produce | 12,046 | 2,024 | 14,070 | 85.6\% | 14.4\% |
| Harvesting crops | 100,471 | 87,803 | 188,274 | 53.4\% | 46.6\% |
| Marketing crops | 27,682 | 13,501 | 41,183 | 67.2\% | 32.8\% |
| Processing home produce for sale | 2,508 | 17,718 | 20,226 | 12.4\% | 87.6\% |
| Buying farming inputs | 6,983 | 1,008 | 7,991 | 87.4\% | 12.6\% |
| Gathering coconuts, copra Cutting, husking and amp; drying | 99,995 | 87,441 | 187,436 | 53.3\% | 46.7\% |
| Cleaning/Washing/Drying/Peeling | 14,063 | 13,266 | 27,329 | 51.5\% | 48.5\% |
| Floriculture farming | 247 | 199 | 446 | 55.4\% | 44.6\% |
| Other crop tasks | 27 | 9 | 36 | 75.0\% | 25.0\% |

## Livestock

Mainly men perform livestock activities. Women register higher participation in feeding and managing poultry (27 percent of performers are women) and delivery of livestock or products ( 24 percent are women). Higher involvement of women in poultry may be connected to the fact that this kind of activity is mainly developed close to the house and allows women to be active in this and take care of the household chores at the same time. In addition, chicken is a more common alternative for feeding the family in comparison with bigger animals that are usually sold in the market or consumed only on special occasions.

Table E.2. Number and percentage distribution of members of agricultural households by livestock task and sex

| Livestock Tasks | Men | Women | Total | Men | Women |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Feeding/Shepherding cattle, goats and sheep | 13,360 | 1,598 | 14,958 | $89.3 \%$ | $10.7 \%$ |
| Milking cows/goats | 3,385 | 359 | 3,744 | $90.4 \%$ | $9.6 \%$ |
| Managing bee hives | 155 | 36 | 191 | $81.2 \%$ | $18.8 \%$ |
| Feeding/managing pigs | 7,184 | 1,104 | 8,288 | $86.7 \%$ | $13.3 \%$ |
| Feeding/managing poultry | 6,631 | 2,411 | 9,042 | $73.3 \%$ | $26.7 \%$ |
| Delivery of livestock or products | 597 | 190 | 787 | $75.9 \%$ | $24.1 \%$ |
| Marketing | 772 | 128 | 900 | $85.8 \%$ | $14.2 \%$ |
| Buying farming inputs/feeds | 691 | 109 | 800 | $86.4 \%$ | $13.6 \%$ |
| Other | 376 | 17 | 393 | $95.7 \%$ | $4.3 \%$ |

## Forestry

In forestry, male and female agriculture household members participate more equally in the different tasks, with being men more dedicated to planting trees (such as sandalwood, mahogany, etc.) and the nursery work, and women more dedicated to harvesting voivoi ${ }^{2}$ and handicraft work. Both women and men gather firewood and cut tree branches, harvest wild food, plant and harvest voivoi and masi, ${ }^{3}$ and harvest wild plants for herbal medicines.

This distribution of roles suggests that men are engaged in a more commercial kind of forestry activity, involving high value spices for the international market.

Table E.3. Number and percentage distribution of members of agricultural households by forestry task and sex

| Forestry Activities | Men | Women | Total | Men | Women |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Planting trees (such as sandalwood, mahogany, etc.) | 2,573 | 641 | 3,214 | $80.1 \%$ | $19.9 \%$ |
| Planting voivoi | 10,875 | 11,080 | 21,955 | $49.5 \%$ | $50.5 \%$ |
| Planting masi | 550 | 596 | 1,146 | $48.0 \%$ | $52.0 \%$ |
| Tree nursery work | 82 | 41 | 123 | $66.7 \%$ | $33.3 \%$ |
| Gathering firewood/cutting tree branches | 95,257 | 87,063 | 182,320 | $52.2 \%$ | $47.8 \%$ |
| Harvesting wild food (e.g. Ota, etc.) | 4,133 | 3,615 | 7,748 | $53.3 \%$ | $46.7 \%$ |
| Harvesting of masi | 360 | 407 | 767 | $46.9 \%$ | $53.1 \%$ |
| Harvesting of voivoi | 1,893 | 11,368 | 13,261 | $14.3 \%$ | $85.7 \%$ |
| Harvesting wild plants for herbal medicine | 86,915 | 86,503 | 173,418 | $50.1 \%$ | $49.9 \%$ |
| Handicraft | 445 | 7,476 | 7,921 | $5.6 \%$ | $94.4 \%$ |
| Selling handicrafts, wild foods, etc. | 262 | 984 | 1,246 | $21.0 \%$ | $79.0 \%$ |
| Other | 84 | 42 | 126 | $66.7 \%$ | $33.3 \%$ |

## Fisheries

For fisheries, numbers reveal that both men and women participate in inshore and offshore fisheries, with the percentage of women 51.2 percent in the inshore fisheries and 40 percent in offshore fisheries. Freshwater fishing and making of fish products at home for sale (e.g., smoked fish etc.) are mainly women's jobs, with percentages of participation of 94 and 99 percent, respectively. Men have a predominant role in selling fish and other fish products.

These figures show again that the involvement of agriculture household members in fisheries is much higher than what the numbers of primary and secondary occupations indicate, which is the same trend as for forestry, as highlighted in the previous section. The numbers also offer some additional information in terms of gender, since women who do not consider fisheries as a primary or secondary occupation do fish and they do it in a similar proportion to men, especially for inshore and freshwater fishing. This could be because frequently women go out fishing for home consumption (maybe over the weekend/after working hours), but they do not count this activity as an occupation.

[^1]Table E.4. Number and percentage distribution of members of agricultural households by fishery task and sex

| Fishing Activities | Men | Women | Total | Men | Women |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Inshore fishing | 19,708 | 20,715 | 40,423 | $48.8 \%$ | $51.2 \%$ |
| Offshore fishing | 10,001 | 6,665 | 16,666 | $60.0 \%$ | $40.0 \%$ |
| Freshwater fishing | 1,171 | 17,063 | 18,234 | $6.4 \%$ | $93.6 \%$ |
| Making fish products at home for sale (e.g. smoked <br> fish, etc.) | 48 | 6,084 | 6,132 | $0.8 \%$ | $99.2 \%$ |
| Selling fish and fish products | 613 | 166 | 779 | $78.7 \%$ | $21.3 \%$ |

### 4.2.3. Roles of farmers

Crops
Analysing the same information for farmers (Table F.1), those that declared farming as primary or secondary occupation give us additional insights on the distribution of roles. In this case, farming tasks are mainly performed by male farmers. Many actions had more than 80 percent of farm household male members participating. For the farmer population, these percentages rise above 85 percent and above 90 percent for buying farming inputs and delivery of produce, respectively.

At the national level, the only tasks equally performed by male and female farmers are the cleaning, washing, drying and peeling of agriculture products. Other than that, female farmers only have higher participation in the marketing of crops ( 30.6 percent) and floriculture farming ( 37.7 percent), and are responsible for the processing of home produce for sale (83.2 percent).

This suggests that when considering the farmer population, female farmers have less participation in the agricultural tasks than women's participation in the whole agriculture household member group.

It seems that the more agriculture is selected as a primary or secondary occupation, the less is the share women's participation. Percentages in most of the activities remain around 14 percent, consistent with same values for female farmers.

Table F.1. Percentage distribution of farmers by crop task and sex

| Crop Tasks | Primary occupation as farmer Male | Primary occupation as farmer Female | Secondary occupation as farmer - Male | Secondary occupation as farmer Female | Total male farmers |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land preparation (e.g. land clearing, slash and amp; burning, ploughing, etc.) | 60.18\% | 4.52\% | 25.49\% | 9.81\% | 85.67\% | 14.33\% |
| Planting crop tree seedlings | 61.84\% | 4.63\% | 23.95\% | 9.58\% | 85.79\% | 14.21\% |
| Planting temporary crops/seeds | 60.17\% | 4.52\% | 25.49\% | 9.83\% | 85.66\% | 14.34\% |
| Pollinating of vanilla flowers | 72.13\% | 6.56\% | 12.30\% | 9.02\% | 84.43\% | 15.57\% |
| Oversee nursery for annual crops | 67.74\% | 3.69\% | 18.43\% | 10.14\% | 86.18\% | 13.82\% |
| Transplanting annual crops | 60.35\% | 4.53\% | 25.31\% | 9.80\% | 85.66\% | 14.34\% |
| Applying fertilizer/ pesticides, etc. | 60.35\% | 4.53\% | 25.31\% | 9.80\% | 85.66\% | 14.34\% |
| Weeding | 60.17\% | 4.52\% | 25.49\% | 9.83\% | 85.66\% | 14.34\% |
| Irrigation/Water management | 60.35\% | 4.53\% | 25.31\% | 9.80\% | 85.66\% | 14.34\% |
| Delivery of produce | 79.10\% | 3.79\% | 11.54\% | 5.57\% | 90.64\% | 9.36\% |


| Crop Tasks | Primary occupation as farmer Male | Primary occupation as farmer Female | Secondary occupation as farmer - Male | Secondary occupation as farmer Female | Total male farmers |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Harvesting crops | 60.17\% | 4.52\% | 25.49\% | 9.83\% | 85.66\% | 14.34\% |
| Marketing crops | 61.43\% | 9.68\% | 7.94\% | 20.95\% | 69.37\% | 30.63\% |
| Processing home produce for sale | 14.84\% | 26.30\% | 1.96\% | 56.91\% | 16.80\% | 83.20\% |
| Buying farming inputs | 76.42\% | 3.25\% | 14.11\% | 6.21\% | 90.53\% | 9.47\% |
| Gathering coconuts, copra: cutting, husking and amp; drying | 60.17\% | 4.52\% | 25.49\% | 9.83\% | 85.66\% | 14.34\% |
| Cleaning/Washing/ Drying/Peeling | 38.35\% | 15.02\% | 14.12\% | 32.51\% | 52.47\% | 47.53\% |
| Floriculture farming | 32.45\% | 14.25\% | 29.82\% | 23.48\% | 62.27\% | 37.73\% |
| Other crop tasks | 53.13\% | 9.38\% | 21.88\% | 15.63\% | 75.00\% | 25.00\% |

Analysing the same information by division, numbers show that most women are involved in processing of home produce for sale in all four divisions, as highly reported at the national level. For the other activities, women are involved in - mostly cleaning/washing/peeling/drying, marketing of crops and floriculture farming - numbers are particularly high in the Central Division, where more economic activities are taking place.

## Livestock

As in the case of the agriculture household members (Table F.2), livestock activities are implemented mainly by men, in all cases with percentages over 83.5 percent. Women register more relevant participation only in feeding and managing poultry ( 22.2 percent).

Table F.2. Percentage distribution of farmers by livestock task and sex

| Livestock Tasks | Primary occupation as farmer Male | Primary occupation as farmer Female | Secondary occupation as farmer-Male | Secondary occupation as farmer Female | Total male farmers | Total female farmers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Feeding/Shepherding cattle, goats and sheep | 69.19\% | 2.82\% | 22.31\% | 5.69\% | 91.5\% | 8.5\% |
| Milking cows/goats | 76.39\% | 3.03\% | 16.29\% | 4.28\% | 92.7\% | 7.3\% |
| Managing bee hives | 65.34\% | 6.25\% | 18.18\% | 10.23\% | 83.5\% | 16.5\% |
| Feeding/Managing pigs | 65.65\% | 2.81\% | 26.00\% | 5.54\% | 91.6\% | 8.4\% |
| Feeding/Managing poultry | 50.78\% | 5.49\% | 27.00\% | 16.73\% | 77.8\% | 22.2\% |
| Delivery of livestock or products | 78.61\% | 2.09\% | 12.35\% | 6.96\% | 91.0\% | 9.0\% |
| Marketing | 72.30\% | 4.44\% | 16.19\% | 7.07\% | 88.5\% | 11.5\% |
| Buying farming inputs/feeds | 69.30\% | 4.29\% | 19.03\% | 7.37\% | 88.3\% | 11.7\% |
| Other | 89.36\% | 1.06\% | 7.18\% | 2.39\% | 96.5\% | 3.5\% |

## Forestry

Forestry activities that are performed equally by male and female farmers are gathering firewood, and harvesting wild food and wild plants for herbal medicine (Table F.3). Male farmers have a much more prominent role in planting trees (especially for commercial spices) and nursery work, and female farmers in all the other tasks, including being a majority in planting and harvesting voivoi, and making and selling handicraft work.

Table F.3. Percentage distribution of farmers by forestry task and sex

| Forestry Tasks | Primary occupation as farmer Male | Primary occupation as farmer Female | Secondary occupation as farmer Male | Secondary occupation as farmer Female | Total male farmers |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Planting trees (e.g. sandalwood, mahogany, etc.) | 5.7\% | 6.5\% | 66.7\% | 21.1\% | 72.4\% | 27.6\% |
| Planting voivoi | 1.3\% | 34.2\% | 21.3\% | 43.2\% | 22.6\% | 77.4\% |
| Planting masi | 25.5\% | 37.9\% | 15.1\% | 21.5\% | 40.6\% | 59.4\% |
| Tree nursery work | 19.4\% | 22.6\% | 41.9\% | 16.1\% | 61.3\% | 38.7\% |
| Gathering firewood/cutting tree branches | 2.4\% | 15.1\% | 47.0\% | 35.5\% | 49.4\% | 50.6\% |
| Harvesting wild food (e.g. ota, etc.) | 0.8\% | 8.8\% | 50.0\% | 40.4\% | 50.8\% | 49.2\% |
| Harvesting masi | 31.2\% | 34.4\% | 8.5\% | 25.9\% | 39.7\% | 60.3\% |
| Harvesting voivoi | 0.8\% | 40.2\% | 11.2\% | 47.9\% | 12.0\% | 88.0\% |
| Harvesting wild plants for herbal medicine | 2.0\% | 15.9\% | 45.4\% | 36.6\% | 47.5\% | 52.5\% |
| Making handicrafts | 3.7\% | 53.6\% | 4.6\% | 38.1\% | 8.2\% | 91.8\% |
| Selling handicrafts, wild foods, etc. | 4.8\% | 62.6\% | 10.1\% | 22.5\% | 14.9\% | 85.1\% |
| Other | 32.3\% | 32.3\% | 9.7\% | 25.8\% | 41.9\% | 58.1\% |

## Fisheries

Fisheries as primary or secondary occupation (Table F.4) seem dominated by men with exception in a couple of tasks: making fish products at home for sale, where 93.8 percent of the performers are women, and fresh water fishing, with 71.7 percent of fishers women.

Table F.4. Percentage distribution of farmers by fishery task by sex

| Fishing Activities | Primary <br> occupation <br> as farmer - <br> Male | Primary <br> occupation <br> as farmer - <br> Female | Secondary <br> occupation as <br> farmer - Male | Secondary <br> occupation <br> as farmer - <br> Female | Total <br> male <br> farmers | Total <br> female <br> farmers |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Inshore fishing | $32.4 \%$ | $19.3 \%$ | $32.7 \%$ | $15.6 \%$ | $65.2 \%$ | $34.8 \%$ |  |
| Offshore fishing | $38.1 \%$ | $16.5 \%$ | $32.4 \%$ | $13.0 \%$ | $70.5 \%$ | $29.5 \%$ |  |
| Freshwater fishing | $8.4 \%$ | $28.4 \%$ | $19.8 \%$ | $43.4 \%$ | $28.3 \%$ | $71.7 \%$ |  |
| Making fish products <br> at home for sale (e.g. <br> smoked fish, etc.) | $3.9 \%$ | $65.8 \%$ | $2.3 \%$ | $28.0 \%$ | $6.2 \%$ | $93.8 \%$ |  |
| Selling fish and other fish <br> products | $64.1 \%$ |  | $10.7 \%$ |  | $17.7 \%$ |  | $7.5 \%$ |

These differences suggest that the more professional/commercial/profitable the agriculture activity, either farming, livestock, forestry or fisheries, the smaller the share of women's participation.

Women are participating, as the numbers of the agriculture household member's show in the previous section, but not as primary or secondary occupations.

### 4.2.4 Male- and female-headed farmer households - Type of crop

Table G shows that almost half ( $49.6 \%$ ) of the total farmer households are involved in growing root crops such as cassava, dalo, yams and kumala. Data showing much higher absolute numbers of male-headed households than female-headed households in all crops are consistent with men dominating agriculture activity. For root crops, these numbers are 84,369 male-headed households and 7,142 female-headed households.

In percentages, however, not many differences are observed between male- and female-headed households except for vegetables and kava. Vegetables, the second most grown crops ( 20 percent) for all households have more femaleheaded households, which are growing ( 29.2 percent) compared to $19.1 \%$ for female-headed households. Although the total number of male-headed households is much higher ( $\mathbf{3 2 , 1 0 6}$ male-headed households and 4,800 femaleheaded households), this figure gives an idea of crops in which female-headed households are highly involved.

Kava, on the other hand, is dominated by male-headed households. 10.4 percent of male and 6.1 percent of femaleheaded households are growing it. In absolute numbers, just 997 female-headed households are growing kava, a very low figure when compared with the 17,481 male-headed households that are growing it. This is consistent with kava being a very profitable cash crop grown for export purposes, and men being more involved in commercial agriculture than women are.

Table G: Top ten crops grown by sex of the household head

| No. | Male-headed households | Female-headed households |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | Cassava | Cassava |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | Dalo | Bele |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | Yaqona | Dalo |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | Vudi | Eggplant |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | Bele | Yaqona |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | Banana | Vudi |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | Eggplant | Banana |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | Sugarcane | Chilli |
| $\mathbf{9}$ | Yam | Sugarcane |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | Coconut | Coconut |

### 4.2.5. Male- and female-headed farmer households - Type of Livestock

There are 22,991 households involved in livestock farming in Fiji.
At the national level, the majority of these households are involved in goat ( 40.1 percent), poultry ( 38.5 percent) and pigs ( 36.1 percent). Female-headed households had 49.1 percent involved in poultry farming. This is consistent with poultry being an activity easily compatible with other women's chores in the household, and chicken being a more common alternative for feeding the family in comparison to goats or pigs. These are usually sold in the market or consumed on special occasions.

According to FAO, most smallholder households that raise pigs also raise poultry - mainly chickens but occasionally ducks. Most cattle farms also raise pigs and chickens, with the exception of Hindu Indo-Fijian farmers who raise cattle, goats, sheep and pigs, and Muslim Indo-Fijian farmers who raise only cattle, sheep and goats. ${ }^{4,5}$

At the divisional level (Table G.1), most households in the Central division (57.7 percent) and Eastern division (87.8 percent) have pigs. The Western division households are more involved with goats at 58.2 percent and households in the Northern division raise more poultry ( 52.9 percent).

Table G.1: Percentage distribution of households involved in livestock farming by sex of the household head and type of livestock farming

| Division | Province | Gender of <br> Household <br> Head | Dairy | Beef | Sheep | Goat | Pigs | Poultry | Apiculture |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fiji | Total | Male | 27.3 | 29.3 | 19.3 | 39.9 | 36.7 | 37.5 | 5.7 |
|  |  | Female | 21.0 | 17.7 | 14.5 | 41.8 | 30.0 | 49.1 | 5.0 |
|  |  | Total | 26.7 | 28.3 | 18.9 | 40.1 | 36.1 | 38.5 | 5.6 |
| Central | Naitasiri | Male | 46.6 | 55.5 | 2.7 | 9.2 | 56.1 | 19.8 | 0.0 |
|  |  | Female | 42.2 | 26.1 | 6.3 | 11.5 | 73.5 | 35.5 | 22.6 |
|  |  | Total | 46.3 | 53.5 | 3.0 | 9.3 | 57.3 | 20.9 | 1.5 |
|  | Namosi | Male | 44.8 | 22.2 | 4.7 | 8.5 | 19.3 | 26.4 | 0.0 |
|  |  | Female | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.1 | 35.7 | 28.6 | 0.0 |
|  |  | Total | 45.1 | 20.8 | 4.4 | 8.4 | 20.4 | 26.5 | 0.0 |
|  | Rewa | Male | 25.2 | 11.8 | 1.4 | 6.9 | 89.7 | 19.4 | 1.9 |
|  |  | Female | 32.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 13.4 | 77.5 | 35.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | Total | 25.8 | 10.8 | 1.3 | 7.4 | 88.7 | 20.7 | 1.7 |
|  | Serua | Male | 33.8 | 28.9 | 4.5 | 23.4 | 58.4 | 52.5 | 3.7 |
|  |  | Female | 38.4 | 17.8 | 3.0 | 14.5 | 52.8 | 64.6 | 1.4 |
|  |  | Total | 34.4 | 27.4 | 4.3 | 22.2 | 57.7 | 54.1 | 3.4 |
|  | Tailevu | Male | 28.2 | 33.6 | 1.2 | 9.8 | 52.3 | 18.3 | 1.2 |
|  |  | Female | 21.5 | 14.3 | 0.0 | 11.2 | 46.1 | 35.3 | 0.7 |
|  |  | Total | 27.5 | 31.7 | 1.1 | 9.9 | 51.7 | 20.0 | 1.2 |
|  | Total | Male | 34.1 | 35.2 | 2.2 | 10.6 | 58.0 | 23.0 | 1.5 |
|  |  | Female | 30.1 | 14.5 | 1.4 | 12.1 | 55.6 | 40.4 | 1.8 |
|  |  | Total | 33.7 | 33.3 | 2.1 | 10.8 | 57.7 | 24.6 | 1.5 |

[^2]| Division | Province | Gender of Household Head | Dairy | Beef | Sheep | Goat | Pigs | Poultry | Apiculture |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eastern | Kadavu | Male | 4.1 | 5.4 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 95.7 | 10.9 | 1.4 |
|  |  | Female | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 109.8 | 13.8 | 0.0 |
|  |  | Total | 4.0 | 5.3 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 96.0 | 10.9 | 1.3 |
|  | Lau | Male | 9.4 | 6.9 | 0.4 | 4.9 | 89.8 | 10.5 | 0.1 |
|  |  | Female | 7.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 88.9 | 22.2 | 0.0 |
|  |  | Total | 9.3 | 6.7 | 0.4 | 4.7 | 89.8 | 10.9 | 0.1 |
|  | Lomaiviti | Male | 3.8 | 36.4 | 1.2 | 3.8 | 81.6 | 44.5 | 0.8 |
|  |  | Female | 0.0 | 23.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 79.3 | 92.6 | 0.0 |
|  |  | Total | 3.7 | 35.9 | 1.1 | 3.7 | 81.5 | 46.3 | 0.7 |
|  | Rotuma | Male | 9.5 | 30.2 | 5.3 | 29.1 | 76.2 | 27.5 | 0.0 |
|  |  | Female | 6.3 | 12.5 | 0.0 | 18.8 | 81.3 | 25.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | Total | 9.3 | 28.8 | 4.9 | 28.3 | 76.6 | 27.3 | 0.0 |
|  | Total | Male | 7.4 | 14.8 | 1.1 | 7.2 | 87.8 | 18.7 | 0.5 |
|  |  | Female | 4.9 | 6.7 | 0.0 | 5.3 | 88.5 | 32.3 | 0.0 |
|  |  | Total | 7.3 | 14.5 | 1.0 | 7.1 | 87.8 | 19.3 | 0.5 |
| Western | Ba | Male | 36.6 | 23.4 | 25.1 | 67.9 | 24.5 | 45.1 | 6.5 |
|  |  | Female | 24.2 | 13.4 | 24.8 | 62.3 | 19.5 | 59.9 | 3.7 |
|  |  | Total | 35.2 | 22.2 | 25.0 | 67.3 | 24.0 | 46.8 | 6.2 |
|  | Nadroga/ Navosa | Male | 16.2 | 45.4 | 24.5 | 41.0 | 23.5 | 29.6 | 1.7 |
|  |  | Female | 13.5 | 32.2 | 14.3 | 40.2 | 23.5 | 39.2 | 4.9 |
|  |  | Total | 15.9 | 44.1 | 23.5 | 40.9 | 23.5 | 30.5 | 2.0 |
|  | Ra | Male | 46.6 | 47.2 | 37.5 | 57.8 | 36.7 | 25.3 | 20.4 |
|  |  | Female | 30.1 | 32.4 | 26.4 | 58.6 | 51.8 | 39.1 | 48.6 |
|  |  | Total | 45.1 | 45.9 | 36.5 | 57.9 | 38.1 | 26.5 | 22.9 |
|  | Total | Male | 32.3 | 33.6 | 26.9 | 58.5 | 26.2 | 37.4 | 7.4 |
|  |  | Female | 22.3 | 21.5 | 22.2 | 55.8 | 24.9 | 51.2 | 10.4 |
|  |  | Total | 31.3 | 32.3 | 26.4 | 58.2 | 26.1 | 38.8 | 7.7 |
| Northern | Bua | Male | 31.0 | 37.2 | 33.3 | 38.7 | 31.5 | 37.4 | 7.1 |
|  |  | Female | 31.0 | 23.4 | 35.1 | 42.1 | 25.7 | 48.1 | 4.7 |
|  |  | Total | 31.0 | 36.3 | 33.5 | 38.9 | 31.1 | 38.1 | 7.0 |
|  | Cakaudrove | Male | 11.6 | 42.4 | 44.3 | 24.0 | 51.1 | 35.1 | 9.3 |
|  |  | Female | 8.5 | 29.0 | 40.8 | 37.2 | 31.2 | 55.9 | 6.9 |
|  |  | Total | 11.4 | 41.5 | 44.0 | 24.9 | 49.8 | 36.5 | 9.2 |
|  | Macuata | Male | 18.8 | 12.1 | 15.7 | 47.0 | 13.9 | 61.9 | 6.3 |
|  |  | Female | 11.6 | 8.3 | 9.9 | 45.7 | 11.6 | 60.3 | 1.4 |
|  |  | Total | 18.1 | 11.7 | 15.2 | 46.9 | 13.6 | 61.7 | 5.8 |
|  | Total | Male | 19.6 | 22.2 | 24.3 | 41.1 | 24.1 | 52.5 | 7.0 |
|  |  | Female | 13.8 | 14.0 | 18.0 | 44.0 | 16.8 | 57.9 | 2.7 |
|  |  | Total | 19.1 | 21.6 | 23.8 | 41.4 | 23.5 | 52.9 | 6.6 |

### 4.3. Access to Inputs and Services

### 4.3.1. Level of education and agriculture education

Differences between female and male agriculture household members at all levels of education (Table H), including tertiary education and those currently studying are significant from Years 1 to year 8, with women representing be-
tween 32 and 40 percent in these lower educational levels, and in vocational education, where women are only 27.3 percent of the total group.

For the rest of categories, women represent between 47.5 percent and 51.8 percent of the population, and 48.3 percent of the total group are women.

However, when looking at the education figures for farmers, the numbers show that in this case women are considerably behind representing in an average of 14.4 percent of the total population for all the degrees. As in the previous case, numbers drop for vocational training where female farmers represent only 6 percent (Table H.1).

This shows that female farmers have considerably lower level of education than female agriculture household members whose primary and secondary occupation is not agriculture, forestry or fisheries.

Table H. Percentage distribution of female agriculture household members by sex and level of education

| Pre-school/ <br> Kindergarten | Years <br> $\mathbf{1 - 4}$ | Years <br> $5-6$ | Years <br> $7-8$ | Years 9- <br> $\mathbf{1 0}$ (FJC) | Years <br> $\mathbf{1 1 - 1 2}$ <br> (FSLC) | Year 13 <br> (FSFE) | Vocational | Tertiary | Currently <br> Studying |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $48.7 \%$ | $32.8 \%$ | $38.5 \%$ | $40.7 \%$ | $47.5 \%$ | $51.9 \%$ | $53.2 \%$ | $27.3 \%$ | $49.2 \%$ | $49.0 \%$ |

Table H.1. Percentage distribution of female farmers by sex and level of education

| Pre-school/ Kindergarten | Years 1-4 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Years } \\ 5-6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Years } \\ 7-8 \end{array}$ | Years 9 - $10 \text { (FJC) }$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } 13 \\ & \text { (FSFE) } \end{aligned}$ | Vocational | Tertiary | Currently studying |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5.6\% | 9.6\% | 10.4\% | 11.4\% | 14.5\% | 16.6\% | 15.7\% | 6.0\% | 12.8\% | 16.1\% |

Agriculture household members by sex and age group who attended agriculture education, understood as any training provided by the ministries of agriculture, fisheries or forestry (Table H.2), were only 5.3 percent of this population (13,111 people). From them, in the range of age older than 20 years old, percentages of men attending this education are between 68 and 82 percent, while women are between 18 and 22 percent. So, just a small section of the agriculture household members attended agriculture education and they were mostly men.

When looking at similar figures in the farmer population for those declaring that farming/livestock was their primary or secondary occupation, we find that 10.3 percent of them ( 8,574 people) attended agriculture education (Table H.2). From this number, just a small percentage ( 6.9 percent) was women.

When looking at similar figures in the farmer population for those declaring that forestry was their primary or secondary occupation, we find that 1.2 percent of them (1,007people) attended agriculture education (Table 1.21.a). From this number 24.3 percent were women.

When looking at similar figures in the fisher population (those declaring that fisheries was their primary or secondary occupation) we find that just 0.8 percent of them ( 645 people) attended agriculture education. From this number, just a small percentage ( 10.7 percent) was women.
The difference between the numbers of agriculture household members and the farmers who attended training provided by the ministries of agriculture, fisheries or forestry ( 4,537 people) indicates that although agriculture household members had received agriculture training when the survey was conducted, they considered agriculture neither their primary nor their secondary occupation.

It seems that farmers do not have many opportunities to attend trainings related to their primary/secondary occupation, and that female farmers barely attend these trainings. This suggests a gender gap in terms of technical training in agriculture, forestry and/or fisheries.

Table H.2. Number and percentage distribution of farmers who attended any agriculture training

| Division | Province | Male | Female | Total | Male (\%) | Female (\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { By division (\% } \\ & \text { of Fiji total) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FIJI | Total | 7,985 | 589 | 8,574 | 93.13 | 6.87 |  |
| Central | Total | 2,038 | 140 | 2,178 | 93.57 | 6.43 | 25.4 |
|  | Naitasiri | 500 | 39 | 539 | 92.76 | 7.24 |  |
|  | Namosi | 253 | 24 | 277 | 91.34 | 8.66 |  |
|  | Rewa | 313 | 16 | 329 | 95.14 | 4.86 |  |
|  | Serua | 220 | 12 | 232 | 94.83 | 5.17 |  |
|  | Tailevu | 752 | 49 | 801 | 93.88 | 6.12 |  |
| Eastern | Total | 896 | 17 | 913 | 98.14 | 1.86 | 10.6 |
|  | Kadavu | 179 | 3 | 182 | 98.35 | 1.65 |  |
|  | Lau | 266 | 0 | 266 | 100.00 | 0.00 |  |
|  | Lomaiviti | 412 | 12 | 424 | 97.17 | 2.83 |  |
|  | Rotuma | 39 | 2 | 41 | 95.12 | 4.88 |  |
| Western | Total | 2,238 | 141 | 2,379 | 94.07 | 5.93 | 27.7 |
|  | Ba | 994 | 70 | 1,064 | 93.42 | 6.58 |  |
|  | Nadroga/Navosa | 704 | 26 | 730 | 96.44 | 3.56 |  |
|  | Ra | 540 | 45 | 585 | 92.31 | 7.69 |  |
| Northern | Total | 2,813 | 291 | 3,104 | 90.63 | 9.38 | 36.2 |
|  | Bua | 650 | 38 | 688 | 94.48 | 5.52 |  |
|  | Cakaudrove | 971 | 104 | 1,075 | 90.33 | 9.67 |  |
|  | Macuata | 1,192 | 149 | 1,341 | 88.89 | 11.11 |  |

Divisional differences are observed in the number of farmers attending agriculture training. The highest number of farmers trained (women and men at 36.2 percent) is from the Northern Division, mostly from Macuata Province. The high rate of farmer's training in Macuata could be the result of diversified farming activities that the Ministry of Agriculture has been promoting in the province, including kava, rice, dalo and some fruits. The same division and province also recorded the highest (11.1 percent) number of women trained.

### 4.3.2. Understanding of climate change

The census collected information on number and percentage distribution of farming households by sex of the head of household and understanding of climate change from 68,502 households (Table I). The difference between this number and the total number of farming households in the country ( 70,991 households) is 2,489 households that did not provide any response to this question.

From the analysis of the data, it can be concluded that most of the agriculture households have an understanding of climate change, with small differences registered between female- and male-headed households.

Table I. Number and percentage distribution of farming households by sex of the household head and understanding of climate change

| Sex of head of household | Understanding of climate change |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Male | Yes | No |
| Female | 47,734 | 2,546 | 10,437 |
|  | $78.6 \%$ | $4.2 \%$ | $17.2 \%$ |
|  | 5,642 | 470 | 1,673 |
|  | $72.5 \%$ | $6.0 \%$ | $21.5 \%$ |
|  | $\mathbf{5 3 , 3 7 6}$ | $\mathbf{3 , 0 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 , 1 1 0}$ |
|  | $\mathbf{7 7 . 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 . 7 \%}$ |

*Just 68,502 out of 70.991 households answered this question

### 4.3.3. Agriculture services

Access to finance
From the analysis, we found that only 5.9 percent of the households that took a loan/credit are from female-headed households, and that 12.7 percent of the borrowers are women (see Table 10.1 in Volume 1 of 2020FAC). This percentage of borrowers is higher for farms with less than 1 hectare (with 23.5 percent women) and farms between 1 and 3 hectares (with 17 percent women). For bigger farms, female borrowers are under 10 percent in all cases.

Credit for farms with more than 3 hectares are dominated by male borrowers (more than 90 percent) in all categories. This shows that the smaller the farm, the more likely that women are the ones borrowing, and the bigger the farm, the fewer women are borrowers, suggesting that more women are involved in decision-making related to subsistence agriculture. This is consistent with the finding of the Asian Development Bank (ADB) gender assessment, which stated that that almost one-quarter ( 23 percent) of rural women are engaged in subsistence work (ADB, 2015). For all farm sizes, the Fiji Development Bank (FDB) is the main source of credit.

Both female- and male-headed households prefer FDB (42 percent of all credit) and the Sugarcane Growers Fund (SGF) ( 38 percent of all credit) as sources of credit. However, female-headed households choose FDB in 33.7 percent and SGF in 43.8 percent of the cases, and the male-headed households choose FDB in 42.5 percent and SGF in 37.8 percent of the cases.

This shows that loans are highly related to sugarcane, and that there is a certain level of involvement from women in this activity, at least as borrowers.
Analysis of relationships between the farming household land area and the purpose of the loan/credit shows that the most popular purposes for asking for a credit (chosen by 20 percent of more of the borrowers) in farms with less than 1 hectare (where 23.5 percent were women) are farm land purchase; planting materials/ new varieties of crops; purchase of fertilizer/chemicals and purchase of tools or machinery. Not many differences can be observed in the purposes for the credit depending on either the size of the land or the sex of the head of household.

## Assistance received for Agricultural activities during last 12 months

During the past 12 months, 6,758 farming households have received assistance, with 8 percent of them female-headed households and 92 percent male-headed households. In 77.6 percent of the cases, the source of assistance received was the government, while in 17 percent of the cases, a non-governmental organization (NGO) provided the assistance. Of the attended households, 44 percent had less than 1 hectare of land and 83 percent had less than 5 hectares, showing that assistance has targeted the smaller farms in Fiji.

A higher percentage of female-headed households was attended by NGOs in the last 12 months, in comparison with the percentage attended by government organizations. From the total number of households attended by NGOs, 11.8 percent were female-headed households, for the government, this figure was 7.4 percent. This may be explained by higher use of "sex of household criteria" within the targeting systems of NGOs.

No significant differences have been found in the type of assistance received between female- and male-headed households.

With regard to differences between female- and male-headed households on the method of accessing agriculture ser-
vices during last 12 months, analysis shows that the biggest difference is lower female-headed household participation in three categories: extension visits, provincial and district meetings, and meetings with other farmers. This may reflect women's difficulties in participating in meetings regarding their agriculture when these activities are held outside of their communities. Other potential reasons can be not being informed of these meetings, which are usually attended by selected representatives, mostly men.

## Access to transport for the market

From the total number of farming households, findings show that 31,033 farming households reported access to the market. From these, 93 percent were from male-headed households and only 7 percent from female-headed households. This difference is not so stark when looking at percentages within each group, as the numbers of femaleheaded households is much lower ( 8,445 households) than male-headed households ( 28,899 households). In this case, 46.2 percent of male and 25.3 percent of female-headed households had access to markets. Still, the analysis shows a gender gap in terms of access to markets by female-headed households.

Regarding the main mode of transport from farm to market, no significant differences between male- and femaleheaded households were reported, although numbers show that small boats and maritime vessels are more used by a higher percentage by male-headed households whilst female-headed households use buses in a higher percentage. This can be an indicator of access to transport, as female-headed households are more reliant on public transport to access markets. In addition, this finding can also be explained because there are less female-headed farmer households in maritime areas (where boats are used) compared to mainland Viti Levu where more female farmers are found as well as more buses and trucks to transport their products to the market.

In terms of time taken to reach markets to sell agricultural products, no significant differences between male- and female-headed households were reported, although a higher percentage of female-headed households take less than 30 minutes to reach the market and a higher percentage of male-headed households take more than two hours. This means that male-headed households reach further locations for selling their products, suggesting greater mobility, which includes travelling from the islands and reaching further markets that demand different crops and possibly better market opportunities. It may also be related to male farmers willing/being able to take higher levels of risks and being able to be away from their households longer.

### 4.3.4. Use of farming equipment

Analysing Table J.1, which refers to the kind of equipment used by agriculture households (excluding foresters and fishers), most of the $\mathbf{6 0 , 6 9 1}$ farmer households surveyed (all having farming as the primary occupation) used hand tools ( 99.6 percent of all men and 99.6 percent of all women, although 90.1 percent of the respondents were men and just 9.9 percent were women). This is consistent with similar percentages of female-headed households in all the agriculture households.

Just 11.7 percent of the respondents use small machinery, and just 4.3 percent declared using heavy machinery. When looking at the numbers by sex, while there are no differences among the users of hand tools, some differences are found between men and women for small-machinery users ( 12.2 percent of men and 7.3 percent of women) and heavy-machinery users ( 4.4 percent of men and 2.9 percent of women).

Table J.1. Equipment used in percentages above users ${ }^{6}$

| Sex | Hand tools | Small machinery | Heavy machinery |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Male | $99.6 \%$ | $12.2 \%$ | $4.4 \%$ |
| Female | $99.6 \%$ | $7.3 \%$ | $2.9 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{9 9 . 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 . 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 3 \%}$ |

Moreover, these gaps are more evident when looking at users out of the total number of farmers. Just 6.2 and 6.8 percent of the users for small and heavy machinery respectively, are women, making evident the gender gap in terms of use of any kind of machinery. In turn, this may suggest a more disadvantageous position of women in terms of productivity/efficiency.

[^3]Table J.2. Equipment used in percentages above the total number of farmers.

| Sex | Small machinery | Heavy machinery |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Male | $93.8 \%$ | $93.2 \%$ |
| Female | $6.2 \%$ | $6.8 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0} \%$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0} \%$ |

## Use of small machinery

When looking at the use of small equipment from households with farmers only (excluding foresters and fishers), it can be appreciated that from the 60,691 households surveyed, the most common small machinery types used are bush cutters ( 9 percent of the total households), chainsaws ( 5.5 percent) and tractor implements ( 1.2 percent). These figures show the very small uptake of machinery among farmers (crops and livestock).

When looking at disaggregated numbers by sex, same type of small machinery is the most used among men and women, but within each category, finding show that just 6.1 percent, 7.9 percent and 4.5 percent of the bush cutters, chainsaws and tractor implement users, respectively, are women. Again, these numbers reveal a gender gap in the use of small machinery for farmers (crops and livestock).

Looking at the same figures including foresters and fishers total 70,991 households surveyed. Again, by type of machinery, the bush cutters ( 8 percent), chainsaws ( 4.8 percent) and tractor implements ( 1 percent) are the most used machines, as farmers are the predominant category and highest in number by far.

The small change in numbers when adding foresters and fishers suggests that the use of machinery is even lower for foresters and fishers than for crop and livestock farming, and that machinery was already reported by the same individuals, since many of the foresters declared farming as their primary occupation (with forestry a secondary occupation) and fishers do not use most of the small machinery.

Of the small-machinery users, 96 percent own the machinery, with just a few borrowing, sharing or renting it. From the total number of owners, just 4 percent are women (Table J.3). This gender gap in terms of ownership is consistent with the gender gap in the use of machinery.

Table J.3. Use and ownership of small machinery

| Number of farms using small machinery | Hired | Borrowed | Shared | Owned | Male owned | Female owned |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9,991 | 147 | 151 | 104 | 9,589 | 9,228 | 384 |
|  | 1.5\% | 1.5\% | 1.0\% | 96.0\% | 96.2\% | 4.0\% |

*Sum of male and female ownership does not tally with the total machinery own as these questions allowed for multi-selection.

## Use of heavy machinery

Table J. 4 refers to farmer households using and owning heavy machinery. The most utilized types of heavy machinery are tractors ( 69.4 percent), pick-up trucks ( 15.4 percent) and sugarcane harvesters ( 8.2 percent).

In addition to owning the equipment, borrowing, sharing and particularly hiring are frequent options. Tractors are still mostly owned ( 58 percent) but also hired ( 35 percent); pick-up trucks are owned by users in 51 percent of the cases while sugarcane harvesters are mostly hired ( 81 percent of the cases) and only owned by 4.7 percent of the users. This can be explained because of the high price of acquiring this equipment and the existence of companies that provide this service.
In terms of disaggregated information, 95 percent of the heavy machinery owners are men and only 5 percent are women. Looking at the female owners, findings show they own tractors in practically all cases (just a few reported owning a pick-up truck). This data reveals a gender gap for the use and ownership of heavy machinery.

Table J.4. Use and ownership of heavy machinery

| Number of <br> farms using <br> heavy | Hired | Borrowed | Shared | Owned | Male Female owned <br> owned |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| machinery |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3,292 | 1,447 | 110 | 127 | 1,608 | 1530 | 81 |
|  | $44.0 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ | $3.9 \%$ | $48.8 \%$ | $95.1 \%$ | $5.0 \%$ |

[^4]
### 4.3.5. Savings accounts

The question about savings accounts was only for those that had declared that farming, fisheries or forestry were either their primary or secondary occupation, and included a total of 83,395 people. Of these, $\mathbf{5 1 . 3}$ percent have a savings account, from which 88.8 percent are men and 11.2 percent are women. However differences are not so stark when looking at percentages within each group, as the numbers of female farmers $(11,971)$ are much lower than their male peers ( 71,424 ). In this case, $\mathbf{5 3 . 2}$ percent of all male farmers and 40 percent of all female farmers (Table K) own a savings account, which shows a gender gap in terms of ownership of bank accounts for the farmer population.

Table K. Number and percentage distribution of farmers having savings account by sex

|  | Savings Account |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Yes |  | No |  |
| TOTAL | 42,751 | 51.3\% | 40,644 | 48.7\% |
| By Sex | Male farmers | Female farmers | Male farmers | Female farmers |
|  | 37,965 | 4,786 | 33,459 | 7,185 |
| Percentage of total farmers | 88.8\% | 11.2\% | 82.3\% | 17.7\% |
| Percentage of each group | 53.2\% | 40\% | 56.9\% | 60\% |

Comparing data by divisions shows that more farmers from the Western Division ( 55.9 percent) and less from the Eastern Division ( 29.2 percent) have savings accounts. This can be explained because banks are not easily accessible in the maritime islands. For female farmers reporting to have savings accounts, the highest number ( 13.9 percent) is from the Northern Division.

By province, most farmers from Macuata in Northern Division (61.6 percent) and Rewa in the Central Division (61.2 percent) are saving money in the bank. In the case of women, most female farmers from Macuata ( 15.8 percent) and Serua ( 13 percent)/Namosi ( 15 percent) in the Central Division reported having savings accounts.
A higher number of crop and livestock farmers reported having a savings account than their peers in forestry and fisheries, however this does not completely allow inferring that a particular sub-sector has more or less access to banking services, since the definition of farmers, foresters and fishers is not exclusive, and someone can answer farming as the primary and forestry as the secondary occupation.

More fishers from the Western Division (47.8 percent) have savings accounts, and the least have savings accounts in the Eastern Division (20.4 percent). All four divisions reported that savings is not a priority for fishers. Most farmers who have a savings account chose a bank account (98.4 percent), with Bank South Pacific (BSP) as the most popular bank ( 51 percent of the farmers chose it), and other financial institutions are rarely used by both men and women. Just 2.04 percent of the farmers in Fiji or 872 people have their money in the Fiji National Provident Fund (FNPF), suggesting that an overwhelming majority of farmers do not use this coverage, information that is consistent with high levels of informality/subsistence in the agriculture sector.

When asked about the reasons for not having an account, the main reason for the majority of farmers ( 62.8 percent) was that it was not a priority; not having enough to save was the reason for not having an account for 25.3 percent; while just 11.1 percent mentioned the unavailability of services in their locations as the reason for not having a savings account. Numbers in terms of men and women do not show significant differences in this case.

Data by province show interesting differences. Most farmers in the Central Division ( 69 percent) pointed out that saving is not a priority, especially for those in the Namosi Province. Many Western Division farmers reported they do not have enough to save ( 36 percent), while most farmers from the Eastern Division gave accessibility - bank services not available in the area - as the reason for not having a savings account.

### 4.3.6. Mobile phones

Just 63.3 percent of farmers who have crops and/or livestock farming as their primary/secondary occupation own a mobile phone. When looking at disaggregated information by sex, data show that 35.3 percent of male farmers and 45.5 percent of female farmers do not own a mobile phone, showing a gender gap. Smartphone ownership has been identified as a key barrier for accessing the Internet (GSMA, 2020). This may represent a disadvantageous
position for women in terms of access to Internet services and information regarding key aspects for their agriculture activity such as pricing information, market opportunities, on-line trainings and other services or information.
Looking at the numbers by province, phone ownership is higher for farmers from the Western Division ( 68.3 percent). This could be related to the level of participation in the tourism-related activities that are very common in this division. Female farmers in Nadroga/Navosa Province in the Western Division have more phone ownership ( 71.3 percent) than women from Namosi Province in the Central Division, where the ownership is only 21 percent. Connectivity is an issue in Fiji, especially in the maritime islands and in the interior of Viti Levu.

Table L.1.: Number and percentage distribution of farmers with mobile phones by sex and location

| Division | Sex of Farmers | Do not own mobile phone | Own mobile phone | Total | Do not own mobile phone (\%) | Own mobile phone (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fiji | Total | 30,626 | 52,769 | 83,395 | 36.7 | 63.3 |
|  | Male | 25,180 | 46,244 | 71,424 | 35.3 | 64.7 |
|  | Female | 5,446 | 6,525 | 11,971 | 45.5 | 54.5 |
| Central | Total | 9,204 | 13,858 | 23,062 | 39.9 | 60.1 |
|  | Male | 7,052 | 11,887 | 18,939 | 37.2 | 62.8 |
|  | Female | 2,152 | 1,971 | 4,123 | 52.2 | 47.8 |
| Eastern | Total | 3,466 | 4,239 | 7,705 | 45.0 | 55.0 |
|  | Male | 3,111 | 4,031 | 7,142 | 43.6 | 56.4 |
|  | Female | 355 | 208 | 563 | 63.1 | 36.9 |
| Western | Total | 8,166 | 17,551 | 25,717 | 31.8 | 68.2 |
|  | Male | 7,064 | 15,630 | 22,694 | 31.1 | 68.9 |
|  | Female | 1,102 | 1,921 | 3,023 | 36.5 | 63.5 |
| Northern | Total | 9,790 | 17121 | 26,911 | 36.4 | 63.6 |
|  | Male | 7,953 | 14,696 | 22,649 | 35.1 | 64.9 |
|  | Female | 1,837 | 2,425 | 4,262 | 43.1 | 56.9 |

## Forestry

Overall, 61.2 percent of foresters do not own a mobile phone. Out of these foresters, a high percentage ( 72.9 percent) is women (Table L.2).

At the divisional level, almost three quarters of foresters from the Eastern Division have no mobile phone, which could be attributed to poor connectivity. Women foresters from the Northern Division (especially in Cakaudrove Province at 81.4 percent) have fewer phones ( $79 \%$ without phones), closely followed by the Eastern Division ( $75.2 \%$ ).

Table L.2. Number and percentage distribution of foresters with mobile phones by sex and locations

| Division | Sex | Do not own mobile <br> phone | Own mobile <br> phone | Total | Do not own mobile <br> phone | Own mobile <br> phone |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Fiji | Total | $\mathbf{8 , 6 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{5 4 6 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 , 0 9 4}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{3 8 . 8}$ |  |
|  | Male | 3,364 | 3516 | 6880 | 48.9 | 51.1 |  |
| Central | Female | Total | 5,261 | 1953 | 7214 | 72.9 | 27.1 |
|  | Male | $\mathbf{2 , 5 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 6 8}$ | $\mathbf{4 4 7 3}$ | $\mathbf{5 6 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 4 . 0}$ |  |
|  | Female | 1,026 | 1,231 | 2,257 | 45.5 | 54.5 |  |
| Eastern | Total | 1,479 | 737 | 2,216 | 66.7 | 33.3 |  |
|  | Male | $\mathbf{1 , 3 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{5 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 8 3 5}$ | $\mathbf{7 2 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 7 . 8}$ |  |
|  | Female | 154 | 124 | 278 | 55.4 | 44.6 |  |


| Division | Sex | Do not own mobile <br> phone | Own mobile <br> phone | Total | Do not own mobile <br> phone | Own mobile <br> phone |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Western | Total | $\mathbf{6 3 8}$ | $\mathbf{4 4 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 0 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 9 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 . 9}$ |  |
|  | Male | 178 | 185 | 363 | 49.0 | 51.0 |  |
| Northern | Female | Total | 460 | 257 | 717 | 64.2 | 35.8 |
|  | Male | $\mathbf{4 , 1 5 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 5 4 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 , 7 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 2 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 8 . 0}$ |  |
|  | Female | 2,006 | 1,976 | 3,982 | 50.4 | 49.6 |  |

## Fisheries

At the national level, 51.7 percent of fishers have a mobile phone. When looking at disaggregated information by sex, data show that 38.8 percent of male farmers and 67.2 percent of female farmers do not own a mobile phone, showing an even wider gender gap for mobile phones in fisheries than in the case of crop farmers.

Looking at the numbers by provinces, the highest percentage of fishers owning a mobile phone ( 64.5 percent of the total) is in the Western Division (Table L.3). The Eastern Division has the least mobile phone ownership and again, this would be most likely due to connectivity problems. Women from the Western Division have more mobile phones than other divisions and this could be attributed to good connectivity and involvement in various tourism activities in the division.

Table L.3. Number and percentage distribution of fishers with mobile phones by sex and locations

| Division | Sex | Do not own mobile phone | Own mobile phone | Total | Do not own mobile phone | Own mobile phone |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fiji | Total | 2,178 | 2,335 | 4,513 | 48.3 | 51.7 |
|  | Male | 1,166 | 1,841 | 3,007 | 38.8 | 61.2 |
|  | Female | 1,012 | 494 | 1,506 | 67.2 | 32.8 |
| Central | Total | 460 | 517 | 977 | 47.1 | 52.9 |
|  | Male | 228 | 382 | 610 | 37.4 | 62.6 |
|  | Female | 232 | 135 | 367 | 63.2 | 36.8 |
| Eastern | Total | 448 | 293 | 741 | 60.5 | 39.5 |
|  | Male | 173 | 200 | 373 | 46.4 | 53.6 |
|  | Female | 275 | 93 | 368 | 74.7 | 25.3 |
| Western | Total | 280 | 508 | 788 | 35.5 | 64.5 |
|  | Male | 176 | 398 | 574 | 30.7 | 69.3 |
|  | Female | 104 | 110 | 214 | 48.6 | 51.4 |
| Northern | Total | 990 | 1,017 | 2,007 | 49.3 | 50.7 |
|  | Male | 589 | 861 | 1,450 | 40.6 | 59.4 |
|  | Female | 401 | 156 | 557 | 72.0 | 28.0 |

### 4.3.7. Households particulars

## Female head of households

Female-headed household at the national level stood at 12.2 percent. The Western Division (mostly from Ba and Nadroga provinces) has the highest number of female-headed households at 14.3 percent while the Eastern Division has the lowest at 7.01 percent. Within the female headed-households, 73.8 percent are widowed, again mostly from the Western Division (33.9 percent) in the province of Ba.
Table M: Number and percentage distribution of households by sex and marital status of the household head and geographic location

| Division | Head of household (numbers) <br> Never Married |  |  | Percentages |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Married |  | Defacto |  | Widowed |  | Separated |  | Divorced |  | Total |  |  |  |
|  | $\frac{\square}{\text { E }}$ | N | \% | $\sum_{2}^{\frac{0}{\pi}}$ | 先 | $\frac{0}{\sum_{2}^{5}}$ | \# | E | $\stackrel{\stackrel{0}{\pi}}{\stackrel{y}{\Xi}}$ | $\sum_{2}^{\frac{N}{\pi}}$ | \% | $\stackrel{0}{\mathrm{~N}}$ | \% |  | \# | $\frac{N}{\frac{\pi}{\pi}}$ | $\stackrel{0}{\square}$ |
| Fiji Total | 6,2867 | 8,763 | 71,630 | 4.1 | 8.1 | 88.0 | 10.0 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 5.2 | 73.8 | 1.3 | 4.8 | 0.6 | 2.5 | 87.8 | 12.2 |
| Central | 15,842 | 2,336 | 18,178 | 4.5 | 7.7 | 87.3 | 10.9 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 5.6 | 71.7 | 1.3 | 5.8 | 0.6 | 2.8 | 87.1 | 12.9 |
| Naitasiri | 4,204 | 525 | 4,729 | 4.5 | 7.6 | 88.5 | 8.0 | 0.6 | 1.7 | 5.1 | 73.9 | 0.8 | 5.3 | 0.5 | 3.4 | 88.9 | 11.1 |
| Namosi | 1,071 | 106 | 1,177 | 4.9 | 9.4 | 86.9 | 5.7 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 5.5 | 74.5 | 1.3 | 8.5 | 0.6 | 1.9 | 91.0 | 9.0 |
| Rewa | 2,413 | 336 | 2,749 | 3.9 | 8.3 | 87.9 | 15.2 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 5.0 | 67.9 | 1.1 | 5.7 | 1.2 | 3.0 | 87.8 | 12.2 |
| Serua | 1,670 | 280 | 1,950 | 2.5 | 8.9 | 88.5 | 9.3 | 1.2 | 0.4 | 6.6 | 71.1 | 1.0 | 8.2 | 0.2 | 2.1 | 85.6 | 14.4 |
| Tailevu | 6,484 | 1,089 | 7,573 | 5.1 | 7.2 | 86.0 | 11.9 | 0.7 | 1.2 | 5.8 | 71.8 | 1.8 | 5.2 | 0.6 | 2.7 | 85.6 | 14.4 |
| Eastern | 5,599 | 427 | 6,026 | 4.7 | 14.3 | 87.7 | 15.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 4.7 | 62.3 | 1.0 | 4.7 | 0.6 | 2.1 | 92.9 | 7.1 |
| Kadavu | 1725 | 52 | 1,777 | 3.8 | 9.6 | 88.6 | 9.6 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 4.9 | 69.2 | 0.8 | 5.8 | 0.5 | 5.8 | 97.1 | 2.9 |
| Lau | 1678 | 138 | 1,816 | 4.1 | 18.1 | 88.8 | 17.4 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 5.1 | 53.6 | 0.8 | 6.5 | 0.6 | 3.6 | 92.4 | 7.6 |
| Lomaiviti | 1857 | 187 | 2,044 | 5.5 | 12.8 | 86.6 | 15.0 | 1.9 | 2.1 | 3.9 | 66.3 | 1.6 | 3.2 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 90.9 | 9.1 |
| Rotuma | 339 | 50 | 389 | 7.4 | 14.0 | 83.5 | 16.0 | 0.3 | 2.0 | 6.8 | 64.0 | 0.6 | 4.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 87.1 | 12.9 |
| Western | 23,192 | 3,863 | 27,055 | 3.4 | 8.5 | 87.8 | 7.7 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 6.1 | 76.8 | 1.3 | 4.1 | 0.6 | 2.3 | 85.7 | 14.3 |
| Ba | 12,475 | 2,096 | 14,571 | 3.2 | 7.3 | 88.2 | 7.7 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 6.1 | 77.4 | 1.1 | 4.5 | 0.7 | 2.7 | 85.6 | 14.4 |
| Nadroga/ <br> Navosa | 7,157 | 1,204 | 8,361 | 3.4 | 10.9 | 87.0 | 6.0 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 6.8 | 76.9 | 1.5 | 3.5 | 0.5 | 1.9 | 85.6 | 14.4 |
| Ra | 3,560 | 563 | 4,123 | 4.0 | 8.0 | 88.3 | 11.7 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 4.9 | 74.4 | 1.5 | 3.7 | 0.5 | 2.0 | 86.3 | 13.7 |
| Northern | 18,234 | 2,137 | 20,371 | 4.5 | 6.6 | 89.1 | 12.0 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 4.0 | 72.7 | 1.3 | 5.0 | 0.5 | 2.8 | 89.5 | 10.5 |
| Bua | 2,727 | 230 | 2,957 | 4.5 | 11.3 | 90.0 | 10.9 | 0.8 | 1.7 | 2.9 | 70.0 | 1.3 | 4.8 | 0.6 | 1.3 | 92.2 | 7.8 |
| Cakaudrove | 7,078 | 718 | 7,796 | 6.4 | 9.2 | 87.5 | 17.8 | 0.6 | 1.8 | 3.8 | 61.6 | 1.1 | 6.8 | 0.6 | 2.8 | 90.8 | 9.2 |
| Macuata | 8,429 | 1,189 | 9,618 | 3.0 | 4.2 | 90.1 | 8.7 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 4.5 | 80.0 | 1.5 | 3.9 | 0.4 | 3.0 | 87.6 | 12.4 |

## House type

At the national level, almost all (96 percent) of farming households have independent dwellings. Similar data is reported at the divisional level.

The outer wall material for most farmers' houses at the national level are permanent walls made of tin or corrugated iron ( 37.3 percent) and wood ( 34.1 percent). However, at the divisional level, material for most farmers' houses in the Central (46.9 percent) and Western (40.2 percent) Divisions are permanent walls made tin or corrugated iron but in the Northern and Eastern Divisions, most farmers' outer walls are made of wood.. Good infrastructure in the Central and Western Divisions enable farmers to have access to cheaper options for tin and corrugated iron. The Northern and Eastern Divisions are more accessible to forests, where wood is used to build houses at a lower cost.

In terms of male- and female-headed households, there are no big differences, suggesting that geographical location is the most important factor influencing the kind of materials used to build a house in the rural areas of Fiji.

## Piped water

The main source of water supply in most farming households nationally is metered piped water ( 39 percent) (Table N.1). At the divisional level, most farmers in the Central (48 percent) and Western (47 percent) Divisions have metered water supply while in the Eastern ( 50 percent) and Northern ( 38 percent) Divisions more households have piped water supply without meters since the water infrastructure is very limited in rural areas, and households tend to connect their own water supply (Table N.2). At the national level, between male- and female-headed households, there are a few differences. A majority of female-headed households have metered water supply systems ( 50.1 percent of the houses), in comparison with just 37.9 percent of the male-headed households.

This may suggest that female-headed households prioritize better water services, which is consistent with the gendered division of labour in households in Fiji, where women manage water and sanitation related to their task as family carer and other household tasks. This is also consistent with the fact that where water services are poor or intermittent, the workload of rural women increases (Country Gender Assessment of Agriculture and the Rural Sector in Fiji, 2019).

Table N. 1 Percentage distribution of male and female farming households by source of water supply

| Sex of head of household | Metered | Piped without meter | From a communal standpipe | Roof-tank | Borehole | Well | River or creek | Other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 37.9\% | 29.3\% | 11.3\% | 6.3\% | 8.6\% | 1.9\% | 2.1\% | 2.6\% |
| Female | 50.1\% | 23.1\% | 8.3\% | 4.7\% | 8.5\% | 1.5\% | 1.5\% | 2.3\% |

Looking at data by province, as expected, those that have better infrastructure (e.g. Rewa, Serua, Tailevu, Ba, Nadroga/ Navosa and Macuata) will have metered water supply while those that have poor infrastructure will have piped water without meters, except in Rotuma where 94.2 percent of households have metered water supply.

In all divisions, female-headed households generally show a trend similar to the national trend, with more metered water supply than male-headed household counterparts, except in the Eastern Division where all numbers are low.
Table N. 2 Number and percentage distribution of households by sex of the household head, source of water supply and geographic location
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| Region | Sex of head of household | Total number of farming households | Percentage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Metered | Piped without meter | From a communal standpipe | Rooftank | Borehole | Well | River or creek | Other |
| Kadavu | Male | 1,718 | 0.6 | 60.5 | 27.6 | 2.8 | 8.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
|  | Female | 49 | 4.1 | 57.1 | 20.4 | 6.1 | 10.2 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Total | 1,767 | 0.7 | 60.4 | 27.4 | 2.9 | 8.1 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Lau | Male | 1,673 | 15.5 | 25.8 | 10.5 | 39.3 | 8.4 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
|  | Female | 130 | 26.9 | 26.9 | 4.6 | 37.7 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Total | 1,803 | 16.4 | 25.8 | 10.0 | 39.2 | 8.0 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Lomaiviti | Male | 1,844 | 5.3 | 73.8 | 7.6 | 9.4 | 2.0 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 1.2 |
|  | Female | 177 | 17.5 | 63.8 | 6.8 | 9.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 1.1 |
|  | Total | 2,021 | 6.4 | 72.9 | 7.5 | 9.4 | 1.9 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 1.2 |
| Rotuma | Male | 331 | 94.3 | 0.3 | 4.5 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Female | 47 | 93.6 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Total | 378 | 94.2 | 0.5 | 4.2 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Western | Male | 23,045 | 45.7 | 18.4 | 7.6 | 3.7 | 16.5 | 2.5 | 1.8 | 3.8 |
|  | Female | 3,726 | 54.3 | 16.8 | 4.7 | 3.2 | 14.8 | 2.1 | 1.1 | 3.0 |
|  | Total | 26,771 | 46.9 | 18.2 | 7.2 | 3.6 | 16.3 | 2.5 | 1.7 | 3.7 |
| Ba | Male | 12,390 | 63.0 | 12.4 | 4.2 | 3.0 | 11.6 | 1.5 | 1.4 | 2.8 |
|  | Female | 2,023 | 70.1 | 9.5 | 2.3 | 2.1 | 11.1 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 3.0 |
|  | Total | 14,413 | 64.0 | 12.0 | 3.9 | 2.9 | 11.6 | 1.4 | 1.3 | 2.9 |
| Nadroga/ Navosa | Male | 7,114 | 31.5 | 17.6 | 7.0 | 6.1 | 27.9 | 4.9 | 2.6 | 2.4 |
|  | Female | 1,170 | 43.6 | 18.4 | 3.7 | 5.8 | 21.6 | 4.3 | 1.9 | 0.8 |
|  | Total | 8,284 | 33.2 | 17.7 | 6.5 | 6.1 | 27.0 | 4.8 | 2.5 | 2.2 |
| $\mathbf{R a}$ | Male | 3,541 | 13.9 | 40.9 | 20.6 | 1.0 | 10.8 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 9.7 |
|  | Female | 533 | 18.0 | 41.1 | 15.9 | 1.3 | 13.5 | 1.5 | 0.9 | 7.7 |
|  | Total | 4,074 | 14.5 | 40.9 | 20.0 | 1.0 | 11.2 | 1.5 | 1.4 | 9.5 |


| Region | Sex of head of household | Total number of farming households | Percentage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Metered | Piped without meter | From a communal standpipe | Rooftank | Borehole | Well | River or creek | Other |
| Northern | Male | 18,166 | 28.4 | 38.4 | 15.5 | 5.6 | 4.3 | 2.5 | 3.8 | 1.5 |
|  | Female | 2,056 | 38.9 | 33.1 | 12.6 | 4.9 | 4.0 | 1.5 | 3.3 | 1.7 |
|  | Total | 20,222 | 29.5 | 37.9 | 15.2 | 5.6 | 4.3 | 2.4 | 3.8 | 1.5 |
| Bua | Male | 2,723 | 13.2 | 43.2 | 23.8 | 5.1 | 8.8 | 2.5 | 2.6 | 0.8 |
|  | Female | 217 | 16.6 | 44.2 | 17.1 | 8.8 | 10.6 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 0.0 |
|  | Total | 2,940 | 13.5 | 43.2 | 23.3 | 5.4 | 8.9 | 2.4 | 2.5 | 0.7 |
| Cakaudrove | Male | 7,070 | 7.2 | 54.3 | 19.2 | 10.0 | 1.1 | 0.4 | 7.1 | 0.8 |
|  | Female | 705 | 10.9 | 52.9 | 18.3 | 8.5 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 7.4 | 1.0 |
|  | Total | 7,775 | 7.5 | 54.1 | 19.1 | 9.8 | 1.1 | 0.3 | 7.1 | 0.8 |
| Macuata | Male | 8,373 | 51.2 | 23.5 | 9.6 | 2.2 | 5.5 | 4.2 | 1.5 | 2.2 |
|  | Female | 1,134 | 60.6 | 18.6 | 8.3 | 1.9 | 4.9 | 2.2 | 1.1 | 2.4 |
|  | Total | 9,507 | 52.4 | 22.9 | 9.5 | 2.1 | 5.4 | 4.0 | 1.5 | 2.3 |

## Toilets

Most farming households at the national ( 80 percent) and divisional ( 82 percent) levels, and female-headed households use flush toilets for exclusive use. Water-sealed toilets are used more in the Eastern and Northern Divisions where infrastructure is still lagging behind. No significant differences have been found in terms of male- or female-headed households.

Bua Province ( 64.4 percent) in the Northern Division and Lau Province ( 65.2 percent) in the Eastern Division reported the fewest flush toilets for exclusive use. This could be explained by the remoteness of these areas. Similarly, Bua also has the lowest ( 65.9 percent) of female-headed households with flush toilets compared to other provinces in the country.

## Electricity

At the national level, electricity is the main source of light in farmers' households where 71 percent of households use it. The second most important source of light is solar panel units, which are used by 25.1 percent of the total households. The Central ( 87 percent) and Western ( 79 percent) Divisions have more households using electricity since it is accessible, in comparison to the Eastern and Northern Divisions where electricity is limited to urban and perurban areas and solar power units are gaining popularity due to cheaper running costs.

In terms of differences between male- and female-headed households, despite electricity and solar panel units being the two most used sources of light, electricity is the most prevalent in female-headed households and solar power units in male-headed households. A possible explanation may be that women are less updated/ behind their male peers in terms of technology use or alternate energy sources.

Table O. Percentage distribution of male and female farming households by source of light

| Sex of head of <br> household | Electricity | Kerosene lamp | Benzene lamp | Solar power unit | Other |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Male | $69.5 \%$ | $2.2 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ | $26.2 \%$ | $2.0 \%$ |
| Female | $78.6 \%$ | $2.4 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ | $17.5 \%$ | $1.4 \%$ |

## Cooking method

A majority of farming households in Fiji use wood ( 76.6 percent) for cooking followed by kerosene ( 62.2 percent). At the divisional level, the Central Division reported the opposite, as more households use kerosene rather than wood for cooking. The Eastern Division has almost the same level of wood and kerosene use while the Western and Northern Divisions mostly use wood for cooking due to availability. In female-headed households, interestingly, both at the national and divisional levels, electricity is used as fuel for cooking since it is more accessible and convenient than other options.

In terms of household cooking fuel by province, households in the Bua Province from the Northern Division use the most ( 97.3 percent) wood for cooking, households in Kadavu Province in the Eastern Division use the most kerosene ( 94.2 percent), Rotuma Province has the highest ( 70.4 percent) use of liquefied petroleum gas (LPG) while Macuata Province in the Northern Division uses more electricity (27.6 percent). It is interesting to note that different provinces use different cooking fuels according to what is accessible in the area.

No significant differences have been found in terms of male- or female-headed for cooking method. In all the provinces, female-headed households seems to have the same trend as male-headed households except for in Lomaiviti Province in the Eastern Division where female-headed households have double the use of electricity than their male counterparts.

Table P. Percentage distribution of male and female farming households by source of light and geographic location

| Region | Fuel for cooking (Percentages) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Wood |  |  | Kerosene |  |  | LPG |  |  | Electricity |  |  | Other |  |  |
|  | $\stackrel{0}{\sqrt{5}}$ |  | $\frac{\pi}{0}$ | $\stackrel{N}{\Sigma}_{2}^{0}$ |  | $\stackrel{\Xi}{0}$ | $\stackrel{N}{\stackrel{N}{\Sigma}}$ | - | $\stackrel{5}{0}$ | $\frac{0}{\mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{J}}^{2}}$ | N | تِّ | $\sum_{2}^{0}$ | - | ज |
| Fiji Total | 77.8 | 68 | 76.6 | 61.8 | 64.7 | 62.2 | 46.8 | 50 | 47.2 | 11.5 | 13.2 | 11.7 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Central | 70.9 | 60.1 | 69.6 | 76.6 | 77.6 | 76.7 | 41.2 | 43.6 | 41.5 | 9.6 | 11 | 9.7 | 1 | 0.9 | 1 |
| Naitasiri | 77.9 | 68.9 | 76.9 | 74.2 | 76.7 | 74.4 | 32.4 | 32.1 | 32.3 | 7.7 | 8.4 | 7.8 | 0 | 0.2 | 0 |


| Region | Fuel for cooking (Percentages) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Wood |  |  | Kerosene |  |  | LPG |  |  | Electricity |  |  | Other |  |  |
|  | $\frac{0}{\sum_{2}^{\pi}}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{5}{0} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{0}{\Sigma_{2}^{2}}$ |  | $\frac{\pi}{0}$ | $\frac{0}{\sqrt[\pi]{x}}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{0}{\Sigma_{\mathrm{N}}^{2}}$ | $\stackrel{\text { \% }}{\text { ¢ }}$ | $\frac{5}{9}$ | $\frac{0}{\sqrt[\pi]{2}}$ | ご | - |
| Namosi | 79.6 | 73.8 | 79.1 | 70.4 | 62.1 | 69.7 | 47.5 | 43.7 | 47.2 | 11 | 11.7 | 11.1 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.1 |
| Rewa | 65 | 53.4 | 63.6 | 71.5 | 72.7 | 71.6 | 49.4 | 49.7 | 49.4 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 6.3 | 6.1 | 6.3 |
| Serua | 65.3 | 59.5 | 64.5 | 70.6 | 69.3 | 70.4 | 64.5 | 65.7 | 64.7 | 4.9 | 4 | 4.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Tailevu | 68.7 | 56.8 | 67 | 82.7 | 83.3 | 82.8 | 36.7 | 41.6 | 37.4 | 12.8 | 15.4 | 13.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Eastern | 89.6 | 74.9 | 88.6 | 85.8 | 84.1 | 85.7 | 33 | 40.9 | 33.6 | 6.5 | 16.4 | 7.1 | 0 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Kadavu | 95.6 | 89.8 | 95.4 | 94.2 | 93.9 | 94.2 | 35.1 | 38.8 | 35.2 | 0.5 | 0 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.1 |
| Lau | 91.8 | 79.2 | 90.8 | 80.1 | 83.8 | 80.4 | 21.2 | 24.6 | 21.4 | 1.3 | 3.8 | 1.4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lomaiviti | 88 | 75.7 | 86.9 | 87.3 | 87 | 87.3 | 35.1 | 46.3 | 36.1 | 17.7 | 33.3 | 19.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rotuma | 56.8 | 44.7 | 55.3 | 62.8 | 63.8 | 63 | 70.7 | 68.1 | 70.4 | 0.9 | 4.3 | 1.3 | 0.3 | 2.1 | 0.5 |
| Western | 75.3 | 69.6 | 74.5 | 67.1 | 70.1 | 67.5 | 52.7 | 53.7 | 52.8 | 9.7 | 10.8 | 9.9 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ba | 71.5 | 66.5 | 70.8 | 63.2 | 67 | 63.7 | 59.3 | 60.1 | 59.4 | 9.3 | 10.4 | 9.4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nadroga/ <br> Navosa | 74.9 | 67.1 | 73.8 | 72.3 | 73.8 | 72.5 | 51.2 | 53.5 | 51.5 | 12.8 | 14.1 | 13 | 0 | 0.1 | 0 |
| Ra | 89.7 | 86.7 | 89.3 | 70 | 73.7 | 70.5 | 32.4 | 29.6 | 32 | 5 | 4.7 | 5 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.1 |
| Northern | 83.3 | 72.6 | 82.2 | 35 | 36.7 | 35.1 | 48.6 | 52 | 48.9 | 16.8 | 19.5 | 17.1 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.5 |
| Bua | 97.6 | 93.1 | 97.3 | 30.8 | 31.8 | 30.9 | 44.1 | 49.3 | 44.5 | 3.2 | 1.8 | 3.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cakaudrove | 87.4 | 76.6 | 86.4 | 42.2 | 42.6 | 42.3 | 44.8 | 48.8 | 45.1 | 9.2 | 13.5 | 9.6 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.2 |
| Macuata | 75.1 | 66.2 | 74.1 | 30.2 | 34 | 30.6 | 53.3 | 54.6 | 53.4 | 27.7 | 26.5 | 27.6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## Household durables

Mobile phones are the most popular household durables in farming households at the national level (90.1 percent) and the divisional level since this is the fastest medium of communication with families in the country.

### 4.3.8. Land ownership and tenure

Information in this section applies to land under three categories: freehold land, land leased from the state and native lease land. The analysis of on distribution of those by sex of household reveals that out of 20,140 households and 20,342 owners/leasers in the three categories, 67.5 percent of the owners are men, whilst 9.8 percent are women and 23.7 percent are under the non-household label (owned by an institution).

In terms of area measured in hectares, men own 68 percent, women 6.7 percent and non-household 22 percent of the total land under these three categories.

Women have considerably less access to land than men and have access to owning only small pieces of land, with 13.8 percent of owners for land sizes under 1 hectare being women, whilst within the other categories women are below 8 percent and lower. The bigger is the land size, the smaller the number of female owners. In addition, the highest percentage of women is found is in the landless category, with $\mathbf{2 6 . 5}$ percent of all landless households being female-headed.

These numbers reflect the big gender gap that exists in term of access to land (either owned or leased), a key aspect for agriculture activity as a whole. Owners are able to determine what use they can give to their land within the current legislation, including long-term investments for production and productivity improvements, and can use land as collateral to obtain a credit.

Men and women ownership in the three categories is very similar with 34 percent of men and 33 percent of women owning freehold land, 15 percent of both leasing from the state, and 51 percent of men and 52 percent of women leasing native land.

### 4.3.9. Food insecurity

Food insecurity was estimated through the number of farming households by size of farmland and frequency of access to a balanced meal three times a day during last 12 months. It is important to consider that only those households with access to land ( 20.140 households) were asked the questions under this section.

Analysis of the census data shows that 42 percent of male-headed households and 32 percent of female-headed households always had access to a balanced meals three times a day during last $\mathbf{1 2} \mathbf{~ m o n t h s}$. Of the male-headed households, 53 percent and of female-headed households 60 percent responded they that sometimes had access to a balanced meal three times a day during last 12 months. Percentages in both male and female-headed households who stated that they never had access to a balanced meal three times a day during last 12 months were under 4 percent, and only 6 households said that they had missed some meals.

In terms of food insecurity and size of farmland, just 37.1 percent of farming households with less than 1 hectare of land and 11.5 percent of landless farming household responded that they had always had access to a balanced meal three times a day during last 12 months. This confirms the importance of access to land and size of land for the food security of the farming households, presenting the worst values when the household has a small piece of land or no land at all.

As shown in the previous section, women have access to smaller pieces of land than men or are landless, which suggests that the female-headed households may be exposed to a higher risk of food insecurity.
From data that combines number of households by size of farmland and frequency of access to balanced meal three times a day during last 12 months, it is evident that smallest sizes of farms (less than 1 hectare) present substantial differences between male and female headed households.

The analysis of the available data suggests that size of land is a much more important factor for influencing food insecurity at the household level than the number of members within the household. No substantial differences or consistent trends were found in this sense.

### 4.4. Laws, Policies and Institutions

As the FAO/SPC Country Gender Assessment acknowledges, women's roles in agriculture have remained invisible and the contributions of rural women to household and rural economies need to be better recognized and adequately reflected in policies, strategies, plans and programmes. The committee members responsible for this report have prepared this section based on data collected in the census and complemented with desk reviews. It refers to the main gender policy documents and initiatives included in section 1.2 of this report, and aims to briefly identify gaps in Fiji's current gender policy framework, with some references to the agriculture sector, outlining potential areas for improvement.

As a starting point, the committee members agreed upon the relevance of the gender policies and their usefulness as reference documents for the government and other stakeholders across the sectors, as well as entry points to facilitate joint work among different national and international agencies. The collaboration of the MWCPA with interested organizations to facilitate the implementation of these policies was acknowledged as well.

However, in terms of mainstreaming gender in other development policies, more awareness raising is needed among different government units as gender aspects are complex, involve many disciplines and may be difficult to explain in some contexts. Gender sensitive policy development, which has involved some degree of participation from different stakeholders, still has to be more inclusive and promote inter-sectoral coordination to get decisive support across the sectors.

The CEDAW report for Fiji in 2016 acknowledged that despite government investments in the development of services and infrastructure in rural areas, and a growing recognition that equality of women and girls is key to achieving real and sustainable development in Fiji, the impact of these development programmes on rural women and girls was yet to be assessed. The absence of a proper monitoring framework with indicators able to measure the progress and impact achieved in different areas is still weak, and an essential aspect to improve if measures to achieve gender equality and empower the women in Fiji across all sectors are going to be enforced.

Providing baseline information on gender gaps in the agriculture sector is essential for any further assessment, and this census report represents a substantial effort from the Ministry of Agriculture in this regard. Findings and recommendations of this report will inform future sectoral policies and strategies and will be helpful for improving the budget allocation for gender sensitive initiatives, which is not clearly distributed at the moment. Despite the availability of funds from international agencies, such as those from New Zealand, Canada and Australia (DFAT) and several United Nations agencies, there is room for improvement in terms of fund distribution and targeting.

Capacities of the staff from key ministries from the agriculture sector, both technical and related to procedures and protocols required, need to be reviewed. Officers working in areas or departments where gender issues are more relevant must be trained to develop the skills to mainstream gender in their regular activities. Capacities need also to be supported to make sure that the design, implementation and monitoring of the different initiatives includes gender aspects.

In terms of communication, senior officers should be sensitized to incorporating gender language in their speeches, especially when talking to the media. Gender officers should have the analytical skills to assist them in analysing data
for the reporting of their ministries projects and activities. Efforts should be made to ensure that available information and data are shared regularly, and that the turnover in staff does not affect this. The use of info graphics and other visual materials may help to create gender awareness for stakeholders and communities by facilitating the dissemination of key messages among a greater number of people.

## CHAPTER 5: FINDINGS

The analysis of the disaggregated Fiji Agriculture Census data confirms that men are more advantaged than women in many aspects concerning the agriculture sector.

Some findings are summarized below.

### 4.1.1. Agriculture household member demographics

- The total number of agriculture household members is 300,861 at the national level, of which 51.7 percent are men and 48.3 percent women. A total number of 246,373 are members aged 10 years old and above.


### 4.1.2. Farmer demographics

- A total of 83,395 people ( 33.85 percent) indicated that farming was their primary or secondary occupation and are identified in this report as farmers, with 85.6 percent of this total men and 14.4 percent of this total women).
- A total of 14,094 agriculture household members identified forestry as their primary or secondary occupation (48.8 percent and 51.2 percent were men and women, respectively). Both men and women seem to be equally engaged in forestry, which is more of a secondary occupation for men and women, especially for men, who mostly have farming as their primary occupation.
- A total of 4,513 agriculture household members identified fisheries as primary or secondary occupation, just 33.3 percent of these were women, which makes being a fisher a male predominated occupation.


### 4.1.3 Farmer occupation status

- Most of the farmers are unpaid family workers ( 59.8 percent) and self-employed ( 39.5 percent), suggesting a predominance of subsistence agriculture at the national level


### 4.1.4. Farmers by sex, age group and geographic locations

- The most populated group of farmers is in the age range $30-39$ years or $\mathrm{x}>29 \mathrm{yrs} \leq 39 \mathrm{yrs}$ ( 22 percent for both female and male farmers).


### 4.2.1. Agriculture household members performing agriculture tasks

- At least 188,768 people or 76.6 percent of the total agriculture household members aged 10 years old and above were performing tasks related to crops, and 28,719 or 11.7 percent performed tasks related to livestock.
- Of all female farmers in agricultural households, 74.1 percent aged 10 years old and above ( 88,034 women) perform some kind of agriculture task
- This suggests that although just 83,395 people declared agriculture as their primary or secondary occupation, most of the household members, 188,768 people (or the majority of the agriculture household members, 76.6 percent of them), are involved in agricultural tasks some way.
- In the case of forestry, although just 5.7 percent of the total agriculture household members declared it as their primary or secondary occupation, at least 74.3 percent of the total members and 73.7 percent of all female members aged 10 years old and above ( 87,537 women) are engaged in forestry to a certain extent.
- In terms of fisheries and aquaculture, 27.9 percent of the total agriculture household members, 29.5 percent of all farm household male members and 27.1 percent of all farm household female members above 10 years old perform tasks related to this sector.
- These differences suggest that agriculture (including crops, livestock, forestry and fisheries) may be underrated/ unrecognized as a formal occupation, specifically for women but also for men.


### 4.2.2. Roles of agriculture household members

- Differences between the kind of roles performed by male and female agriculture household members seem to be related to the involvement of men in a more commercial/profitable type of agriculture activity, with some degree of technical knowledge, and access to agricultural inputs and equipment.
- It has been found that activities in which women have higher involvement are more easily compatible with their chores in the household and their role in feeding the family. These activities may include taking care of poultry around the house or fishing for home consumption, and build on particular skills, such as processing home produce for sale or making handicrafts.


### 4.2.3. Roles of farmers

- Farming tasks are mainly performed by male farmers, suggesting that when considering the farmer population, female farmers have less participation in the agricultural tasks than when considering women's participation in the whole of the agriculture household member group.
- Similar data are shown for forestry and fishing, suggesting that the more professional/commercial/profitable the agriculture activity is (according to the information collected the activities that provide the highest cash/non-cash value) in farming, livestock, forestry or fisheries, the smaller women participation is.
- Similar conclusions to the previous section can be drawn with regard to the involvement of female farmers in certain tasks more compatible/related to their other responsibilities within the household.


### 4.2.4 Male- and female-headed farmer households - Crops

- Data showing much higher absolute numbers of male- than female-headed households in all crops are consistent with men dominating agriculture activity. For root crops, these numbers are 84,369 for male-headed households and 7,142 female-headed households.
- Vegetables, the second most ( 20 percent) grown crops for all households, are grown by 29.2 percent of femaleheaded households $(4,800)$ and 19.1 percent of male-headed households $(32,106)$. Although the total number of men is much higher, this gives an idea of higher involvement of female-headed households in growing vegetables.
- Kava is cultivated by 10.4 percent of male-headed households and 6.1 percent of female-headed households. This corresponds to just 997 female-headed households and 17,481 male-headed households, and is consistent with kava being a very profitable cash crop grown for export purposes, with men being more involved in commercial agriculture than women are


### 4.2.5. Male- and female-headed farmer households - Livestock

- Female-headed households follow the same trend at the national level for livestock, with 41.5 percent involved in poultry farming.
- This is consistent with chickens being a more common alternative for feeding the family in comparison with goats or pigs that are usually sold in the market or consumed on special occasions.


### 4.3.1. Level of education and agriculture education

- Differences between female and male agriculture household members at all levels of education are significant from year 1 to year 8, and in vocational education, where women are only 27.3 percent of the total group.
- However, when looking at the education figures for farmers, the numbers show that in this case women are considerably behind for all degrees. Female farmers have a considerably lower level of education than female agriculture household members whose primary and secondary occupation is not agriculture, forestry or fisheries.
- Just a small section of the agriculture household members attended agriculture education, and they were mostly men.
- Agriculture household members who had received agriculture training when the survey was conducted, considered agriculture neither their primary nor their secondary occupation. Farmers do not have many opportunities to attend trainings related to their primary/secondary occupation, and female farmers barely attend these trainings. This suggests a gender gap in terms of technical training in agriculture, forestry and/or fisheries.


### 4.3.2. Understanding of climate change

- Most of the agriculture households have an understanding of climate change with small differences registered between female-headed households and male-headed households.


### 4.3.3. Agriculture services

## Finance

- Just 5.9 percent of the households that took a loan/credit are female headed, and 12.7 percent of the borrowers are women. This percentage is higher for farms with less than 1 hectare (where 23.5 percent were women) and farms between 1 and 3 hectares (with 17 percent of female borrowers).
- For bigger farms, female borrowers are under 10 percent in all cases.
- With regards to access to finance, the smaller the farm, the more likely that women are the ones borrowing, and the bigger the farm the less number of women are borrowers. This shows that women are more involved in decisionmaking processes related to subsistence farming rather than commercial agriculture, which is consistent with women's level of participation in both agriculture types.


## Assistance in the last 12 months

- From the total households assisted, 8 percent of them were female headed and 92 percent were male headed.
- Assistance was mostly provided by the government and focused on small-size farms.
- In terms of targeting, numbers show that a higher percentage of female-headed households were attended by nongovernment organizations in comparison to government organizations.
- Women seemed to have more difficulties accessing assistance when it is facilitated through extension visits, provincial and district meetings, and meetings with other farmers. This may reflect women's difficulties in participating when meetings are held outside their communities. Other potential reasons may be not being informed of these meetings, which are usually attended by selected representatives, mostly men.


## Access to markets

- Of the total number of farming households accessing markets, 93 percent were male head and 7 percent female headed. Differences are as stark when looking at percentages within each group, 46.2 percent of the total maleheaded 28,899 households, and 25.3 percent of the total 8,445 female-headed households had access to markets. Still, the analysis shows a gender gap in terms of access to markets by the female-headed households.
- Numbers show that small boats and maritime vessels are used by a higher percentage of male-headed households, and female-headed households use buses in higher numbers. This can be an indicator of female-headed households being more reliant on public transport to access to market. It and can also be explained because there are less female-headed farmer households in maritime areas (where boats are used) compared to main land Viti Levu, where more female farmers are found as well as more buses and trucks to transport their products to the market.
- A higher percentage of female-headed households take less than 30 minutes to reach the market and a higher percentage of male-headed households take more than two hours, showing that male-headed households reach further locations for selling their products, possibly getting better market opportunities. It may also be related to male farmers willing/being able to take higher levels of risks and spend more time away from their households.


### 4.3.4. Use of farming equipment

- Most of the 60,691 households surveyed with farming as primary occupation used hand tools. Just 6.2 percent of the users of small machinery are women and 6.8 percent of the users for heavy machineries are women, making evident the gender gap in terms of use of any kind of machinery. In turn, this may suggest a more disadvantageous position of women in terms of productivity/efficiency.
- Of the users of small machinery, 96 percent own the equipment, with just a few borrowing, sharing or renting it. Of the total number of owners, just 4 percent are women. This gender gap in terms of ownership is consistent with the gender gap in the use of small machinery.
- For heavy machinery, 95 percent of the owners are men and 5 percent are women. In practically all cases, women only own tractors with just a few reported to own pick-up trucks. This data again reveals a gender gap for the use and ownership of heavy machinery.


### 4.3.5. Savings accounts

- Of the total number of farmers, 51.3 percent have a savings account, of which 88.8 percent are men and 11.2 percent are women. Differences when looking at percentages within each group are less, as the numbers of female farmers $(11,971)$ is much lower than their male peers $(71,424)$. In this case, 53.2 percent of all male farmers and 40 percent of all female farmers own a savings account, still showing a gender gap in terms of ownership of banking accounts for the farmer population.
- Most farmers having a saving account ( 98.4 percent) chose a bank account. Just 2.04 percent of the farmers in Fiji have their money in the Fiji National Provident Fund (FNPF), suggesting that an overwhelming majority of farmers do not use this coverage. This information is consistent with high levels of informality/subsistence in the agriculture sector.


### 4.3.6. Mobile phones

- Data show that 35.3 percent of male farmers and 45.5 percent of female farmers do not own a mobile phone, revealing a gender gap. Smartphone ownership has been identified as a key barrier for accessing the Internet and other related key agriculture services, such as price information, market opportunities or on-line trainings.


### 4.3.7. Household particulars

## House type

- In terms of male- and female-headed households, there is no big difference in house type, suggesting that geographical location is the most important factor influencing the kind of materials used to build a house in the rural areas of Fiji.


## Piped water

- Female-headed households prioritize better water services, which is consistent with the gendered division of labour in households in Fiji, where women manage water and sanitation related to their tasks as the family carer along with other household tasks.


## Source of light

- Electricity is the most prevalent source of light in female-headed households, and solar power units prevalent in male-headed households. A possible explanation may be that women are less updated/behind their male peers in terms of technology use or alternative energy sources.


### 4.3.8. Land ownership and tenure

- Out of 20.342 owners/leasers of freehold land, land leased from state and native lease land, 9.8 percent are women and 67.5 percent are men, while 23.7 percent is owned by an institution. Women have access to 6.7 percent of the total land under these three categories.
- The bigger is the land size, the smaller the number of female owners. The highest percentage of women is found in the landless category, with 26.5 percent of all landless households being female headed.
- These numbers reflect a big gender gap that exists in term of access to land (either owned or leased), a key aspect for agriculture activity as a whole


### 4.3.9. Food insecurity

- Only those households with access to land $(20,140)$ were asked the questions under this section.
- Of the households with access to land, 42 percent of male-headed and 32 percent of female-headed households always had access to a balanced meal three times a day during last 12 months.
- Just 37.1 percent of farming households with less than 1 hectare of land and 11.5 percent of landless farming household responded that they had always had access to a balanced meal three times a day during last 12 months.
- Given the importance of having access to land and the size of land for the food security of the farming household, and the existent the gender gap, female-headed households may be exposed to a higher risk of food insecurity.


## CHAPTER 6: THE WAY FORWARD

The findings of this report provide relevant and updated information for the government and other relevant stakeholders to work towards a more equitable agriculture sector. The recommendations presented in this chapter address some of the barriers identified in the previous sections and intend to increase the contribution of women to agricultural productivity and rural development, improving their lives and those of their families and communities.
Promote professionalization of female farmers in the agriculture sector
The report found that the more professional the agriculture activity, the smaller women's participation is. However, women perform many agriculture tasks in crops, livestock, forestry and fisheries. Based on the identification of the productive agriculture areas where women are already involved, prioritize assistance that enable women's engagement in commercial and semi-commercial activities. Some of the preliminary identified areas are in crops including vegetables, fruits, root crops and floriculture; in livestock including poultry, goats and pigs; in processing of produce for sale; in forestry activities related to voivoi and other spices and materials used for handicrafts; and in fisheries including freshwater fishing and making fish products at home for sale.

The assistance should be adjusted to the particular needs of each professional activity and include technical training, support for accessing to inputs, equipment and finance, and market information.

Increase technical education levels and technical assistance
The report shows that for both male and female farmers, the opportunities to access agriculture education are scarce. Strengthening male and female farmers' capacities and upgrading their skills related to technology, management, marketing, transport and developing networks is key to improving agriculture livelihoods. These programmes, which should issue competency certificates, can be part of vocational training offered to both men and women in order to facilitate better access to the labour market.

In particular, the promotion of women participation may increase if the method for accessing the assistance acknowledges the time that women can dedicate for training, the availability of childcare and the proximity of the training venues. Organizing the training when existing regular meetings of women groups take place in rural areas can be an effective way of involving them without requiring additional time from their busy daily schedules.

The report shows that the highest number of both male and female farmers trained is in the Northern Division. It could be worth exploring the reasons for this in order to learn best training practices and find ways to apply them to other geographical areas.

## Collaborative approach to close gender gaps in agriculture

Many agriculture institutions and units within the sector need to be involved in bringing about change and closing gender gaps in agriculture. The findings of this report should be disseminated among stakeholders as a good starting point for increasing their awareness of gender-equity and developing skills to close the gaps. Training on gender could start with basic concepts on gender roles, gender needs and stereotypes, and continue with a more advanced phase of training focused on gender analysis, gender budgeting, and gender mainstreaming in programme formulation and implementation, and monitoring and evaluation. This should be done in collaboration with the Government Gender Transformative Institutional Capacity Development Initiative in Fiji of the MWCPA.

Extension services are essential for providing technical assistance in the field and developing the capacities of government officers to address critical aspects of gender in the delivery of services, and are key to making progress. Training should include measures to empower women and increase their self-confidence to make valuable contributions to the sector. At the institutional level, the MoA and other ministries related to the sector should include basic sexdisaggregated data in their reporting formats. This would provide a means to monitor men's and women's participation in the different, and when women's attendance is low, they should be able to propose measures that may help to close this gap.
The Agricultural Marketing Authority of Fiji (AMA), operating under the MoA, plays an essential role in terms of providing employment and income-generation opportunities to the rural communities in Fiji. Gender-sensitive AMA officers aware of the findings of this report should propose actions that facilitate more equal access to markets from female- and male-headed households, for example, by reviewing the criteria used to establish clusters of farmers as a potential way forward.

Land is a fundamental asset for the development of agriculture activities. The engagement with the Committee on Better Utilization of Land (CBUL) programme to make them aware of new information related to inequality in land access and ownership could be a first step to promote equal access by men and women to land through agriculture leases. This would be a strategy to increase agriculture productivity as well.

## Access to finance and digital services

Government officers at the divisional level should collaborate with state banks and the private sector to carry out broad publicity campaigns targeted to rural women to promote services that can support them in obtaining credit at reasonable interest rates and acquiring insurance.

In addition, women need to increase their access to digital services and the Internet, fundamental for many agriculturerelated services including price information, market opportunities, on-line trainings, and banking.

## Raise gender awareness

Working in agriculture with a gender perspective will require the support of many stakeholders and should start with creating awareness on gender inequality among them. The results of this study must be shared with all the stakeholders in the government, non-government organizations and partners. Having reliable information on the development status of men and women at the national and divisional levels will help to develop and share coherent messages, adjusted to different audiences from the general public to community members, politicians and decision makers.

## Gender-inclusive policies and programmes

The aim of generating gender evidence is to inform policies and programmes that may contribute to closing the gap between men and women in the agriculture and rural sector. The MoA will develop a Gender in Agriculture Policy based on the findings of this analysis, which will mainstream gender and contribute towards reducing gender inequality in its programmes. In addition, the report information will facilitate the MoA's participation in the Gender Responsive Planning and Budgeting (GRPB) initiative for the budget submission this financial year.

Coordination with the National Women's Machineries, which are key institutional mechanisms for the advancement of women that play a critical role in the promoting and ensuring the implementation of CEDAW and BPA at the national level, and other partners, especially those ministries that are providing assistance at the community level, it is important to promote coherence and efficiency to avoid duplication.

Policies should help allocate appropriate resources to undertake gender actions and consider the importance of creating awareness among the ministries' staff, assessing the possibility of establishing gender focal points in key ministries and departments to implement gender action plans. Capacities of the responsible officers should be developed as well, including those related to planning, budgeting and monitoring, with indicators able to track changes and measure progress.
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## ANNEX 1. CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS

## Source: Census Manual

2.7.1 Farm - A household or Institution (agricultural holding) that has land utilized for agriculture (crop, livestock, fisheries and forest). The land may be owned, leased, occupied with traditional arrangements or occupied and farmed with no formal arrangement for its use.
2.7.2 Agricultural Household/Farming Household - A household is a small group of persons who share the same living accommodation, contribute their income and wealth to acquire certain goods and services and share the same eating arrangement. The same defines an agricultural household where the main economic activity identified is farming or practice of any agricultural activity (crop, livestock, fisheries and forest).
2.7.3 Institutional Farm - is defined as a farming unit managed or operated by a cooperative, group of individuals, institution, or government agency without regard to title, legal form or size. An institutional farm involves production of all crop, livestock, fisheries and forest produce. For the 2020 Fiji Agriculture Census (FAC), there were two types of agricultural holdings covered:
(i) Farming Household e.g. households in villages and settlements that practice agricultural activities.
(ii) Institutional farms e.g. Naboro, Navuso Agriculture School, village-owned fish ponds, large-scale farms. Enumerators were advised to consider the following criteria when identifying institutional farm:
I. Ownership: Consists of two or more individuals e.g. village projects

- Government owned, e.g. Naboro Correction Centre, government schools
- Farms owned by companies/corporations, e.g. hotels, large estates
- Large-scale farms, e.g. joint ventures


## II. Farm Output:

- Farm cash income - standard and equally shared
- Farm non-cash income - to benefit the community instead of individual households
- Farm produce - crop, livestock, fisheries and forest [fresh, no value added]


## III. Management:

The institutional farm should have a manager or chairperson as the head, coordinated by a committee or board. It should have a standard administration arrangement. An institutional farm should be registered.
2.7.4 Parcel - A holding parcel is any piece of land of one tenure type, entirely surrounded by other land, water, road, forest, etc. not forming part of this holding or forming part of it under a different form of tenure. A parcel may consist of one or more fields adjacent to each other. A field is a piece of land in a parcel separated from the rest of the parcel by easily recognizable demarcation lines, such as paths, and/or hedges. A field may consist of different plots. A plot is a part or whole of a field on which a specific crop or crop mixture is cultivated.
2.7.5 Land tenure - Land tenure refers to the arrangements or rights under which the holder operates the land making up the holding. The following definitions on land tenure were prepared as options
I. Freehold: Land that the household holds a legal formal title to.
II. Lease from the State (Crown Land): Land leased by the state or government
III. Native Lease: This refers to land operated with a lease arranged through the Native Land Trust Board (NLTB)
2.7.6 Land use - Land use refers to activities, such as growing crops, raising livestock or cultivating fish, carried out on the land making up the holding with the intention of obtaining products and/or benefits.

## ANNEX 2. COMPOSITION OF THE NATIONAL STEERING COMMITTEE OF 2020 FIJI AGRICULTURE CENSUS

| Position | Ministry | Role |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Permanent Secretary | Ministry of Agriculture | Chairman |
| Permanent Secretary | Ministry of Fisheries | Vice Chairman |
| Permanent Secretary | Ministry of Forestry | Vice Chairman |
| Chief Economist | Ministry of Agriculture | Secretary |
| Chief Executive | Fiji Bureau of Statistics | Member |
| Permanent Secretary | Ministry of Economy | Member |
| Permanent Secretary | Ministry of Sugar Industry | Member |
| Permanent Secretary | Ministry of Rural \& Maritime Development | Member |
| Permanent Secretary | Ministry of iTaukei Affairs | Member |
| Permanent Secretary | Ministry of Health and Medical Services | Member |
| Permanent Secretary | Ministry of Women, Children and Poverty Alleviation | Member |

ANNEX 3. COMPOSITION OF THE TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP OF 2020 FIJI AGRICULTURE CENSUS

| Position | Ministry | Role |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Chief Economist | Ministry of Agriculture | National Census Coordina- <br> tor/Chairperson |
| Director Crop Extension Division | Ministry of Agriculture | Member |
| Director Animal Health \& Production | Ministry of Agriculture | Member |
| Director of Planning, Policy and Research | Ministry of Sugar Industry | Member |
| Principal Economic Planning Officer | Ministry of Fisheries | Member |
| Senior Economic Planning Officer | Ministry of Fisheries | Member |
| Principal Economic Planning Officer <br> Senior Forestry Officer <br> Chief Statistician (Economics) | Ministry of Forestry | Member |
| Chief Statistician (Social Statistics) | Fiji Bureau of Statistics | Member |
| Principal Statistician | Fiji Bureau of Statistics | Member |
| Principal Economic Planning Officer | Fiji Bureau of Statistics | Member |
| Principal Research Officer | Ministry of Rural \& Maritime | Member |
| Development |  |  |
| Senior Women Interest Officer | Ministry of Women, Children | Member |
| Manager | and Poverty Alleviation |  |
| Ministry of Women, Children | Member |  |
| Director Development Services | Fiji National Food and | Member |
| Consultants | Nutrition Centre |  |
|  | Ministry of iTaukei Affairs | Member |
|  | UnFAO | Member |


| Section | Purpose | Data Items | SDG Linkage |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Household Composition | The purpose of this section is to determine households that mainly rely on agriculture as their main economic activity, and identify the population that considered farming or fishing or forest activity as their primary or secondary occupation and those that only assist in agricultural activities in Fiji. And also determine and analyse the role of women in the agriculture sector. Data collected from this section is also useful in determining the frame for special gender surveys and other agriculture-related surveys in the future. | Household Members - Sex, Relationship to Head, Age, Religion, Marital Status, Highest Education Completed, Mobile Contacts (Farmer, Fisher, Forester), Economic Activity (Primary Occupation, Secondary Occupation), Occupation Status, Involvement in Agriculture Activities, Savings, Attended any Agriculture Training, <br> Functioning Challenges |  |  |
| 2. Housing Particulars | Data collected in this section is useful for infrastructure development planning that could support the initiatives and plans of government agencies in the economic sector in promoting economic growth, employment creation, reducing poverty and ensuring sustainability of livelihoods of all Fijians who relies on agriculture as their main economic activity. This section is also useful in identifying vulnerable areas in farming and the depth of the impact that a disaster can create on farms and households, and is a project identification process that measures the impact of farming on the well-being of every agricultural household. | Household - Type of House, Type of Building Material for Outer Walls, Main Source of Water Supply, Use for Cooking, Type of Toilet Facility, Household Durables |  |  |
| 3. Land |  | Number of Pieces of Land Operated by Household, Location of the Farm Land [Province, District], Land Tenureship, Land Ownership, Number of Years of Operating Land for Agriculture Purpose, Land Area, Land-Use Type, Accessibility to Farm Land | 5 $\stackrel{\ominus}{\ominus}$ <br> $15^{4}$ <br>  |  |


| Section | Purpose <br> 4. <br> Crop <br> Production |  | Data Collected in this sec- <br> tion will be used as a sam- <br> pling frame for crop surveys <br> in the future and as a com- <br> plete enumeration census to <br> provide a unique opportunity <br> to determine the status and <br> structure of crop farming in <br> the country. Production data <br> in an agriculture census are | Type of Crops, Method of Planting, <br> Areas, Number of Plants, Production, <br> useful as benchmarks for cur- <br> rent crop production statistics <br> and determine the different <br> utilization rates of harvested <br> crops, and use of fertilizers <br> and chemicals, which is use- <br> ful in assessing and analysing <br> impacts on the environment. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Section | Purpose | Data Items | SDG Link |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7. Fishing | This section provides items that captured fishery activities conducted at the household level. It was not intended to cover the activities of largescale commercial fishing enterprises. <br> The items were collected either from fishers, who also have agricultural farms, or for other households as well when conducting a wider agricultural census. In this census, the items would be collected for fishers who do not have farms and also fishers who do have farms. In this case, the data collected should provide a complete frame of household capture fishery activities or a complete picture of household fisheries in the country. <br> These data would provide a more complete account of household fishing activities of the nation. Production data in an agricultural census are useful as benchmarks for current informal production statistics. | Area for Collecting Fish, Main Mode of Transportation to area of collecting fish, Methods of Fishing, Type of Fish, Production/Harvesting, Market |  |  |
| 8. Aquaculture | Data collected in this section are useful for assessing food and nutrition security in Fiji, income-generating activities in rural areas, and other economic indicators for both men and women from different age groups in rural areas. | Type of Aquaculture Farming Practiced, Type of Water Used for Aquaculture Farming, Type of Aquatic Organisms, Production/ Harvest, Market and Feed |  |  |
| 9. Climate Change | This section provided data on the farmers level of understanding on climate change, measures the level of climate change awareness platforms implemented by government agencies at the lowest administrative units per region, impact of climate change and causes of changes by geographical areas, adoption of climate change mitigation practices by farmers and species of trees planted for agroforestry. | Understanding Climate Change, Noticed or Observed any change by type, Causes of Change, Frequency of Occurrence, Climate Adoption/ Mitigation Practice | $13 \mathrm{cman}$ |  |


| Section | Purpose | Data Items | SDG Linkage |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10. Equipment | A broad concept of machinery and equipment is used for the agriculture census, covering all machinery, equipment and implements used as inputs to agricultural production. This includes everything from simple hand tools, such as hoes, to complex machinery, such as combine harvesters. However, the main interest centres on farm mechanization. <br> This section provided data on inventories of all farming equipment in the country, including baseline information used for impact/damage assessment of any natural disasters in the country, baseline information for providing rehabilitation assistance in terms of equipment after disasters, farm mechanization areas, ratio of farm to machinery by geographical area, which could be a challenge for moving towards commercial farming, number of farmers who own, hire and borrow hand tools, small machinery and heavy machinery, and total value of assets of the agriculture sector | Types, Quantity and Ownership of Hand Tools, Small Machinery and Heavy Machinery |  |  |
| 11. Agriculture Services | Credit for agricultural purposes refers to any type of credit approved and available for purposes related to the operations of agricultural holdings. This includes credit for purchasing crop and livestock inputs, constructing farm buildings and purchasing farm machinery. Credit not related to agricultural operations, such as for construction of the holder's house, for other family businesses or for consumption expenditure, should be excluded. Data from this section can also be used as a basis for evaluating Government (MoA) interventions over the years and status of farmers market accessibility in Fiji as we move towards commercialization. | Accessibility to Agriculture Finance (Source, Purpose and Responsible Member for Loan), Accessibility to Government Assistance, Accessibility to Market | $5$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2 \mathrm{~B} \\ 3 \\ 3 \end{array}$ |


| Section | Purpose | Data Items | SDG Linkage |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12. Household Food Security | Household food security refers to the situation in which all members of a household at all times are consuming enough safe and nutritious food for normal growth and development and for an active and healthy life. A household is food insecure if it is not able to procure enough food or if its members are unable to eat adequate safe or nutritious food due to limited resources. Food insecurity refers to conditions related to a household not producing enough food and not having enough resources to buy food. <br> This section can produce information that can assist planners and decision makers in evaluating the level of intervention by ministries over the years through programmes that procure and distribute planting materials, seeds and seedlings to the farmers. Also, will assist in evaluating, modifying and aligning existing policies, strategies and programmes that can improve food and nutrition security for all Fijians. | Have access to food to feed family a balanced meal three times a day? <br> A time when a household ran out of food because of a lack of money or other resources? |  |  |

For more information contact us at:


[^0]:    1 According to the preliminary result of the 2015 NNS, fresh fish is the main source of protein in the daily diet contributing $24 \%$ to the total protein intake of the Fijian population and a common source of protein in the Eastern Islands.

[^1]:    2 Voivoi (Pandanus caricosus) is traditionally used for weaving mats.
    3 Mulberry tree (Broussentia papyrifera) that has bark used for making bark cloths (masi).

[^2]:    4 http://www.fao.org/3/w9676e/W9676E01.htm\#:~:text=Most\%20smallholder\%20households\%20which\%20raise,only\%20 cattle\%2C\%20sheep\%20and\%20goats.
    5 Fiji Mission Report for TCP/SAP/3709/C5: Technical support for project development to enhance livestock production for food security and nutrition

[^3]:    6 Percentages do not add 100 percent, because some of the hand-tools users are also using either small or heavy machinery as well.

[^4]:    * Sum of male and female ownership does not tally with the total machinery own as these questions allowed for multi-selection.

