

Annex 11 – FAO's work in Fisheries and gender issues

1. Introduction

1. The Fisheries expert member of the Evaluation team assessed the work by FAO in the area of fisheries and aquaculture through extensive interviews in FAO HQ and interviews and direct assessment of related projects in four countries – Bangladesh, Philippines, Thailand and Uganda.

2. Overall, the Evaluation assessed 19 projects across the visited countries, 7 of which had been identified as GAD and 12 were selected from those on-going in the visited countries for comparison purposes led by the Fisheries Department (9), the Regional Office for Asia and Pacific (5). Further, it also assessed 22 GPGs, 12 of which had been identified as GAD and ten were selected randomly from the FI Web site.

2. Resources

3. During the evaluation period 2002-2010, total FAO resources for Technical Cooperation (TC) projects in the fisheries sector totalled just over USD 327 million dollars. Of this 18% was directed towards projects tagged as GAD. In addition, over USD 90 million was spent on emergency projects, of which 10% was deemed to be gender relevant.

4. For the purposes of this evaluation, 15 projects and programmes were examined. Of these, 12 were only concerned with the fisheries sector while the remainder involved both fisheries and work in other sectors. Six were regional projects focused on Southeast Asia; one a regional project concerned with Africa; two were based in Thailand; two were in the Philippines; three were in Bangladesh; and one was in Uganda. In addition, material relating to one regional project in West Africa was also referred to. Field visits were made to projects in Uganda, Bangladesh, Thailand and the Philippines. Throughout, the focus was solely on the gender aspects of these projects and not on more general aspects of the interventions.

5. Of the 15 projects examined, nine were not tagged as GAD/WID. However, this classification is questionable. In at least one case which was tagged as GAD, the project had little gender relevance. In others, projects were GAD relevant although the gender implications of the intervention were not recognized and should thus be considered Missed Opportunity. In other projects also tagged as non-GAD, a gender element had been introduced.

6. The Fisheries Department had committed through the two GAD Plans of Action to deliver Gender Mainstreaming Outputs; in the PoA 2008-13, these included gender sensitive guidelines, capacity development and technological information. In PWB 2010/11, the Department tagged 32 of its Products and Services (12%) as Gender Sensitive, which represented a 28% increase in number over the sum of the products planned in the previous PWB and in the GAD-PoA 2008-13.

3. Gender and fisheries in FAO Strategic Objectives and GAD-PoA

7. FAO's two Strategic Frameworks covering the evaluation period included little mention of fisheries. The 2000-2015 Strategic Framework made no direct linkage between fisheries and aquaculture on the one hand, and gender on the other. However, gender was mentioned in the wider context of development.

8. In the 2010-2019 Strategic Framework Strategic, Objective C covers this sector and aims at 'The sustainable management and use of fisheries and aquaculture resources'. Once again there are no direct references to gender, only more general comments on stakeholders, which presumably include women and cover gender relations. There is also a mention of fisheries under Strategic Objective F 'Sustainable management of land, water and genetic resources and improved responses to global environmental challenges affecting food and agriculture'. Again there is no direct reference to gender.

9. The Medium Term Plan for 2010-2013 also says little about gender in the context of Strategic Objective C. The only references are in the context of aquaculture, where capacity building is cited "*to facilitate adoption and implementation of FAO guidelines, focusing on rural sectors, small farmers and women*". There are also plans for the 'Support and promotion of small farmers' clusters and associations', emphasising the involvement of women and minorities.

10. Whilst the Gender and Development Plan of Action for 2002-2007 made no mention of the fisheries and aquaculture sector, its successor for 2008-13 contained a number of elements related to the fisheries sector. These included the elaboration of gender guidelines for fisheries and aquaculture as well as training for men and women on fish handling, quality control, enterprise development, bookkeeping and marketing.

4. Effectiveness, Impact, Sustainability of projects

11. As mentioned above, the Evaluation assessed 19 projects led by the Fisheries department, 7 of which had been identified as GAD and 12 had not. The assessment concluded that gender qualifiers were relatively correct although the non-GAD projects were a heterogeneous group: three of them were assessed as GAD in practice and one as WID, but most were considered Missed Opportunity. Overall, 4 out of 19 (21%) were assessed as non-GAD. Box 1 illustrates these data.

Box 1. Gender - sensitive assessment of projects in the Fisheries and Aquaculture sector: revised gender qualifiers

Evaluation qualifiers	GAD	WID	MO	Non GAD	Total
FAO qualifiers					
<i>Identified as GAD/WID</i>	5	1	0	1	7
<i>Not identified as GAD/WID</i>	3	1	5	3	12
Total	8	2	5	4	19
<i>Percentage within total</i>	42%	11%	26%	21%	

Source: Evaluation team

12. Two examples of projects where gender was not relevant both concerned aquaculture in Thailand. The first: 'Aquaculture Information Management System in Thailand-TCP/THA/3304' was a highly technical project concerned with GIS and the technical management of aquaculture to ensure sustainability and the demands of markets both within and outside Thailand. Although it could be argued that the long term implications of this

project might have gender elements, that was clearly beyond the competence of project planners or implementers to judge and potential benefits were likely to accrue to both men and women.

13. The second example is also concerned with aquaculture in Thailand: 'Certification of small-scale aquaculture in Thailand-TCP/THA/3202'. As its title implies, the objective of this project was to provide the means for certification and thus access to international markets for small scale producers. Again, there were no direct gender implications, and the project beneficiaries were both men and women with no gender disparities. However, this project had been identified by the Fisheries Department as GAD.

14. A third example where gender was probably irrelevant was: 'Developing a national shrimp seed certification system-TCP/BGD/3101'. Here again the project was highly technical and probably had no gender implications, although it was not clear what impact this certification system might have had on poor women who collect uncertified shrimp seed.

15. The second category of projects is those where gender has been ignored but should have been taken into account. Two examples of those projects were: 'Reducing the dependence on the utilization of trash fish/low value fish as feed for aquaculture of marine finfish in the Asian region- TCP/RAS/3203'; and 'Strategies for by-catch management-GCP/RAS/238/GFF'. In the first of these, the design of the project did not take into account the dependence of relatively poor women on supplying feed-fish for aquaculturalists. Their role was mentioned – and indeed pictures were supplied – but the implications for these women if the project were successful were not considered. The same points appeared to be relevant to GCP/RAS/238/GFF. This was despite the GEF advisory STAP panel pointing out that "*FAO and partners will need to undertake detailed ... social science analysis*". Here again, there was no analysis of how trash fish and low value fish were processed at present, and comparative evidence would indicate that almost certainly women were heavily represented in these activities. If these projects achieved their stated objectives, then it is probable that there would be a negative impact on some categories of women currently involved in post-harvest activities.

16. The third category of projects consists of those where a WID rather than a GAD approach was adopted. One example of this is 'Emergency response to cyclone Sidr affected farmers and fishers in the worst affected districts of Southwest Bangladesh- OSRO/BGD/703/BEL'. In this project it was clear that men and women were viewed as separate categories of beneficiaries, and no regard was taken of how gendered relations reinforced distinctions of power and economic inequality. Similarly Poverty alleviation through improved aquatic resource management in Asia–TCP/RAS/2908 appears to have adopted a WID approach but the evidence is too slight to come to a firm conclusion.

17. The final group of projects are those in which gender considerations have been integrated into project design and implementation. The first of these was 'Empowerment of coastal fishing communities for livelihood security- BGD/97/017'. Gender, or at least women, figured prominently in the design of the project. Although concerned with fishing communities, the project was less concerned with fishing *per se* than with community development and economic and political empowerment of both men and women. Here the stress was less upon narrow technical aspects of the fisheries or the post-harvest sector, but more upon the livelihoods of the people who to a greater or lesser extent were involved in fisheries. The relative success of the project appeared to be due to the inclusion of a gender specialist in project design and in the early stages of implementation, and a trained and committed project staff.

18. Another example was the 'Regional Fisheries Livelihood Programme (RFLP)– GCP/RAS/237/SPA'. This ambitious project focused on the livelihoods of artisanal fishing

groups in Southeast Asia, and a strong gender component focusing on the potential for women's economic and social empowerment was written into project design. Project staff members appeared to be strongly committed to the objectives of the project and its underlying values, and one early output from the project was a workshop on gender held in 2010. This workshop in part focused on discussing a draft field manual, 'Mainstreaming gender into project cycle management in the fishery sector'. This appeared to be the first comprehensive discussion of its type to be produced by FAO.

19. Whilst these two projects are firmly within the GAD category, there are others which are more difficult to classify. In some cases gender considerations enter into the projects either as a modification of the original conceptualization of the project or as an add-on. One of these is 'Sustainable management of the Bay of Bengal large marine ecosystem-GCP/RAS/236/GFF'. This project appeared to have had a long gestation period finally being established in 2010. Earlier conceptualizations of this project marginalized gender, but the final project document did include a fairly strong gender component, gender being 'retrofitted' into its earlier manifestations. This project was running alongside GCP/RAS/237/SPA (see above) and was benefiting from a degree of synergy between the two. However, whether gender issues are successfully integrated remains an open question.

20. In Uganda, FAO was implementing the project 'Increased supply of Mukene (*Rastrineobola argentea*) for human consumption-TCP/UGA/3204', which had a mixed GAD-WID approach. Although the primary focus was not on gender but on improving post-harvest fish handling, there were elements of the project which sought to empower women through actively encouraging and supporting female access to productive resources, including fishing gear. These elements were not supported through technical backstopping from HQ and the lack of gender-informed technical advice from HQ may limit the ability of the project to achieve its objectives.

21. In two cases the add-on approach to gender was apparent. One of these is 'Formulation of an integrated programme for fisheries and aquaculture in Africa-GCP/INT/073/SWE'. Here, women alongside youth were mentioned in the context of equity but there was little evidence as to how that equity was to be achieved. Thus although gender was mentioned, it is probably better to view this project as an example of a missed opportunity. Similarly, in 'Support to Safety at Sea for Small-Scale Fisheries in Developing Countries-GCP/GLO/200/MUL', mention was made of gender but precisely how gender issues were to be integrated into the project was left opaque. In this case it is probable that the project should be classified as not being relevant to gender.

22. One of the key issues emerging from an examination of these projects was how gender was conceptualized. Throughout, there was a tendency to equate gender with women, and what was presented as gender-sensitive activities were frequently aimed at women alone, ignoring the wider gendered context. This was particularly true of emergency and rehabilitation projects in Bangladesh, for example, OSRO/BGD/703/BEL mentioned above. Even in situations where a more nuanced or sophisticated understanding of gender informed project design – as in the case of GCP/RAS/237/SPA – the degree to which this understanding percolated down to the field level was questionable.

23. In countries such as the Philippines, it is not always the case that women in fishing communities form an underprivileged category, yet project staff members at times appeared to work on this assumption. One of the issues here was that women and men tended to be seen as an undifferentiated category, lumping together relatively rich and powerful women who owned resources with much poorer women who lacked access to productive assets.

24. This failure to institutionalize a satisfactory understanding of gender in project design and implementation severely limited the potential effectiveness of interventions in the

fisheries sector. Indeed, at times it could be a negative influence. In one project visited, weak gender analysis carried out by poorly trained specialists alienated other project staff and project beneficiaries.

25. Overall, a number of factors could be identified which limited the effectiveness of fisheries projects in pursuing gender equality as an objective. These include:

- a. Lack of training for project staff: there appeared to be little training for project staff even at the most minimal level on gender issues. Where project staff members had experienced training, this was often the result of previous employment with other agencies, and this training was often WID rather than GAD orientated (e.g. Bangladesh);
- b. Poorly qualified gender specialists: at the project level there was little evidence of well-trained social analysts or gender specialists who could understand the complexities of social relationships and that gender was important not only at the household level, or who could move beyond preconceived stereotypes (e.g. the Philippines);
- c. Pressure on FAO professionals: FAO staff from HQ lacked the time or the expertise on gender to effectively supervise the activities of project staff in this field (e.g. Uganda);
- d. An ethnocentric approach to an understanding of gender: it was claimed by some observers that the training materials and general approach to gender relations were too closely based on a particular cultural understanding of gender which was not appropriate to all situations (e.g. in the Regional Fisheries Livelihoods Programme);
- e. A focus on outputs rather than results: this led to a concentration on simple but shallow quantitative indicators - e.g. head counts; attendance at meetings - rather than to the results of the processes which are being measured (e.g. Bangladesh).

26. Most of these weaknesses stemmed from a lack of competent and informed FAO staff who could train and supervise project staff, rather than from a lack of awareness amongst FAO professionals of the importance of gender. Furthermore, it was clear that where there was national support – both formal and informal – for a gendered approach to development, then projects were likely to be more effective. Thus, although there were weaknesses in FAO projects in the Philippines, the general social and political context was such that the gender aspects of projects were likely to be relatively successful. In contrast, despite government support for gender equality, the social context in Bangladesh was more conducive to a WID rather than a GAD approach to development. This, coupled with relatively weak competence on gender issues amongst FAO staff, meant that the best that could be expected were woman-centred but not gender-centred outcomes.

27. In terms of the impact of FAO's overall gender objectives, in many cases there was insufficient evidence to come to any firm conclusion. Of the projects reviewed for the Evaluation, none appeared to have had a negative impact on gender relations, although there was a potential in some to affect negatively the economic position of poor women who did not control resources (e.g. TCP/RAS/3203). Certainly it was found that many interventions had worked to reinforce existing gender differences rather than transform these relationships. It has to be remembered that in the fisheries sector women are by no means always financially marginalized (e.g. they frequently control trade and may control productive assets); that financial empowerment does not ensure that women are not socially or politically marginalized; and that in some cases empowering interventions should focus on men rather than women.

5. Portfolio and assessment of GPGs

28. Between 2003 and 2010 the Fisheries Department (FI) produced over 880 publications of various sorts. These included the flagship biannual publication, 'State of the World's Fisheries and Aquaculture' (SOFIA), circulars, technical guidelines, reports, policy documents and statistical digests. For the purposes of the Evaluation, all editions of SOFIA were examined along with 12 documents tagged as GAD and 10 other randomly selected documents.

29. SOFIA is the flagship publication of the Fisheries Department, each edition focusing on a particular set of issues in the sector. In terms of gender, the quality of the SOFIAs varies greatly. The 2002 SOFIA had little to say on either women or gender, but since then greater interest in gender was visible, although to variable extent. The 2004 SOFIA called for gender mainstreaming in fisheries development, while the 2006 SOFIA had an extended discussion of HIV/AIDS in the fisheries sector, as well as a section on the influence of international trade in marine products on the role and status of women. The 2008 edition was less focused on gender issues and ignored the significance of gender in a number of areas, for instance in the use of by-catch and in the commercialization of small scale aquaculture. The 2010 edition reported on the findings of the World Bank-funded 'Big Numbers' project, executed in part by FAO, which estimated that globally at least 50% of those involved in the fisheries sector were women and that in the artisanal sector, especially inland fisheries and aquaculture as well as in post-harvest activities, women were particularly prominent. It also included significant data concerning the role of women as fish consumers and the potential for consumer-led demands feeding back into the processes of production and distribution.

30. Turning to the 20 GPGs identified as GAD by FI, the quality of output was highly variable. Although the documents scored well in terms of relevance for GAD, in terms of technical competence the score was only 3.7 and in terms of innovativeness, only 2.6. Although most deal with issues which require a gender analysis, they frequently fail to address gender in an analytical fashion, focusing on women rather than gender and often treating women as an add-on topic.

31. However, two products were outstanding. The first of these, 'Microfinance and aquaculture: guidelines and case studies' was published in 2003 and was an impressive treatment of the actual and potential role of women in financing aquaculture. The second 'Trends in poverty and livelihoods in coastal fishing communities of Orissa State, India, 2006' was an excellent example of how gender can be mainstreamed in an analysis of fisheries. These however were exceptional, and most others failed to deal with gender in a comprehensive fashion.

32. A random sample of 10 non-GAD GPGs was also analyzed. Although many of the issues addressed in these documents had a gender dimension, the technical quality of the GAD contents was low and there was little sign of an innovative approach to the issues involved. Overall, what stood out in these documents was a failure to recognize the importance of women as producers - for example, a document which made no mention of female fishers had a cover picture clearly showing a woman fishing - nor the significance of gender relations, e.g. in treatments of the impact of changing forms of technology.

33. Average scoring for both GAD and non-GAD GPGs is in Box 2.

Box 2. Assessment of FAO Global Public Goods for Fisheries and Aquaculture: average scoring

Criteria Type of products	Relevance of GAD to the topic (1-6)	Technical quality of GAD contents (1-6)	Innovativeness on GAD (1-6)	Potential impact as advocacy tool (1-6)	Potential impact as capacity development tool (1-6)	Links between GAD and social inclusion (1-6)	Number products
<i>Average scoring GAD GPG</i>	5.7	3.7	2.6	3.6	3.2	2.1	12
<i>Average scoring non-GAD GPG</i>	4.5	2.0	1.4	2.0	2.2	1.6	10
<i>Average scoring SOFIA</i>	4.4	2.8	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.8	5

Source: Evaluation team

34. It was notable in both sets of documents, but particularly in the non-GAD tagged set, that opportunities had been missed and that competent gender analyses would have improved the quality and relevance of the products. Furthermore, throughout the documents there was a tendency to equate gender with women, and thus fail to identify the often complex relationships between men and women in the production process and thus both the barriers to gender equality and the potential for changing these inequalities. There was a general tendency to see the role of women as being confined to the post-harvest sector, while the role of women as producers – for example in aquaculture or in the collection of aquatic products along the coast – was frequently ignored. Too often women were treated as an undifferentiated category, and frequently they were conflated with various disadvantaged or marginalized groups such as the young or ethnic minorities. In general, there was a tendency to deny women agency: the ability to act in terms of their best interests. And overall, the level of social analysis was decidedly weak.

35. Much of the normative output of FAO was set within the framework of the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries, which recognized the importance of managing the wider ecosystem within which fisheries is only a part. Furthermore, as the 2008 publication 'Human dimensions of the ecosystem approach to fisheries: an overview of context, concepts, tools and methods' recognized, the human population is an intrinsic part of this ecosystem. Yet as far as men and women are concerned, there has been little attempt to integrate gender into the analysis. Thus the 2008 paper went no further than listing gender as a factor which had to be considered. A more recent publication, 'Ecosystem approach to fishing and aquaculture: implementing the FAO code of conduct for responsible fisheries', only mentioned women and gender in passing, as did the 2009 'Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries and Indigenous People: an Operational Guide'.

36. Despite these criticisms, there were positive aspects to the way in which gender had been approached by FI. There was clearly a growing awareness of the importance of gender and an acknowledgement of the critical role of women in the overall productive process. In 2007 FAO published a policy brief on 'Gender Policies for Responsible Fisheries'. This document outlined clearly and succinctly the major features of a comprehensive gender-aware approach to fisheries. It arose out of the Sustainable Fisheries Livelihood Programme based in West Africa which produced a series of important publications on gender and HIV/AIDS in the fisheries sector. The relevant sections of the 'Gender in Agriculture Sourcebook' jointly

published with the World Bank and IFAD in 2009 also showed a sophisticated understanding of gender in the fisheries sector.

37. In sum, as far as fisheries and gender are concerned, the FAO GPGs that were assessed were very mixed and contradictory. Some showed great sensitivity towards gender and an appreciation of the importance of understanding gender relations in the context of development. Others showed a remarkable disregard for gender analysis. Overall, there were a number of common issues which should be addressed. These include:

- a. When gender was mentioned, the focus was usually on women rather than women and men. Whilst the arguments were couched in terms of GAD, in practice a WID approach was adopted;
- b. Women tended to be treated as an undifferentiated category. Little attempt was made to differentiate between, for instance, rich and poor women; women who had partners and those who did not. Discussions of gender frequently focused on female-headed households rather than on more complex households;
- c. Women tended to be categorized alongside various marginal groups, for instance ethnic minorities, youth or the very poor. As a result women were frequently presented as victims rather than as active agents;
- d. In most cases the quality of the social analyses in the GPGs was poor. The stress throughout was on technical issues, the social (including gender) being treated as of marginal interest and frequently as a 'barrier' to technologically-led development.

6. GAD awareness and competence among staff

38. As a whole, the FI saw itself as gender-aware. In part they argued that gender awareness was essential in the fisheries sector because of the common existence of a division of labour in the sector between men as primary producers and women as handling the post-harvest sector. Gender was written into the structure of the fisheries sector. Some individuals took a more nuanced position, recognizing that women were at times directly involved in primary production in riverine and estuary situations, which involve not only fish but also products such as seaweed, crustaceans and other non-vertebrates.

39. The FI also pointed to their GPGs, arguing that the 'Code of conduct for responsible fisheries' had provided the platform on which more recent thinking on gender had been developed, for instance the 'Gender policies for responsible fisheries' and the fisheries components in the 'Gender in Agriculture Sourcebook'. Moreover the gender elements in the forthcoming 'Good practices in the governance of small scale fisheries', which was presented to COFI in February 2010, moves beyond the frequent identification of men with fishing and women with post-harvest activities. Staff also pointed to the on-going production by the RFLP of a field manual on 'Mainstreaming gender into project cycle management in the fishery sector' and to the gender elements in the projects managed by the Department.

40. The Fisheries Department also stressed the linkages and relations with external agencies as evidence of its internal awareness of gender issues. For example, FAO is a sponsor of the 'Third Global Symposium on Gender in Aquaculture and Fisheries' (using funds made available through the multi-disciplinary award scheme), to be held in Shanghai in 2011, which itself was a product of the FAO-sponsored 2008 Global Conference on Small Scale Fisheries. Moreover, FAO works in conjunction with Worldfish and the World Bank through such organizations as PROFISH in gender-related fisheries activities and also has close relations with civil society organizations with a strong gender interest, for example the International Collective in Support of Fishworkers (ICSF).

41. Yet while there was certainly a strong public commitment to gender awareness and gender sensitivity within the department, there were still major issues which have to be resolved. There was still a tendency to view gender as being solely a matter concerning women, and to take a WID rather than GAD approach to development issues. Furthermore, there was a tendency to focus on the household and not on the wider set of relationships – including gender – within which the household is set. So for instance, interventions which affected the balance of gender relations within the household might also affect relations between men and women in the wider community.

42. There was also the perception from project personnel that support and advice in the context of gender was lacking. Thus, although there was a strong rhetoric in support of a gendered approach to development interventions, in practice this was not backed up with concrete assistance, partly through lack of resources, and partly through lack of expertise. Where gender issues were addressed, it appeared to be the result of individual interest and commitment rather than the institutionalization of gender awareness and competence into the Fisheries Department as a whole.

43. In part these problems are the result of the absence of professionals with the requisite skills within the Fisheries Department. There are no specialists professionally trained in gender analysis or indeed in social analysis within the FI; these functions are performed by professionals trained almost entirely within the “hard” sciences. This weakness is recognized by at least some staff members within the department, who are aware of the very different intellectual traditions of the two sets of sciences and of the difficulties in integrating them effectively. The result, at least as far as gender and social analysis is concerned, is that FI is not considered by other agencies as a world leader in gender issues. The Department appears to be heavily reliant on external consultants for an understanding of matters relating to gender, and the lack of expertise within the department limits its ability to control quality. It also encourages the production of over-simplistic manuals and guides to gender and social analysis.

44. This raises the issue of whether or not FI should raise its profile in the context of gender and social analysis. One option mentioned was for a post to be funded from elsewhere in FAO with the remit of championing gender issues and analysis within the fishery sector,¹ but it is unclear where funds would come from. A second was for FI to fund the post, or part of a post, if gender became a real corporate priority. A third option mentioned within the department was for FI to focus on those areas of expertise in which it has a clear comparative advantage, and then partner with agencies and organizations which do possess clear advantages in the context of gender and social analysis. To a certain extent this is already the case in that FI appears to rely heavily on ICSW and agencies such as Worldfish and the World Bank for inputs on social and gender analysis.

7. Relation with ESW and GFP's work

45. No uniform picture of the relationship between the FI and ESW emerged during the course of the Evaluation. Some respondents saw their relationship with ESW as positive and beneficial and went to ESW for advice on gender-related issues. So for instance the RFLP approached ESW for advice on gender tools. Others were much more critical, claiming that it was difficult to obtain advice from ESW, and that ESW appeared to be overwhelmingly

1 The model for this is a post funded by TCE in order to raise awareness and competency in FI to deal with emergency and rehabilitation activities.

concerned with its own internal interests rather than acting as a service unit for other departments in FAO. A few indicated that ESW had set itself too ambitious an agenda and simply did not have the resources to meet all the demands made on it.

46. Where relationships with ESW were good, this appeared to be the result of personal contacts and relations between individuals in the FI and ESW. At an institutional or organizational level there seemed to be a lack of meaningful cooperation and coordination between the departments. And while people were aware of SO-K, there was little interest in it or how it might affect their activities.

47. In FI there are two GFPs and three alternates. All of them are at P3 or P4 level. Whilst all claimed to be committed to their role, they expressed disquiet at the lack of training and resources. The degree to which they are consulted by their colleagues varied, again the crucial factor appearing to be personal contacts and relationships.

8. Conclusions

48. Overall, the Fisheries Department had made attempts to include gender in its operations but it was only partly successful. In the gender context success was greatest where the Department adopted an approach stressing household livelihoods. It was much weaker when the focus was upon technical issues and the implications of these technical solutions on social relationships (including gender) were sidelined. This tendency was intensified by a general focus on outputs such as scientific knowledge, improved fish catching techniques and more hygienic harbours, rather than on outcomes or impacts, for example higher incomes in rural areas or empowerment of women in rural communities.

49. There was a degree of willingness to take gender seriously but in the absence of available expertise, gender was either ignored if it were not immediately clear that it was an issue, or reduced to being a matter of women and women alone. In the absence of specialized gender expertise, there was still a tendency to take recourse in stereotypes that, for instance, equate men with fishing and women with the post-harvest sector or assume that there was a universal asymmetry in power relations between men and women.

9. Steps forward

50. All recommendations stemming from the discussion above formed the basis for the Evaluation's recommendations. Two broad recommendations which are made in the main report are particularly pertinent to the fisheries sector:

- I) There is a need to adopt a rigorous results-based approach to project management. Only too often the projects focus on outputs and as a result fail to realize the gender impacts which are likely to result.
- II) Social expertise, including gender expertise, is required within the department. Reliance on ESW or consultants does not appear to be sufficient to meet the department's needs, and the alternative of outsourcing all social expertise appears overly drastic and administratively difficult. High level expertise would lead to a more sophisticated understanding of the contexts within which projects are situated and greater awareness of gender issues, and would also assist in ensuring a more results-based approach to project design and implementation.