

April 2012



منظمة الأغذية  
والزراعة للأمم  
المتحدة

联合国  
粮食及  
农业组织

Food and  
Agriculture  
Organization  
of the  
United Nations

Organisation des  
Nations Unies  
pour  
l'alimentation  
et l'agriculture

Продовольственная и  
сельскохозяйственная  
организация  
Объединенных  
Наций

Organización  
de las  
Naciones Unidas  
para la  
Alimentación y la  
Agricultura

## EUROPEAN COMMISSION ON AGRICULTURE

### Thirty-seventh Session

Baku, Azerbaijan, 17 and 18 April 2012

### Agenda Item 5

## CLOSING THE GENDER GAP IN AGRICULTURE - THE NEED TO STRENGTHEN DATA COLLECTION, ANALYSIS AND DISSEMINATION INCORPORATING A REPORT ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE WORKING PARTY ON WOMEN AND THE FAMILY IN RURAL DEVELOPMENT (WPW)

### Executive Summary

This document presents the results of an extensive research on the socio-economic status of rural women and men that, in line with The State of Food and Agriculture (SOFA) 2010–11, explored the degree of the gender gap in agriculture in selected countries of Eastern Europe and Central Asia (Albania, Bulgaria, Georgia, Kazakhstan, the Republic of Moldova, and Tajikistan). The paper acknowledges the constraints on providing a comprehensive analysis due to the lack of sex-disaggregated data in the agricultural sector in the Region. In addition, the document includes a report on activities of the FAO/ECA Working Party on Women and the Family in Rural Development (WPW) in the 2010–11 biennium and January/February 2012.

### Guidance Sought

- Note that, in line with the findings of the FAO State of Food and Agriculture (SOFA) 2010–11 report, providing women with the same access as men to agricultural resources and inputs may raise yields significantly, and thus contribute to poverty alleviation; however the general lack of sex-disaggregated data in agriculture hinders the full understanding of the status of rural populations and the possible gains of closing the gender gap in Europe and Central Asia.
- Urge member countries to cooperate with the FAO Regional Office for Europe and Central Asia (REU) on awareness-raising and capacity development in the ministries of agriculture and national statistical offices in the field of collection, analysis and dissemination of sex-disaggregated data in agriculture, and related core gender indicators.
- Within the framework of revitalizing the FAO/ECA Working Party on Women and the Family in Rural Development, urge member countries to further review and discuss the proposals of the WPW Secretariat, which have been endorsed by the Board, for: a) the creation of a National Gender Focal Point in the Ministry or relevant national institution; b) the revised roles and responsibilities of the Board and Secretariat of the WPW; and c) a new name for the WPW.

*This document is printed in limited numbers to minimize the environmental impact of FAO's processes and contribute to climate neutrality. Delegates and observers are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and to avoid asking for additional copies. Most FAO meeting documents are available on the Internet at*

*www.fao.org*

## I. INTRODUCTION

1. The State of Food and Agriculture (SOFA) 2010–11 “Women in agriculture: closing the gender gap for development” shows that agriculture is underperforming in many developing countries and one of the key reasons is that women do not have equal access to inputs and resources they need to be more productive. To support this argument, the SOFA 2010–11 presents data on the gender gap (i.e. inequality) in accessing land, livestock, farm labour, education, extension services, financial services and technology. It also shows that providing women with the same access as men to inputs and resources could raise yields on women’s farms by 20–30 percent. This could increase national production by 2.5–4.0 percent, which in turn would decrease the number of undernourished people in the world by 12-17 percent.
2. The SOFA 2010–11 draws on empirical evidence from developing countries in most regions, but strongly emphasized sub-Saharan Africa, Asia and Latin America. With the exception of a few references to Tajikistan, no data on other countries from Central Asia and Eastern Europe are included.
3. This document presents the main findings of an intensive literature and data research carried out by FAO within the framework of the WPW, to assess the socio-economic status of women and men in the rural sector of countries in the Region. In line with the SOFA, the main objective of this research was to discern whether there remain substantial gender gaps in formal labour markets; between female and male-headed households; and in the access to, control and use of productive resources, including education, land, livestock holdings, agricultural inputs, credit and markets.
4. Moreover, the paper acknowledges the constraint on providing a comprehensive analysis due to the general lack of sex-disaggregated data in the agricultural sector. The work carried out by FAO to enhance the collection, analysis and dissemination of sex-disaggregated data, including a proposal on a core set of gender indicators, is presented for information.
5. The present document also includes a report on the activities of the WPW, subsidiary body of the European Commission on Agriculture (ECA), in the biennium 2010–11 and during January/February 2012.

## II. THE GENDER GAP IN AGRICULTURE IN EASTERN EUROPE AND CENTRAL ASIA

6. Due to time, resource and data constraints, the research focused on six selected countries: Albania, Bulgaria, Georgia, Kazakhstan, the Republic of Moldova and Tajikistan. FAO has insufficient information to state whether this sample is representative of the region; however, the geographical distribution should give an adequate picture of socio-economic status. The sources of information were the websites of the national statistical offices, specific country and thematic reports available on the internet, other library publications, the FAO flagship publication: SOFA 2010–2011 “Women in agriculture: closing the gender gap for development”, and “Demystifying the Agricultural Feminization Myth and the Gender Burden”, by Gustavo Anriquez (2010).
7. The summarized research paper is some 30 pages long, and this document only provides a very general overview, with key findings, conclusions and recommendations:

### A. *Rural Labour Force*

8. In the six countries considered, 62 percent of men and 47 percent of women are employed or looking for work, although differences across countries are more extreme: for men, the labour force participation ranges from a low in the Republic of Moldova of 45 percent to a high in Kazakhstan of 76 percent, for women, a low of 30 percent in Tajikistan to a high of 66 percent in Kazakhstan. There

remain difficulties, however, in accurately counting female labour participation as the high number of “inactive” women (average 53 percent) appears to conceal women working in productive or reproductive activities on their own account and/or as unpaid family labour. Further time use data are required. Following the above general picture, the table below shows data that are more specific to the rural labour force.

**Table 1: Rural Employment**

Country	Total Rural Population	Total Rural Employment	Rural Women to Men Ratio	Employed Adult Rural Women to Men Ratio	% of Employed Rural Women
Albania (2011)	1,527,280	506,664	94.6*	96.0*	48*
Bulgaria (2010)	2,129,799	711,900	103.7	96.1	48.1
Georgia (2011)	2,097,900	1,097,100	103.0	87.5	47.5
Kazakhstan (2010)	7,428,600	2,370,000	108.0	95.0	47.3
Republic of Moldova (2011)	2,177,800	605,000	104.9	99.0	49.5
Tajikistan (2009/10)	5,542,100	1,451,177	99.0	37.8	32.3

Source: Albania: \* Based on G. Anríquez calculations for Albania, other data from INSTAT, Albania, Table 2. Bulgaria: National Statistical Institute (NSI), Tables 6 and 10. Georgia: National Statistics Office of Georgia (GEOSTAT), Tables 3–4, and the population census of 2002. Kazakhstan: Statistical Yearbook Kazakhstan, 2009 (SYK), p.16, van Klaveren pp.24–25, Workers' Movement of Kazakhstan, 2010 (WMK), p.7. Republic of Moldova: Labor Force Survey, 2011 (LFS). Tajikistan: Living Standards Measurement Survey, 2007 (LSM), pp. 99–101, Women and Men in Tajikistan, 2007 (WAM) p.43, Tajikistan in Figures, 2010 (TIF) p.27.

### **B. Rural Household Types**

9. There is a clear need to distinguish between female-headed households (FHHs) and male-headed households (MHHs) when investigating a gender gap. This is because FHHs tend to have less access to productive resources than their male-headed counterparts, and tend to be poorer. Furthermore, the increasing prevalence of FHHs calls for such specific analysis.

10. Just over 19 percent of all rural households are FHHs, although this varies from just over 7 percent of rural households in Albania and the Republic of Moldova to nearly 36 percent in Kazakhstan. Unfortunately, timeline studies that confirm that FHHs are increasing in these countries could not be found.

11. In any case, regarding FHHs, it is equally important to note the distinction between *de facto* households that are headed by females because the male person is absent (e.g. the wives of male migrants), and the more vulnerable *de jure* households that are headed by single, widowed, divorced, or separated women. In the six countries under review, the outmigration of males for work is a clear cause of *de facto* FHHs. *De jure* female household headship is positively correlated with the prevalence of women in the older age cohort (as widows). FHHs are normally poorer than their MHH

counterparts, in part, because of higher dependency ratios (i.e. working adult to dependent children or elderly), and a smaller household size (i.e. because of a missing working adult).

### ***C. Productive Resources***

12. Most information about productive resources is not sex-disaggregated in national statistical bases, and most of the information in this research is drawn from small studies or regional surveys.

13. Education/Human capital. While there may have been past gender disparity in formal educational attainment in some of these countries, to the detriment of women, the information presently available from official country statistics from all six countries clearly demonstrates that there is gender parity in literacy and in levels of education attained, except for Tajikistan, where boys averaged two years longer in school than girls, as of 2008. However, no data could be found on potential disparities in agricultural based training for men and women – as for example, through farm visits by crop or animal specialists.

14. Land: Generally speaking, MHHs in developing regions tend to have 2-3 times larger landholdings than those of FHHs. In the six countries analyzed in this document, data from the sources cited above, indicate that FHHs own about the same amount of land as their MHH counterparts in Bulgaria, Kazakhstan and the Republic of Moldova. However, in his 2010 review, Anriquez found that MHHs in Albania, Bulgaria and Tajikistan held between 20 percent to 30 percent more land than their FHH counterparts. In any case, the amount of land owned or controlled seems less important than the amount of land that can actually be utilized. In this regard, the 2005 study of Bulgaria, Kazakhstan and the Republic of Moldova showed that, on average, the FHHs used less land than the MHHs, and they were more likely to rent out land to other users, because they did not have the resources to utilize their full holdings themselves.

**Table 2: Some characteristics of small-scale farming households**

Item	Albania	Bulgaria	Georgia	Kazakhstan	Rep. of Moldova	Tajikistan
MHH	92.6%	78%	71%	64%	92.6%	81.7%
FHH	7.4%	22%	29%	36%	7.4%	18.3%
Avg. family size/persons	3.5	3.0	3.4	4.0	3.5	6.5
Farm plots privately owned	N/A	90%	65%	80%	99%	68%
Farm plots rented or shared	N/A	10%	35%	15%	0.6%	32%
Avg. family holding/ha.	N/A	1.62	N/A	22.54	2.51	N/A
Avg. size of farm plot/ha.	N/A	1.56	1.05	1.72	0.25	1.50

Dudwick, et al., 2007, for data on Bulgaria, Kazakhstan and the Republic of Moldova. Numerous other sources. Georgia: GEOSTAT First Agricultural Census, 2006. Kazakhstan: World Bank, Dimension of Poverty in Kazakhstan, 2004, p.22, Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey, 2006 (MICS), pp.2, 18, 69, and Kazakhstan Summary of Poverty, 2010, Table 2. The Republic of Moldova: Household Budget Survey, 2010, (HBS) pp.26–29, \* 70 percent are FHHs.

15. Livestock: plays an important role in supporting women caring for their families (for example, with dairy and poultry products for home consumption). Livestock provides security for the household against income fluctuations. This is particularly true of small livestock, which are normally under the

control of women. Unfortunately, specific information on the role of large or small animal production in the rural household economies, disaggregated by sex, in Eastern Europe and Central Asia is not easily found. However, studies for Albania, Bulgaria and Tajikistan show that the livestock holdings of MHHs range between 30 to 50 percent higher than FHHs.

16. Agricultural inputs: MHHs are more likely than FHHs to use fertilizers, improved seeds, mechanized equipment and irrigation. This is true for the two countries in the present study for which such information is available: Albania and Bulgaria. Unfortunately, sex-disaggregated information on such input usage for the other four countries could not be found. The inequality in input usage might be caused by lower purchasing power, or more binding time constraints on FHHs. It might also be partially caused by lower access by women to newer technologies, training and labour. Regardless of the cause, the under-usage of agricultural inputs by FHHs contributes to the lower income levels for rural FHHs as compared to their male counterparts.

17. Markets: Households selling their farm produce in markets were, on average in recent years, 60 percent of FHHs and 80 percent of MHHs in Albania, 40 percent and 48 percent in Bulgaria, and 41 percent and 48 percent in Tajikistan. Nevertheless, even though these appear to be fairly high percentages of households accessing markets, the data does not really provide information on the quantity of goods sold or the monetary value of such sales. Further, access to markets is an issue if the smallholders manage to produce a surplus for sale. Overall, it appears that income from selling throughout the six countries under review does not exceed 10 percent of all income in any given year for rural households, on average.

18. Credit: There do not appear to be legal restrictions on women accessing formal credit, and they apparently do in significant numbers. In Georgia, a 2004 study showed that women were 50 percent of credit union members, and that about 65 percent of these had obtained loans as of that year. Likewise, in Tajikistan in 2006, women received 42 percent of all micro loans made in the country. No information could be found concerning the amounts of funds accessed and how (i.e. collateral, joint signatures, etc.), or how these funds were used by the rural families. Without these kinds of data, it is very difficult to assess the value of formal credit sources.

#### ***D. Income Sources***

19. Within the six selected countries, the available household budget surveys indicate that both urban and rural household budgets are derived from a number of basic sources, and these would apply to FHHs or MHHs, although data disaggregated by type of household on these income sources is extremely rare.

20. Income derived from paid employment is the largest source of household income in five of the six countries, the exception being the Republic of Moldova, where it is the second highest source of income. However, this is not the case in rural households for which the information is available, i.e. Albania, Georgia and the Republic of Moldova, and it is presumed not to be the case in the other three countries. Among the reasons for this is that there are far fewer jobs available in rural areas, rural salaries are always lower than urban salaries regardless of occupation, and the agriculture sector offers just about the lowest salaries of all occupations for formal employment. In the end, the income derived from formal employment in rural areas is about 50 percent less than that received by their urban counterparts.

21. For rural households, self-employment is the first or second most important source of income. Most commonly, these sources of income for agricultural families are derived from own production on agricultural farms or household plots. Own production constitutes 19 percent of the total income for rural families in the Republic of Moldova, 25 percent in Kazakhstan and 66 percent in Tajikistan.

22. Pension payments are particularly beneficial to women. In recent years, for example, 66 percent of pension recipients in Georgia, 53 percent in Tajikistan, and 71 percent in Kazakhstan were women. A pension is a good contribution to household income if a pensioner lives in a household with

at least one other income earner. This might help to explain why in 2002 35 percent of all rural households in Kazakhstan had a woman of pensionable age residing in the house.

23. When considered at the national level, remittances are a substantial source of financing for households in the countries under review. However, in reality, rather few households actually benefit from this sort of income. In Georgia, in 2010, for example, just 11 percent of households actually received remittances. Nevertheless, for families that do receive remittances, the impact can be extraordinary. In Georgia, 39 percent of the households receiving remittances were female-headed. In particular, for the rural families, this income has positive effects on the acquisition of more land, on small business activities, and on improved health care, as well as on general household food security. In Albania, the impact of remittances is very high for rural families as its contribution to the total household income is three times higher than it is for urban households. Nearly 50 percent of all income in single-parent households in Albania is derived from remittances. In the Republic of Moldova, remittances provided 31 percent of all income for FHHs.

24. It must be noted that many of these FHHs that receive remittances are probably *de facto* FHHs, precisely because the adult males have left for work in another country. In Tajikistan, 91 percent of the migrants were males in 2009 – and 24 percent of these men were heads-of-households.

**Table 3: Average monthly salaries: Total (all surveyed positions/professions);  
Rural (salaried agricultural workers)**

Country	Total		Rural	
	F	M	F	M
Bulgaria (2006)	\$235.66	\$270.63	\$169.93	\$153.85
Georgia (2011)	\$297.00	\$518.00	\$167.00	\$257.00
Kazakhstan (2008)	\$298.98	\$436.02	\$169.75	\$234.25
Republic of Moldova (2007)	\$157.00	\$216.00	\$ 85.00	\$103.00
Tajikistan (2006)	\$22.60	\$40.90	\$ 9.74	\$14.24

Source: Albania: Household Budget Survey (HBS), 2006–07. The \* notes that the income was not disaggregated by sex. The total is \$442.13gender. Bulgaria: National statistical Institute: Household Budget in the Republic of Bulgaria. Sofia: 2010 (NSI) Tables 2–4. Georgia: GEOSTAT Table 2. Kazakhstan: van Klaveren p.29. Moldova: Women and Men in the Republic of Moldova 2008AM pp.239–243. Tajikistan: Women and men in the Republic of Tajikistan. 2007AM pp. 142–143.

25. Rural households consistently have lower total incomes than urban households (often just 50 percent of urban incomes). When rural women are in paid employment, they are more likely to be in part-time, seasonal and/or low-paying jobs, and women are almost always paid less than men for the same work in all six countries, with these differences ranging from 60 percent to 75 percent of the salaries received by men. Moreover, while it is often the case, unfortunately no specific data exists on the ‘quality’ of employment, such as long working hours, exposure to hazardous substances, lack of access to social protection, weak organization of workers and thus the lack of, or a weak voice in bargaining processes.

26. In Kazakhstan, food purchases consume 67 percent of the monthly income of the poorest 20 percent of HHs, while it is 52 percent of the highest 20 percent. In addition, the poorer households would tend to have higher cereal/bread product purchases and lower vegetable, meat, milk and dairy product purchases, leading to an unbalanced diet and resulting health problems.

### *E. Findings*

27. The evidence offers an incomplete and mixed picture about gender issues in the countries under consideration. This is mainly due to the lack of adequate national sex-disaggregated data in the rural and agricultural sectors.
28. On the positive side, for example, the educational systems display little evidence of a gender gap over the past several generations and, in fact, women are ahead of men in achieving higher degrees. Also, there does not appear to be biases in most of these countries for women to access formal credit systems, or to own and inherit land and other productive resources.
29. On the negative side, however, it must be remembered that, while it appears that formal legislation and procedures are gender-neutral, women's access to information and legal recourse is substantially less than men in actuality, which is acutely apparent with regard to discriminatory and unequal pay practices. In effect, national laws appear to be in adherence with international standards and prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex, but the intermittent implementation of these laws combined with a general lack of awareness and knowledge of the law among women often constrain women's full participation in the growing market economies, and these problems are greater in rural as opposed to urban areas.
30. The evidence suggests that at least 20 percent of all households in rural areas are FHHs. Of these, the *de facto* FHHs that are caused by male migration for work seem not to be among the poorest households due to the remittances they receive. *De jure* FHH households, however, seem consistently to be in the poorest income and expenditure categories.
31. Regardless of the household type, the evidence suggests that rural women are at a disadvantaged position relative to their male counterparts in some important ways. In addition to the pay problem in formal employment, there is a low level of overall employment (for men as well as women), limited possibilities for flexible working hours or part-time work (only 2.3 percent of all employees work part-time in Bulgaria, for example), and an inadequate supply of childcare facilities. Cultural factors, such as the traditional division of tasks within families, and social factors may also play a significant role in preventing women from participating in the formal or informal labour markets.
32. The data also show that social transfers of various sorts are important for household well-being. Pensions are the most important overall, and poverty would be much higher in their absence. Remittances are extremely important to the households that receive them. Unemployment benefits, child allowances, disability pensions, maternity benefits, transport allowances, and so forth, are all small and, in any case, few households actually receive these kinds of social transfers, and their poverty impact is consequently limited. Still, overall, women tend to benefit more directly from these various transfers than men.
33. Further, in a general sense, poverty in all these countries is correlated with geographical location (where families that live in more remote, less fertile parts of a country are more likely to be poor), with families where the household head has just secondary or lower educational attainment, with families where the head of household is jobless, with families with higher numbers of children, with families employed in agriculture, and with families that do not receive remittances, pensions or other kinds of income transfers. The depth of the poverty can be seen in the income distribution for the lowest and highest decile in the six countries.
34. While it is inconclusive based on the available data, women appear to be using fewer agricultural inputs (including family labour) and to have accumulated substantially fewer productive assets of all types. Even when women may have equitable land rights, they seem to have difficulty in making optimum use of the land because of shortages of time, labour, mechanization, irrigation, agricultural inputs, accessing credit, and so forth, coupled with their heavier household responsibilities, especially caring for children and the elderly, which decreases their ability to engage in even household farming or to enter a more formal labour market.

35. In any case, household head aside, for the vast majority of smallholders in all of the countries discussed here, the agricultural activities are almost exclusively limited to small-scale, own-account agricultural production, much of it for home consumption, with some products sold in small, local markets.

### ***F. Recommendations***

36. Agricultural censuses should incorporate, as much as possible, a more focused gender dimension to enable the derivation of relevant gender indicators.

37. Household budget surveys (HBSs) could do a better job of recording income and expenditures based on the type of head-of-household with, if possible, a distinction made between *de jure* and *de facto* FHHs.

38. Agricultural Surveys, and Market and Credit Research could better delineate land and livestock ownership, crop production, actual access and usage of agricultural inputs, labour, markets and credit by FHHs and MHHs. On this latter point, it would also be useful to have information concerning informal credit sources in the rural areas as these may well be more important to FHHs.

39. Time Use Studies would be most useful to achieve a better understanding of the real labour expenditure of women, men and, indeed, children in maintaining rural households.

40. Qualitative Household Surveys and Quality of Life Surveys in the rural areas would help to more carefully delineate the population sub-sets that are in the most need of help as, for example, FHHs, ethnic minorities, those who have attained lower educational levels, the unemployed, and so forth. These kinds of surveys do, of course, add context to the very valuable numbers obtained through the more quantitative surveys.

## **III. THE LACK OF SEX-DISAGGREGATED DATA IN THE AGRICULTURAL SECTOR**

41. The intensive data research presented above reveals, among other things, a general lack of sex-disaggregated data in the agricultural and rural sector in the Region. Despite recognizing the importance of gender statistics in this sector, countries do not give enough emphasis to systematic collection/tabulation, analysis and dissemination of data needed to assess the socio-economic status of the rural and agricultural population in Europe and Central Asia.

42. In the last two decades FAO has undertaken several studies and initiated projects and activities to improve the production, analysis and dissemination of gender statistics in the agricultural and rural sector. In this regard, capacity development activities have been carried out in the region by FAO, which include a highly successful capacity development workshop was organized in 2011 in Ankara, Turkey, with the participation of nine countries from Central Asia and Eastern Europe and more will be organized in the current biennium at national and regional level.

43. Moreover, a project on the FAO Gender and Agricultural Statistics Framework (GASF)<sup>1</sup> will be implemented in 2012–13 in three Central Asian countries, i.e. Turkey, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan. Funded under the FAO-Turkey Partnership Programme for a total budget of USD330,000 its main objective is to assist the countries in developing sex-disaggregated data sets – mainly through data re-tabulation – on the agricultural and rural sector to assess the current status of rural population and to ensure evidence-based policy-making processes.

---

<sup>1</sup> The GASF is a framework designed by FAO (with the financial support of the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA) to help guide both producers and users of statistics through a series of standard stages for producing sex-disaggregated data. It comprises five standard stages of sex-disaggregated data production: (1) identification of gender and agriculture issues/topics for investigation; (2) listing of relevant statistics/indicators; (3) identification of appropriate data sources; (4) data production and analysis; and (5) presentation and dissemination.

44. Despite the focus on gender statistics, a core set of globally/regionally applicable gender indicators was not yet agreed upon. A number of countries brought to the attention of FAO the importance of providing clear guidelines to the Statistical Offices on the gender sensitive indicators that should be produced. To respond to this request, FAO developed a core set of gender indicators that countries should collect for comparable data on the socio-economic status of the rural and agricultural population (see Annex I). The proposed core set of gender indicators<sup>2</sup> was presented at the Fourth Wye City Group Conference (Rio de Janeiro, November 2011). It was further discussed with a number of countries of the region for feedback during the 22<sup>nd</sup> Expert Meeting of the WPW (Rome, February 2012) and recommendations to FAO to continue working on this field were endorsed by the 15<sup>th</sup> Session of the WPW (Rome, February 2012).

#### **IV. REPORT ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE WORKING PARTY ON WOMEN AND THE FAMILY IN RURAL DEVELOPMENT (WPW)**

45. The 2010–11 biennium was a transitional period for the WPW. The focus of the Board and the Secretariat of the WPW (which is part of REU) was on better planning and strategizing future direction rather than implementing some of the foreseen activities. Consequently, the 22<sup>nd</sup> Expert Meeting and the 15<sup>th</sup> Session of the WPW – originally planned in 2011 – were postponed to February 2012. The need for a substantial revitalization of the WPW was identified by the WPW Secretariat and Board as a core objective for the biennium and a number of initiatives were undertaken in this regard, which are explained in the following paragraphs 46-62. In line with the requirements to report to the ECA this section includes a summary of the discussions of the 22<sup>nd</sup> Expert Meeting, held on 20 - 21 February 2012. It also refers to the discussions of the 15<sup>th</sup> Session of the WPW<sup>3</sup>, held on 23 February 2012. However, in the absence of an adopted report, this is not to be considered as agreed recommendations.

##### ***A. The renewed Secretariat of the Working Party on Women***

46. A new FAO REU Gender Focal Point, serving as Secretary to the Working Party on Women, was appointed in November 2010. In addition, a Gender and Rural Development consultant and a Junior Technical Officer in Gender, Equity and Rural Employment (financed by Hungary) were recruited to support the gender activities of the office, including the WPW.

##### ***B. Increased visibility of the Working Party on Women***

47. In line with the recommendation on increasing the visibility of the WPW from the “Needs assessment and survey 2009” (ECA:14/WPW/09/3), a website for the WPW was developed in 2011. Hosted by the general FAO REU website, it includes information on the aim, structure and members of the WPW and about its past and future activities.<sup>4</sup> In addition, the first issue of the WPW Newsletter, entitled *Rural Development in Europe and Central Asia: A Gender Perspective*<sup>5</sup> was prepared and disseminated. The visibility of the WPW was also ensured in a number of key events through presentations by the Secretariat and the Board members.

---

<sup>2</sup> The full paper can be found at: [http://4thwyeconferencerio.ibge.gov.br/images/s4e9d36a32ce71-core%20gender%20%20indicators%20in%20agriculture%20wye18oct\\_v02.pdf](http://4thwyeconferencerio.ibge.gov.br/images/s4e9d36a32ce71-core%20gender%20%20indicators%20in%20agriculture%20wye18oct_v02.pdf)

<sup>3</sup> At the time of finalization of this document, the Report of the 15th Session of the WPW was still under adoption.

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.fao.org/europe/activities/gender/reu-wpw/en/>

<sup>5</sup> [http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user\\_upload/Europe/documents/WPW/gender\\_files/Newsletter1\\_en.pdf](http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/Europe/documents/WPW/gender_files/Newsletter1_en.pdf)

### ***C. The WPW Board Meetings 2010 and 2011***

48. In order to enhance cooperation between the Board and the Secretariat, two Board Meetings were held in the reported biennium. The first Board meeting was held in September 2010, in Rome, with the participation of five members (of a total of seven), whereas the second was held in June 2011 in Budapest with the participation of six (of a total of seven) Board members. During the first Board meeting it was agreed that the WPW, inter alia, should contribute to filling the existing data gap on rural women, and therefore, should support the collection, analysis and dissemination of sex-disaggregated data, in and from the member countries. Among other Board's recommendations, more efforts should be dedicated to enhance the focus on WPW activities follow up by undertaking concrete further actions together with Expert Meetings' and Sessions' participants. During the second meeting, the Board discussed and endorsed three proposals by the Secretariat related to the revitalization of the WPW:

- Guidelines on the roles and responsibilities of the Secretariat and the Board;
- National Gender Focal Point Network in the ministries of agriculture (or other related national institutions);
- Change of the name of the WPW (in line with the progressive shift in the focus from women to gender, and to provide a more attractive and modern image).

### ***D. Extension of the Trust Fund (GCP/RER/018/MUL)***

49. The Trust Fund (GCP/RER/018/MUL) for the Working Party on Women, which had an end date of 31 December 2011 was extended to ensure coverage of expenses related to the organization of the 22<sup>nd</sup> Expert Meeting and 15<sup>th</sup> Session of the WPW. It is important to note that the resources of the Trust Fund (GCP/RER/018/MUL) were exhausted by the costs of the 22<sup>nd</sup> Expert Meeting (including participation costs). Continuity of funds has not been guaranteed by other sources/donors.

### ***E. Data-based Research on the Status of Rural Women and Men in Europe and Central Asia and FAO work on gender indicators in agriculture***

50. Significant progress was made in the collation of sex-disaggregated data (SDD) for assessing the *status of rural women and men in Europe and Central Asia*. Following the recommendation of the WPW, FAO prepared a draft paper on "The Socio-economic Status of Rural Women and Men in Selected Countries of the Region" and developed a proposal on a core set of gender indicators in agriculture to guide SDD collection in member countries (shown above in paragraphs 6 - 44). The draft paper and FAO's proposal on indicators were discussed during the 22<sup>nd</sup> WPW Expert Meeting.

### ***F. The 22nd Expert Meeting of the Working Party on Women and the Family in Rural Development***

51. The 22<sup>nd</sup> Expert Meeting of the WPW was held on 20 and 21 February 2012 at FAO Headquarters, Rome, Italy. The Expert Meeting had an exceptionally high rate of participation. 70 participants attended the meeting, including 42 experts from 26 countries, 8 representatives from 4 international organizations, 17 FAO staff and 3 members of the WPW Board.

52. The theme of the meeting was "*Gender statistics for assessing the socio-economic status of rural women and men in Europe and Central Asia*". In particular, the FAO draft paper on "The Socio-economic Status of Rural Women and Men in Selected Countries of Europe and Central Asia" was presented and discussed. 14 country presentations were given on this subject matter and/or on the availability of sex-disaggregated data in the respective countries.

53. Moreover, FAO presented the proposed *core set of gender indicators in agriculture* for feedback from the national experts. Some of the general findings on the core set of indicators are listed as follows.

- Almost all the countries expressed interest in collecting or providing information for the core set of indicators.
- A number of countries indicated that they already had information for a maximum of 15 indicators that could be drawn from numerous sources and they mostly lacked data on social networks/cooperatives, extension services and food security.

54. Whereas the main recommendations of the Expert Meeting are included for decision in the first page of this present paper, a detailed explanation of the recommendations from participating experts and the ways forward for FAO and the WPW can be found in the final Report of the 22<sup>nd</sup> Expert Meeting.

### ***G. 15th Session of the Working Party on Women and the Family in Rural Development***

55. The 15<sup>th</sup> Session of the WPW was held on 23 February 2012 at FAO Headquarters, Rome, Italy. A report on the activities of the WPW in 2010–11 (15thWPW/12/2) and on the 22<sup>nd</sup> Expert Meeting were presented and discussed.

56. During the 15<sup>th</sup> Session, the main challenges faced by the WPW and the proposed solutions were discussed.

#### *Exhaustion of Trust Fund (GCP/RER/018/MUL) and lack of commitment of member countries to the activities of the WPW*

57. As is mentioned above the Trust Fund was exhausted in February 2012. In the context of lack of commitment from member countries to self-finance participation in the WPW events, the exhaustion of the Trust Fund, when used to support the participation of the representatives of low-income countries of the Region, might have a negative impact on the regular activities of the WPW.

58. In the 15<sup>th</sup> Session, the Secretariat clarified that FAO has and will continue supporting WPW activities from FAO regular programme funds, in terms of providing personnel of the Secretariat and contributing to covering the high costs related to the organization of meetings (e.g. translation, printing, room reservation, etc). However, FAO regular programme funds are not supposed to cover the participation of experts and country representatives in WPW events, nor the cost of consultants specifically hired for preparing related technical papers. Thus, the effective functioning of the WPW as a network, through the active participation of country experts and representatives in its meetings, would necessitate additional sources of funds.

#### *Proposed follow-up mechanism to the WPW recommendations at the national level*

59. The WPW Board and Secretariat proposed an initiative of creating a *National Gender Focal Point Network* in the ministries of agriculture/rural development. Besides institutionalizing a follow-up mechanism on WPW recommendations to achieve tangible outcomes at national and regional level, this formal network would enable the effective exchange of information, best practices and lessons learned between the member countries.

60. With regard to the location of the gender focal points, it was discussed that they should reside in the ministries of agriculture and/or rural development and would liaise, when necessary, with other national institutions.

#### *Proposed roles and responsibilities of the Secretariat and the Board of the WPW*

61. The Secretariat and the Board developed a proposal on the *Roles and Responsibilities of the WPW Board and Secretariat*, which is based on, and complements the Rules of Procedure of the ECA,

and is suggested to be used as an internal guiding tool. Member countries took note of this initiative. Further consultation with member countries is necessary for the adoption of the proposal.

62. As a last point, the WPW Board made a proposal for further discussion regarding changing the name of the “Working Party on Women and the Family in Rural Development” to “FAO ECA Sub-commission on Gender in Agriculture and Rural Development”, which better reflect status and mission of the statutory body. This appellation was chosen in accordance with the ECA rules of procedure (see Rule IX “Subsidiary Bodies and Ad Hoc Meetings”) and after consultation with FAO Legal office and the ECA Chair. The change from “women and the family “ to “gender” reflects the evolution of gender theories and practices but further consultations regarding a possible new name will be necessary.

## V. THE WAY FORWARD

63.

- Further consultations, as early as possible, with member countries are needed for the:
  - initiative for a Gender Focal Point Network in ministries;
  - Roles and Responsibilities of the WPW Board and Secretariat;
  - new name of the WPW.

These will be for discussion and decision at the next WPW Session.

- FAO should continue working on gender statistics, and specifically on capacity development of relevant ministries/institutes in the collection and analysis of sex-disaggregated data including the proposed core set of gender indicators (with methodological guidelines) (see par. 44). Moreover, the WPW Secretariat should continuously update the research paper on the "Socio-economic status of rural women and men in selected countries of Eastern Europe and Central Asia" whenever new data are found or provided.
- The WPW, among other initiatives, should continue supporting the exchange of information and best practices on gender statistics in agriculture and rural development.
- As statutory body, the WPW should advise/identify special problems and priority areas in the Region related to gender and, in particular, to the active participation of women in the development process of their countries.

## ANNEX 1

Proposed core set of gender indicators in agriculture (explanation of the headings can be found in the full paper on the REU website)

	Livelihood Framework, Elements		Global Strategy, Key variables	Gender indicator		SEAGA*						
				Holding/Household	Sub-holding	1	2	3	4	5	6	
1	Livelihood assets	Human	Household/holding composition	Sex	Percentage of holdings/households by sex of the holder/household head	available	X	X				X
2			Household/holding composition	Household composition	Average holding/household size by sex of holder/household head		X	X				X
3			Household/holding composition	Age in completed years	Average age of the holder/household head and household members by sex of holder/household head	applicable	X					X
4			Employment	Number of family/hired workers	Percentage of holdings/households with hired labour by sex of holder/household head	applicable	X					X
5			Food security status	Household consumption	Percentage of holdings/households by sex of holder/household head with the risk of food shortage (past)				X			X
6			Education	Highest level of education	Percentage of holdings/households with holder/household head with education level over a CERTAIN level by sex				X	X		X
7			Knowledge	N/A	Percentage of holdings/households receiving agricultural extension services by sources of agricultural extension services and sex of holder/household head				X	X	X	X
8			Networks and organizations	N/A	Percentage of holdings/households participating in "agricultural" collective actions by sex of holder/household head				X	X		X
9		Natural	Land	Land cover and use	Average area of holding by land use type and sex of the holder/household head	applicable	X	X			X	
10			Livestock	Livestock	Average number of livestock by species and sex of holder/household head	applicable	X	X			X	
11			Forestry	N/A	Average area of forest and other wooded land as primary land use by sex of holder/household head	applicable	X	X			X	
12			Aquaculture	N/A	Average area of aquaculture by sex of holder/household head	applicable	X	X			X	
13		Physical	Irrigation	Irrigation	Percentage of holdings/households with irrigated land by land use type and sex of holder/household head	applicable		X			X	
14			Pesticides/ Fertilizers	Pesticides / Fertilizers	Percentage of holdings/households using chemicals by type of chemicals and sex of holder/household head	applicable		X			X	
15			Agricultural machinery	Machinery	Percentage of holdings/households with selected machinery and equipment by sex of holder/household head	applicable	X	X			X	
16		Financial	Credit and loans	N/A	Percentage of holdings/households receiving credit for agricultural purposes by sex of holder/household head			X		X	X	
17	Livelihood strategies	Livelihood strategies	Area harvested and planted	Percentage of holdings/households by type of farming (crop (temporary, permanent), livestock, aquaculture and forestry) and sex of the holder/household head	applicable	X		X		X		
18		Other income sources	Total income of the household	Percentage of holdings/households with other gainful activity in the household by type of activity and sex of holder/household head		X		X		X		

