ICRW International Center for Research on Women
where insight and action connect

CGIAR Gender Scoping Study

By

Dr. David Kauck (Team Leader), Dr. Silvia Paruzzolo, and Ms. Jennifer Schulte[1]

International Center for Research on Women

December 9, 2010

[1] Under the direction of Dr. Rekha Mehra. Ms. Ellen Weiss provided editorial support and Ms. Adithi Shetty and Ms. Laura Kaufer gave research assistance.

GLOSSARY

Gender analysis is a systematic process of using quantitative and qualitative methods to identify differences in the needs, roles, statuses, priorities, capacities, constraints and opportunities of women and men, and to use this information in the design, implementation and assessment of research, policy and programs.

Gender mainstreaming is a systemic and systematic integration of gender analysis into research, development and policy planning, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) and management. Gender mainstreaming enables researchers and development practitioners to identify and address key gender issues through research, program and policy design, implementation and M&E.

Gender-specific research (or a strategic gender research initiative): As used in this study, these terms refer to studies that focus on the examination of gender issue(s) in the agricultural context, i.e., gender is the research topic. This contrasts with gender mainstreaming which integrates gender into an agriculture topic as, for example, aquaculture or development of a new seed variety. Gender analysis is used in both types of research.

Gender-neutral approaches do not account for the differences between women and men and do not consider how women and men may be marginalized and harmed or may not benefit from research, programs and policy.

Gender aware (or responsive) approaches are designed to meet both women's and men's needs. These approaches ensure that both women and men will benefit, and neither will be harmed by research, programs and policy, such as, for example, by exacerbating their work burdens.

Gender transformative approaches actively strive to examine, question, and change rigid gender norms and the imbalance of power as a means of achieving development goals as well as meeting gender equity objectives. These research, programmatic and policy approaches challenge the distribution of resources and allocation of duties between men and women.

Background and Objectives

The Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR), as part of its new research for development strategy, has made a commitment to incorporate a gendered approach throughout its new portfolio of Consortium Research Programs (CRPs). Achieving this objective requires careful integration of gender into research objectives, technology development, diffusion and extension strategies, and evaluation frameworks. It also entails valuing gender analysis as a critical component of agricultural research – one that can help CGIAR scientists develop products that are responsive to the needs, preferences and capabilities of farmers (women as well as men) and, therefore, more likely to be adopted.

This scoping study is intended to help the CGIAR quickly and effectively mainstream gender across the CRPs. The study has three principal objectives:

- Summarize previous recommendations to mainstream gender in the CGIAR system. Analyze the extent to which these recommendations were acted upon and how those efforts fared. Consider what has worked, what has not, and what barriers and enabling factors influenced past performance;

- Reflect on the quality of the gender strategies included in the CRP proposals. Provide guidance on how to effectively mainstream gender into the CRPs. Consider the types of financial support, technical assistance, capacity-building, coordination and supervision that will be required in order to concretize and promote gender analysis and mainstreaming in each CRP; and

- Recommend system-wide actions needed to ensure gender is mainstreamed throughout the CRPs.

Methods[2]

We gathered and reviewed information from more than a hundred sources[3] including:

- CGIAR background and strategy documents;
- Previous studies and recommendations relating to the integration of gender at CGIAR (including documents mentioned in the RFP's scope of work, and the gender e-consultations and related reports);
- CRP documents including all available concept notes, drafts, gender reviews and all 15 final CRP proposals; and
- Review of an extensive literature on gender mainstreaming and gender, agriculture and development.

Key informant interviews were carried out with donors, current and former employees knowledgeable about past attempts to embed gender in the CGIAR system, coordinators responsible for the development of each CRP proposal, and gender experts and other staff involved in the development of CRP gender strategies.[4] Interviews focused on planning processes and the content of the gender strategies.

[2] See Annex 1 for more details on methodology.
[3] See Annex 2 for a complete list of documents.
[4] See Annex 3 for a complete list of key informant interviews conducted.

CRP gender strategies were assessed using an adapted version of the analytical framework that ICRW had previously developed for proposal reviews and program evaluations on issues related to gender and agriculture.[5,6]

Draft recommendations were discussed with a sample of key informants to ensure that they are pertinent, practical and adequately cover CRP needs.

Findings and Recommendations

1. Historical perspectives on gender integration within the CGIAR system.

There has been no lack of substantive recommendations for mainstreaming gender into the CGIAR system.

Numerous sets of recommendations have been generated since the early 1980s through internal and external reviews, conference conclusion statements, publications and reports from gender research initiatives within the system.[7] Key among these recommendations are the following:

- Increase the technical and managerial capacities of CGIAR biophysical and social scientists to take gender as an analytic category across agricultural research and development (R&D);
- Conduct strategic gender research on pressing policy issues relevant to women farmers;
- Establish accountability mechanisms to track and ensure that gender analysis is being integrated across the system and within Centers;
- Lay out concrete steps to address gender issues in institutional culture in and across the Centers; and
- Address the need for greater knowledge management and sharing, and network building across the system.

CGIAR Center work and strategic gender initiatives have demonstrated instances of excellence and innovation in incorporating gender analysis in agricultural technology R&D.

Beginning in the mid-1980s, a few Centers started to address gender issues. Since then, efforts to integrate gender have attempted to do one or more of the following:

- Question assumptions that appear to be gender biased;
- Employ gender as a category of analysis across a range of social science disciplines;
- Build a foundation of gender analysis as part of scientific capacities and systems;
- Include more women farmers in agricultural R&D processes; and
- Recruit and appoint more women scientists as Center staff, management and board members.

[5] See Annex 4 for the complete analytical framework for gender mainstreaming in the CRPs.
[6] "Gender Mainstreaming Compendium." ICRW, 2009, unpublished; and "Gender Checklist." Agricultural Development Program, Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. 2008.
[7] See Annex 5 for key sources of past gender mainstreaming recommendations.

Historically, strategic gender initiatives that questioned gender biased assumptions and used gender explicitly as an analytic category include the Women in Rice Farming Systems of IRRI (established in 1986) and the Intrahousehold Program of IFPRI (1992-2003). The Women in Rice Farming Systems initiative fostered collaboration between social and biophysical scientists and translated insights from gender analysis into targeted actions to reduce women's work and time burdens in ways that benefited them and their families.

The Intra-Household Research Program is an example of the transformative use of sex-disaggregated quantitative data to assess and identify ways to reach gender equitable policy outcomes. The objectives of the program were to document resource allocation patterns on an intrahousehold basis, develop economic models and data collection methods, analyze factors relevant for food policy in a gender-differentiated way, and evaluate the costs and benefits of intrahousehold data collection. Findings were used in part to develop guidelines for implementing and managing other intrahousehold studies. A 2005 multicountry study measured impacts of the Intra-Household Research Program in terms of food policy response and found that intrahousehold modeling produced results central to policy formation.

Additionally, adaptive research conducted through the Participatory Research and Gender Analysis Program (established in 1997) at the field level has been vital for analyzing the different needs, preferences and interests of women and men farmers and adapting agricultural biotechnologies to those needs. Qualitative studies have been crucial for finding ways to increase women's participation in adaptation research and improve potential adoption rates.

These efforts have paralleled those of other science, technology and engineering institutes and initiatives around the globe, whose insights are useful for helping to identify strategies to avoid gender bias in basic and adaptive research and using gender analysis as both a means and an end to producing scientific excellence and breakthroughs. Scientific research institutes pursuing gender analysis include Stanford University's Clayman Institute for Gender Research, European Commission gender mainstreaming into the European Research Area network, the International Development Research Centre (IDRC), the Institute of Development Studies (IDS), and the Swedish Research Council Committee for Gender Research. The Clayman Institute, for example, holds that gender materially influences knowledge production and that taking gender analysis into account leads to formulating new questions and answers.

Box 1: What gender analysis can contribute to agricultural research

Gender analysis can yield information and insights that enhance the impacts of agricultural research as, for example[8]:

- When researchers at the Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT) determined and took account of women's preferences by involving them in selecting genetic material of bean varieties in Rwanda, production increased up to 38 percent over breeder-selected varieties and outperformed local mixtures 64-89 percent of the time.
- In Zimbabwe, researchers found that women had more constrained access to credit than men, which explained why men were more willing to adopt high-yielding varieties (HYVs) of maize and women did not. HYVs required large initial investments and complementary investments in fertilizers. Getting women to adopt HYVs required additional interventions to make them more affordable.
- In Bangladesh, researchers were successful in getting women, who are prevented from working outside the homestead by cultural norms, to adopt improved vegetable technologies in Bangladesh because these crops could be cultivated on homestead land.

A variety of factors have been instrumental in generating excellence and innovation in gender research in the CGIAR.

Consistent attention to gender has most often occured where there has been adequate:

- **institutional support** (e.g., committed leadership from line managers, a gender strategy, and recognition for researchers who integrate gender analysis into agricultural research);
- **a critical mass of qualified technical staff** at Center, National Agriculture Research and Extension Systems (NARES), and local levels;
- **partnerships** with well-qualified, gender expert collaborators and development partners who are peer-leaders on gender mainstreaming;
- **methodological diversity**;
- **a knowledge management and results sharing strategy**; and
- **donor support and influence.**

In spite of some excellent examples of gender research, the level of commitment to gender analysis has varied considerably across the Centers.

Levels of effort to integrate gender within the CGIAR Centers fall into three categories (adapted from Poats 1991) to date:

- The Center has a gender policy or clear mandate, has a gender-focused research program, conducts training on gender analysis, and publishes findings based upon empirical gender research;
- Individual scientists work on strategic gender research issues or incorporate gender analysis into existing research methodologies and themes. These

[8]A. Quisumbing and L. Pandolfelli. "Promising Approaches to Address the Needs of Poor Female Farmers." IFPRI Note 13. 2008.

Centers do not have a clear gender policy and gender work has received limited support and recognition; and
- The Center shows limited or no attention to gender analysis or does not mention women in research project documents, reports, publications, or in annual reports or strategic plans.

Overall, most CGIAR Centers historically have not had a clear gender policy, have not mainstreamed gender into the research program or conducted strategic gender research (e.g., gender initiatives), have not trained staff in gender analysis and have not consistently published gender-specific research findings.

In spite of a number of strategic gender initiatives, a robust, properly resourced and supported effort to embed gender analysis across the CGIAR system has not yet been attempted.

When asked about prior system-wide gender mainstreaming efforts, numerous informants in this scoping study reported that, in the course of recent debates, they had heard some stakeholders remark that gender mainstreaming has been tried before, it has not worked, and the errors of the past should not be repeated. Conversely, informants knowledgeable about the issue commonly observed that claims that system-wide gender mainstreaming has already been attempted were overstated.

Through a review of the historical record, the scoping study team observed that past gender initiatives lacked:
- A system-wide gender policy with strategies and action plans for all research programs with appropriate and adequate resources allocated;
- A set of internal and external accountability mechanisms established at system-wide levels, or consistently within Centers; and
- System-wide consistency in understanding what gender analysis is and its value-added in agriculture research.

A range of untested beliefs and assumptions have chronically impeded constructive gender mainstreaming attempts.

Persistent myths that have not yet been systematically addressed within the CGIAR system:
- That women are not “farmers,” or do not play complex formal and informal roles that affect and are affected by agricultural technology research and development;
- That gender analysis concerns only qualitative and participatory methods and mainly falls to social sciences *other than* economics;
- That gender analysis is useful only for adaptive or "downstream" applied research or priority setting; and
- That household resources are pooled and decisions about labor and resource allocation are made cooperatively and equitably by female and male household members.

Historical differences of opinion concerning the value, means or ends of gender analysis have also not yet been resolved, but guidance is available both within the CGIAR system and outside it to map out a way forward.

Some CGIAR staff working on gender have seen gender analysis as a prerequisite or pathway to achieving greater adaptation, adoption, diffusion and ultimate impacts of agricultural technologies. Others have seen it as part of a larger process of addressing institutional transformation. Both approaches are essential. In addition, underlying these differences of opinion is the need for greater operational and conceptual clarity regarding what is gender analysis in agricultural R&D and how it supports research in addressing poverty, hunger and environmental issues.

Center biophysical and social scientists have not always agreed on the value of gender analysis. As a result, there have been major differences in commitment to gender integration within and across CGIAR Centers and projects.

Going forward, lessons learned from the gender mainstreaming literature provide insights into recognized 'minimum requirements' to embed gender in organizations (e.g., Kardam 1991; Hannan-Anderson 1992; Jahan 1995; Macdonald 1994; Mehra and Rao Gupta 2008). They include:

- Leadership and managerial clarity on commitment to gender mainstreaming clearly expressed in internal and external communications, support and steady accountability;
- Gender objectives written into planning and implementation procedures, and performance evaluations;
- Catalytic expertise from gender technical specialists on core teams to design and implement gender analytic research;
- Awareness- raising and skills-building for all research staff through targeted interdisciplinary, agroecological or spatial zone-relevant gender training and technical assistance; and
- Clear identification of who has responsibility for implementation and a system of accountability, through monitoring and evaluation, knowledge sharing and communications.

2. Mainstreaming gender into the CRPs

This section outlines a framework to guide CRP teams in effectively integrating gender into their proposals and work-plans. Next, we report findings determined by our use of this framework in assessing the current level of gender mainstreaming in the CRPs. Finally, the section concludes with recommendations to the Office of the Consortium's CEO on how to mainstream gender in the CRPs.

2.1 Analytical framework for mainstreaming gender into the CRPs

After carrying out key informant interviews and conducting an in-depth review of the CRP documents, we developed an analytical framework that specifies the "optimal level" of gender integration in the CRPs (see Box 2 for the key features of the

framework). This framework draws on standard gender mainstreaming methods,[9] but is tailored to specific characteristics of the CRPs. We subsequently used the framework to assess and compare each CRP proposal, and to identify system-wide patterns and gaps.[10] We recommend using the framework as a checklist with key benchmarks to integrate gender into the CRPs in the future.

Two main principles guided the development of the framework:

1. **Gender mainstreaming is the integration of gender analysis** into research, program and policy throughout the whole process of planning, design, implementation and M&E; and
2. **Gender is a critical analytical variable in development and in most[11] areas of international agriculture research.** It follows that if gender is not addressed in a particular CRP, the onus of proving that it is not relevant to the research topic should be on the CRP team and the reasoning should be made explicit.

Box 2: Key features of the analytical framework for achieving an optimal level of gender integration into the CRPs

Problem Statement: Presents convincing and clear evidence-based arguments for addressing gender in the proposal.

Priority Setting: Defines gender-responsive goals and objectives and states whether gender is a stand-alone research topic (i.e. strategic gender research) or a cross-cutting thematic research area in which gender analysis is used to inform an deepen other research themes (i.e. gender mainstreaming).

Research & Development: Presents an R&D plan that discusses how empirical gender analysis will be undertaken and used across the R&D cycle which starts with the establishment of priority research questions, and is followed by design and development, dissemination, adoption and M&E.

Work Plan and Staffing: Describes activities that will be carried out to deliver on the overall gender strategy, recommend appropriate staffing levels, level of effort and expertise and discuss the level of technical capacity needed to carry out the work by the involved CG Centers and/or partners.

[9] The main dimensions of the framework were drawn from a gender checklist and other assessment tools that ICRW has developed for proposal reviews and program evaluations on issues related to gender and agriculture.

[10] See Annex 4 for the complete framework and an illustrative example of how we applied it to assess the extent to which gender was mainstreamed into **CRP 1.3: *Harnessing the Development Potential of Aquatic Agricultural Systems for the Poor and Vulnerable.***

[11] Major sections of several CRPs fail to mention gender analysis at all. Researchable gender issues are oftentimes ignored in upstream stages of the R&D process, and are occasionally absent from entire research themes. While some CRP research topics do appear to be gender neutral (e.g., mapping the genome of certain crops), some CRP teams have been much too quick to assume that gender analysis is irrelevant to certain topics. Therefore, we recommend that **the notion that a particular research topic is 'gender neutral' should always be clearly stated and subject to peer review**.

Gender Strategy: Synthesizes and highlight the different parts of the proposal where gender is mainstreamed and states the big picture goals and objectives of conducting gender analysis and research and how these contribute to the overall CRP goals and objectives.

Budget: Specifies the costs associated with staffing and capacity building needed to conduct the gender activities proposed.

Monitoring and Evaluation: Presents a plan for a gender-responsive M&E system for strategy level goals as well as thematic research areas and articulates clear plans on how the results of gender responsive M&E will be systematically used for: (1) setting R&D priorities; (2) design and development of programs and technologies (3) dissemination and adoption; and (4) impact assessment.

2.2 Findings on the Current Level of Gender Mainstreaming in the CRPs

The following findings are based on a careful analysis of the CRPs using the analytical framework and on the data from the key informant interviews.

The CRP drafting teams did not have a clear understanding of what was expected in terms of gender mainstreaming and what the gender strategy section should include. Most informants interviewed were aware that gender would be used as a criterion to assess their proposals, yet they expressed uncertainty about how their proposals would be evaluated and what the Board's expectations were with respect to gender. Moreover, teams did not have a common understanding of what gender mainstreaming entailed.

The gender strategies sections in the CRP proposals are strikingly brief and oftentimes lack the basic elements of a concrete strategy. While some provide statements of the importance of focusing on gender, most of the CRP strategy sections are very vague and do not articulate specific gender goals and objectives nor action plans on how to achieve them. In fact, some strategies had not been developed at all because the drafting teams were awaiting the results of this scoping study to inform their gender strategy development.

The majority of CRPs are gender-neutral. Given the lack of understanding of expectation around gender mainstreaming and no clear guidelines and accountability mechanisms, it is not surprising that only five CRP proposals integrated gender in original and effective ways. They include:

- CRP 1.3 (Harnessing the Development Potential of Aquatic Agricultural Systems for the Poor and Vulnerable);
- CRP 2 (Policies, Institutions and Markets to Strengthen Assets and Agricultural Incomes for the Poor);
- CRP 3.4 (Roots, Tubers and Bananas for Food Security and Income);
- CRP 3.7 (More Meat, Milk and Fish by and for the Poor); and
- CRP 6 (Forests and Trees: Livelihoods, Landscapes and Governance).

These proposals draw on gender research findings related to the CRP and make a systematic effort to identify researchable gender questions. Gender goals are clearly stated, and commitments to gender analysis are credible. CRP 1.3 is particularly notable.[12] Evidence of commitment to gender analysis in CRP 1.3 is reflected in budget figures, M&E plans and gender goals that are clearly stated and are transformative in nature.

The remaining CRP proposals reflect a lack of systematic efforts to address gender. Most CRP drafting teams appear not to have considered gender issues in presenting their problem statement and when setting the CRP goal and objectives. Consideration of existing gender research or researchable gender issues is more common downstream – when discussing the design and development of outputs, dissemination and adoption of technologies, and impact analysis. This is particularly common among those CRPs that focus on plant breeding. Research on gender is frequently treated as a cross-cutting *activity*, embedded within the core research themes. This semantic distinction between *theme* and *activity* is consequential. Because the CRPs do not present activity plans, gender is frequently treated as a secondary topic that does not yet require detailed consideration.

Most CRPs do not include budgets for gender analysis. The CRP proposals are high-level strategic documents that do not include activity-level plans and budgets. Because gender research was often labeled an *activity* rather than an integral part of the research *theme*, it was absent from all but the following two CRP budgets. (CRP 1.3 earmarked 10% of its funding to "gender" for FY2011-2013; CRP 3.3 set aside a small amount [0.3-0.4% of the total budget] for a gender audit and various capacity building activities). It was not possible to tell whether the CRP budget for gender analysis and/or research amounted to a lot or a little, or whether funding levels were expected to change substantially from current practice.

Conversations with CRP coordinators revealed that the budgets in the draft CRPs were not based on detailed cost estimates of new research plans.[13] In most cases, CRP budget teams carried out budget building exercises that involved using FY09 audited budgets for signed grants and contracts as the base from which varying projections of funding growth were calculated. The resulting budget estimates appeared to be business-as-usual projections. Coordinators from Centers that currently have small budgets for gender analysis reported that they expected to have limited funding in the future. Those that currently have greater resources for gender work expected to have more.

The quality and level of gender mainstreaming is clearly correlated with the level of involvement of gender experts in the development of the CRPs. CRP teams that involved senior gender experts and other researchers whose work brought them into contact with farmers in early priority setting discussions and systematically throughout the whole process of proposal development were more likely to effectively mainstream gender across all themes and parts of the proposal. CRP 1.3 is a clear example of best practice. A senior gender expert was involved in early stages of proposal development. Funding was provided to bring in other gender experts from

[12] See Annex 4, where CRP 1.3 is used as an illustrative example alongside the analytical framework.
[13] Since the CRPs do not yet specify activities or estimate levels of effort, it is not yet possible to cost out new initiatives.

the field of aquaculture in different countries. The "critical mass" of gender expertise was fundamental in getting the buy-in of the rest of the team and the result is reflected in the high level of gender integration in the proposal.

Weaker gender strategies are often associated with limited, ad-hoc, and non-systematic involvement of gender experts and field practitioners in the proposal development process. The role of gender experts was limited to drafting the gender strategy or providing review comments on sections of the proposal rather than being involved as key team members at all stages of proposal development. Several gender experts reported that they worked in isolation from the drafting team, never saw the full proposal, and did not know whether and how their recommendations were included in the final version. On the other hand, where a senior gender expert was involved in all stages of the process and his/her inputs were taken into consideration, the quality and level of gender mainstreaming and attention to strategic gender research was much higher. The key ingredients of successful gender integration in the proposals are: early and systematic involvement of experts with enough (1) seniority and legitimacy in the field to be credible with other scientists and (2) explicit management support for their role in the team.

2.3 Recommendations for Gender Mainstreaming in the CRPs

Based on our assessment of the current level of gender mainstreaming and extensive consultation with managers and gender experts involved in the development of the CRPs, we recommend that the Office of the Consortium's CEO should provide tools and incentives as well as hold designated managers in each Center accountable for proper focus on gender in the CRP proposals. In particular, the Office of the CEO should:

2.3.1 Ensure that the analytical framework developed for this study (see Box 2 and Annex 4) is used by the CRP drafting teams as a tool in clarifying the "optimal level" needed both to mainstream gender and guide development of the gender strategies.

The analytical framework simultaneously provides the CRP teams a common set of expectations and guidelines on how to mainstream gender in their proposals. It should be used by them to develop and refine their proposals and the gender strategies. While the choice of specific methods and tools may be situation-specific, managers and scientists should be clear that research teams should systematically gather and analyze sex-differentiated data to better understand gender differences in uptake and outcomes of agriculture research. Gender analysis must inform the definition of CRP priorities, R&D design, implementation and M&E.

2.3.2 Award provisional approval to the CRPs that are furthest along in their gender mainstreaming efforts (although still incomplete) and provide a year's funding to appropriately mainstream gender across the CRP and complete a satisfactory gender strategy.

We recommend giving provisional approval to the following CRPs:

- CRP 1.3 (Harnessing the Development Potential of Aquatic Agricultural Systems for the Poor and Vulnerable);

- CRP 2 (Policies, Institutions and Markets to Strengthen Assets and Agricultural Incomes for the Poor);
- CRP3.4 (Roots, Tubers and Bananas for Food Security and Income);
- CRP3.7 (More Meat, Milk and Fish by and for the Poor); and
- CRP6 (Forests and Trees: Livelihoods, Landscapes and Governance).

Provisional approval should be granted for Year 1 of the requested funding. During that year, the team should be asked to complete a more detailed plan for final approval of the full multi-year plan. The final proposal should include expected activities, outputs and detailed budgets for the entire CRP, including all gender-related work. Until gender is appropriately mainstreamed across the CRP and a fully developed gender strategy is presented and approved, we suggest earmarking 5% of the budget to add gender experts to the staff and to pay for gender analysis.

2.3.3 Ensure that each CRP drafting team is sufficiently staffed with strong gender expertise.

Set up a fund under the management of the Consortium CEO for the exclusive purpose of offering gender planning grants on an as needed basis to CRP drafting teams whose CRPs do not yet qualify for provisional approval. Make planning grants immediately available to Centers that need additional assistance in order to contribute to a sound CRP gender strategy. The start-up funds could be used to hire additional gender experts in Centers that currently lack sufficient expertise.

2.3.4 Verify that each CRP has a detailed budget with a sufficient level of funding to implement its gender strategies; where the level of funding is not clear or adequate, earmark 5-10% of the budget to gender strategy implementation.

As discussed above, most of the CRP proposals do not include budgets for gender-related work. It is usually not possible to tell whether the level of funding is adequate, whether it amounts to a lot or a little, or whether the levels are expected to change substantially from current practice. Activity-based budgeting related to gender is entirely absent from most of the CRP strategies presented thus far.

Moving forward, the proposals should include activity plans and estimated levels of effort to conduct the proposed gender analysis and research work and obtain the gender goals and objectives stated in the gender strategy. The budget estimates should be based on these activity plans and the required level of effort.

2.3.5 Hold each CRP team accountable by requiring an annual report that tracks progress toward meeting the gender goals of the CRP.

Once the proposals are approved (i.e. gender is effectively mainstreamed in the proposal, the gender strategies are completed in a satisfactory manner and the budget allocates an appropriate level of funding to gender), each CRP team should select a few (2-3) indicators to track its progress based on the goals and objectives set in their gender strategies. Illustrative indicators are presented in the M&E section of Annex 4.

3: System-wide issues and recommendations

The previous section of this report focused on the individual CRPs, analyzing the extent to which gender was mainstreamed into each proposal and the reasons why many proposals have fallen short with regard to gender integration. The similar and widespread nature of the deficiencies across the CRPs raise concerns about systemic shortcomings across the CGIAR system. This section examines these systemic shortcomings and focuses on a discrete number of system-wide actions that are needed to support gender mainstreaming in the CRPs. The following questions guided our inquiry and analysis:

- What system-wide governance actions, accountability mechanisms, support systems and implementation strategies will be required in order to quickly and effectively mainstream gender research in the entire portfolio of CRPs?
- What additional system-wide measures would be needed for the CGIAR to become a recognized global leader in gender-responsive agricultural research?

3.1 Findings

Evaluations of gender mainstreaming initiatives have consistently found that success depends in large measure on the following elements:

- A shared understanding embodied in an institution-wide gender mainstreaming policy and strategy;
- Committed leadership, particularly on the part of senior managers;
- Sufficient funding;
- Sustained effort to build staff capacity; and
- Accountability.[14]

This study finds that, although a few Centers have demonstrated a commitment to gender mainstreaming, the above elements have been largely lacking from past efforts to promote gender integration across the whole system. For example, we found considerable support for gender analysis, as evidenced by various documents and the formative interviews. Yet, there was a wide variety of opinion about its purpose among the informants interviewed, suggesting a lack of a shared understanding of gender mainstreaming across the system. Moreover, numerous informants reported that the level of commitment to gender analysis on the part of senior managers varies considerably across the Centers.

Additionally, the CGIAR system lacks a critical mass of gender experts. The availability of expertise on gender is also unevenly distributed across the system; a few Centers have access to strong gender expertise, whereas the capacity of some others is negligible. Most Centers rely on one or two social scientists who may or may not have specialized training in gender analysis.

[14] See R. Mehra and G. Rao Gupta (2008). "Gender Mainstreaming: Making It Happen." In *Equality for Women: Where Do We Stand on the Millennium Development Goal 3?* eds M. Buvinic, A. R. Morrison, A. Waafas Ofosu-Amaah and M. Sjoblom. Washington, DC: The World Bank.

The current CRP budgeting process, which is not activity-based, appears to have discouraged some Centers from planning to recruit additional gender experts. If CRP plans are approved in their current form, the shortage of appropriate staff is likely to persist.

Gender experts from many centers reported that they are already overworked and understaffed. Technical assistance from other centers has the potential to reduce gaps in coverage to some degree, although some CGIAR gender experts already report that such requests are burdensome and interfere with their primary responsibilities. There are also reports that centers that lend technical assistance to others are not always compensated for this service.

The advent of the CRP as a mechanism for large-scale research implies a shift from a radically de-centralized system of autonomous Centers to one that enables team-based collaboration across multiple institutions. If the CRPs are to become the basis of a sustained, productive system of research collaboration, the CGIAR will have to develop management systems to ensure effective coordination and accountability across the Centers, including on gender mainstreaming. Further, success will depend, critically, on leadership from system-wide senior management, particularly in gender mainstreaming.

Finally, system-wide knowledge management can help the CGIAR attain global leadership in gender-responsive agricultural research. An internal e-consultancy on gender research across the CGIAR system found that "there is a wealth of experience, especially with attention to gender in local adaptive research, but this experience has not been drawn together to find broader lessons for application."[15] Because of the comprehensive scope of the 15 CGIAR Centers, the system is unusually well-positioned to examine gender-related issues across agro-ecological zones, integrated production systems, market conditions and institutional contexts. But because of the de-centralized nature of the system, these opportunities have been underexploited. Looking ahead, the CGIAR has the potential to undertake syntheses, comparative analysis, identification of global trends, and other meta-analyses to support gender-responsive agricultural research that can be standard-setting.

3.2 Recommendations

3.2.1. Leadership for gender mainstreaming should come from all levels of management and leadership within the system—the CEO, Center Directors Generals, Center research managers and CRP team leaders.

- First, the CEO and Center Director Generals should take leadership on developing a shared vision on gender mainstreaming and voicing their commitment:
    - Jointly prepare a brief **vision statement on gender.** If necessary, this can be done with technical input from a consultant gender and agriculture expert but should bear the stamp and commitment of system leaders.

[15] CGIAR. Report on Recommendations for Gender Integration in the CGIAR Strategy and Results Framework, June 2009.

- Based on the vision prepare a brief system-wide **gender strategy** that reflects the CGIAR's common understanding of "gender mainstreaming" i.e., the key elements of what is meant by gender analysis, how it can support agriculture research and development in the context of the system, expected results and how they will be measured. Recommendations and indicators offered in this report on the CRPs and in this section should be used as the blueprint to develop the system-wide gender strategy. Again, it can be drafted initially by a consultant who should also devise a simple but systematic process to vet and obtain agreement on the strategy throughout the leadership and research staff of the system.

- Center Directors Generals, Center research managers and CRP team leaders should be charged by the CEO to provide leadership (i.e., set expectations, hold staff accountable and offer the appropriate resources) to ensure that the vision and the strategy are implemented via the concrete work on gender spelled out in each CRP via a strategy, action plan, resources and staff, as described above.

3.2.2. Take system-wide measures to strengthen gender and agriculture capacity and to utilize gender analysis in agriculture research and development.

- Increase the number of highly qualified gender and agriculture experts within the system and the demand for their services. This will involve at least two different types of targeted training to: (1) build a high-quality corps of gender and agriculture experts to work on the CRPs; and (2) train non-gender experts among staff and managers in gender and agriculture to establish a common understanding of and demand for gender analysis. Detailed recommendations for each step in this gender and agriculture capacity-building process are as follows:
  - Immediately, use gender planning grants to help under-staffed Centers recruit highly qualified gender experts;
  - As CRPs determine their gender staffing needs, support them with the appropriate resources, especially funds, to meet those needs with high quality gender experts;
  - As part of the CRP reporting process, require each CRP to report on progress vis-à-vis recruitment targets for gender and agriculture experts; and
  - Train non-gender expert researchers and managers: The staff training should be carefully targeted to particular needs and designed to enhance understanding of gender mainstreaming, achieve a common understanding of the role and key elements of gender analysis as it pertains to the CGIAR, and the basic elements of how to do gender analysis.

- Carefully assess gender training needs. Assess who needs to be trained, and the level and scope of training needs for each category of staff. Separate trainings are likely to be required for: managers to understand key principles of gender analysis; CRP team leaders to have a working knowledge of how to address gender issues in their programs; and agronomists and other natural

scientists to enable them to become informed users of gender analysis and research. Based on this assessment, develop a system-wide training strategy.

- Use existing internal and external gender and agriculture resources and expertise more effectively in the immediate and medium term until internal staff capacity is built.
    - Formalize on-going practice in engaging gender and agriculture staff across Centers and programs to provide input in a more systematic way. Specifically, create financial cross-charging mechanisms so that gender specialists providing technical input to other Centers or CRPs are acknowledged for their contribution and their staff-time is compensated.
    - Develop formal partnerships (e.g., MOUs) on a competitive basis with gender expert institutions and international networks to supplement and complement internal expertise and resources, particularly in training and technical assistance.

3.2.3. Establish system-wide accountability on gender mainstreaming that involves the following levels: the CEO, the Centers, the CRPs and individual staff.

- At the Center level, use the Performance Management System[16] to hold researchers accountable for efforts to mainstream gender in the program of research, as follows:
    - Add an indicator that reflects gender mainstreaming in Indicator 1: Composite measure of Center research publications.[17]
    - Add a composite indicator on "Center gender responsive culture" (modeled on Indicator 4) which will develop a gender checklist (which could assess staffing, capacity, funding, use of gender analysis for R&D).[18]

- Build accountability at the CRP level into the M&E framework of each CRP as described in Section 2 above. This will become operational when the CRP is approved as having effectively mainstreamed gender. The CEO will receive annual reports from each CRP team on progress in meeting gender goals.

- At the individual level, include in the Individual Performance Appraisals a qualitative indicator to assess how research staff addressed gender in their work and how managers provided leadership and incentives for researchers to address gender.

- Based on information on the indicators reported from each level, the CEO should prepare an annual progress report on gender mainstreaming to submit to the Consortium Board (as noted in the CRP section above).

[16] CGIAR. Instructions for the Reporting of Performance Indicators for CGIAR Centers (2008 data). Science Council and CGIAR Secretariat, January 2009.
[17] Ibid, p.5.
[18] Ibid, p. 12-13.

3.2.4. Establish a web-based knowledge sharing e-platform focused on gender within the CGIAR system to foster on-going learning and collaboration.

- Draw on the CGIAR's substantial history of successful system-wide approaches (e.g., the Collective Action and Property Rights (CAPRi), Urban Harvest, the Consortium for Spatial Information (CSI), the Genetic Resources Program) to develop a web-based platform that will effectively communicate findings, share data, and help create a community of practice on gender in agriculture.

  A gender e-platform will be most useful if it is tailored to ensure coordination and support on gender research across the CRP. The CRP as a mechanism for large-scale and coordinated research provides an excellent way to shift from the current de-centralized system of autonomous Centers to one that enables team-based collaboration across multiple institutions for maximum synergy and impact. Creating a gender e-platform can leverage this opportunity to strengthen collaboration on gender and agriculture research across the system. This opportunity should be fully tapped.

  A knowledge sharing e-platform on gender would be useful, for example, to house in one place system-wide information and knowledge on gender, including tools and resources on gender analysis and research findings and results. It could also serve as a platform for on-going dialogue on gender, or specific gender and agriculture-related topics on an as-needed basis, and for sharing or seeking information on challenges and lessons learned. It could serve as the "one-stop shop" for everything related to gender within the system.

- To get the process set up it may be useful to create a steering committee that includes one senior researcher from each of the fifteen Centers to ensure system-wide involvement and ownership, to identify knowledge sharing needs and opportunities and provide guidance on roll-out of the gender e-platform.

- Finally, to jump-start processes and create excitement around gender and agriculture issues, consider setting up a time-bound competitive small grants program to incentivize analyses of existing gender-differentiated data in local adaptive research, draw out the gender implications, including comparative analysis, identification of trends, and documentation of programmatic lessons.

Annex 1 – Scoping Study Methodology

The overall methodology included the following activities and procedures.

Activity 1: In-person consultation with members of the Consortium Board
On August 17th, ICRW team members met with the Chairman of the Consortium Board and three Board Members to discuss the overall goal of the study and finalize the work plan, including the sampling strategy for the key informant interviews.

Activity 2: Desk review
The team collected and reviewed a broad range of documents to: (1) better understand the CGIAR system and past efforts to integrate gender; (2) ensure an in-depth understanding of the current reform; (3) determine whether lessons from past experiences to embed gender have been incorporated into the CGIAR's reformed research agenda; (4) better understand the CRPs; and (5) assess the CRP gender strategies. These documents included:

1. CGIAR background and strategy documents;
2. Previous studies and recommendations relating to the integration of gender at CGIAR (including documents mentioned in the RFP's scope of work, and the gender e-consultation and related reports);
3. CRP proposals including available concept notes, drafts, final versions and gender reviews; and
4. Selected bibliography on gender mainstreaming and gender, agriculture and development relevant to the scoping study

Activity 3: Key informant interviews (KIIs)
KIIs have been conducted to: (1) gather additional background information on past efforts to integrate gender in CGIAR's work; (2) obtain information about the process and steps undertaken to develop the CRP proposals with special reference to efforts to embed gender in the CRPs; (3) assess the needs, capacities and partnerships for integrating gender in the CRPs; and (4) investigate staff's perceptions of the CRP proposal development process.

The interviews were semi-structured; an interview guide was developed by the team based on initial conversations with Board Members and donor representatives. The guides were tailored to each key informant category. Key informants were purposefully selected based on a snowball sampling technique. Initial names were provided by Anne-Marie Izac, Chief Officer of the Interim Consortium Office. The final list consists of the following categories of informants:

1. Donors representatives with a stake in gender integration in the CRPs and across the CGIAR;
2. Key gender experts, current and/or former employees knowledgeable about past attempts to embed gender in the CGIAR system;
3. The focal points/coordinators responsible for the development of each CRP proposal; and
4. The CRP gender focal point (i.e. the gender expert(s) involved in the development of the CRP proposal – if any were involved - and/or other team members with a key role in the thinking behind the gender components of the program proposal).

Activity 4: Developed and applied an analytical framework
The ICRW team developed an analytical framework of the "optimal level" of gender integration in the CRPs. CRP proposals were then assessed against this standard and compared to identify broad patterns and common gaps. The main dimensions of the framework were drawn from a gender checklist and other assessment tools that ICRW has developed for proposal reviews and program evaluations on issues related to gender and agriculture. The dimensions consist of: Background and Priority Setting; Research & Development; Work Plan; Monitoring and Evaluation; Budget; Overall level of gender mainstreaming. Annex 3 presents an illustrative example of how the ICRW team applied the framework to assess the CRPs.

Annex 2 – List of Documents Reviewed

CG System Gender Background and Strategy Documents:

A Global Strategy and Action Plan for Gender-Responsive Participatory Research in International Agricultural Research Workshop on 'Repositioning Participatory Research and Gender Analysis in Times of Change' Cali, Colombia, June 16–18, 2010. CIAT and PRGA, September 2010.

A Strategy and Results Framework for the CGIAR, 7 June 2010.

Bringing Together the Best of Science and the Best of Development. Independent Review of the CGIAR System Technical Report, E. McAllister (Chair), November 2008.

Engendering Agriculture Research. R. Meinzen-Dick, A. Quisimbing, J. Behrman, P. Biermayr-Jenzano, V. Wilde, M. Noordeloos, C. Ragasa and N. Beintema, Global Conference on Agriculture and Rural Development, Montpellier, France, 28-31 March, 2010.

Gender and Development Scenarios, 11 September 2009.

Global Platform for Gender in Agriculture.

Instructions for the Reporting of Performance Indicators for CGIAR Centers (2008 data). Science Council and CGIAR Secretariat, January 2009.

IPMS Gender Analysis and Strategy.

New Directions in Participatory Plant Breeding for Eco-Efficient Agriculture. CIAT, June 2010.

Opportunities and Challenges to Address Gender Issues in Agricultural Development Organizations: Lessons from a Self-Assessment in the CGIAR. R. Meinzen-Dick and L. Pandolfelli, International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), 2010.

Participatory Research and Gender Analysis, 1997–2009: The Work and Impact of a Systemwide Program. International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT), June 2010.

PRGA Workshop: Critical Elements for Gender-Responsive Participatory Research in the CGIAR Mega-Programs, 2010.

PRGA Program Demand Analysis Report: Gender-Responsive Participatory Research, Facilitating Impact Team – CIAT: S. Alvarez, S. Staiger-Rivas and K. Tehelen, August 2010.

Publications on Gender: From GT-IMPI, 2003-2008. International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics (ICRISAT).

Report of the First External Review of the Systemwide Program on Participatory Research and Gender Analysis (PRGA), Review Panel: T.S. Walker (Chair), E.M. Rathgeber and B.S. Dhillon, May 2007.

Report on Recommendations for Gender Integration in the CGIAR Strategy and Results Framework. To be submitted to the CGIAR Executive Council at its meeting in June 2009

Stripe Review of Social Sciences in CGIAR, C.B. Barrett (Chair), A. Agrawal, O.T. Coomes, and J.P. Platteau, October 2009.

Strengthening Food Policy Through Gender and Intra-household Analysis: Impact Assessment of IFPRI Multicounty Research. C. Jackson. IFPRI, Impact Assessment Discussion Paper 23. April 2005.

Towards a Strategy and Results Framework for the CGIAR, J. von Braun (Chair), D. Byerlee, C. Chartres, T. Lumpkin, N. Olembo and J. Waage, 7 December, 2009.

The Consortium Design Moves Forward – Report from the Alliance of CGIAR Centers Executive and Centre Board Chairs Meeting in Rome, May 2009.
The Award Theory of Change Diamond, 2010.

Gender Consultations and Reports:

Center Consultation on Strengthening Gender in Agricultural Research. Africa Rice Center (WARDA).
CGIAR Strengthening Gender in Agricultural Research: Consultation in a Box: WorldFish Center Results.
CIAT Center consultation results: Michael Peters,(CIAT) OLL, Tropical Forages and Aracely Castro (Soil Scientist).
CIP Gender Meeting: Case Studies, March 23, 2010 and CIP-Online Consultation.
Consultation strengthening GM in AR4D.
CP Gender consultation Round 1 and 2.
Gender Perspectives on HarvestPlus Activities.
Gender in Agricultural Biodiversity Research.
ICRAF Gender and Research Stories.
ICRISAT Approach in Gender Research and Internal Consultation on Strengthening Gender Research in Agriculture: A collation of Responses. ICRISAT, 2009.
IFPRI Gender Consultation.
Integrating Gender in ILRI Research.
IWMI Electronic Consultation.
Progress Report: Women and Livestock: A Global Challenge Dialogue. ILRI: J. McDermott and P. Kristjanson (Executive Sponsors), October 9, 2008.
Strengthening Gender in Agricultural Research in the CGIAR Center: IRRI Consultation in a Box, Compiled by Dr. T. Paris, March 25, 2009.
Study of Gender in ICARDA's Research.
Synthesis of CGIAR Center Consultations on Gender in Agricultural Research: Areas of Success/Importance of Gender, Constraints/Limitations, Factors Enabling Success.
Toolkit for Gender Analysis of Crop and Livestock Production, Technologies and Service Provision. International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI): Clare Bishop-Sambrook and Ranjitha Puskur, 2007.

Fast-tracks, Concept Notes and Gender Reviews (submitted May, 2010):

CRP 1.1: Integrated Agricultural Production Systems for Dry Areas
CRP 1: Agricultural Systems for the Poor and Vulnerable Component 2: Integrated Systems for the Humid Tropics
CRP1.3: Harnessing the Development Potential of Aquatic Agricultural Systems for the Poor and Vulnerable and External Gender Review
CRP 2: Policies, Institutions, and Markets to Strengthen Assets and Agricultural Incomes for the Poor - Draft and Gender Reviewer's Report
CRP 3.1: WHEAT - Global Alliance for Improving Food Security and the Livelihoods of the Resource-poor in the Developing World & Gender Reviewer's Report
CRP 3.2: MAIZE - Global Alliance for Improving Food Security and the Livelihoods of the Resource-poor in the Developing World & Comments of External Reviewer

CRP 3.3 CGIAR Thematic Area 3: Sustainable Crop Productivity Increase for Global Food Security - A Global Rice Science Partnership (GRiSP), Gender Review of CRP 3, Gender Concerns in Rice Research, Technology and Capacity Enhancement: Experiences and Challenges, Thelma R. Paris
CRP 3.4: RTB Mega Program: Roots, Tubers and Bananas for Food Security and Income
CRP 3.5 CRP3-Grain Legumes: Enhanced Food and Feed Security, Nutritional Balance, Economic Growth and Soil Health for Smallholder Farmers & Gender Review report
CRP 3.6 CRP3-Dryland Cereals: Food Security and Growth for the World's Most Vulnerable Poor
CRP 3.7: Sustainable Staple Food Productivity Increase for Global Food Security: Livestock and Fish
CRP 4: Agriculture for Improved Nutrition and Health
CRP 5: Durable Solutions for Water Scarcity and Land Degradation & Gender Review of CRP5: Water, Land and Ecosystems, J. Dey de Pryck, September 2010
CRP 6: Forests and Trees: Livelihoods, Landscapes and Governance
CRP 7: Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security & Gender Assessment

Consortium Research Program (CRP) Full Proposals & Gender Reviews (submitted September, 2010):

CRP 1.1: Integrated Agricultural Production Systems for Dry Areas, Gender review, and Addendum: Communications Strategy
CRP 1.2: Integrated Systems for the Humid Tropics & Gender Review.
CRP 1.3: Harnessing the Development Potential of Aquatic Agricultural Systems for the Poor and Vulnerable & Gender Review
CRP 2: Policies, Institutions, and Markets to Strengthen Assets and Agricultural Incomes for the Poor & Gender Review
CRP 3.1: WHEAT - Global Alliance for Improving Food Security and the Livelihoods of the Resource-poor in the Developing World
CRP 3.2: MAIZE - Global Alliance for Improving Food Security and the Livelihoods of the Resource-poor in the Developing World
CRP 3.3: GRiSP: A Global Rice Science Partnership
CRP 3.4: Roots, Tubers and Bananas for Food Security and Income & Gender Review
CRP 3.5: Grain Legumes: Enhancing Food and Feed Security, Nutritional Balance, Economic Growth and Soil Health for Smallholder Farmers & Gender Review
CRP 3.6: Dryland Cereals: Food Security and Growth for the World's Most Vulnerable Poor & Gender Review
CRP 3.7: Livestock and Fish: Sustainable Staple Food Productivity Increase for Global Food Security
CRP 4: Agriculture for Improved Nutrition and Health & Overall Assessment
CRP 5: Durable Solutions for Water Scarcity and Land Degradation & Gender review
CRP 6: Forests and Trees: Livelihoods, Landscapes and Governance & Gender review
CRP 7: Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security

Gender Mainstreaming

Daly, M. (2005). Gender mainstreaming in theory and practice. Social Politics 12(3): 433-450.

Dawson, E. (2005). Strategic gender mainstreaming in Oxfam GB. Gender and Development 13(2) Mainstreaming: A Critical Review: 80-89.

Gender Mainstreaming Compendium. ICRW, 2009. unpublished

Goetz, A. (1998). Getting Institutions Right for Women in Development. London: Zed Books.

Hannan-Andersson, C. (1992). Gender Planning Methodology: Three Papers on Incorporating the Gender Approach in Development Cooperation Programmes. Rapporteur Och Notiser 109. Institution for Kuffurgeografi och ekonomik geografi unid lund Universitet.

Harding, S. (1991) Whose Science? Whose Knowledge?: Thinking from Women's Lives. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Jahan, R. (1995). The Elusive Agenda: Mainstreaming Women in Development. London: Zed Books.

James-Sebro, M. (2005). Revealing the power of gender mainstreaming: Enhancing development effectiveness of non-governmental organizations in Africa. Washington, DC: InterAction's Commission on the Advancement of Women.

Kabeer N. (2003). Gender Mainstreaming in Poverty Eradication and the Millennium Development Goals: A Handbook for Policy-makers and Other Stakeholders. IDRC.

Mehra, R. and G. Rao Gupta. (2008). Gender Mainstreaming: Making It Happen. In *Equality for Women: Where Do We Stand on the Millennium Development Goal 3?* eds M. Buvinic, A. R. Morrison, A. Waafas Ofosu-Amaah and M. Sjoblom. Washington, DC: The World Bank.

Molyneux, M. and Razavi, S. (2005). Beijing plus ten: An ambivalent record on gender justice. Development and Change. 36(6): 983-1010.

Moser C. and A. Moser. (2005). Gender mainstreaming after Beijing: A review of success and limitations in international institutions. Gender and Development. 13(2) Mainstreaming: A Critical Review: 11-22.

Rao, A. and D. Kelleher (2005). Is there life after gender mainstreaming? Gender and Development. 13(2) Mainstreaming: A Critical Review: 57-69.

Rathberger, E. (1990). WID, WAD, GAD: Trends in research and practice. The Journal of Developing Areas. 24(4): 489-502.

UNCTAD (2008) Mainstreaming Gender into Trade and Development Strategies in Africa. Trade Negotiations and Africa Series. No. 4.

Walby, S. (2005). Gender mainstreaming: Productive tensions in theory and practice. Social Politics. 12(3): 321-343.

World Bank. (2006). Gender Equality as Smart Economics: A World Bank Group Gender Action Plan (Fiscal Years 2007-10). Washington, DC: The World Bank.

Gender, Agriculture and Development

Agrawal, B. (1983). Diffusion of rural innovations: Some analytical issues and the case of wood-burning stoves. World Development. 11(4), 359-376.

Agarwal, B. (2001). Participatory exclusions, community forestry and gender: An analysis for South Asia and a conceptual framework. World Development. 29 (10): 1623-1648.

Appleton, H. and A. Scott (1994). Gender Issues in Agricultural Technology. Development, ITDG, Paper presented at the 12th Panel of Experts on Agricultural Engineering, FAO, Rome.

Ashby, J.A. (1989) Production and Consumption Aspects of Technology Testing Pescador, Colombia. In *Working Together – Gender Analysis in Agriculture*. eds H.S. Feldstein and S.V. Poats, 109-133. West Hartford, Connecticut: Kumarian Press.

Boserup, E. (1970) Women's Role in Economic Development. London: Allen & Unwin.

Buvinic, M. (1986). Projects for women in the Third World: Explaining their misbehavior. World Development, 14(5), 653-664.

Cernea. M. and A. H. Kassam (eds.) (2005). Researching the Culture in Agri-Culture: Social Research for International Agricultural Development. Oxfordshire: CABI Publishing.

Chambers, R. and J. Jiggins (1986). Agricultural research for resource poor farmers: A parsimonious paradigm. IDS Discussion Paper 220. Sussex: Institute of Development Studies.

Doss, C. R. (2001). Designing agricultural technology for African women farmers: Lessons for 25 years of experience. World Development. 29(12): 2075-2092.

Doss, C. R. (2009). If Women Hold Up Half the Sky, How Much of the World's Food do They Produce? Paper prepared for the 2010 FAO State of Food and Agriculture.

El-Fattal, L. (1996). Women in Agriculture in West Asia and North Africa: A Review of Literature. CGIAR Gender Program, Working Paper, No. 10. Washington, DC: World Bank.

Elson, D. (1995). Male Bias in the Development Process. Oxford: Manchester University Press.

FAO (1985). Women and Developing Agriculture. Women in Agriculture Series No. 4. Rome.

Feldstein, H.S. and S.V. Poats, Eds. (1990). Working Together: Gender Analysis in Agriculture. West Hartford, Connecticut: Kumarian Press.

Feldstein, H.S. and J. Jiggins (eds.) (1994). Tools for the Field: Methodologies Handbook for Gender Analysis in Agriculture. West Hartford, Connecticut: Kumarian Press.

Feldstein, H.S. and A. Slack. (1995). Inventory of Gender-related Research and Training in the International Agricultural Research Centers 1990-1995. Washington, DC: World Bank.

Fernandez, M.E. (2008). How Gender Affects Knowledge and Innovation. Paper presented at IFPRI conference, "Advancing Agriculture in Developing Countries Through Knowledge and Innovation," 7-9 April, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Foster, M. (1998). Supporting the invisible technologists: The Intermediate Technology Development Group. Gender and Development. 7(2): 17-24.

Garrett, J. (1999). Research that Matters: The Impact of IFPRI's Policy Research. Washington, DC: IFPRI.

IFPRI (2002) Impact Evaluation: Assessing the Impact of Policy-Oriented Social Science Research. Washington DC: IFPRI.

IRRI (1985). Women in Rice Farming. Los Banos, Philippines.

Jiggins, J. (1986). Gender-related Impacts and the Work of the International Agricultural Research Centers. CGIAR Study Paper Number 17. Washington, DC: World Bank.

Kabeer, N. (1994). Reversed Realities: Gender Hierarchies in Development Thought. London: Verso.

Kardam, N. (1991). Bringing Women In: Women's Issues in International Development Programs. Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Reinner.

MacDonald, M (1994) Gender planning in development agencies: Meeting the challenge. Oxford: Oxfam.

Malhotra, A. and S. Schuler (2005). Women's Empowerment as a Variable. In *International Development, In Measuring Empowerment*, ed D. Narayan, 71-88. Washington, DC: The World Bank.

Malhotra, A., J. Schulte, P. Patel and P. Petesch (2009) Innovation for Women's Empowerment and Gender Equality. Summary Brief. Washington, DC: ICRW.

Meinzen-Dick, R., A. Quisimbing, J. Behrman, P. Biermayr-Jenzano, V. Wilde, M. Noordeloos, C. Ragasa and N. Beintema (2010). Engendering Agriculture Research. Global Conference on Agriculture and Rural Development, Montpellier, France, 28-31 March.

Paris, T.R. (1992). Integrating the Gender Variable in Farming Systems Research. Presented at the International Workshop on Gender Concerns in Rice Farming, Chiang Mai, Thailand.

Poats, S. (1991). The Role of Gender in Agricultural Development. Issues in Agriculture. No. 3. Washington, DC: CGIAR.

Quisumbing, A. and L. Pandolfelli (2008). Promising Approaches to Address the Needs of Poor Female Farmers. IFPRI Note 13.

Rockefeller Foundation and International Service for National Agricultural Research. (1985) Women and Agricultural Technology: Relevance for Research. Volume 1—Analyses and Conclusions. Report for the CGIAR Inter-Center Seminar on Women and Agricultural Technology. Bellagio, Italy, 1985. The Hague, Netherlands.

Quisumbing, A. (ed.) (2003). Household Decisions, Gender, and Development: A synthesis of recent research. Washington, DC: IFPRI.

Sims Feldstein, H. et al. (1989). The Gender Variable in Agricultural Research. Women in Development Unit. Ottawa: IDRC.

Sweetman, C. (1998). Gender and Technology. Oxford: Oxfam.

UNRISD (2005). Gender Equality: Striving for Justice in an Unequal World. New York, NY: UN Publications.

World Bank (2009) Gender in Agriculture Sourcebook. Washington, DC: The World Bank, FAO, and IFAD.

Annex 3 – List of Key Informants and Affiliations

	KEY INFORMANT	INSTITUTION / CENTER
1.	Anne-Marie Izac	Interim Consortium Office
2.	Catherine Coleman	CIDA
3.	Haven Ley	Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
4.	Meredith Soule	USAID/EGAT/ESP
5.	Ruth Haug	CGIAR Funding Council
6.	Paula Bramel	IITA
7.	Patrick Dugan	WorldFish
8.	Marianne Banziger	CIMMYT
9.	Achim Dobermann	IRRI
10.	David Hoisington	ICRISAT
11.	John Mc Dermott	ILRI
12.	David Molden	IWMI
13.	Andrew Taber	CIFOR
14.	Bruce Campbell	CCAFS
15.	Thomas F. Randolph	ILRI
16.	Graham Thiele	CIP
17.	Aden Aw-Hassan	ICARDA
18.	Amare Tegbaru	IITA
19.	Nireka Weeratunge	WorldFish
20.	Jonathan Hellin	CIMMYT
21.	Malika Martini	ICARDA
22.	Thelma Paris	IRRI
23.	Jemimah Njuki	ILRI
24.	Barbara van Koppen	IWMI
25.	Riina Jalonen	Biodiversity Intl
26.	Sonja Vermeulen	CCAFS
27.	Gordon Prain	CIP
28.	Ruth Meinzen-Dick	IFPRI
29.	Vicki Wilde	G&D Program
30.	Janice Jiggins	PRGA Program
31.	Patricia Biermayr-Jenzano	PRGA Program
32.	Jacqueline Ashby	CIAT
33.	Julia Behrman	IFPRI
34.	Agnes Quisumbing	IFPRI
35.	Hilary Sims Feldstein	Consultant
36.	Susan Poats	Consultant
37.	Kent Glenzer	Oxfam-America

Annex 4 – Analytical Framework for Gender Mainstreaming in the CRPs

	Illustrative Example: CRP 1.3. Harnessing the Development Potential of Aquatic Agricultural Systems for the Poor and Vulnerable
1. Background and Priority Setting	
1.1. Problem Statement: Does the problem statement draw on existing knowledge and explain why consideration of the status, roles, needs, interests and preferences of women and men (as farmers and consumers) are or are not relevant to CRP goals and objectives?	CRP provides a rationale for the gender strategy that articulates the need and a commitment to carry out gender transformative work.
1.2. Background on target populations: Does the CRP present sex-disaggregated statistics on the target population and the socioeconomic context to show patterns of activities, access and control over agricultural and natural resources in target populations and geographical areas?	Not much data are provided in general, but there is acknowledgement of relevant gender differentials such as, for example, that female and male run farming systems specialize in different crops in Zambia.
1.3. Goals and Objectives: Are gender-responsive goals and objectives defined (e.g. goals and objectives that consider the different status, roles, needs, interests and preferences of men and women as farmers and consumers)?	Out of 6 overall objectives, one is gender-responsive (Objective 5: reduced gender disparities in access to, and control of resources and decision making through beneficial changes in gender norms and roles) and one is a gender equality goal (Objective 4: improved policy and formal and informal institutional structures and processes implemented to support pro-poor, gender equitable and sustainable development).
1.4. Impact Pathways: Are gender dimensions explicitly mentioned in the discussion of impact pathways, i.e. the hypothetical causal chains of activities, outputs and outcomes that lead to the achievement of goals and objectives? Does this logic always involve assumptions about the context in which the activities will occur and key gender issues that should be highlighted?	CRP presents a very simplified model of an impact pathway that doesn't provide many details. It is very abstract and high-level and doesn't present any discussion of its gender dimensions.

1.5. Thematic Research Areas: Is gender treated as a stand-alone priority thematic research area or as a cross-cutting thematic research area? Are the choice and its rationale explicit and motivated by research or programmatic needs?	A research framework is defined that entails six research themes, which reflect the above objectives. Theme 4 is a stand-alone theme on gender equality which (quoting the proposal) "represents a recognition that we must comprehensively address gender in all aspects of the program." Most of the other themes have gender integrated in the rationale; e.g. in Theme 1, "Sustainable increases in system productivity," the authors state that "gender mainstreaming will focus on reducing the productivity gap between men and women by engaging both groups in priority setting, research, field trials, dissemination and monitoring."
2. Research & Development	
2.1. Gender analysis: Has the CRP R&D plan demonstrated how it will undertake and use empirical gender analysis, i.e. a systematic examination of how the different roles, responsibilities and status of women and men affect and will be affected by the work being undertaken?	The use of gender analysis is mentioned systematically across the proposal. Quoting the proposal, "the program will incorporate rigorous gender analysis to understand the relationship between changes in aquatic systems, their impacts on agriculture and fisheries production and persistent poverty, social exclusion and vulnerability."
2.2. Research Questions: For each research theme: Do the research questions developed take into consideration the different roles, responsibilities, needs, interests and preferences of women and men and/or explore the different needs, interests and priorities of women and men? Does the CRP propose a new research agenda on gender?	Every research theme includes gender research questions.
2.4. R&D stages: Are key gender issues explicitly integrated in all R&D stages: (1) setting priority research questions; (2) design and development (3) dissemination and adoption (including a discussion about extension); and (4) M&E?	CRP acknowledges the need to involve both women and men in all R&D stages.
2.5. Research Methods: Will CRP research be carried out in a gender-responsive manner, i.e. paying attention to the particular needs of women and men in deciding how, when and by whom the data will be collected?	CRP lists a range of gender-responsive tools that will be used to carry out the gender work.

3. Work Plan and Staffing	
3.1. Activities: Does the CRP describe activities that will be carried out to deliver on the overall gender strategy?	CRP doesn't list precise activities but mentions three action areas at the "core of the transformative potential of the gender areas:" 1) using Gender Gap Mapping and interactive social media for changing attitudes and behaviors relating to gender roles and relations; 2) using a Livelihood Trajectory and Decision-Making Tool for enhancing decision making at regional and national levels 3) organizing a Gender And Assets Action Network for pursuing an integrated approach to assessing the current status of policies and processes for gender equitable access to a wide range of productive assets within aquatic agricultural systems.
3.2. Implementation Plan: Does the CRP outline a plan of when, how and by whom the activities will be carried out?	No detail provided on implementation of any theme.
3.3. Capacity building: Does the CRP include a discussion of the current level of capacity to carry out gender work within CG centers and/or partners and a plan on how to reach the adequate level of capacity?	Not discussed.
3.4. Staffing: Does the CRP commit to appropriate staffing levels, level of effort and expertise to carry out the gender work?	No detail provided on staffing of any theme.
4. Gender Strategy: Does the CRP's gender strategy articulate the links between the rationale to do gender work, the work integrated within each of the thematic research areas and the overall goals and objectives?	The gender strategy is articulated in different sections of the proposal and describes a transformative approach to gender mainstreaming in R&D interventions in aquatic agricultural systems. It's specific to the spheres of interest of the program and provides links between the rationale and the proposed gender work.
5. Budget: Does the budget specify an appropriate level of funding for planned gender work?	10% of the budget is earmarked to gender work.

6. Monitoring and Evaluation	
6.1. Expected results/impact: Have targets been articulated and set for expected differential participation of and impacts on women vs. men and on gender relations in the household, community and economy?	Key impact targets include gender gaps (e.g. in income and savings, in consumption, in nutrition) within each theme.
6.2. M&E design and plan: Has a gender-responsive M&E system been developed for strategy level goals as well as thematic research areas (e.g. including baseline and endline sex-disaggregated data, sampling of both women and men, data on female-vs-male headed households, and specific gender-responsive indicators such as differential access and control over household resources; intra-household dynamics, etc.)?	The M&E system is overall weak.
6.3 Gender-responsive indicators: Have a minimum set of indicators been defined? For example: • The level of gender disparities in access to and control over productive resources (e.g., land, water, fertilizers), services (e.g., extension and information) and income from agricultural production; • Women and men's roles and responsibilities, livelihood strategies, constraints and preferences in female and male-headed households; • The extent to which women and men are involved in the crop/sector in terms of production, marketing, or processing; the level of women's participation in and leadership of producer organizations; and • The nutritional status of individuals (particularly in areas where there are marked gender disparities in nutritional status/nutrient adequacy).	Gender-responsive indicators are included.
6.4. Use of M&E: Do plans articulate how the results of gender responsive M&E will be systematically used for: (1) setting R & D priorities; (2) design and development (3) dissemination and adoption; and (4) impact assessment?	No details are provided on the use of M&E.

7. Overall level of gender mainstreaming: Is gender integrated systematically in the overall proposal in an effective way? What are its strengths and weaknesses? Is the proposal gender neutral, gender responsive or gender transformative?	Gender is integrated across all relevant dimensions of the proposal. The integration is effective and the commitments are credible and reflected in budget figures and M&E plans. The gender goals are of a transformative nature, if successfully carried out.

Annex 5 – Key Past Recommendations to Integrate Gender into the CGIAR System

1981	Quinquennial Review Committee Report[19]
1983	IRRI *Women in Rice Farming* international conference participants' statement
1984	ISNAR and Rockefeller Foundation co-sponsored Bellagio seminar, "Women and Agricultural Technology: The Users' Perspective in International Agricultural Research." The seminar "signaled the beginning of a system-wide dialogue on the subject of women and agricultural development" (CGIAR News, 1985).
1986	Janice Jiggin's CGIAR commissioned study *Gender-Related Impacts and the Work of the International Agricultural Research* on sectors including livestock, breeding, post-harvest issues, among others.
1986	University of Florida *Gender Issues and Farming Systems Research and Extension* conference
1987 & 1989	CGIAR International Centers Week Seminars
1988	CIP IARC "Workshop on Human Resource Development" in Lima, Peru
1990-1995	Hilary Sims Feldstein's *Inventory of Gender-related Research and Training in the International Agricultural Research Centers 1990-1995*, CGIAR Gender Program Working Paper, No. 8.
1998-2003	External Review of Gender and Diversity Program
2007	First External Review of the PRGA and the Science Council Transmittal Note attached to PRGA Review 2007
2008	IFPRI self-assessment survey of Center Deputy Directors General
2008	Independent Review Panel of informed stakeholders (McAllister report), involving Extermal Program and Management Reviews (EPMRs)
2009	Recommendations for Gender Integration in the CGIAR Strategy and Results Framework, Report of an Electronic Consultation

[19] Stated case for why it is critical to take into account women's multiple roles in agriculture development following a new stream of research on women in development that began in 1970 with Esther Boserups' seminal work, *Women's Role in Economic Development*.