



# **GENDER AND DIVERSITY AUDIT - Uganda**

**September 2010**

**Beatrice Mukasa, Lora Forsythe and  
Adrienne Martin**

## Table of Contents

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Acknowledgements.....   | 5  |
| Executive Summary.....  | 6  |
| 1 Introduction.....   | 12 |
| 1.1 Background.....   | 12 |
| 1.2 Objective.....  | 12 |
| 1.3 Methodology.....  | 13 |
| 1.4 Short description of partner organisations.....                     | 13 |
| 1.5 Districts and regions visited, time-period of the study.....        | 15 |
| 1.6 Structure of the report.....  | 16 |
| 2 Organisational Analysis.....  | 17 |
| 2.1 Partners' scope of work.....  | 17 |
| 2.2 Areas of success and areas for improvement.....                     | 17 |
| 2.3 Capacity building.....  | 19 |
| 2.4 Recommendations.....  | 19 |
| 3 Providing equal opportunities and promoting equality.....             | 21 |
| 3.1 Staff and management understanding of equal opportunities.....      | 21 |
| 3.2 Recruitment, retention and promotion of women and other groups..... | 21 |
| 3.3 Representation of women in partner organisations.....               | 22 |
| 3.4 Monitoring and evaluation.....                                      | 22 |
| 3.5 Recommendations.....  | 23 |
| 4 Awareness and responsiveness to practical gender needs.....           | 24 |
| 4.1 Understanding of gender and practical gender needs.....             | 24 |
| 4.2 Addressing practical gender needs in the workplace.....             | 24 |
| 4.3 Organisational culture.....   | 25 |

|     |   |    |
|-----|---|----|
| 4.4 | Gender-orientated activities .....                                | 25 |
| 4.5 | Gender targeting and women’s participation .....                  | 26 |
| 4.6 | Practical gender issues in service delivery .....                 | 27 |
| 4.7 | Volunteer agents .....  | 28 |
| 4.8 | Gender skills among staff .....                                   | 28 |
| 4.9 | Recommendations .....   | 29 |
| 5   | Impact on strategic gender needs and women’s empowerment .....    | 30 |
| 5.1 | Understanding of empowerment and strategic gender needs .....     | 30 |
| 5.2 | Gender strategy .....   | 31 |
| 5.3 | Women in decision-making positions and gender focal persons ..... | 31 |
| 5.4 | Addressing strategic gender issues and women’s empowerment .....  | 32 |
| 5.5 | Decision-making .....   | 33 |
| 5.6 | Partners’ impact on communities and women’s empowerment .....     | 34 |
| 5.7 | Recommendations .....   | 35 |
| 6   | Awareness and responsiveness to key diversity issues .....        | 36 |
| 6.1 | Understanding and skills in diversity .....                       | 36 |
| 6.2 | Work arrangements for different groups .....                      | 36 |
| 6.3 | Activities targeted to different groups and impact .....          | 37 |
| 6.4 | Identification of the needs of different groups .....             | 37 |
| 6.5 | Groups that are not benefiting .....                              | 37 |
| 6.6 | Recommendations .....   | 38 |
| 7   | Enabling participation .....                                      | 39 |
| 7.1 | Participation within organisations .....                          | 39 |
| 7.2 | Participation in field activities and group mobilisation .....    | 39 |
| 7.3 | Staff skills in participatory methods .....                       | 40 |
| 7.4 | Recommendations .....   | 40 |
| 8   | Innovation .....  | 42 |

|   |  |    |
|---|--|----|
| 8.1   | Learning and organisational promotion of innovation..... | 42 |
| 8.2   | Use of innovative methods and examples.....              | 42 |
| 8.3   | Recommendations .....                                    | 43 |
| Appendix A: Areas of strength and areas to be improved for service providers..... |  | 44 |

## **Acknowledgements**

We would like to thank all the people who contributed to the study with their time, effort and ideas. We would particularly like to thank the Ugandan C:AVA team and the GLCI team led by the Catholic Relief Services (CRS). Most of all, we would like to thank the management and staff from all the organisations visited who gave us their time, assistance and candidness in discussions.

Last but not least we would like to thank the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation for providing the funds for this study through a grant to the University of Greenwich's Natural Resources Institute. The views expressed here are not necessarily those of the Foundation.

## **Executive Summary**

In January 2010, a Gender and Diversity Audit of the Cassava: Adding Value for Africa (C:AVA) and Great Lakes Cassava Initiative (GLCI) projects<sup>1</sup> was conducted. The objective was to identify the ways in which partners think and act in relation to gender and diversity within their organisations and as part of their operations. This is designed to ensure that the project impacts are equitable, that opportunities for vulnerable groups are promoted and that adjustments are made to encourage participation.

This report presents the main findings from the C:AVA and GLCI Gender and Diversity Audit in Uganda in the following performance areas: organisational management; equal opportunities and promotion of equality; awareness and responsiveness to practical gender needs; impact on women's strategic needs and empowerment; awareness and responsiveness to diversity issues; enabling participation and innovation.

### **Organisational management**

Overall, both C:AVA and GLCI partners shared similar goals and motivations for their work, and provided complementary activities to each other, which could provide a future basis for partnership working. Staff and management in partner organisations were positive about their organisations and their achievements. Staff and managers' perceptions of the areas of strength in their organisations were management, financial management and planning. Training and mobilisation of farmers was another key area of strength for partners.

The organisational areas felt to be in need of improvement were incentives, both monetary and non-monetary, and policy influence, to lobby government for additional resources, particularly for more staff. This was similar to findings from other C:AVA and GLCI countries. Lack of resources was a key reason cited for lack of investment in staff.

There were indications of opportunities for shared learning between partners, as areas of strength and areas for improvement varied slightly between them, such as in monitoring and evaluation, targeting beneficiaries and using innovative methods. Other key capacity needs are: gender and diversity skills, crop management and processing, financial training for farmers, participatory M&E methods, information dissemination and awareness raising, seed multiplication and conservation, commercial production, marketing and value addition.

Recommendations were for GLCI and C:AVA country offices to organise and facilitate a shared-learning session for partners to share experiences and good practices; partners to build capacity in advocacy and proposal writing, and partner organisations should focus on improving staff incentives, both monetary and non-monetary, to improve staff motivation, retention, development and greater independence.

---

<sup>1</sup> GLCI began one year before C:AVA and C:AVA activities are starting currently.

## **Providing equal opportunities and promoting equality**

This performance area examined the ability of partners to provide equal opportunities for staff and beneficiaries. Overall, staff had a good understanding of equal opportunities and a general picture of employment rights as established in the law. As employers, partners felt there was no discrimination of men, women and other minority groups, but emphasised that staff selection and promotion was on the basis of the abilities of the candidates, regardless of their personal characteristics. Therefore there was no deliberate effort, policy or strategy to hire underrepresented groups.

Partners felt they had a balanced representation of women and other groups among staff; despite the actual low number of female staff in management. The lack of female representation in partner organisations however could be due to the lack of consideration of gender at the recruitment stage; therefore, there is a need to mainstream gender and diversity in the human resource policies of the partner organisations if this problem is to be addressed.

The work environment and conditions of work for different groups in partner organisations were found to be sufficient for staff. Examples of provisions for staff included insurance coverage, sick pay, and the opportunity for mothers, long-term sick and elderly staff to select a preferred location for fieldwork.

The monitoring and evaluation process in partner organisations was not uniform in quality or structure. However, partners felt that monitoring and evaluation was done well. A number of GLCI partners exemplified capacity in monitoring and evaluation which could be shared with CAVA partners.

Recommendations for partners are: increase their understanding of equal opportunities human resource practices; establish formal procedures and policies in recruitment, retention and promotion of staff, along with undertaking positive discrimination to improve underrepresentation of women; promote a positive and supportive organisational culture for staff, and revise monitoring and evaluation procedures to include gender and diversity sensitive indicators.

## **Awareness and responsiveness to practical gender needs**

Practical gender needs are what women and men perceive to be immediate necessities for their livelihoods, which correspond to different roles and responsibilities of women and men. Overall, partners had a basic understanding of gender and its changing nature reflected in the roles and responsibilities of men and women. However, it was easier for staff to apply the concept of gender to field operations than to their workplace. Staff had less understanding of the concept of practical gender needs; however, they could provide examples of such as the provision of maternity leave and need for separate space for men and women to participate in activities.

Staff in C:AVA and GLCI partner organisations felt that their workplace offered them the flexibility required to fulfil their parenting roles, mainly described as the provision of maternity leave and flexible working for nursing mothers. However, these arrangements were largely

afforded to female staff, which could reinforce men's exclusion from participation and responsibility in parenting. One organisation was also accommodating women's travel arrangements by providing vehicles, however, it would be more effective and transformative to empower and train more women to drive motorcycles.

Overall, most C:AVA and GLCI partners expressed positive and supportive organisational cultures, gender-sensitivity and minimal preferential treatment. However, due to a low level of understanding of gender concepts, staff may be unaware of more subtle types of discrimination which can impact on women's employment.

In terms of field activities, C:AVA and GLCI partners have instituted a number of programs that address the practical needs of women and men. Activities involving a large number of women had a tendency to focus on traditionally 'female' domains, such as family welfare and household food security. In contrast, activities involving more men focused on agricultural production and marketing, particularly of cash crops.

Partners felt that the sex composition of beneficiary groups they worked with was important in delivering services. Some partners had established targets for women and men's participation, ranging from one-third, two-thirds and three-quarter women, equal numbers or separate groups, all which have different implications. Due to targeting, there were good levels of participation of women and men among partners who monitored levels of participation by sex; however, it varied according to the type of activity and the extent to which activities corresponded to traditional gender roles.

Some of the practical gender needs that partners were currently addressing were: holding training sessions at convenient times and locations, having separate consultations with men and women, provision of meals and transport refund for training outside the community, providing appropriate and targeted technical training. Some practical gender issues that partners should address are: income-generating opportunities for men to reduce migration; labour-reducing and gender-sensitive equipment provision; targeting women for financial management capacity building; providing pictorial communication as learning materials; reasonable and appropriate fees/cost for services; gender sensitisation; use of preferred varieties (e.g. Migera), and greater access to transportation.

Volunteer agents with GLCI were found to mostly be men, which staff stated was due to the high level of illiteracy among women and their constrained mobility. The selection process of volunteer agents depends on the partner organisations' focus and scope of work. Gender-sensitive selection criteria should be introduced to increase the number of female volunteer agents.

Partners will need to build their capacity in gender analysis frameworks, and gender-sensitive needs identification as these areas were generally weak among C:AVA and GLCI partners.

Recommendations include: GLCI and C:AVA to undertake capacity building with partner staff in gender and diversity skills; partners to closely examine the conditions of work for staff and work to improve organisational culture for gender sensitivity; the practical needs of

female and male staff should be identified and met; partners should ensure that women's labour and time burden do not increase with the GLCI and C:AVA projects, while at the same time they are not excluded from activities; improve access to gender-sensitive and labour saving technology; promote single-sex cassava group gardens; build on the success of SILC groups; develop customised training packages appropriate to the different knowledge bases and needs of male and female beneficiaries.

### **Impact on strategic gender needs and women's empowerment**

Strategic gender needs and women's empowerment are concepts that focus on the systemic factors that discriminate against women. Overall, partners had limited understanding in this area, revealing that partners are less aware of the structural barriers that constrain men and women in different ways. However, partners were able to cite a number of changes in gender roles in the past decade that pointed to strategic changes in society at large, due to changes in education levels of men and women, sensitisation activities and greater access and ownership over property for women.

None of the GLCI or C:AVA partners had a gender strategy or approach in place in their organisations. However, partners felt that they implicitly operated with gender in mind, especially in terms of equal representation of women and men in groups and in implementing activities. Therefore, there is a need for partners to establish a clear gender framework on which to base activities. This is a critical capacity need as it will establish a consistent and clear organisational approach that will identify precisely what organisations are aiming to achieve with regard to gender.

The levels at which women were involved in decision making positions within partner organisations was limited, but did vary to some extent. In terms of leadership within the partner organisations for gender issues, most partners did not have a person(s) responsible for gender (three out of nine partners). This is a clear area where C:AVA and GLCI partner organisations will need to improve. However, it was noted that some partner organisations were addressing strategic gender issues including: promoting women to take on leadership roles, promotion of education among girls, sensitisation on property ownership, promoting role-models for women, and training for community/clan leaders in human rights abuses and violations.

Partners stated the following positive impacts of their field operations on women's empowerment: improvement in women's skills, additional sources of income for women, increased control over income and increases in savings, creation of social bonds and networks, greater access to decision making, greater access to finance and changes in attitudes towards women and their roles.

Important strategic gender issues that partners could address to improve the impact in their organisations and their work are as follows: develop a gender strategy framework and mainstream it throughout their organisations and their operations; promote ownership among women through credit provision to invest in equipment; encourage and enhance group savings such as with SILC; train beneficiaries in entrepreneurial skills and value addition; ensure women's ongoing participation in all aspects of the cassava value chain through

gender-sensitisation activities and sex-disaggregated targets; promote access to land for women and girls, and encourage men to share more household and productive activities with women.

### **Awareness and responsiveness to key diversity issues**

While gender is a principal area of social difference, it can interact with a number of other characteristics and increase vulnerability or social exclusion. Partners showed a lack of exposure to the concept of diversity, but had a strong appreciation of it and were implicitly addressing some diversity issues in the field.

Stemming from the lack of awareness of the concept of diversity, many partners did not have measures in place that would address difference in the workplace. However, in field operations, staff felt that their beneficiaries represented the diversity within the country. A number of organisations were supporting vulnerable groups, including orphans, disabled people and people affected by conflict. It is important that the experiences in these programmes are also transferred to GLCI and C:AVA activities in order for these groups to benefit from activities.

The majority of partners felt that they were aware of the different needs of groups and were meeting these through their activities. However, the extent to which monitoring and consultation was done with different groups in the community to identify these needs is unknown. Some partners expressed that their activities could exclude people with disabilities and people with HIV/AIDS. Others felt that due to limitations in the scope of the projects they work on, they were unable to meet the specific needs of certain groups because of constraints in their remit. Working with other organisations that address some of these issues, along with mainstreaming a diversity approach in activities, may help to address the needs of minority or disadvantaged groups.

Recommendations are: GLCI and C:AVA to undertake capacity building activities to improve the understanding of diversity issues among partner organisations; partners to consult staff on their work place needs and agree on action points; internship opportunities should be promoted in organisations, specifically targeting women and youth; youth should be a priority target group; GLCI and C:AVA should promote the use and facilitate partnerships to delivery more adaptable technologies and processing equipment for different beneficiary groups; GLCI and C:AVA to facilitate capacity building for partners in conflict resolution and negotiation, particularly in terms of land and natural resources.

### **Enabling participation**

The purpose of this performance area is to identify what is currently being done to enable participation and how it can be improved with gender and diversity in mind, within organisations and in their field operations. The majority of staff in partner organisations felt that their opinions and views were included in decision making in the organisation. Overall, staff participated in the strategic direction of their organisations through regular planning meetings with management.

In field operations partners utilised a range of participatory methodologies, which they felt added value to their activities. Some of the methods used were: community engagement through village leadership, participatory rural appraisal, sex-disaggregated consultations, participatory action research and farmer-to-farmer training. However there were some practices that could be improved upon, such as over-reliance on written questionnaires and consulting with village leadership only.

Recommendations included: partners should develop more creative ways to encourage staff participation; with GLCI and C:AVA support, partners should improve communication by making it gender and diversity sensitive; partners to review, revise and implement leadership criteria within farmer groups with village leaders and groups themselves, address barriers to participation; C:AVA and GLCI country offices should promote a participatory monitoring and evaluation system.

## **Innovation**

Innovation simply means ‘a new way of doing something’, or for organisations, doing something new. Innovation provides different ways to achieve a goal often in terms of improving efficiency, productivity, quality etc. Overall, staff felt that learning was an area that required improvement in their organisations. There were a number of areas in which staff felt that they required new skills; however, due to limited resources this was seldom realised. Despite this, findings from the staff self-assessment questionnaire indicated that learning and innovation were promoted in their organisations. It is therefore important for partners to undertake cost-effective means to promote learning for their staff, to increase the effectiveness of staff and their motivation.

Overall, the majority of staff from partner organisations felt that they were innovative in their work. Staff at some partner organisations reported that they tried ‘new ways of doing things’ in their work, for example: encouraging women to participate through building the trust of their spouses, embarking on value addition with cassava flour, starting a “Mr. and Madam Agriculture” competition, and the establishment of farmer learning centres in communities linked with farmer clubs.

Recommendations included: GLCI and C:AVA to facilitate the improvement in understanding of ‘innovation systems’ among partners and promote shared-learning activities; partners should encourage staff development through skill and confidence building and incentives; facilitate more participatory processes between staff and with external partners for shared learning, new ideas and information dissemination; sustain and create effective partnerships, particularly between research and field operations; encourage ownership in the organisation such as giving staff control over budgets.

# **1 Introduction**

## **1.1 Background**

The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation is currently funding two major projects in Africa relating to cassava: the Natural Resources Institute (NRI)-led Cassava adding Value for Africa (C:AVA) project operating in five countries (Nigeria, Ghana, Tanzania, Uganda and Malawi) and the Catholic Relief Services (CRS)-led Great Lakes Cassava Initiative (GLCI) which is working in six countries (Burundi, Democratic Republic of Congo, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania and Uganda). Uganda is one of two countries where both projects are operating. Both projects have recognised the importance of linking the disease and production-focus of GLCI with the market-orientation of the C:AVA project in order to maximize impact on cassava production, productivity, profitability, sustainability and scalability. The respective specific purposes of the two projects are as follows:

C:AVA was designed to support sustainable and equitable high quality cassava flour value chains and thereby improve the livelihoods and incomes (by a minimum of USD 190 per year) of more than 90,000 smallholder households and of stakeholders in micro, small and medium scale enterprises. Benefits will be equitably distributed and will particularly promote the empowerment of women. In Uganda the project is being implemented over a three year period, which started in April 2009 in partnership with the Africa Innovations Institute, Kampala.

GLCI envisions strengthening the capacity of 60 local African partners and approximately 1.15 million farmers within four years, to address cassava mosaic disease and the emerging cassava brown streak pandemics that threaten food security and incomes of cassava dependent farm families.

Gender and diversity is a key cross-project theme, the importance of which is recognised by both projects. The two projects agreed to use a common methodology for gender and diversity situation analyses and audits to improve project implementation and to facilitate sharing and lesson learning.

This report is compiled from research conducted with C:AVA and GLCI partners in central, mid-eastern and eastern Uganda.

## **1.2 Objective**

The objective of the Gender and Diversity Audit is to identify how partners think and how they do things regarding gender and diversity. A Gender and Diversity Audit is a type of social audit that is used to analyse organisational culture, technical capacity, policies and practices in order for partners to develop more sensitive practices and structures. This is to help ensure that the impacts of the project are equitable, that opportunities are promoted for different groups and that adjustments are made to encourage participation at all points along

the value chain. The idea is not to impose ideas but rather explore opportunities for C:AVA and GLCI partners to meet project goals.

### 1.3 Methodology

Based on the lessons learned from previous social audits (Underwood, 2000), the methodology for the C:AVA and GLCI gender and diversity audit attempts to triangulate evidence and include both internal and external evaluation. This will ensure that the data obtained is reliable, and reflects both tangible and intangible gender and diversity aspects. However, because the gender and diversity audit is conducted with a wide range of partners with various structures and levels of participation in the C:AVA and GLCI projects, the methodological tools were used flexibly - but the audit team put in an effort to make the results as comparable as possible.

A key point of clarity in conducting the audit is to clearly establish the level at which the audit was conducted in partner organisations. This is because some of the stakeholders have only a few staff dedicated to the C:AVA and GLCI projects; they are large bodies and have alternative demands to C:AVA and GLCI. To overcome this, the scope was limited in the organisational sphere to a sample of staff that are most relevant to C:AVA and GLCI. This is to ensure that the audit is reflective of the resources, remit and responsibilities of all those directly involved with the project.

The methodological tools, their scope and the staff interacted with are tabulated below:

| Methodological tools          | Who                       | Description   |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------|---|
| Document review               | Partners and country lead | All available strategies, policies, learning material, reports and evaluations relevant to gender and diversity.  |
| One-to-one interviews         | Partners and country lead | Interview with C:AVA/GLCI managers and/or strategic, operational and human resource management staff.   |
| Focus groups                  | Partners                  | Approximately two discussion groups with C:AVA/GLCI staff, separated by sex where numbers were large enough (over 3 women).   |
| Self-assessment questionnaire | Partners                  | Self- assessment questionnaire distributed to a sample of staff and management. The sample consisted of those who participated in the interviews and discussion groups, and anyone else showing interest in completing the questionnaire. Questions rating performance on a scale of one to five. |

### 1.4 Short description of partner organisations

There were nine partner organisations involved in this study. A short description of each of the partners is provided below. These include Nakasongola District Farmers Association (NADIFA), The Hunger Project (THP), Farming for Food and Development Programme – Eastern Uganda (FADEP-EU) and Volunteer Efforts for Development Concern (VEDCO) for

the GLCI project, and Pallisa Agribusiness Training Association (PATA), Popular Knowledge (Wo)men's Initiative (P'KWI Inc.), Vision Teso Rural Development Organisation (Vision TERUDO), Matilong Community Development Organisation (MaCDO), Soroti Sweetpotato Production and Processors Association (SOSPPA).

### ***Great Lakes Cassava Initiative (GLCI) Partners***

**Nakasongola District Farmers Association (NADIFA)**: Nakasongola District Farmers Association is a member organisation of Uganda National Farmers Federation. It is a company limited by guarantee and established in April 1998. NADIFA's vision is to have a leading farmers' organisation with commercial-oriented members for sustainable development. The organisation mobilises farmers to work together to fight poverty, increase food production and incomes at the household level in the rural farming communities of Nakasongola District. NADIFA has attracted 4023 members comprising of 1730 women and 2293 men.

**The Hunger Project (THP)**: The Hunger Project (THP) has operated in nine districts for the last ten years. THP's vision is a future free from chronic hunger and extreme poverty, a future where all women, men and children have the opportunity to lead healthy and productive lives. Its mission is to end hunger and poverty by empowering people to lead lives of self-reliance, meet their own basic needs and build better futures for their children. THP carries out its mission with strategies that are affordable, effective, replicable and sustainable using three strategic priorities, namely partnerships, advocacy and impact.

**Volunteer Efforts for Development Concern (VEDCO)**: VEDCO operates in the districts of Luwero, Wakiso, Nakaseke, Nakasongola, Kamuli, Apac, Lira, and Moyo. Its vision is to improve the quality of life of small/medium scale farmers through improving food and income security. VEDCO employs three strategies in pursuing its vision, namely improving community access to clean quality planting materials such as cassava, sweet potato, and banana, development of trainers in the community and working closely with farm research institutions such as Namulonge, Kawanda and IITA.

### ***Partner to GLCI and C:AVA***

**Farming for Food and Development Programme – Eastern Uganda (FADEP-EU)**: FADEP-EU works with the neediest communities in eastern Uganda but does not encourage giving relief/handouts, but sustainable support measures. It also works with women, who they feel are the main actors in farming. FADEP-EU's mission is promoting increased agricultural productivity and profitability, improved environmental/natural resources management and mitigation of rural socio-economic effects of HIV/AIDS plus basic community health management. Its goal is to increase sustainable livelihood opportunities for the rural poor through increased household production vigour/efficiency, and therefore contributing to rural poverty.

## ***Cassava Adding Value for Africa (C:AVA ) Partners***

**Pallisa Agribusiness Training Association (PATA):** PATA comprises of 37 farmer groups and was formed in 2002 by Private Sector Development Centre in Mbale. Its goal is to contribute towards improving the livelihoods of farmers and micro-entrepreneurs through food security, capacity building and income generation by the end of years. PATA's mission is to improve rural livelihoods through capacity building, increased productivity, promotion of commercial farming, improvements in farming technology, food security and household income. Its vision is to provide high quality farmer empowerment services for enhancement of food security and farm families' income generation. PATA's activities include work with cassava, sorghum, maize, groundnuts, cow peas, fruit growing, bee keeping, local poultry and farmer training services.

**Popular Knowledge Women's Initiative (P'KWI Inc.):** P'KWI Inc. started in 1993 by women in the north eastern region of Uganda. P'KWI Inc. focuses on dealing with issues of poverty, inequality and conflict. Its mission is to facilitate education; interaction and trade through the medium of club work for oil seed and fruit value chain.

**Vision Teso Rural Development Organisation (Vision TERUDO):** Vision TERUDO was started in 1982 with a focus on using community resources to help development, to localize development issues and to help design their programme. Vision TERUDO runs three main programmes, namely education, agriculture and health. The organisation operates in the entire Teso region covering the districts of Bukedea, Amuria, Katakwi, Kaberamaido, and Soroti. Vision TERUDO provides improved seeds, cocks, he-goats to farmers and builds capacity in the agronomic practices to these inputs. It also operates a loan and savings scheme.

**Matilong Community Development Organisation (MaCDO):** MaCDO was formed in 1992 by the youth in the Eastern region districts of Amuria and Katakwi. Its mission is to enhance the efforts of vulnerable people in Eastern and Northern regions of Uganda to attain socio-economic aspirations through capacity building, lobbying and advocacy for sustainable development. MaCDO has a vision of an enlightened, responsive and prosperous civil society promoting sustainable development.

**Soroti Sweetpotato Production and Processors Association (SOSPPA):** SOSPPA operates in Soroti district and started as an association of 13 graduate sweet potato small farmers groups, comprising 60% female members while 40% is male. SOSPPA started as a sweet potato processing association and has now taken on cassava.

## **1.5 Districts and regions visited, time-period of the study**

The districts visited include Nakasongola in the Central region, Kamuli and Pallisa Districts in the Eastern region and Kumi, Soroti and Bukedea in the North Eastern Region of Uganda. The fieldwork took place in January 2010.

## **1.6 Structure of the report**

This report presents an analysis of gender and diversity issues with C:AVA and GLCI partners including government and non-governmental service providers. Each section considers the current understanding of performance areas among staff and management, identifies trends in the organisational and operational spheres and summarises recommendations for C:AVA and GLCI partners.

Where relevant, the chapters are split into organisational and operational sections to distinguish between the two spheres. The report starts with a short chapter on the findings from the organisational analysis conducted with staff, which identified strengths and areas for improvement for C:AVA and GLCI partners. This is followed by six chapters, which are based on the six performance areas. This is followed by recommendations for C:AVA and GLCI partners. A listing of the capacity strengthening needs of partners is provided in the appendix.

## 2 Organisational Analysis

This chapter examines C:AVA and GLCI partners' organisational management performance based on the views of staff and management. This includes a general assessment of partners' ability to meet their set objectives, their strengths and areas identified as requiring improvement.

### 2.1 Partners' scope of work

Overall, both C:AVA and GLCI partners shared similar goals and motivations for their work. For the most part, partners were aiming to reduce poverty experienced by rural people through increasing their income and promoting food security with a focus on agriculture. Some organisations, particularly NGOs, also addressed social issues, such as HIV/AIDS. C:AVA partners were also undertaking more activities that work along other parts of the value chain, such as processing.

### 2.2 Areas of success and areas for improvement

In order to access views on organisational performance, staff at partner organisations were asked to rate various aspects of their organisation out of ten, in order to identify what was being done well in their organisations and what needed improvement. This exercise revealed that overall; staff and management were positive about their respective organisations and proud of their achievements. The table below summarises the organisational ratings for partner organisations in the various functions of management measured.

**Table 1 Staff ratings of key organisational areas by region (average score)**

| Organisational areas | GLCI Partners |       |     | GLCI & C:AVA | C:AVA Partners <sup>2</sup> |        |       | AVERAGE SCORE FOR ORG AREA |
|----------------------|---------------|-------|-----|--------------|-----------------------------|--------|-------|----------------------------|
|                      | NADIFA        | VEDCO | THP |              | FADEP                       | SOSPPA | MaCDO |                            |
| Management           | 7.3           | 7.2   | 7.7 | 9.3          | 7                           | 9.6    | 8.7   | 8.1                        |
| Financial management | 7.6           | 6.7   | 8   | 7.6          | 9                           | 9.4    | 8.7   | 8.1                        |
| Planning             | 7             | 7     | 8.2 | 8.4          | 8                           | 9.6    | 8.3   | 8.1                        |
| Communication        | 8.3           | 6     | 8   | 6            | 4                           | 9.2    | 7.8   | 7.0                        |
| Governance           | 5.3           | 6.6   | 8.2 | 6.5          | 8                           | 9      | 8.3   | 7.4                        |
| Monitoring systems   | 4             | 7     | 8   | 7.7          | 5                           | 9.8    | 7.5   | 7.0                        |

<sup>2</sup> Two C: AVA partners are not included in this table due to unavailability of staff (Pata and P'KWII)

|                                      |     |     |      |     |     |     |     |     |
|--------------------------------------|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Learning                             | 5   | 5.6 | 8.85 | 8   | 8   | 9   | 8.7 | 7.6 |
| Organisational policies              | 6.3 | 6.4 | 9.3  | 5.8 | 7   | 9.8 | 7.5 | 7.4 |
| Policy influence                     | 5   | 5.6 | 7.75 | 6.8 | 6   | 9   | 7.7 | 6.8 |
| Incentives                           | 2   | 5.9 | 7    | 6.3 | 9   | 8.8 | 7.5 | 6.6 |
| <b>AVERAGE SCORE BY ORGANISATION</b> | 5.8 | 6.4 | 8.1  | 7.2 | 7.1 | 9.3 | 8.1 |     |

Overall, the organisational areas that were rated the highest (on average) were: organisational management, financial management and planning. NADIFA (GLCI partner) for example, felt that planning was done well in their organisation because it included the views of staff on the priorities of their work. Training and mobilisation of farmers was another key area in which partners felt they were very successful.

V/TERUDO and MaCDO (both C:AVA partners) gave their organisation the highest average ratings compared to other partners, even in areas that were most likely to be perceived negatively by partners such as incentives. Importantly, two partners, NADIFA and VEDCO (both GLCI partners), mentioned that monitoring and evaluation (M&E) was done very well in their organisations. Other partners felt they were best at targeting male and female partners and in using innovative methods. This reveals that the successful areas of partners are complimentary and that there are opportunities for shared-learning.

The areas with the lowest (on average) scores were incentives and policy influence, which is similar to findings from other C:AVA and GLCI countries. NADIFA and VEDCO (both GLCI partners) had the lowest average ratings; however, the average score for both was over five out of ten.

Partners felt that incentives for staff to do high-quality work and meet their targets were inadequate. Interestingly staff incentives were not always described as being monetary, but also included mobility insurance, safety and leave, some of which should be a mandatory part of their employment package. Policy influence was another area that partners felt needed improvement. Partners stated that they needed greater skills in lobbying government for additional resources to conduct their work and also to raise awareness of important issues that government should address in rural areas. Partners also felt that they required additional staff because current staff were overstretched. Additional female staff were mentioned in particular, in order for their organisations to become more gender-balanced. Other areas staff felt needed improvement were M&E, communication with farmers and staff participation.

## 2.3 Capacity building

Partners felt that staff development and learning was an important area for improvement in order to address key capacity gaps in their organisations. Staff and management reported that these gaps were impacting on their ability to meet their organisational goals and C:AVA and GLCI objectives more specifically. In addition, with the increasing complexity of the relationship between livelihoods, wellbeing and the wider environment (e.g. global trade, climate change etc) staff require a greater range of skills to deal with these problems. The predominant barrier to addressing these needs is the lack of resources. To address this, partners' should first build their capacity in attracting funding and resources.

The specific capacity needs identified by staff and management are as follows, which are also provided in the appendix in more detail:

- Gender and diversity skills in human resources, policy development and building a positive organisational culture
- Gender analysis skills to enable staff identify and address practical and strategic gender needs of their beneficiaries, particularly in areas such as gender-based violence, human rights and inheritance rights
- Crop management and processing
- Financial management training for farmers
- Accessing and promoting technology to increase crop productivity and reduce labour burden
- Participatory M&E methods
- Information dissemination and awareness raising
- Seed multiplication and conservation, commercial production, marketing and value addition

It is important that C:AVA and GLCI work together to fill these capacity gaps in order to meet project objectives and help partners to improve the sustainability of their activities. Because the areas of strength and weakness ranged between partner organisations, there are opportunities for shared-learning within C:AVA and GLCI projects. For example, C:AVA partners could share skills in cassava value addition with GLCI partners, and GLCI partners could share their skills in group or farmers mobilization and participation, particularly from NADIFA and THP (GLCI partners) whose methods were found to be very empowering to both rural men and women. MacDO (CAVA partner) also has experience in policy influence and advocacy with work it undertook when foot and mouth disease erupted. Policy influence and advocacy are areas many partners felt needed improvement in their organizations.

## 2.4 Recommendations

- GLCI and C:AVA country offices to organise and facilitate a shared-learning session where partners can meet to discuss issues, share information and feed into country action plans. An area where GLCI can share its experience with C:AVA is on monitoring and evaluation.

- Partner organisations should take measures to increase finance in their organisation, such as attending training on advocacy and proposal writing.
- Partner organisations should focus on improving staff incentives, both monetary and non-monetary, to improve staff motivation, retention, development and greater independence

### **3 Providing equal opportunities and promoting equality**

This chapter examines equal opportunities in the context of the capacity of C:AVA and GLCI partners to provide and promote opportunities for all staff with their organisations and for beneficiaries.

#### ***Internal in the organisation***

#### **3.1 Staff and management understanding of equal opportunities**

In line with the Constitution of the Republic of Uganda 1995, the Employment Act of 2006 promotes equal opportunity in employment in that it sets out to eliminate discrimination. It also provides for equal pay for equal work. The Act further broadly defines discrimination to include any distinction, exclusion or preference made on the basis of race, color, sex, religion, political opinion, national extraction or social origin and HIV status or disability. The Employment Act also prohibits sexual harassment in employment.

Partner organisations stated that they understood the concept of equal opportunities and felt that they were provided for in their workplace for men, women and other minority groups. For the majority of partners, this understanding was limited to meaning non-discrimination. Emphasis was on employing staff according to their ability to do the job and their qualifications, regardless of their personal characteristics. Therefore there was no deliberate effort, policy or strategy to hire employees that were underrepresented or had a history of exclusion from employment. This does not take into consideration all of the provisions in the Constitution which provides for affirmative action of women and marginalised groups.

#### **3.2 Recruitment, retention and promotion of women and other groups**

The partner organisations' Boards and Executives Committees were responsible for human resources and the recruitment process. As noted earlier, recruitment was done on merit with no regard to representation of particular groups in the organisation.

Overall, staff felt that fair representation of different social groups was apparent in their organisations. Ten respondents felt that representation was 'excellent' (36%), while 15 felt it was 'sufficient' (51%). Only one person felt it was 'insufficient' (3%) while three people felt there was 'no adequate representation' of women and other groups (10%). On the whole organisations felt they had a fairly balanced representation of women and other groups in terms of numbers, despite the actual low number of female staff in reality (refer to section 3.3).

The work environment and conditions of work for different social groups in partner organisations was found to be adequate for most partners. According to the self-assessment questionnaire, 26 staff felt it was 'sufficient' (67%), while seven felt it was 'excellent' (18%).

An example of promoting a positive work environment and conditions of work for staff was FADEP-EU (GLCI and C:AVA partner) who provides insurance coverage for its staff and allows one hour break for nursing mothers. Nursing mothers were also allocated nearby field locations to operate and maternity leave was given for expecting mothers. Special needs of the elderly were accommodated by assigning them a work area close to their home. A further example is MaCDO (C:AVA partner), which supports staff with HIV/AIDS and long term sickness both personally and professionally. Good practices such as these can be institutionalised and mainstreamed throughout the organisation through policy development and capacity building.

### **3.3 Representation of women in partner organisations**

Despite the opinion of partners that they provided equal opportunities in their workplace, the majority of organisations had a low representation of women in their workforce. While the representation of women among staff was different for each C:AVA and GLCI partner, the number of women staff generally could be improved. In most cases, the number of women at management level was either non-existent or very low. Among non management staff there were more women, but male staff often were double the number of female staff. There were no targets found among partner organizations for female staff or other minority groups that would focus organizations on working towards a more balanced workforce.

For example in Kumi District out of the 20 Agricultural Officers, 18 were male and only two were female. Given the fact that women provide 60% to 80% of the labour to produce food for household consumption and sale, and the cultural taboos and suspicions associated with any male stranger entering a household to speak to the wife, one wonders how the male extension staff can be able to give quality extension services to the female farmers.

The lack of female representation in partner organisations however could be due to the lack of consideration of gender at the recruitment stage; therefore, there is a need to mainstream gender and diversity in the human resource policies of the partner organisations if this problem is to be addressed. To improve women's representation in the workforce, partners can use methods such as special job advertisements, posting advertisements in areas frequented by women, visiting university classes at agricultural higher education institutions to recruit women and even visiting schools to encourage girls into science at a young age. Secondly, the organisation should advertise how it will address the practical gender needs of female employees, such as by providing posts that are closer to the home, delivering motorcycle or driver training, providing crèche facilities and flexible working. Other partners who have been successful at recruiting women could also share their methods with other partners.

### **3.4 Monitoring and evaluation**

The M&E process in partner organisations was not uniform in quality or structure. However, partners felt that monitoring and evaluation was done well. Nine respondents felt that monitoring was 'excellent' (23%) while 24 respondents felt it was 'sufficient' (62%). Three respondents felt it was 'insufficient' (8%).

As for P'KWI (C:AVA partner), M&E was conducted during community meetings and training using the three parameters; namely the views of the executive and farmers members and using picture reports. While for NADIFA (GLCI partner), the district executive committee undertook monitoring activities at parish, community and staff levels. THP (GLCI partner) was more advanced in its methods and had developed qualitative indicators and data gathering instruments for effective monitoring and evaluation, with a focus on gathering evidence for impact of their activities. At VEDCO, M&E was participatory, done through community meetings guided by SWOT analysis tools, with the M&E officer facilitating the process. FADEP-EU uses question and answer, face to face interactions, attendance lists, meetings with farmer groups and spot checks on the field. These experiences and lessons should be shared among C:AVA and GLCI partners to build greater capacity in monitoring and evaluation.

### **3.5 Recommendations**

- With support from C:AVA and GLCI country offices, partners should seek more knowledge in skills in understanding of inequality, stereotypes and hidden types of discrimination and favouritism in formal and informal practices and activities.
- Partners should establish formal equal opportunities procedures in recruitment, retention and promotion of staff, monitor progress and consider undertaken positive discrimination measures to rectify current imbalances in staff recruitment.
- Activities should be undertaken to promote a positive and supportive organisational culture for staff. This can be accomplished through staff social events, mentorship opportunities and training.
- Monitoring and evaluation procedures should be revised in organisations to include gender and diversity sensitive indicators along the timespan of projects. Impact indicators should also identify changes in the quality of life / livelihood /household welfare/status of women and men in the project areas.

## 4 Awareness and responsiveness to practical gender needs

Practical gender needs are what women and men perceive to be immediate necessities for their livelihoods, such as water, food, employment or healthcare. These needs correspond to different responsibilities and priorities of women and men based on their traditional gender roles. This section reviews the findings on partners' awareness and responsiveness to practical gender needs in the workplace and in field activities.

### *Internal in the organisation*

#### 4.1 Understanding of gender and practical gender needs

Overall, partners had a basic understanding of gender. In general, staff definitions of gender included reference to the different roles and responsibilities of men and women, and relations between them. Staff explained that these differences resulted in inequalities, and therefore special measures were sometimes necessary to ensure equal participation and benefit. Most staff referred to examples of gender in their work referring to rural farm communities. There was less reference to gender within their workplace. For the majority of staff, gender was described as mainly to do with women and revealed more of a 'Women in Development' approach to their thinking.

Staff had less understanding of practical gender needs; however, staff could provide examples of meeting practical gender needs, such as the provision of maternity leave and the need for separate space for men and women to participate in activities in the field.

*"[Gender] is how males and females relate to each other for a respective purpose. Gender means to be sensitive in group formation. Practical gender needs means job separation [based on] gender roles" (MaCDO – C:AVA).*

*"Gender means women and girls. It is associated with women and how we can uplift women" (THP - GLCI).*

#### 4.2 Addressing practical gender needs in the workplace

Staff and management at partner organisations were asked to discuss the changes in the workforce in the past decade in terms of women's employment and measures introduced by employers to accommodate the demographic change. For both C:AVA and GLCI partners, staff felt that their workplace offered them the flexibility required to fulfil their parenting roles, which is often considered a practical need of women, who are often considered responsible for childcare. On the whole, ten respondents felt that the arrangements made for parents in the workplace were 'excellent' (26%), 23 felt they were 'effective' (59%), and five respondents felt that there were 'no practices in place' (13%).

Maternity leave was provided by employers in line with the government workplace policy; however, paternity leave, which is also afforded in the Employment Act, was not provided except at VEDCO (GLCI partner). VEDCO also provided female staff with time to nurse children, and importantly, women with young children could be exempted from fieldwork or choose to work close to their home. This is a positive finding, as it allows women and men to manage their multiple responsibilities while maintaining employment. However, arrangements for parenting were largely afforded to female staff, which could reinforce men's exclusion from participation and responsibility in parenting.

There was some evidence that partners, particularly THP (GLCI partner), were addressing women's practical needs in travel. Travel is seen as a major issue for female agricultural extension agents and represented a key reason why some women had difficulty working in extension in many countries. This is because motorbikes are seen as difficult for women to drive because it requires strength and straddling the bike is considered to be inappropriate for women. THP recognised this and has provided vehicles for female staff to travel to the field instead of motorbikes. While this shows the attention that THP takes in addressing practical gender needs, it is important to challenge traditional stereotypes that can restrict women's ability to travel to promote more strategic changes in the lives of women.

### **4.3 Organisational culture**

Overall, most C:AVA and GLCI partners expressed positive and supportive organisational cultures and gender-sensitivity, but there is room for improvement. According to the staff self-assessment questionnaire, 26 respondents felt that gender-sensitive behaviour was 'always' used (67%), 11 respondents felt that they are 'usually' used (28%), and one person felt this behaviour was 'seldom' used. However, due to a low level of understanding of gender concepts, staff may be unaware of more subtle types of discrimination which can impact on women's employment, which would be reflected in higher scores.

Another trend found in the self-assessment exercise was that the majority of staff felt that there was little preferential treatment in their organisations for a particular individual or group in their organisations, which indicates an equitable workplace environment. Twenty-two respondents felt that preferential treatment 'never' took place in their organisation (59%), ten people felt that it happened 'sometimes' (30%), and four individuals felt that it happened 'often' (11%).

#### ***Operations (field activities)***

### **4.4 Gender-orientated activities**

Partners have instituted a number of programs that address the practical needs of women and men. Most activities for partners did not target men or women separately, but farmers of both sexes in general. All partner activities had different participation levels of men and women. Activities involving a large number of women had a tendency to focus on

traditionally 'female' domains, such as family welfare and household food security. In contrast, activities involving more men focused on agricultural production and marketing, particularly of cash crops. This reinforces the finding that the addressing gender for partners was largely understood in practical terms instead of more strategically.

In terms of raising awareness of gender among beneficiaries, only one partner was found to be active in this area, where they conducted gender and workshops four times a year (THP – GLCI partner). GLCI and C:AVA should draw on the experience of THP to assist other partners in delivering similar types of programs.

## **4.5 Gender targeting and women's participation**

As stated in the Uganda Gender Situational Analysis, extension services in GLCI and C:AVA areas of operation are generally biased towards men, as support is provided on the basis of household headship basis, which is culturally considered to be male (UNHS 2005/06). Given this, it is very important that partners take appropriate action to limit the bias and target women. Women also play a greater role in the day-to-day care of cassava and are more involved in processing. Female headed households should also be targeted as they are more likely to be growing cassava, as opposed to male headed households which allocate more land to cash crops (NSDS 2004).

A positive finding was that partners felt that sex composition of beneficiary groups they worked with was important in delivering services. Some partners had established targets for women and men's participation, ranging from one-third, two-third and three-quarter women, equal numbers or separate groups. These approaches have different implications; for example, a 'women only' group may provide women with the necessary space to participate and not to feel intimidated by men, but it also avoids linking with men for more strategic activities that challenge gender roles. A 'one third women' group could place women in marginalised positions, especially in terms of decision making within the group.

Due to targeting, there were good levels of participation of women and men among partners who monitored levels of participation by sex. For example:

- NADIFA (GLCI): 43% female membership, 60% of training participants are women
- SOSPPA (C:AVA): 60% female membership
- VEDCO (GLCI): 80% female membership, 60% women in farmer group management
- PATA (C:AVA): 53% female members
- Community based processor groups (C:AVA) comprised of (on average) 70% women and 30% men in all the regions

Participation of men and women varied according to whether the type of activities conducted by partners corresponded with traditional gender roles or stereotypes. For example, in VEDCO's (GLCI partner) activities, men had higher levels of participation in marketing programmes, which was due to their greater mobility and experience in marketing as compared with women. In credit programs, such as with THP's and FADEP-EU, the far

majority (approximately 90%) of treasurers were women. For THP, even the board members of village banks were all women. This is because partners have been encouraging greater access to credit for women, and because women are considered to be more trustworthy than men with finance, a gender stereotype.

## **4.6 Practical gender issues in service delivery**

Overall, most partners felt that gender was considered during planning, implementation and monitoring of field activities; however, there is room for improvement. According to the staff self-assessment questionnaire, seven staff felt that gender was 'completely' considered in planning, implementation and monitoring (24%), 13 people felt it was 'to a great extent', (45%), and nine people to 'some extent' (31%).

Some of the practical gender needs that partners were currently addressing were:

- Holding trainings at convenient times and locations FADEP-EU (GLCI and C:AVA partner, VEDO (GLCI partner), PATA and- V'TERUDO (C:AVA partners)
- Having separate consultations with men and women to encourage active participation and identify needs - V'TERUDO (C:AVA partner), FADEP-EU (GLCI and C:AVA partner)
- Provision of meals and transport refund for training outside the community - V'TERUDO (C:AVA partner)
- Providing appropriate and targeted technical training: women were found to be intercropping, which enhances food security, income and saves time in weeding, which is very important to women and vulnerable groups; women were found to be more knowledgeable than men in terms of knowledge of cassava diseases and management (GLCI partner).

Other practical gender needs that GLCI and C:AVA partners will need to address to encourage sustainable participation of men and women in project activities are as follows:

- Need for income-generating opportunities for men to reduce migration
- Labour-reducing and gender sensitive equipment to reduce the work burden on women. Weeding and peeling cassava is particularly burdensome and time consuming on women
- Better access to transportation; a practical need with strategic potential, which, if addressed could provide women with greater access and control over income through increased participation in marketing
- More appropriate equipment for women, the long-term ill and disabled (to alleviate the heaviness of ox-ploughs, tediousness of hand tools in land preparation etc.)
- Financial training and credit targeted for women, as it often favoured men (SILC groups with GLCI)
- Targeting women for capacity building, particularly for the delivery of disease identification/prevention and value-addition training in order to ensure their continued participation in the production and processing of cassava as it becomes more commercial.

- Use of preferred varieties (e.g. Migera) to reduce time spent drying
- Providing pictorial communication and learning materials in areas frequented by men and women to increase access to information;
- Holding meetings in communal and neutral areas (e.g. schools),
- Reasonable and appropriate fees/cost for services
- Sensitisation for women's participation: in some isolated cases, men refused to allow their wives to participate in group activities (Kamukamu FGD in Luweero)

Other limitations in participation stemming from practical gender needs are lack of access to information, poor leadership skills, low literacy levels and conflicts in groups. It would also be beneficial for partners to build their capacity in gender analysis frameworks, particularly for needs identification of men and women, as it was found that no partners referenced specific gender-sensitive methodologies.

#### **4.7 Volunteer agents**

As part of GLCI activities, volunteer agents are selected as the key liaison between the project and community. For the most part, the majority of volunteer agents are men, which staff stated was due to the high level of illiteracy among women and their constrained mobility. The selection process of volunteer agents depends on the partner organisations' focus and scope of work. For example, PATA (C:AVA partner) selects one volunteer for every sub-county and women are encouraged to participate - they now have a total of six men and three women. V'TERUDO and SOSPPA (both C:AVA partners) ask the communities to select volunteers and the majority of those selected were professionals. Communities usually select volunteers who are respected members of the community, stay within their localities, are readily available and have some reasonable level of education, and even a profession such as teaching.

#### **4.8 Gender skills among staff**

Gender and Diversity skills were generally weak among C:AVA and GLCI partners. Gender concepts were only partially or poorly understood for partner organisations. However, there were relatively good skills in gender among VEDCO and THP (GLCI partners), and V'TERUDO (C:AVA partner). The remaining organisations felt that they needed training in order to improve their responsiveness to gender and diversity issues in their organisations and in the field.

With regard to availability and use of information on gender and diversity, 21 people felt that information, resources and people with expertise on gender and diversity were 'available and used' (75%); while seven people felt they were 'not available' (25%). This is a good indication that there are existing resources available to staff to build their capacity in gender and diversity that can also be shared with other partners. It is important that management provide staff the time and appropriate environment to make use of these resources.

## 4.9 Recommendations

- GLCI and C:AVA should undertake capacity building with partner staff in gender and diversity skills, such as undertaking gender and diversity analysis, interpreting results and implementing gender-sensitive projects.
- Partners should undertake group critical reflection activities to closely examine the conditions of work for male and female staff in the partner organisations and work to improve organisational culture for gender sensitivity. This should identify the different practical needs of female and male staff and how they are being met or assisted within their workplace.
- Partners should ensure that women's labour and time burden do not increase with the GLCI and C:AVA projects, while at the same time they are not excluded from activities (this may be done by examining opportunity costs of participation for men and women). This can be addressed by partnering with organisations to introduce labour saving technology (peelers, processing equipment) and equipment that is sensitive to the needs of women and men and reduces labour time.
- Partners should promote single-sex cassava group gardens to ensure adequate space for both men and women to participate, and ultimately benefit from, opportunities provided in both projects.
- GLCI and C:AVA should build on the success of SILC groups, to encourage and enhance group savings for beneficiaries, particularly among women who are often excluded from credit provision. A SILC component could also be linked to the government 'Prosperity for All Program' with their access procedures. Credit facilities will need to take into account the particular needs of women, such as lack of collateral.
- Extension training packages should be customised to the different knowledge bases of beneficiaries (such as the high level of illiteracy among women), and consider the different needs of men and women, such as time availability, travel constraints and cultural restrictions.

## 5 Impact on strategic gender needs and women's empowerment

Strategic gender needs and women's empowerment are concepts that focus on the systemic factors that discriminate against women. Strategic gender needs are long-term, usually non-material, and are often related to structural changes in society regarding women's status and equity. Empowerment is an expansion of this concept, and refers to the ability of women to make strategic life choices in a context where it has previously been hindered or denied. This section examines partners' impact in this area.

### *Internal in the organisation*

#### 5.1 Understanding of empowerment and strategic gender needs

On the whole, empowerment and strategic gender needs were understood by few partner organisations. Most descriptions of these terms included the importance of participation and the involvement of both sexes in activities, which did not differentiate from their explanation of gender. Staff therefore had limited understanding of strategic gender issues and understood gender more in terms of practical needs, revealing that partners are less aware of the structural barriers that constrain men and women in different ways. Some explanations of empowerment and strategic gender needs given by partners are provided below:

- *"Gender is tricky and that women's work was divided by gender roles"* (SOSPPA, C:AVA partner)
- *"How women and men relate to each other for respective purpose. Being gender sensitive in their groups. Empowerment is understood as bringing females and males on board, fair involvement of both sexes. SGNs are roles set to help one's family to come up"* (MaCDO, C:AVA partner)
- *Empowerment basically deals with changing their perspectives, taking on leadership positions such... in communities and groups* (PATA and V'TERUDO, C:AVA partners, and FADEP (GLCI and C:AVA partner).

However, partners were able to cite a number of changes in gender roles in the past decade that pointed to strategic changes in society at large. Reasons for these changes were education, sensitisation and access and ownership over property. Some of the examples given were:

- Some men were reported to have started working to help their wives to do some housework. Men would now fetch water, bathe the children, nurse the sick and engage in collective decision making
- Women's dependency on men in terms of income had reportedly reduced.

- Women would now eat different types of food which were previously enjoyed only by men, such as the forbidden fish head, eggs, chicken, lungfish - these delicacies could now be shared among husband, male and female children and wife.
- Women's involvement in planning and decision making at the household level had increased
- Women contributed money for household expenditures
- Women were perceived less as property or objects
- Increase in women's leadership and political involvement
- Increase in the number of female entrepreneurs
- Women riding bicycles
- Increased involvement in marketing activities

Despite these changes, SOSPPA (C:AVA partner), felt more needed to be done, as men continued to *"have the upper hand in everything"*. In addition, there is also a perception that women's greater involvement in supplying income for household expenditures is very positive; however, it is important that responsibility is shared within the family in order not to increase women's responsibilities in the household.

## **5.2 Gender strategy**

None of the GLCI or C:AVA partners had a gender strategy or approach in place in their organisations. However, partners felt that they implicitly operated with gender in mind, especially in terms of equal representation of women and men in groups and in implementing activities. Some organisations have developed targets for equal participation in field operations, such as the one-third requirement for women's representation as laid out in the Affirmative Action Clause of the Constitution of the Republic of Uganda (1995), as was the case with THP (GLCI partner), and PATA (C:AVA partner). VEDCO (GLCI partner) has a gender manual to guide operations and community engagement, but no policy document per se. As for Vision TERUDO, there was no strategy on gender but *'gender was mainstreamed as a culture in the organisation'*.

Therefore, there is a need for partners to establish a clear gender framework on which to base activities. This is a critical capacity need as it will establish a consistent and clear organisational approach that will identify precisely what organisations are aiming to achieve with regard to gender. Furthermore, this approach should be 'mainstreamed' or applied throughout organisational and operational spheres to reduce the segregation of gender issues in one department or programme(s).

## **5.3 Women in decision-making positions and gender focal persons**

The levels at which women were involved in decision making positions within partner organisations was limited, but did vary to some extent. THP (GLCI partner), FADEP (GLCI and C:AVA partner), and MACDO (C:AVA partner) showed the most positive results, where all had at least one women in management positions, either as chief executives or senior managers.

This is a clear area where C:AVA and GLCI partner organisations will need to improve, in order to improve the inclusiveness and gender impact within their own organisations.

In terms of leadership within the partner organisations for gender issues, most partners did not have a person(s) responsible for gender. At the time of the consultations, three out of nine partners had a gender focal point person (NADIFA and VEDCO - GLCI partners, and FADEP-EU - GLCI and C:AVA partner). Hiring a gender focal point person or training an existing member of staff in gender-related skills is very important in ensuring that gender issues are addressed in the organisations and providing key skills to support staff in the work with communities.

### ***Operations (field activities)***

## **5.4 Addressing strategic gender issues and women's empowerment**

It was noted that some partner organisations were addressing strategic gender issues even though most of their activities were either gender-neutral or targeting practical gender needs. Some of these activities included:

- Promoting women to take on leadership roles at the farmer group level and on board of credit institutions
- Interventions on girl child education and HIV/AIDS (FADEP-EU, GLCI and C:AVA partner)
- Sensitisation on property ownership with linkages to culture and the law (FADEP-EU, GLCI and C:AVA partner)
- Employing a role-model approach in order to motivate women's participation (SOSPPA, C:AVA partner)
- Gender awareness and sustainable development programme (MaCDO, C:AVA partner)
- Training for community/clan leaders in human rights abuses and violations, particularly against women (V'TERUDO, C:AVA partner)

Partners also undertook some gender sensitisation activities in communities, which can help to promote women's empowerment, particularly by promoting women's involvement in decision making positions and encouraging men to help lessen the workloads of women. The practice of keeping separate demonstration gardens for men and women, as in the case of THP (GLCI partner) interventions in Kiboga District, was found to be a good example of empowering women as it gave them their own space to make decisions and benefit from their gardens.

Some of P'KWI Inc.'s (C:AVA partner) farmer groups showed evidence of promoting women's empowerment. Some of its female processors were having conflict with their husbands and experiencing domestic violence, which was related to the new income they received from processing. P'KWI Inc. would identify women experiencing these hardships

and the group will pay the woman in kind, according to her needs and in consultation with the affected woman. This shows that such groups already have existing mechanisms for ensuring that benefits are used by the women themselves.

In general however, the implicit approach of many partner organisations was a ‘women in development’ (WID) approach as opposed to ‘gender and development’ (GAD) approach. Generally, the WID approach targets women specifically in interventions; because of the roles they play in household wellbeing, to address poverty. While this approach can be beneficial in emphasising women’s inclusion into programmes, it can have the consequence of placing disproportional responsibility for women in poverty alleviation and household wellbeing. It also can ignore women’s important roles in production activities and roles outside the household, and reinforce a subordinate position of women in the household. A GAD approach in partner organisations would enhance gender equity and bring women’s empowerment to the fore. Partners should make effort of to involve women in decision making and leadership positions, sensitise men and women on gender sensitivity, and improving women’s awareness and exercise of their rights.

Important strategic gender issues that partners could address to improve the impact of their work, as identified in the Situational Analysis, are as follows:

- Encouraging men to share more household and productive activities with women
- Promoting women’s access to and ownership of land and other assets, such as by promoting positive gender relations within households and extended family
- Promoting girls inheritance to land and other assets
- Targeting widows, orphans, the elderly, people living with HIV/AIDS, people with disabilities and the youth for income-generating activities due to less access to land
- Addressing food shortages
- Maintaining women’s benefit and participation in the cassava value chain with increasing commercialisation

## **5.5 Decision-making**

Partners were active in encouraging women into leadership positions, as they have been traditionally underrepresented in authoritative positions in the community. Some organisations have introduced quotas or rules for women’s leadership and others have informally encouraged it, for example:

- P’KWI Inc. (C:AVA partner): three quarters must be women among the executive of groups, including as chairpersons and treasurers of all member groups
- FADEP-EU (GLCI and C:AVA partner) ensures that two-thirds of the project beneficiaries are women, also two women for sub-committees of five members
- NADIFA (GLCI partner): 40% target for women on board of groups
- VEDCO (GLCI partner): 80, 60% women in farmer group management

In some cases, such as with VEDCO’s groups, there are more women in decision making positions than men. FADEP’s community groups and THP’s bank board members also have more women than men in treasury positions, which reaffirms that women are often

considered to be more trustworthy than men when dealing with money. While this is an important source of power for women, partners should be careful it isn't the result of excluding men in accessing credit or participating in decision making.

*“At the District epicentre, 12 persons both sexes are equally represented i.e. 6:6. If the chairperson is a male, the vice chairperson has to be female and vice versa”*  
(THP, GLCI partner).

## **5.6 Partners' impact on communities and women's empowerment**

The staff self-assessment survey shows that the majority of staff feel they are making an impact on women's empowerment. Out of all staff surveyed, five people felt that the partners had 'completely' empowered women and helped them to make strategic life changes concerning their lives (17%), while 24 people felt that they had 'sufficiently' empowered women (83%). This indicates that partners feel they have made some progress, but due to their limited understanding of empowerment and strategic gender needs, this could be improved.

The following details are some examples of partners' strategic impacts and results for women:

- Improvement in women's skills (e.g. agronomy)
- Additional sources of income for women, increased control over income and increases in savings (PATA, SOSSPA, C:AVA partners; NADIFA, GLCI partner; and FEDEP-EU, GLCI and C:AVA partner).
- Creation of social bonds and networks among women through activities (e.g. baking with PATA, C:AVA partner)
- Improved confidence
- Greater access and participation in decision making
- Almost 10% - 20% of women have bank accounts (THP, GLCI partner)
- Positive changes in community attitudes towards women and development such as girl child education and protection (V'TERUDO, C:AVA partner)
- Men allowed women to participate in activities, talk and contribute (VEDCO GLCI partner)

Other more general changes in communities indicating improvement in the standard of living of beneficiaries are as follows:

- Acquisition of assets e.g. boda boda motorcycles (THP, GLCI partner)
- Changes in nutrition: e.g. taking 3 meals a day with food reserves available (V'TERUDO, C:AVA partner). Members were able to consume two meals a day, and fewer people than before would fail to get food (VEDCO GLCI partner).
- Group marketing and improved health (V'TERUDO, C:AVA partner)

## **5.7 Recommendations**

- Partners should develop a gender strategy framework and mainstream it throughout their organisations and their operations. This should address the strategic needs of women, men and vulnerable groups and how they will be met, if not recognised, by partner activities.
- Promote ownership among women through credit provision to invest in equipment and develop user friendly technologies for women. GLCI and C:AVA should encourage and enhance group savings such as the SILC component for GLCI since these help the women to source affordable funding for hired labour but at the same time promote knowledge brokering on micro-financing.
- Train women and men members of partner organisations and staff in entrepreneurial skills and value addition.
- Ensure women's ongoing participation in all aspects of the cassava value chain, particularly as cassava because more valuable and commercial. This should be combined with gender-sensitisation activities for farmer groups and households to ensure that women can have access and control over benefits of the labour and also to promote shared-responsibility for men and women in the household.
- Partners should directly address, or undertake sensitisation activities, that promote women's access and ownership of land, particularly for widows and girls.

## **6 Awareness and responsiveness to key diversity issues**

While gender is a principal area of social difference, it can interact with a number of other characteristics and increase vulnerability or social exclusion. Some of these characteristics are: age; class; ethnicity; religion; disability; national origin or language. Diversity is particularly important when looking at gender, as when it is combined with other personal characteristics such as age or marital status, an individual can experience a higher likelihood of exclusion. With these characteristics in mind, the extent to which partners are aware of and responsive to key diversity issues will be examined.

### ***Internal in the organisation***

#### **6.1 Understanding and skills in diversity**

Partners showed limited understanding and knowledge of the concept diversity, due to limited exposure to the concept. For some, it was an entirely new concept and their primary focus in addressing social difference was gender. Some practiced it, but lacked the knowledge of what they were practicing. However, there was strong appreciation of the concept among staff. They appreciated that people were different i.e. age, sex, religion, tribe etc, and were responsive to this to some extent. As a result, although diversity was not included as a strategic goal of organisation, some organisations have taken the initiative in addressing the needs of people, particularly the disabled, youth and widows, in their activities. Other vulnerable groups mentioned were the very poor, orphans, the elderly, people living with HIV/AIDS and other people without land. Partners expressed that they lacked adequate skills and knowledge in this area and wanted capacity building. There is also a need to develop programmes that target all the above diversity groups. It is also important to examine diversity internally in the organisation to identify how social difference plays a role in the workplace.

#### **6.2 Work arrangements for different groups**

Stemming from the lack of awareness of the concept of diversity among C:AVA and GLCI partners, many partners did not have measures in place that would address difference in the workplace, such as formal policies or even informal practices. Staff members are expected to deliver results and have the same performance requirements, which they felt a diversity-oriented approach may threaten. However, due to the prevalence of HIV/AIDS, management are starting to make arrangements for the long-term sick in their organisation, such as sick leave provided by MaCDO and the payment of medical bills for three months and provision of half salary during leave by V'TERUDO (both C:AVA partners).

## ***Operations (field activities)***

### **6.3 Activities targeted to different groups and impact**

Staff felt that their beneficiaries represented the diversity present in the country in terms of age, gender and ethnicity, depending on the location of the organisation. Despite the fact that diversity as a concept was not known to partners, there was no deliberate or unintended tribal segregation and discrimination noted. For example PATA (C:AVA partner) had membership from Bagwere, Banyole, Bateeso, Basoga, Badama, Bagisu, and Bakenyi ethnic groups. FADEPU-EU (GLCI and C:AVA partner) had mainly Itesots, Bagwere, Bagisu, and Banyole ethnic groups in their activities. Overall, partner organisations respected and worked with the different ethnic groups and gender in the areas they operated.

There were also examples where partners had taken diversity into account in their activities, despite it not being an explicit focus or goal of their activities. For example, P'KWI Inc. (C:AVA partner) is supporting a number of vulnerable groups, including orphans and disabled people through an oil seed and cassava multiplying planting project, addressing both social and economic issues. MaCDO (C:AVA partner) is undertaking a Peace, Reconciliation and Development project to ensure stability and harmonious co-existence between Karamojong and their neighbouring tribes.

### **6.4 Identification of the needs of different groups**

The majority of partners felt that they were aware of the different needs of groups and were meeting these needs in their activities. Six respondents felt that needs of different groups were 'adequately' considered during planning, implementation and monitoring activities (21%), fifteen felt that it was done to 'a great extent' (50%), while eight staff felt that it was done to 'some extent' (29%). However, the extent to which monitoring and consultation was done with different groups in the community to identify these needs is unknown. Different participatory approaches were used to identify the needs of the farmers, but more needs to be done on ensuring that needs and interests of different groups are represented in community meetings, which can often be skewed to particular groups in the community, as the next section describes.

### **6.5 Groups that are not benefiting**

Some partners expressed that their activities could exclude people with disabilities and people with HIV/AIDS. PATA (C:AVA partner), for example, felt that the very poor were excluded from activities because they were not able to afford services. NADIFA (C:AVA partner) stated that disabled people were often excluded from activities because they were physically constrained and could not participate in the labour involved in their activities. Others felt that due to limitations in the scope of the projects they work on, they were unable to meet the specific needs of certain groups because of constraints in their remit, such as people with HIV/AIDS and victims of domestic violence and human rights abuses. Working with other organisations that address some of these issues, along with mainstreaming a

diversity approach in activities, may help to address the needs of minority or disadvantaged groups.

## **6.6 Recommendations**

- GLCI and C:AVA should undertake capacity building activities to improve the understanding of diversity issues among partner organisations.
- Consult staff on their work place needs and agree on how these issues could be addressed. This should result in a set of action points that partners can implement to address diversity considerations in their work.
- Partners should provide internship opportunities at their offices, specifically targeting women, to encourage youth to participate in agricultural activities and see it as a future career options. Youth should also be a priority target group and for each activity, partners should have a youth-targeted activity alongside in order to increase their participation in sustainable agricultural activities. Workshops should be held with youth to mobilise them.
- GLCI and C:AVA should promote the use and facilitate partnerships to delivery more adaptable technologies and processing equipment for different beneficiary groups.
- Partners require capacity building in conflict resolution and negotiation, particularly in terms of land and natural resources. This will help equip staff with the ability to resolve and mediate conflicts in communities in which they work.

## **7 Enabling participation**

The purpose of this performance area is to identify what is currently being done to enable participation and how it can be improved with gender and diversity in mind, within organisations and in their field operations.

### ***Internal in the organisation***

#### **7.1 Participation within organisations**

The majority of staff in partner organisations felt that their opinions and views were included in decision making in the organisation. Twenty-seven staff felt that their opinions and views were 'always' sought out by their organisations (69%) and ten felt that their opinions and views were 'usually' sought out by their organisations (26%). Only one person felt that they were 'seldom' consulted and another person didn't know.

Overall, staff participated in the strategic direction of their organisations through regular planning meetings with management. For example, at PATA (C:AVA partner), board meetings are held monthly and group meetings are held weekly and are designed to ensure maximum participation of members by being held regularly and timely, using open discussions to solve problems. Other ways for staff to feed into the activities of their organisation were through weekly reports, monitoring and evaluation activities and board meetings.

### ***Operations (field activities)***

#### **7.2 Participation in field activities and group mobilisation**

Partners utilised a range of participatory methodologies in their field activities, which they felt added value to their activities. Some of the methods used were as follows:

- Consultations with sex-disaggregated groups
- Community engagement through local community leaders (MaCDO, C:AVA partner)
- Participatory Rural Appraisal, review meetings, consulting sub-county development plans and needs assessments (V'TERUDO, C:AVA partner)
- Needs assessment and baseline surveys conducted using participatory-action research (THP, GLCI partner)
- Farmer-to-farmer training strategy on value addition and post harvest handling (SOSPPA, C:AVA partner)

However there were some practices that could be improved upon. One partner utilised field-questionnaires to access information from community members. However, this relied on the ability of participants to read and write, which can exclude a large number of people who are illiterate, which is more prevalent among women and the vulnerable.

In addition, most partners engaged with the community through village leadership structures. While this method is important to gain permission and acceptance in communities which is crucial for activities to take place, it is important to not depend entirely on village leadership to gather community members and spread messages. This is because village leadership are embedded within sets of social relationships that may reflect power-imbalances in the community, causing replication of barriers to access for certain groups. Therefore participatory approaches should adopt measures, such as transect walks around communities, to ensure that different groups within the community are aware of partner activities.

It is important for partners to review their activities to see how women and different groups are participating in their activities, and if there are any barriers to participation that could be addressed. Some of the barriers identified in research are as follows:

- Lack of time for women to participate in lengthy meetings
- Lack of confidence to participate, particularly if it is not common for women to speak in front of men (Madaali Women FGD).
- Illiteracy
- Requirement of women to get permission from men to participate (Tansentu men's FGD)
- Excluding young mothers from youth groups because they are mothers

### **7.3 Staff skills in participatory methods**

The skills of staff in the use of participatory methods at the different levels of project implementation were highly commendable. Findings revealed that 22 staff felt they 'always' used participatory methods (73%), six staff felt they 'usually' use participatory methods (20%), while one staff felt they 'never' used them and one staff did not know (3%). This is a good indication that staff are familiar with participatory methodologies and they are used, but staff could benefit from learning more innovative and current methods.

### **7.4 Recommendations**

- Partners should develop more creative ways to encourage staff participation such as interdepartmental; or external field visits, role play.
- With GLCI and C:AVA support, partners should improve communication by making it gender and diversity sensitive; having female announcers, using local languages and reducing the written materials.
- Partners to review, revise and implement leadership criteria of farmer groups with village leaders and groups themselves, address barriers to participation and encourage groups, or set a quota for groups, to elect more female representatives and people from vulnerable groups.

- C:AVA and GLCI country offices should promote a participatory monitoring and evaluation system where male and female beneficiaries to provide feedback in monitoring and evaluation.

## 8 Innovation

Innovation simply means ‘a new way of doing something’, or for organisations, doing something new. Innovation provides different ways to achieve a goal often in terms of improving efficiency, productivity, quality etc. In terms of gender and diversity innovation is also important because gender and diversity relations are constantly shifting and being re-negotiated. New constraints and opportunities are continually arising and requiring new methods for understanding and addressing differences. In this context, innovation is examined to identify the extent to which partners facilitate processes for the creation and use of new ideas.

### 8.1 Learning and organisational promotion of innovation

Overall, staff felt that learning was an area that required improvement in their organisations. There were a number of areas that staff felt that they required new skills in; however, due to limited resources this was seldom realised. Despite this, findings from the staff self-assessment questionnaire indicated more positive results: 18 staff felt that learning and innovation was very ‘highly’ promoted (46%) in their organisation, and 19 staff felt it was ‘usually’ promoted (49%), while two staff felt that learning and innovation were promoted ‘to some extent’ (5%).

It is therefore important for partners to undertake cost-effective means to promote learning for their staff, to increase the effectiveness of staff and their motivation. Some examples of cost-effective learning opportunities are exchanges to other organisations or communities to share ideas and problem solve with other staff. Staff can also be asked to give presentations to others on areas of interest. SOSPPA (C:AVA partner) exemplified good practice when they created a Education and Publicity Committee that is responsible for promoting staff development, particularly among SOSPPA volunteers, in a cost-effective manner

Other methods were used to promote learning among beneficiaries, including promoting low labour intensive farming technologies, providing farmers with low cost farm implements, training households on effective food storage methodologies, seed multiplication, and adaptive research.

### 8.2 Use of innovative methods and examples

Overall, the majority of staff from partner organisations felt that they were innovative in their work. Ten staff felt that they ‘often’ used new and innovative methods regarding gender and diversity in their work (33%), while 20 staff felt they ‘usually’ use new and innovative methods regarding gender and diversity (67%). Staff at some partner organisations reported that they tried ‘new ways of doing things’ in their work. Some examples are:

- encouraged women to participate through building trust of their spouses (PATA, C:AVA partner)

- embarked on value addition to cassava flour, as in sweet potatoes (SOSPPA, C:AVA partner)
- initiated women leaders of village banks (THP, GLCI partner)
- organisation of a “Mr. and Madam Agriculture” competition, which motivated farmers to participate in extension activities (NADIFA, GLCI partner)
- promotion of a new framing system called “minimum tillage” to reduce on the costs (FADEP-EU, GLCI and C:AVA partner)
- establishment of farmer learning centres in communities linked with farmer clubs (P’KWI Inc., C:AVA partner)

### **8.3 Recommendations**

- Improve understanding of ‘innovation systems’ as an approach to innovation, which focus less on production of new technologies and more on information sharing.
- GLCI and C:AVA country team should facilitate platforms for shared learning on various activities.
- Encourage staff development through skill and confidence building and incentives using bonuses, training opportunities, bottom-up participatory approaches and management support.
- Facilitate more participatory processes between staff and with external partners for shared learning, new ideas and information dissemination.
- Sustain and create effective partnerships, particularly between research and field operations, which are critical for gaining new insight, influencing, and even gaining additional funding.
- Priorities for innovation should fall congruent with the priorities established in the previous chapters, such as developing new ways to present the organisation and communicate with the public, reaching to men and women, participatory research methods etc.
- Encourage ownership in the organisation such as giving staff control over budgets.

## **Appendix A: Areas of strength and areas to be improved for service providers**

|                 | <b>Areas of strength</b>   | <b>Areas to be improved</b>   |
|-----------------|--|---|
| <b>NADIFA</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mobilisation of farmers</li> <li>• Availability of a permanent office block with a hall used for public hiring</li> <li>• Farmer training sessions in agriculture and related enterprises</li> <li>• Cassava and maize processing/milling factory constructed with support from JICA</li> <li>• Periodic monitoring and evaluation</li> <li>• Regular planning with staff participation</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incentives; greater remuneration and benefits such as general support, allowances, mobility insurance and staff safety.</li> <li>• Learning; need for staff development</li> <li>• Sufficient funds to recruit and maintain staff</li> <li>• Influencing policy; need for skills in influencing legislators and donors</li> <li>• Need for a more gender balanced staff force equipped with gender skills and knowledge</li> </ul> |
| <b>FADEP-EU</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Food security – reserves at household level</li> <li>• Innovation – new methods to improve food production, new technologies and skills, well established farmers and entrepreneurs are used as model farmers to try out new technologies because they can bear the risk.</li> <li>• Mobilisation of farmers into mixed groups and ensuring equality in numbers of both men and women in each group.</li> <li>• Conducting farmer trainings on nutrition, farming as a business, and post harvest handling.</li> <li>• Farm Demonstrations and agricultural extension services</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve on the incentives to motivate staff such as annual leave, allowances and insurance.</li> <li>• Involvement of men and women in decision making to enhance gender equality</li> <li>• Learning; need for staff capacity development</li> </ul>  |
| <b>VEDCO</b>    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Management involves all staff</li> <li>• Staff owns the management planning, the decision in the strategic planning</li> <li>• Monitoring and evaluation is done internally and at a regional level</li> <li>• Nutrition and health – training farmers in basic nutrition principles, sanitation and hygiene</li> <li>• Create awareness on management and sustainability response to avoid deflation</li> <li>• Training in Food security</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advocacy skills for staff to be able to influence policy</li> <li>• Improve on the incentives to match with the cost of living for the staff</li> </ul>  |
| <b>PATA</b>     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least 40% of the members are not as</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Involving staff in decision making</li> </ul>  |

|                      |  |   |
|----------------------|--|---|
|                      | <p>poor as they used to be</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shelters have improved</li> <li>• Collective marketing of farm produce</li> <li>• Trainings – farming and leadership skills as well</li> <li>• Planning is encouraged on a weekly, monthly and annual basis. Staff plans for day to day tasks and activities.</li> <li>• Reporting to board and other sponsor organisations.</li> </ul>                                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improving the financial base to enable recruitment of permanent staff</li> </ul>   |
| <b>SOSPPA</b>        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial management</li> <li>• Incentives to staff and members</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employ a technical personnel to handle issues of quality control</li> <li>• Learning; the board requires skills in management, since this is a member-based organisation</li> <li>• Improve on communication and information flow within staff and among member farmers.</li> <li>• Regular monitoring and evaluation of activities</li> </ul> |
| <b>VISION TERUDO</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mobilisation is easy due to parish coordinators (entry point is always community leaders)</li> <li>• Advocacy; children’s clubs, caretakers form groups for loan schemes</li> <li>• Learning; groups’ capacities are built, do work without support from the organisation and initiate projects on their own.</li> <li>• Management involves staff in decision making and holds regular meetings</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve on incentives and their distribution to staff</li> <li>• Policy influence needs to be improved in order to attract donor funds</li> <li>• Annual planning</li> </ul>   |
| <b>MaCDO</b>         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy influence – such as advocacy with Sub County agricultural staff when foot and mouth disease erupted</li> <li>• Planning, weekly activity reports. Monthly meetings for all staff including those in field.</li> <li>• Qualified staff, dedicated, willing and motivated</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve on the incentives to motivate staff such as annual leave, allowances and insurance.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>THP</b>           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff participation, weekly and quarterly meetings attended by all staff to review performance.</li> <li>• Organisational policies</li> <li>• Learning, capacity development and creating awareness among staff.</li> <li>• Partnerships, advocacy and impact as priority strategies</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incentives were rated low especially in terms of long term training, as evidenced by the organisation’s budget; greater remuneration and benefits such as general support, allowances, mobility insurance, and staff safety.</li> <li>• Development of a gender policy for the organisation</li> </ul>   |

|                   |  |  |
|-------------------|--|--|
| <b>P'KWI Inc.</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning; P'KWI Inc. Targets women in the household in order to involve all the household members especially the children and the husband.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employ professional management staff</li> <li>• Improve the financial base through fundraising</li> <li>• Train the available staff to equip them with capacity for policy influence, planning and communication</li> </ul> |
|-------------------|--|--|