



GENDER AND DIVERSITY AUDIT - TANZANIA

APRIL 2010

**Lora Forsythe, Rose Shayo and
Adrienne Martin**



Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	3
Executive summary.....	4
1. Introduction	11
2. Organisational analysis	15
3. Providing equality of opportunities and promoting equality.....	19
4. Awareness and responsiveness to practical gender needs	26
5. Impact on strategic gender needs and women's empowerment.....	35
6. Awareness and responsiveness to key diversity issues	44
7. Enabling participation.....	47
8. Innovation.....	52
References.....	55

Acknowledgements

The Gender and Diversity Audit team 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 Tanzania C:AVA team, the GLCI team led by the Catholic Relief Services (CRS) along with the Tanzania Food and Nutrition Centre (TFNC). We would also especially like to thank Katherine Kimalando from TFNC for her comments and insight during the field research in Mtwara and Masasi regions. 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 & 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

From May to July 2009, the NRI and a local gender consultant conducted a gender and diversity audit of the Cassava: Adding Value to Africa (C:AVA) and Great Lakes Cassava Initiative (GLCI) projects¹. They were supported by CRS and TFNC. The objective of the gender and diversity audit 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 section presents the main findings from the C:AVA and GLCI gender and diversity audit in Tanzania 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. This report presents the *general* performance of partners, highlighting issues that could be addressed.

Organisational management

Areas of good practice: Staff were generally positive about their organisations, which were considered to perform well in most of their activities - in particular, reporting, communication and financial management. Partners also felt they could offer capacity-building support to other organisations participating in C:AVA and GLCI on a range of topics such as participatory methods, cassava production and processing, cassava diseases, entrepreneurial skills and even preparing cassava meals. This indicates that partners are skilled in a wide range of areas, which C:AVA and GLCI can draw upon.

Areas in need of improvement: The areas of their organisations held by staff to be in need of improvement were staff incentives (allowances, bonuses etc.) and learning (qualifications, new skills). In addition, the lack of funding and resources available to partners may constrain the performance of C:AVA and GLCI, particularly in terms of mobility and the number of dedicated staff for the projects. There was a degree of variation among partners' with respect to their areas of strength and areas requiring improvement, which highlights the potential for shared learning that the country teams could facilitate as the projects progress.

Monitoring systems: C:AVA partners should undertake capacity strengthening in monitoring and evaluation systems. This will need to focus on creating more comprehensive data collection and analysis systems. C:AVA stands to benefit from sharing learning with GLCI, where a consultant has already worked with individual partners to build monitoring systems. For both C:AVA and GLCI; however, it is important that the information collected through monitoring and evaluation is used dynamically, in order to correct and respond to issues as they are identified at various project levels.

¹ GLCI began one year before C:AVA and C:AVA activities are starting currently.

Providing equal opportunities and promoting equality

Equality in the workplace: Partners had a good understanding of equal opportunities and the majority of staff felt that there were equal opportunities in their organisations (80%). There was evidence of equitable organisational cultures; however, some of those consulted felt there were some issues of favouritism and gender insensitive behaviour in their organisations. However, partners lacked a policy framework or defined approach to equality, which would set out how equality can be supported systematically in their organisations. Management and staff also had difficulty in recognising more subtle types of discrimination, which can penalise particular groups and individuals within organisations.

Representation of women in the workplace: Generally, representation of female staff was low among partners, despite a number of government policies promoting women's employment. Representation of women was approximately 30% for partners, but for public extension services the proportion was lower. While increasing the number of female staff is important in its own right, it can also improve the ability of partners to work with women in rural communities (and therefore meeting project objectives), since it is often more culturally acceptable and less intimidating for women to work with female extension agents. Reasons given by staff for the low number of female staff include a male bias in recruitment procedures and the 'masculine' stereotype associated with the agricultural sector. Partners would benefit from exploring methods to increase their recruitment of women, such as offering incentives, mentorship programmes, direct recruiting or advertising among female graduates and encouraging young women to obtain qualifications in agriculture. Partners did not object to implementing these types of measures.

Increase opportunities for female staff in non-traditional agricultural areas: Most women employed by partners are working in areas seen as typically 'female' places of work, such as horticulture, home economics, processing, etc. While this helps outreach to women clients, which in turn allows practical gender needs to be met, it is also important to encourage the employment of women in male-dominated areas. Such encouragement, accompanied by the appropriate support, would challenge existing gender roles and stereotypes. However, a number of partners had good female representation at decision-making levels and staff felt that this helped to change perceptions in their organisations. Where women leaders were once looked on negatively, they are now perceived in a positive light. However, 42% of those consulted felt that representation of women and minority groups at the managerial level was insufficient.

Monitoring of staff characteristics: The majority of partners were able to provide information on staff characteristics in their organisations, such as the number of women or the representation of ethnic and religious groups among staff. This information enables organisations to undertake and analyse equality opportunities and identify the extent to which staff represent the local population. Partners should be encouraged to also undertake more systematic monitoring of staff characteristics by recruitment, retention and promotion indicators, in order to identify any bias in employment practices.

Gender and monitoring: Some of the partners, particularly those of GLCI, disaggregated basic project data by sex. This will help partners to identify the extent to which women are included in project activities and should be made a requirement for the C:AVA project. Gender can also be integrated into other areas of monitoring and evaluation, in order to better understand ongoing activities and their impact for

men and women. This may include indicators such as changes in household responsibilities, leisure time or workload, leadership opportunities and skill acquisition.

Awareness and responsiveness to practical gender needs

Practical needs in the workplace: Generally, staff were less able to identify the relevance of gender in the workplace than field activities. There were also some areas where female staff felt that their practical needs were not being addressed. In addition, most female staff were newly employed, indicating, perhaps, that there may be high turnover of female staff within organisations. Problems encountered by female staff include long work days, lack of employment benefits (e.g. housing allowance) and travel requirements. This was particularly problematic for women working in the Southern Region, where staff are typically recruited from outside urban centres. However, some organisations exemplified good practice by providing options for flexible working. C:AVA and GLCI should encourage partners to address practical gender needs to improve the recruitment and retention of women.

Areas where practical gender needs are being addressed in field activities: Overall, partners had a good understanding of gender and practical gender needs in field activities. Operationally, service providers have also instituted a number of programmes that address the practical needs of women in agriculture. These include the provision of credit, technical skills (particularly processing) and health-related support, which have been very successful. Often, these activities are focused entirely on women and correspond directly to their traditional gender roles.

Areas where practical gender needs should be addressed in field activities: Partners could adapt their activities to respond to more practical gender needs, particularly for women, the poor and other vulnerable groups. In areas such as: providing pictorial communication and learning materials in areas frequented by men and women to increase women's access to information; holding meetings in communal areas (e.g. schools) and at convenient times for men and women; reasonable and appropriate fees/cost for services; access to technology; building women's capacity in disease identification/prevention and value-addition.

Technology: Partners need to build the capacity of groups to use maintain new technology, such as graters, mobile graters and drying equipment for C:AVA and new resistant varieties for GLCI, for women to access benefits from the two projects. Equipment maintenance is very important, as in one organisation's experience, a cassava processing machine was left inert by a women's group because members did not know how to fix the machine when it broke down and men declined to become involved.

Lack of expertise: It was noted that partners lacked expertise in gender and its application in the field and within their organisations. Areas where skills gaps were identified included community engagement, (such as group mobilisation), needs assessments, conflict resolution and participatory methods. Some staff had undertaken courses on gender or functioned as the dedicated contact on gender issues; however, they often felt that they lacked knowledge of the practical application of gender in their work.

Impact on women's strategic needs and women's empowerment

Gender strategy: The overall finding was one of limited understanding and application of gender empowerment approaches. Some partners felt that the concept was not relevant to their work and/or too problematic in particular contexts. Other partners stated that they did want to have more of an impact on women's empowerment, but lacked the skills to apply the concept to their work. Both the lack of understanding and commitment to women's empowerment could reduce the strategic gender and poverty impact of the C:AVA and GLCI projects, unless appropriate actions are taken.

Donor requirements: Commitment to gender by organisations is often lacking, due to the precarious courses that many organisations have to pursue between their own strategic direction and those of donor organisations. There was some evidence that organisations are including gender in proposals to simply increase the likelihood of winning donor contracts, or that they can easily shift their attitudes towards gender because of donor requirements. Other partners did not consider including gender at all if it was not specified by the donor. This reveals that partners need to increase their awareness of gender and of the benefits of addressing gender issues in their organisations and in their work. In addition, adopting a strategic approach to how gender is addressed in their work will help staff to build on their skills, experience and commitment over the long term.

Impact: Despite the absence of a strategic commitment to gender among partners, partners did feel that their activities were having an impact on women in a strategic way (92% of those consulted), particularly with regard to poverty reduction, social status and women's leadership and entrepreneurship. Partners also felt that wider societal changes were making it more acceptable for men and women to expand and challenge their traditional gender roles. However, most service providers were not taking any explicit actions or activities designed to promote women's empowerment, such as encouraging women and men to work in areas that do not conform to traditional gender roles.

Conflict resolution and negotiation: Partners were aware that their activities, whether explicit or not, were changing gender roles in the household, and had caused conflict in some cases. Some partners, particularly NGOs, felt that they required capacity-building in terms of gender-based conflict resolution, in order to deal with these issues. In particular, staff wanted capacity in communicating the importance of women's involvement, dealing with situations when men and women's priorities in the household or community conflict and understanding how to empower men to take on household responsibilities. Staff generally felt uneasy in these situations because gender roles were equated with culture, which they felt should be respected and not interfered with.

Awareness and responsiveness to key diversity issues

Awareness: Partners had a low awareness of diversity as a social concept but a high appreciation for the insight it provides in terms of community engagement and reaching out to vulnerable groups. However, there was a notable perception among partners that specific measures for vulnerable groups, designed to equalise opportunities and benefit in their programmes, would run contrary to a merit-based or equality approach – as used by the majority of partners.

Outreach in field activities: Overall, partners felt that they are reaching out to different members of communities through their work; however, this did not constitute an explicit focus and has not been reported on. Partners were facilitating a number of key activities addressing diversity issues, particularly in targeting youth employment in agriculture to reduce urban migration. However, staff felt that there could be more projects that address specific diversity areas such as specific tribal groups, disability and migrants.

Diversity and monitoring and evaluation: Many partners are not including diversity indicators in their monitoring and evaluation systems. As such, there was a lack of awareness among partners of how to reach out to different groups. With diversity in mind, data should be collected and analysed by various modes of difference in C:AVA and GLCI.

Enabling participation

Organisational participation: Internally, organisational participation was mainly conducted through staff meetings, field visits and networking with external organisations. The majority of staff felt that the opinions and views of women and diverse groups were sought out and that these contributed to organisational change. On this subject, partners were for the most part positive.

Partnership difficulties: Some GLCI partners expressed their wish to be more involved in the planning and strategic direction of GLCI in partnership with CRS. Partners wanted to be able to feedback into the project's direction, and to represent the needs of farmers to make the project more responsive and effective. However, interaction between partners has been increasing in the GLCI project, particularly between research institutions and service providers. Participation within organisations and between partners could be improved to include more creative methods to encourage innovation and problem-solving for GLCI.

Participatory fieldwork approaches: There was a good understanding of participation and participatory methods among partners. Partners used a range of methods and approaches to encourage participation in C:AVA and GLCI field activities. Public extension agents, for example, utilised the Opportunities and Obstacles to Development (O&OD) framework for participatory engagement with communities, including needs identification and information dissemination. Other partners utilised farmers' field schools, wealth-ranking, problem-tree activities and participatory variety selection. However, staff could benefit from capacity-building in different participatory approaches, including a greater emphasis on 'who' is participating', as well as issues of access, power structures and inequality – since some of the main barriers to inclusion are structural (e.g. unequal access to education, lack of control over resources, gender stereotypes). C:AVA, in particular, will also need to support processing enterprises, in order to create a diverse and vibrant supplier group that will provide opportunities for participation by women and men.

Village power structures: Community engagement activities of C:AVA and GLCI partners mainly consisted of working through village authorities in field operations. While this step is crucial for gaining entry into communities, it can limit the scope of partners in engaging with the rest of the community. For example, the majority of partners undertake group mobilisation processes by contracting village authorities

and asking leaders to form groups based around the ‘common interests’ of villagers. Alternatively, they rely on existing groups, which are usually of a political nature. Other notable examples included the approach whereby male village leaders would only approach their friends, in order to restrict the benefit of programmes to themselves. Partners should try to combine participatory approaches with attention to equality when pursuing their community engagement activities.

Barriers to participation: There was a need for organisations to develop strategies for participation and engagement of women. For example, many GLCI partners did not use specific methods to ensure equal distribution of cassava planting material for men and women and it was felt that women would be reached *de facto* through the multiplication effort; however, it was questionable whether this could be assured. This shows that service providers tasked with distributing new technology require capacity-building in gender sensitivity in distribution methods, (in particular), and gender mainstreaming, (in general). However, a number of GLCI and C:AVA partners did use specific methods to interact with men and women’s groups different to encourage greater participation; however, these approaches were not used consistently throughout all activities and programme stages. For example, despite organisations use participatory approaches, some had instituted eligibility criteria that were restrictive to female farmers, such as requiring members to have large amounts of land to participate.

Men’s participation: Some partners felt that in some activities open to both sexes, women participated to a greater extent than men such as in processing (washing, peeling) or health-related activities. It is clear, therefore, that men need to be encouraged to participate and that the time constraints that women face need to be considered.

Participation in monitoring and evaluation: There were a number of partners - particularly public extension partners - who were using participatory evaluations to identify the effectiveness of programme from a clients’ perspective. In particular, some GLCI partners had an anonymous feedback system, which allowed men and women to write their views on a card and submit them anonymously to staff, (in the case of illiterate staff, these views would be communicated via a mediator). This information was used for organisations to design effective programmes responding directly to the needs of community members.

Innovation

Understanding: Innovation was largely understood as the production and introduction of new technologies, which was an essential part of most partners’ work. However, this should be extended to looking at processes of increasing opportunities for learning, particularly shared learning between organisations, and also in terms of long-term programme sustainability. With regards to gender and diversity, in particular, partners need to increase their innovation capacity, in order to respond to changing gender roles in the areas in which they work.

Partnerships: Partners were using innovative methods in their day-to-day work and in addressing practical and strategic gender needs. Knowledge sharing and innovation also occurred through partnerships, which were effective, but there were some issues for partners in their relationship with donors, country leads and between research institutions and extension services – particularly in terms of their ability to input into decisions. Of particular importance to GLCI is the cultivation of

relationships with new partners and the facilitation of shared learning between old and new partners, which can help bring together experience and new ideas in project delivery.

Barriers to innovation: Other barriers to organisational innovation include lack of incentives and motivation for staff, lack of ownership and rigid management structures. NGOs were particularly innovative in field activities, which is most likely due to their more flexible structure.

Conclusions and recommendations

C:AVA and GLCI will need to implement a gender strategy in their project activities, which would focus on increasing awareness of gender issues, providing practical tools to build capacity, considering both practical and strategic gender needs, in order to increase the impact of the project on vulnerable groups.

Partners will also need to develop their own strategy on how they will improve their responsiveness to gender and diversity issues within their organisations and in their field operations based on the recommendations made in the gender and diversity audit report. This should include a focus on empowering women and men through their activities. There is tremendous opportunity for partners to learn from each other, as all organisations have vast skills and experience.



1. Introduction

Cassava: Adding Value to Africa (C:AVA) is a four year project aimed at creating sustainable and equitable high quality cassava flour (HQCF) value chains and thereby improving the livelihoods and incomes of smallholder households and micro, small and medium scale enterprises. The project is committed to mainstreaming gender issues and social inclusion throughout its activities, emphasising equitable distribution of benefits, participation, and the empowerment of women and disadvantaged groups. While this is an important end in itself, it is also a means to ensure project efficiency, sustainability and viability (World Bank 2006).

The Great Lakes Cassava Initiative (GLCI) is a four year project aimed at reducing the impact of cassava mosaic disease and the emerging cassava brown streak pandemics. It is funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and led by the Catholic Relief Services (CRS). The goal of GLCI is to strengthen the capacity of 60 local African partners and approximately 1.15 million farmers within four years, to address the cassava pandemics that threaten food security and incomes of cassava dependent farm families in Burundi, Democratic Republic of Congo, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania and Uganda.

As part of this commitment to equitable project activities, the Gender and Diversity Audit was conducted with C:AVA and GLCI partners to inform all project objectives. 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.

Objective

The objective of the Gender and Diversity Audit is to identify how partners think and how they do things regarding gender and diversity. 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.

Purpose

The purpose of the gender and diversity audit is to:

- identify good practice and areas for improvement in gender and diversity
- identify the training and capacity strengthening needs of partners to address gender and diversity issues in their work
- provide accessible and understandable results
- provide a baseline for monitoring and evaluation
- be participatory and encourage ownership
- inform overall activities in the C:AVA project

C:AVA and GLCI partners

The gender and diversity audit was conducted with local service providers (government and non-government) and learning institutions. Due to the considerable diversity among the partners, the Gender and Diversity Audit was conducted in a flexible manner.

This report attempts to discuss general performance of partners and identify issues that can be addressed through the C:AVA and GLCI projects. However, each partner had very different mandates and structures, which posed some difficulties in terms of writing an overall report on findings. Therefore there are some exceptions to the findings in which qualifiers, such as 'some', 'few' or 'many' partners, are used to flag this issue.

In this report, C:AVA and GLCI partners will be referred to as 'partners', which includes NGOs and public sector extension support.

The main service provider organisations are provided in the table below.

C:AVA	GLCI
TFNC	LZARDI (Mwanza)
District Agriculture and Livestock Development Offices (Mtwara, Masasi, Mwanza)	Mwanza Rural Housing and Food Security Program (MRHP) (Mwanza)
Naliendele Research Institute	RUDO (Mwanza)
United Peasants of Tanzania (Mtwara)	Kimkumaka
SIDO (Masasi)	Tahea
Jumuiya Endelevu Bagamoyo (JEBA) (Masasi)	
SADACA (Masasi)	
Caritas (Masasi)	
Centre for Ethical Agriculture (KIMAS) (Masasi)	

Approach

The analytical approach to the C:AVA gender and diversity audit will include equal attention to structures (rules, policies, leadership) and power relationships (discourses, language, symbols) in performance areas. This will help to identify both explicit and implicit opportunities and constraints to achieving equality. Importantly, the audit approach is non-judgemental. As was the case in the gender audit of DfID Rwanda (2008), a partnership approach will help encourage debate, discussion and shared learning. This contrasts to other audits that establish an ideal type to measure performance against. As such, a broad understanding of the concepts is utilised to be responsive to the context of each partner.

The analytical framework utilised for the gender aspects have been informed by literature on gender analysis frameworks, particularly Moser (1987, 1989 and 1993) and Kabeer (2001). These frameworks emphasise practical and strategic gender needs and women's empowerment in overcoming poverty, which are helpful to identify gender priorities and their impact. These frameworks are also reflected in the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation Gender Strategy and C:AVA project objective one.

The approach to diversity was to examine areas of social difference (including age; class; ethnicity; religion; disability; national origin; language) and how partners responded to issues and needs that arise due to these differences.

Participation and innovation are included within the overall approach to bring additional context to Gender and Diversity Audit. Participation is widely accepted as being an intrinsic part of development processes and business innovation. Participation in socio-economic and political life is also a crucial tool for achieving

greater equality, overcoming poverty and gender equality (Sen, 2001; Chambers, 2007). Participation is therefore a key element of partner's performance.

Innovation is included as part of the audit in order to gauge partner performance in responding to a rapidly changing environment. New constraints and opportunities are continually arising and require new methods for understanding and addressing differences. In this context, innovation is examined through a gender and diversity lens to identify the extent to which partners create an equitable environment for new ideas to be realised. Analysis will include an 'innovation systems' approach that will examine the extent to which innovation is stimulated through communication (Hall et al., 2004). This will highlight innovative work of partners in gender and diversity, and how it is used, transferred and built-on by partners.

Performance

The approach of the Gender and Diversity Audit is to measure partner performance in six gender and diversity areas, as described below. The performance areas reflect overall project objectives, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation Gender Strategy, and have been informed by a review of academic and grey literature on gender and social audits.

Performance areas:

- Providing equal opportunities and promoting equality
- Awareness and responsiveness to practical gender needs
- Impact on strategic gender needs and women's empowerment
- Awareness and responsiveness to key diversity issues
- Enabling participation
- Innovation

The performance areas are interrelated and mutually dependent; therefore, references are therefore added to related chapters to signpost some of the areas that overlap.

Each performance area or chapter is split into an 'Organisation' and 'Operations' section. The design highlights the dual roles of partners in operational activities (services it provides or goods it produces) and as an organisation (employer).

Methods

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.

Structure of Report

This report presents an analysis of gender and diversity issues with C:AVA/GLCI partners in three regions in Tanzania: Mtwara (C:AVA), Masasi (C:AVA/GLCI) and Mwanza (GLCI) regions. It includes government and non government service providers and learning institutions. 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/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 /GLCI partners. This is followed by six chapters, which are based on the six performance areas. An analysis of the capacity strengthening needs is provided, followed by recommendations for C:AVA/GLCI partners.

2. Organisational analysis

An organisational analysis identifies how organisations meet their set objectives. Various elements that make up an organisation, such as governance, planning, incentives or reporting, are examined to determine overall organisational performance. The organisation's strengths and areas for improvement are made explicit so appropriate actions can be taken. This chapter examines partners' organisational management performance based on the views of staff and management. The box below indicates key findings.

Key findings

- Staff were positive about their organisations and felt that they performed well in most activities.
- Incentives were the area that required the most improvement for all service providers. For NGOs, they also needed to improve policy/policy influence and learning; public extension needed to improve policy/policy influence, financial management; the research institution needed to improve communication and governance.
- There were a few opportunities for shared learning, such as in organisational monitoring and evaluation.
- Partners' monitoring and evaluation processes and systems will need to be improved to be more systematic, comprehensive and be used to inform the direction of activities.
- The major constraints for service providers were lack of funding and unsupportive government policies, which could hinder meeting C:AVA and GLCI objectives. Subsequently, service providers felt that they needed to strengthen their capacity in advocacy, sourcing funds and communication, in order to attract more funding and be more influential.
- Lack of mobility was one of the most pertinent constraints that service providers face, especially female staff.

Organisational performance

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. The general trend overall in staff perceptions was that their organisations performed well in most activities and there were few areas that needing improvement. There were slight differences between NGOs and public extension organisations and between regions.

Table 1 Staff ratings of key organisational areas by region²

	Masasi (C:AVA/GLCI)				Mtwara (C:AVA)		Mwanza (GLCI)		Average score
	Government	NGO1	NGO2	NGO3	Government	NGO	NGO1	NGO2	
Management	9	7	7	9	7	7	5	9	8
Financial management	8	9	8	7	7	8	5	9	8
Planning	8	9	9	6	9	9	6	6	8
Communication	9	9	8	8	7	8	6	9	8
Governance	9	7	7	6	6	6	5	8	7
Monitoring systems	9	9	6	5	8	8	6	8	7
Learning	7	8	7	4	7	8	3	8	7
Organisational polices	8	9	8	8	7	5	5	5	7
Policy influence	9	9	7	5	8	5	5	5	7
incentives	8	9	5	3	5	5	4	4	5

What is being done well

- **Management:** overall management at partner organisations was given a satisfactory rating, as staff felt they were adequately led by management and given support.
- **Financial management:** was seen very positively by organisations except for one NGO in Mwanza that rated it as a five. This was confirmed in the self-assessment survey where all staff and management felt that ‘transparency and honesty’ in their organisations were ‘satisfactory’ to ‘excellent’.
- **Communication:** staff felt that both their internal and external communication was effective. This was rated slightly less by the DALDO in Mwanza.
- Government organisations in Masasi and Mtwara felt **planning** was done very well.

In addition, the staff assessment questionnaire revealed that staff were very positive about their organisations’ ‘ability to meet priorities, goals and objectives’, as all staff ratings were satisfactory or above. Staff also felt that there was an adequate and safe environment for staff to work in, as 80.5 per cent of staff rated this area satisfactory or higher.

What needs to be improved

- **Incentives:** were the area most often cited by staff as an area for improvement, as almost all staff felt that they were not fairly remunerated for their work. Staff felt that they wanted greater remuneration and benefits in general support, allowances, mobility, insurance and safety. It is noteworthy that staff felt that these requests should be provided by organisations as they are necessary for staff to meet the organisations’ goals.
- **Learning:** staff wanted more opportunities to achieve qualifications and learn new skills. This was often cited as due to funding constraints.

² Note that not all organisations could participate in the exercise due to time constraints of the organisations.

- **Policy influence:** was rated low, particularly in Mwanza and by one NGO in Mtwara, who felt that their influence on their organisations' direction and government policy was minimal.
- One service provider in each of the Masasi and Mwanza regions had lower ratings compared to other providers, and both were NGOs. This may reveal the need for capacity building to ensure that C:AVA and GLCI objectives are met.

The self-assessment questionnaire revealed three other aspects that need to be improved in organisations concerning the difficulties that staff have with lack of resources in their organisations. These areas were: the 'level and quality of human and physical resources', 'level of funds and resources; and 'motivation, incentives, work conditions for staff'.

For 'level and quality of human and physical resources', 14.7 per cent of staff rated this 'poor', but 85 per cent of staff rated this 'satisfactory' to 'excellent', indicating that there is room for improvement. In contrast, the 'level of funds and resources' of the organisation received more consistently low scores, where 31 per cent rated it poor. The same trend was noted with 'motivation, incentives, work conditions for staff', where the total proportion of staff rating it 'poor' to 'very poor' were 27 per cent. The lack of funding and resources and sources of motivation available to partners may constrain the performance of C:AVA and GLCI, particularly in terms of mobility and the number of dedicated staff for the projects.

Monitoring and evaluation was another area requiring improvement by all service providers. C:AVA partners should undertake capacity strengthening in monitoring and evaluation systems. This will need to focus on creating more comprehensive data collection and analysis systems. C:AVA stands to benefit from sharing learning with GLCI, where a consultant has already worked with individual partners to build monitoring systems. For both C:AVA and GLCI; however, it is important that the information collected through monitoring and evaluation is used dynamically, in order to correct and respond to issues as they are identified at various project levels.

Table 2: Quality of monitoring and impact assessment systems

	Total % of staff
Poor	8.1
Satisfactory	24.3
Good	51.4
Excellent	16.2

Total count: 37

Opportunities for shared learning

Partners also felt they could offer capacity-building support to other organisations participating in C:AVA and GLCI on a range of topics such as participatory methods, cassava production and processing, cassava diseases, entrepreneurial skills and even preparing cassava meals. This indicates that partners are skilled in a wide range of areas, which C:AVA and GLCI can draw upon. In addition, research institutions can provide greater advisory support to other providers who felt it needed improvement in their organisations.

Key barriers to improving performance

Financial resources: partners stated that lack of financial resources was a severe constraint on their work and will affect achieving C:AVA and GLCI objectives. Specific areas requiring capacity, such as staff development, mobility, equipment and incentives, all require greater financial resources. The reasons given for financial difficulty included: a decrease in funding from Government due to low interest in agriculture and late funding from the country office. Some partners also felt that the short-term nature of project funding required them to hire staff on contractual basis, which affected their motivation in delivering the project. As a result, service providers felt that they are likely to become more reliant on external funding, in which they would need capacity strengthening in writing research proposals, searching for opportunities, marketing their organisation and in maintaining their independence from donors in their overall agenda.

“Sustainability is a problem. If the donor leaves there is no money. And new donors will start new things and change things” (male manager public extension).

Mobility: mobility was one of the most pertinent issues that partners face and can affect the delivery of C:AVA and GLCI objectives and for the organisation as a whole. Staff felt that there were not enough vehicles or motorbikes to conduct necessary field visits, they were not being paid transportation costs, and often had to use their own transportation. In addition, the majority of service providers did not have insurance for field staff and in some cases they did not have adequate protective gear, leading to feelings of insecurity in the field. Staff reported that they worked late hours and would often travel home in the dark, which may be a deterrent, especially for women, in participating in agricultural extension work.

Recommendations

- Shared learning should be promoted between partners based on their strengths and weaknesses.
- Increase support for staff through incentives, positive feedback and greater independence.
- As a priority, partners should undertake capacity building in advocacy skills, sourcing funds and communication skills to attract more funding.
- There is a need to develop monitoring and evaluation systems to determine what has been achieved, what the gaps are and the extent of impact of interventions on the various groups. Processes should also be put in place to disseminate information from the monitoring and evaluation team throughout organisations.
- C:AVA and GLCI should play an intrinsic role in advocating the support of cassava value chains in the country.

3. Providing equality of opportunities and promoting equality

Providing equality of opportunities and promoting equality relates to the ways that organisations enable opportunities, access and participation in their organisations. This impacts on livelihoods of staff and their clients and creates benefits to organisations such as meeting legal requirements and donor expectations; using labour more efficiently and contributing to community and personal development. Unfortunately, however, disparities exist in all societies in terms of access to income and resources, ownership, employment, safety and security, mobility, decision-making, discrimination and violence. These disparities often form along lines of social difference, particularly gender, age and tribe in Tanzania. This chapter will examine these issues in the context of the capacity of C:AVA and GLCI partners' capacity to provide and promote equality of opportunities for their staff (organisation) and clients (operations).

Key findings

- Overall, partner staff and management had a very good understanding of equal opportunities in the workplace and field activities. For example, one NGO had developed and implemented a comprehensive equal opportunities policy and another two NGOs were taking affirmative action to increase the number of women in their organisations.
- The majority of service provider staff felt that there were equal opportunities in their organisations, they were treated fairly and there was a positive organisational culture. However, for most organisations this was not reflected in organisational policy. The organisational culture was supportive and partners were open to improving their practices.
- Management and operational staff generally need to take a more critical look at their organisations to examine formal and informal work practices to identify more subtle types of discrimination.
- There was low representation of female staff within partner organisations, which was due to a number of factors including: women self-excluding due to the perceived masculine nature of the agricultural sector, male-bias in recruitment procedures, female stereotyping and gender inequality.
- Some partners, particularly public extension organisations and NGOs, had difficulty retaining women in their workforce. This could be due to a lack of attention to practical and strategic gender needs.
- Partners felt that equal opportunities were provided to their clients as there were no eligibility criteria for activities that would constrain participation. Most partners also had provisions to encourage women to participate such as targets and female extension staff, who clients were more comfortable interacting with.
- There was a considerable degree of variance among partners in the quality of monitoring and evaluation they were conducting. Generally, there was a lack of monitoring for equality issues and linking findings to programme change.

Organisation

Understanding and application of equal opportunities

Generally, partners, both staff and management, had a very good understanding of equal opportunities in the workplace and felt there were equal opportunities in their organisation. Staff understood equal opportunities as being most relevant in recruitment, promotion and treatment of staff within their organisations.

However, partners lacked a policy framework or defined approach to equality, which would set out how equality can be supported systematically in their organisations. NGOs did not have equal opportunities policy or strategy for the organisation. But under national government mandate, the DALDOs had instated an equality opportunities policy that targets women. However, it was unknown whether DALDOs were implementing this policy as there was little awareness of it.

“I am not sure whether we are following any policy. In terms of employment men and women are recruited on basis of qualifications and not any other thing” (female, government extension, coastal region).

“In our constitution we are not an organisation where women and the men are differentiated. As long as they have the qualification they can take any position” (SADACA NGO).

“For employment we don’t have written policy. But when we are doing training in the village even from income improvement we balance the gender” (RUDDO NGO Mwanza).

Partners generally felt that providing equal opportunities meant non-discrimination, and none stated that they noticed direct discrimination in recruitment, retention or promotion. Most partners wanted to distance themselves from affirmative action policies, as they felt that this would threaten a competence-based recruitment model. However this was not the case for all partners, as one NGO and the DALDOs were taking affirmative action to increase the number of women in their organisations.

Organisational culture

The majority of partner’s staff felt that there were equal opportunities in their organisations and they were treated fairly. In fact, approximately 92 per cent of staff and management stated in the self-assessment questionnaire that their organisation was very supportive of women and minority groups. Even when women (or men) were a very small minority in their organisation, staff still felt that they were treated equally and worked well together.

Management and staff generally felt that they had positive organisational cultures that supported a diverse workforce. However, some of those consulted did feel there were some issues around favouritism and gender insensitive behaviour in their organisations, as

Table 3 below illustrates. In addition, because so few partners had equal opportunities policies in place, organisations rely on the informal culture of the organisation, which can shift and change with different staff dynamics and power-relationships.

Table 3: Does preferential treatment, favouritism etc. take place in your organisation on the basis of someone's personal characteristics?

	Total % of staff
Often	11.4
Sometimes	31.4
One Occasion	5.7
Never	51.4

Total count: 35

Partners should take a more critical look at their organisations to examine formal and informal work practices that would identify more subtle types of discrimination. Culture is dynamic and can shift and change quickly; therefore, it is important for policies to be established to provide the foundation of equal opportunities. All partners may therefore want to consider developing equal opportunities policies to formalise the responsibilities of staff and management, and to establish procedures and consequences for inappropriate actions.

Low representation of women

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. This is true for the learning institution, public extension organisations and NGOs. While the representation of women among staff was different for each C:AVA/GLCI partner; the number of women staff generally could be improved (refer to the table below).

Table 4 Number of female staff in partner organisations

Region	Institution type	Number of females among core staff
	Learning/research institution	2 /150 scientists 17% (all staff and approximately for scientists) (Jayasinghe and Moore 2003)
	Learning/research institution Naliendele	10/25 (approx) researchers
Mtwara	Public extension service 1	5/33 all staff, 2/10 extension
Masasi	Public extension service 2	6/14
	NGO 1 Kimas	5/12
	NGO 2 SADACA	3/7
	NGO 3 SIDO	1/5
Mwanza	NGO 4 MRHP	1/10
	NGO 5 Ruddo	6/11
	NGO 6 Tahea	5/7

Note: Some of these figures are based on estimates

There was no significant association between the level of women in the organisations and the type of organisation. For example, the public extension service in Mtwara has quite a low number of women compared to its equivalent in Masasi. It is also notable that the number of women represented in management positions is very low. For example, one NGO in Mwanza has women in over half of its core staff positions, but has only one out of eleven women in department head and other management positions. Staff explain that this may be due to the fact that they were a Catholic organisation that was based on a patriarchal system. However, the low number of

women in management was found throughout all three regions and among non-religious organisations so it may be more systematic gender discrimination in agricultural management, as opposed to the beliefs of the organisation.

The low representation of women in partner organisations was said to be due to a number of factors, which include: reproductive roles of women, women self-excluding due to the perceived masculine nature of the agricultural sector, male-bias in recruitment procedures and female stereotyping. The majority of partners felt that women were self-excluding from agriculture and factory work because it was considered 'male' in Tanzania society.

The lack of women recruited to organisations however could be due to the lack of strategic attention to recruiting female staff. To improve women's representation in the workforce, there is a need for targeted recruitment of women beyond stating that 'women are encouraged to apply' on job advertisements (which most NGOs were doing). This can include posting job advertisements in areas frequented by women, visiting classes with high numbers of women in agricultural higher education institutions and even visiting schools to encourage girls into science at a young age. Secondly, the organisation should inform people of how it will address the practical gender needs of female employees, such as by providing posts that are close to the home, delivering drivers training, providing crèche facilities or flexible working, (of which are discussed in the next chapter). Other partners who have been successful at recruiting women could also share their methods with other partners.

The Masasi DALDO uses an open and transparent rating system (OPRAS) for hiring employees where all decisions on candidates must be defended. In addition, the DALDOs have a structured progression system where every six months they discuss progression with the employee. Female staff are encouraged to move up through encouragement and financial incentives; however, final decisions are made primarily on a merit basis. This has changed from the past where women were not hired because it was believed they would leave the job. This is different to other public extension services in other countries where they seemed to be starkly against any special measures to promote women's employment and progression.

"They (the employment board) didn't like women because they would leave. Now they can't say that" (male DALDO manager).

Public extension services and NGOs reported that they also had difficulty retaining women. They did not feel that this was due to discrimination, but that women were deterred due to the strenuous nature of field work, they left to marry or have children. However, management had not had discussions with women who left their positions so there is no reliable data. Exit interviews with gender-sensitive questions can identify precisely why women are leaving their positions. Some statements made include the following:

"I had one (female employee) and she got married and left. She followed her husband to Dar (es Salaam). They will get married if they are educated and move to an urban area" (MRHP NGO manager).

"We recruit equally but it is difficult to get women, especially in technical areas" (SIDO NGO management).

"There is big movement (to promote women). We are using the government scheme. But women go where there are already a lot of women" (SIDO NGO management).

Terms of employment

There was little evidence to show any incidences of discrimination among staff and management in their terms of employment, despite the often poor labour market position of women and minority groups. NGOs and public extension stated that there were no differences in salaries between staff that would reveal inequality and discrimination. Staff also felt that the expectations of male and female staff were the same, but women's practical needs were sometimes overlooked, as the next chapter will explain in more detail. However, there was one example of an umbrella NGO organisation who stated that NGO board members often want to stay past their term limits of the position.

It is also important that as C:AVA supports the growth of cassava processing enterprises that support be given to employers to provide equal terms and conditions of work for men and women. Experience in other countries with established processing enterprises shows that there are often unequal employment terms between men and women. Women's employment was typically casual, paid by piece rate and characterised by a lack of benefits (although there were some female staff employed as secretaries in factories). Underlying this situation are stereotypes of women's ability of factory work and capability of operating mechanised equipment. These barriers also keep the benefits from participation in the labour market low for women. Therefore, as the C:AVA project progresses and processing enterprises are established they should be encouraged to apply a gender and diversity mainstreaming strategy in their organisation.

Operations

Equal requirements for participation

Partners felt that they provided equal opportunities for their clients in their programmes as there were no stringent eligibility requirements or differences in contributions for clients. For example, one NGO's microcredit scheme required all members to make equal payments for their savings, regardless of their financial status, which helped to foster a sense of equality between members. The learning institution involved in agricultural training ensured that men and women performed the same activities, such as driving tractors which was seen as a male activity.

However, it is important that C:AVA/GLCI take further steps to ensure that poorest persons are included in outreach activities to have more of an impact on poverty. This may be, for example, having reasonable and appropriate fees/cost for services for poorer clients.

Client monitoring and evaluation

Systematic and comprehensive monitoring and evaluation systems are important for identifying the reach and impact of projects, and ultimately how well the project is working. Monitoring and evaluation is also very important in determining outreach to different groups, the extent of equal representation and issues around access and impact for different groups. The gender and diversity audit revealed that there was a great degree of variance in their monitoring and evaluation systems.

Specifically in terms of collecting data on different groups, such as men and women, and conducting impact analysis of their work, partners ranged a great deal, as the

table below exemplifies. Some partners had comprehensive plans and management systems, as the quote below exemplifies.

"For agricultural activities, Agricultural Field Extension Staff organise regular monitoring and evaluation visits. Such information is reported in quarterly and semi annual reports. At the end of each farming season, we organise village meetings involving all stakeholders to discuss progress, problems and challenges encountered (staff, NGO Mwanza).

"The group member we speak to. We talk to all of them. When we are assessing the project we get opinion of men and women" (male staff, DALDO Masasi).

However, as the table below shows, 33 per cent of staff and management felt they monitored the impact of their programmes 'seldom' to 'never'.

"Age, marital status and educational background listed under household registration are not targeted. There are gaps in data collection" (female extension officer).

Table 5: Is an analysis or monitoring undertaken on the impact of the programme concerning different groups?

	Total % of staff
Never	19.4
Seldom	13.9
Usually	47.2
Always	19.4

Total count: 36

GLCI service providers had monitoring and evaluation systems in place, which included disaggregating data by sex. GLCI partners had received capacity building in monitoring and were given a system in which to collect and manage data. However, as the table below illustrates, not all GLCI partners were aware of or were actually carrying out disaggregation of their data.

Monitoring among C:AVA partners in Mtwara had implemented some needs assessments for various groups, ongoing project monitoring and impact assessments. However, some improvement is necessary to address gender and diversity in a more systematic way.

Table 6 Type of data collection by partners and region

Region	Implementing partner	Collects disaggregated data	Impact analysis
Mtwara	DALDO	X	X
	UPT	X	X
Masasi	DALDO	X	X
	Caritas		
	JEBA		
	Kimas		
	SADACA	X	

	SIDO		X
Mwanza	MRHP	X	
	RUDDO		X
	Tahea	X	

Moreover, partners that did monitor gender and other personal characteristics stated that this was often not analysed and used to inform future activities with regards to gender and diversity.

“We don’t have funds, and we hand in the report and nothing happens after with the groups” (staff, SIDO Masasi).

This situation results in little information being available to monitor or evaluate impact for different groups of clients, which is crucial to the C:AVA/GLCI mandate. There are a range of indicators that can be included in surveys and questionnaires that would supply this information, such as gender, marital status age, tribe, disability, or country of origin etc. This will require that partners to revise their field tools and documents. This information can then be applied against department and position to determine how diversity is addressed internally, and in field activities, against the type of farming, farmer wealth or village location.

In addition, management suggested the need to develop a tool for a quick appraisal of sample sections of the population against pre-existing data, which can be used to inform future planning and group mobilisation activities. This will help organisations identify the needs of their clients, raise issues in a timelier manner during the programme and improve understanding of the impact of activities. Moreover, capturing these results and communicating them to external organisations will help build the reputation of C:AVA/GLCI partners.

Recommendations

- Improve understanding of inequality, stereotypes, and hidden types of discrimination and favouritism in formal and informal practices.
- Design ways to implement equal opportunities
- Develop explicit written policies on equal opportunities in recruitment, retention and promotion, along with conditions of work, for more consistent, formalised and transparent practice. This should be monitored by gender and diversity indicators.
- Target women in recruitment and consider utilising affirmative action measures.
- Conduct exit interviews with gender-sensitive questions.
- Establish more comprehensive monitoring system with clear targets for the provision of equal opportunities and criteria for data collection (sex-disaggregating data). This should be done at every stage of the project cycle, ensuring that information is disseminated and used to inform all planning and activities.
- Develop a tool for quick appraisal on different groups and programme 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. Due to inequalities in access, authority, and resources, however, women often experience difficulty in fulfilling their needs. Subsequently, discussion around practical gender needs usually focuses on women, as is done in this chapter. Addressing practical gender needs is an important area for partners as it can improve the livelihoods of the people they work with and work for. This section reviews the findings on partners' awareness and responsiveness to practical gender needs in the workplace and in field activities.

Key findings

- Partners had a good understanding of gender and practical gender needs, although they desired more technical knowledge on gender and development. Understanding of the concept was evident in partners' operational work, but to a lesser extent within organisations themselves. This could be contributing to problems in recruiting and retaining women. However, there were examples of good practice, such as some partners providing flexible working schedules for women and not assigning them to remote areas of jurisdiction.
- The most significant barriers for female staff in the workplace were long working hours, lack of employment benefits, inflexible working and travel requirements.
- Partners felt they had positive organisational cultures, especially smaller organisations. However, some staff felt that their organisations did not always comply with gender-sensitive behaviour.
- Operationally, service providers have instituted a number of programmes that address the practical needs of women in a holistic way. These programmes tend to focus on women's traditional gender roles in agriculture. The rationale for programmes was the notion of women's contribution to family welfare.
- Partners stated they would benefit from capacity strengthening in applying a gender approach in their operations in order to meet C:AVA and GLCI objectives, along with conflict management and negotiation skills.

Organisation

Understanding of gender and practical gender needs

Overall, NGOs and public agriculture extension organisations had a good understanding of gender. Staff's description of gender included description of the different roles, responsibilities and needs of men and women; the differences between sex and gender, and how gender roles can shift and change. Staff also understood the main gender issues in agriculture and the inequality women face. Addressing gender was seen as important to family welfare needs, which can reinforce both positive and negative gender roles, as well as being important in their own right. Despite the good knowledge of gender among partners, there is room for improvement in conceptual understanding and identifying practical gender needs, particularly among management. There is however a need for understanding of gender terms/concepts, identification of subtle gender discrimination and strategic gender planning and development.

However, the understanding of practical gender needs was less evident in partners' internal operations. Staff discussions on gender focused on its relevance in field programmes, but they were less inclined to discuss issues in their own workplace. This could be due to the sensitivity of the issue or a lack of gender consciousness within organisations, as gender was something that related to development work. The next sections raise some the issues of practical gender needs for female staff that are currently not be addressed.

Work environment and conditions of work

Staff and management at partner organisations explained the changes in the workforce in the past decade and how women's employment had increased. They felt that women's employment had helped to provide greater access to income, opportunities for skill acquisition and to form new relationships. All partners felt that they provided opportunities for women's employment as there was no direct discrimination evident in their organisation.

However, there was evidence that the work environment and the conditions of work could be unfavourable to female staff. This is due to the different roles that men and women play, and even their physical attributes, which give rise to different employment needs. The table below illustrates that 35 per cent of staff consulted felt that the workplace is insufficiently meeting the needs of women and disadvantaged groups. Therefore, although partners felt they were gradually increasing the number of women in their workforce, it doesn't correspond to the organisation making changes in the workplace to accommodate more women. This could, be contributing to the difficulty of recruiting and retaining women.

Table 7: Is the work environment and conditions of work adequate for the needs of women and disadvantaged groups?

	Total % of staff
Not at all	4.7
Insufficient	30.2
Sufficient	46.5
Excellent	7.0

Total count: 38.

The key practical gender needs identified for female staff in the workplace and in delivering C:AVA and GLCI objectives are discussed below.

Facilities: Working in male-dominated sector, it is important for women to have separate and secure facilities (washing and toilet) for their comfort.

Manageable working hours: Female staff noted the importance of having manageable work days where they could leave work in the early evenings; greater flexibility and being stationed close to home. Three NGOs in particular are addressing these needs by providing informal flexible working. Female staff therefore have some degree of flexibility to meet demands of the household and management seem to be supportive of this; however, this was not the case for most partners.. Other ways to offer more flexibility in employment are through job-shares and part-time work. However, it is recognised that the external environment is constraining these opportunities as Government regulations do not allow for this type of work in public extensions services.

Maternity leave: all partners followed government law for mandatory three-month paid maternity leave. However, management in some organisations felt that it was

difficult to ensure women had the job when they returned, due to the cost (financial and time) of having a new or existing staff to cover during that time.

"If we give maternity leave, it is a problem because we work on projects. For NGOs is very difficult. If I had extra money I could have employed someone to do her job." (Male, NGO manager)

Travel for extension agents: Travel was a major issue for female agricultural extension agents and represented a key reason why some women had difficulty working in extension. Female staff and management reported the following problems which relate directly to the roles that women play in society:

- Lack of security (harassment)
- Travelling on large and heavy motorbikes was difficult for women and many women have not been trained in driving motorbikes
- Cannot be far from home (cannot respond to emergency situations, husband disagrees, not culturally appropriate):

Ignoring women's needs in travel can have the effect of limiting women to administration work and in some cases it may be seen as discriminatory. However, it was evident that some service providers were not addressing women's travel needs and felt it was due just to preference, and not to more pervasive norms which may make women uncomfortable to challenge.

"Women will go with the car, and usually two females will go together. They don't ride motorcycles because I don't think they are interested" (male NGO manager).

"Women can use motorbikes but they want a car to visit the projects. They also have to come back by 6 p.m. from the field" (male NGO manager).

"Women don't like to drive the motorcycle. Some are afraid. Sometimes you must wear the trousers and women are not allowed to wear trousers as an official; women must wear skirt" (male public extension agent).

Other measures that could be taken to support women in agriculture extension, which some service providers were already doing, are to provide gender-friendly transportation, such as lightweight bikes, vehicles or training to drive motorcycles, and to provide greater security in the field by day-time visits, providing a mobile phone, or going with a partner, as some partners were doing.

Workplace culture

Overall staff reported a positive workplace culture in their organisations. There was a high degree of camaraderie and teamwork, especially among the smaller organisations. However, some staff, particularly female staff, felt that their colleagues were 'never' or 'seldom' complying with gender-sensitive behaviour (16.2 per cent of women and 21.6 per cent of men as the table shows below).

Table 8: Does the organisation and staff comply with gender-sensitive behaviour in and outside the office?

	Total %
Never	16.2
Seldom	21.6
Usually	32.4
Always	29.7

Total count: 37

During consultations there were some issues raised of the behaviour of men in the workplace that was not conducive to the needs of women. Management should undergo training to understand and identify inappropriate behaviour in the workplace and put policies in place to communicate to staff that gender insensitive behaviour is against the rules.

Operations

Programme focus on practical gender needs

Service providers have instituted a number of programmes that address the practical needs of women and men. These activities were largely based on the rationale that women should be focused on because of their contribution to family welfare. Most providers take a holistic approach by addressing a range of livelihood issues around the provision of credit, technical skills (particularly processing) and health-related support, which have been very successful. Often, these activities are focused entirely on women and correspond directly to their traditional gender roles. In fact, the concept of gender was largely understood in practical terms instead of more strategically, which emphasises challenging gender roles and reducing structural gender inequalities. A common split for most partners was between production activities for men and processing and marketing activities for women.

However, the focus on processing in women's programmes ignores the other roles women play in agriculture, such as planting, weeding and harvesting. Because women also play a vital role in production, both for the household and in the market, women targeted programmes on agricultural production would also be beneficial. This more holistic approach is closer to providing women with skills to have more control over their work and also recognise women's diverse activities. This must, however, be balanced with recognising the time pressures for women.

Partners could adapt their activities to respond to more practical gender needs, particularly for women, the poor and other vulnerable groups. In areas such as: providing pictorial communication and learning materials in areas frequented by men and women to increase women's access to information; holding meetings in communal areas (e.g. schools) and at convenient times for men and women; reasonable and appropriate fees/cost for services; access to technology; building women's capacity in disease identification/prevention and value-addition.

Gender targeting and including women

Most service providers were aware of the importance of gender composition of client groups, since women can often be excluded from agricultural services. A number of partners had established targets for women and men's participation, ranging from one-third women, equal numbers or separate groups. These approaches have different impacts in terms of gender, which need to be considered when planning and

implementing programmes. 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.

There were differences between partners, for example one NGO and public extension services established women only groups, whereas another NGO included men and women in the same group but had targets for each. The latter may be more difficult as men are likely to dominate activities. Surprisingly, not all service providers have established gender targets. Public extension organisations did have female participation targets but they were dropped for mixed groups due to lack of commitment from management. Furthermore, some of the reported targets that NGOs adopted were not firmly in place and varied according to programme and village.

Another important attribute to including women in activities is to have female extension agents to work with women. This was done by most of partner activities, which helps overcome culture barriers for female clients who may not be able to speak with men alone. This reinforces the need for increasing the number of female extension agents in the workforce to increase outreach to women in rural communities, particularly to meet C:AVA target of 70% female processors.

Table 9 Implementing partner targets for women’s participation in activities

Region	Implementing partner	Participation targets
Mtwara	DALDO	50% in consultation. Separate groups - 200 women’s microcredit groups.
	UPT	50%
Masasi	DALDO	50% in consultation. Separate groups. Half of groups are women’s groups (14)
	Caritas	50%
	JEBA	No.
	Kimas	No.
	SADACA	No.
	SIDO	60%
Mwanza	MRHP	No.
	KIMKUMAKA	Separate groups but don’t know how many women’s groups
	RUDDO	No.
	Tahea	60%

However, it is notable that service providers were struggling with a number of barriers to women’s participation in extension, such as illiteracy, stereotypes of women as working only in the subsistence or processing spheres, lack of access and ownership of resources, lack of time and past negative experiences with development workers.

SILC³ groups have notably more women but GLCI activities are mostly with men. Women are mostly secretaries of SILC groups because they are seen to be more trustworthy.

³ SILC Savings and Internal Lending Community

Practical gender issues in service delivery

There are a number of gender issues common in rural areas, which highlight women's practical needs. The following table presents these issues and comments on the ability of partners to address them through extension services in terms of the C:AVA/GLCI projects.

Time constraints: Women can become over-burdened with additional activities.	Partners were aware of some of the different approaches needed for men and women in service delivery in terms of time. They follow the schedules of men and women and choose to visit women after meal times or on non-market days when they are free.
Access to finance: Rural men and women, but especially women, have low access to credit facilities.	Service providers (as a group) are likely to be able to provide credit to men and women if activities between service providers can be linked up effectively. GLCI's SILC project has provided significant opportunities for women to receive credit in the regions it operates.
Physical capital: Women have difficulty in accessing and controlling labour saving, gender-friendly, technology.	<p>The learning institution has worked in designing labour-saving technology designed to reduce drudgery and time constraints.</p> <p>There were few projects from service providers that aimed to increase women's access to physical assets. One example was providing livestock (chickens) for women as an income generating activity.</p> <p>GLCI activities including the distribution of seeds tended to be focused on male head of households. Women will require more access to improve varieties, and it is important they are included in the first round of seed distribution.</p> <p>However, there was difficulty in identifying if there was the ability or motivation for service providers to increase technology in women's activities or to ensure technology remains in women's control. This area should be addressed if production is to be increased under C:AVA.</p> <p>Partners need to build the capacity of groups to use and maintain new technology, such as graters, mobile graters and drying equipment for C:AVA and new resistant varieties for GLCI, for women to access benefits from the two projects. Equipment maintenance is very important, as in one organisation's experience, a cassava processing machine was left inert by a women's group because members did not know how to fix the machine when it broke down and men declined to become involved.</p>
Human capital: Men have greater access to labour, technology, information, media and higher rates of	The participation of men and women in training depended largely on existing gender roles. For example, if partner training was about food safety or nutrition, women would be the main beneficiaries. However, introduction of technology or work with high-income generating crops will mean more men will participate in training. LZARDI said in these cases,

literacy and time.	perhaps one-third of beneficiaries would be women. Women working as volunteer field agents were reported to have increased skills in group facilitation and management.
Social capital: Women are organised in communities.	Service providers are currently building on women's existing social capital and enriching it by working with and promoting women's groups.

Technical capacity to address gender

Responses from the questionnaire revealed that in some cases gender considerations were not fully integrated into all field operations, such as in programme planning, design, implementation, technical capacity and monitoring and evaluation processes. As the table below illustrates, 32.5 per cent of respondents include gender 'to some extent'. In addition, all partners felt that they would benefit from capacity strengthening in applying a gender approach in their operations in order to meet C:AVA and GLCI objectives.

Table 10: To what extent do you consider and include gender in your work?

	Total %
Never	0
To some extent	32.5
To a great extent	57.5
Completely	10.0

Total count: 40

Areas where skills gaps were identified included community engagement, (such as group mobilisation), needs assessments, conflict resolution and participatory methods. In addition, in some cases, partners had addressed gender issues in other past projects, but do not apply the same approach to other current projects unless it is a clear specification of the project. Partners should be encouraged to apply these experiences in their current projects.

However, as reflected in the table below, the majority of staff felt they were 'good' to 'excellent' in group formation, mobilising women, group management and managing women's groups. This reveals that most staff feel they can do a good job in these aspects, but some staff feel there is room for improvement – particularly in addressing gender issues overall.

Table 11 Staff rating of their skills and ability in gender-related activities

Key gender skills	Excellent (%)	Good (%)	Satisfactory (%)	Poor (%)	Very Poor (%)	Total count
Group formation	35	40	22.5	2.5	0	40
Mobilising women	19.5	51.2	29.3	0	0	41
Group management	24.4	51.2	17.1	7.3	0	41
Women's group management	15	47.5	22.5	15	0	40
Addressing gender issues	17.1	31.7	41.5	7.3	1.4	41

Most partners had not received capacity building in gender, which is most likely due to funding constraints or lack of will from management. Some staff had undertaken courses on gender as the dedicated contact on gender issues; however, they often felt that they lacked knowledge of the practical application of gender in their work. Despite that many staff not have been trained in gender issues, 58 per cent had ‘access to information/resources/people with expertise available regarding gender and diversity’. However, a surprising 21 per cent of staff said they ‘seldom’ to ‘never’ use these resources. This indicates that there may be a lack of skills with regard to gender and diversity in the field, but there also may be a lack of motivation of staff to use resources that are available, along with organisational will, that would improve staff capacity in this area.

Recommendations

- Partners should critically examine their environment from a gender perspective to identify ‘hidden’ or ‘subtle’ barriers for staff in the workplace and overcome barriers that impede practical gender needs from being addressed.
- Improve employment terms, such as access to benefits, formalised flexible working conditions, job-shares, childcare etc. Permanent contracts should be offered to casuals.
- Provide support and mentorship opportunities for women in employment.
- Provide a gender-friendly environment (e.g. separate toilets and wash facilities for men and women), and transportation (Mopeds, vehicles) and security in the field (day-time visits, mobile phone, going with a partner) to address women’s practical and security needs. Conduct training in riding motorbikes and promote positive and gender-friendly organisational cultures.
- Partners should integrate gender considerations into all field operations, such as in programme design, planning, implementation, technical capacity and monitoring and evaluation. Staff will need capacity building and motivation to apply this approach in the field.
- Identify the opportunity cost of women’s time spent on C:AVA/GLCI activities compared to other activities, to ensure participation, (for example, in C:AVA, ensure that the project does not increase women’s workload, by introducing labour saving technology which will also increase production).
- Use a holistic approach as much as possible in designing activities, and acknowledge the many roles women play in agricultural production and processing, in the home, the community and the economy as a whole.
- All partners should encourage women’s participation in all activities, particularly areas where women are not traditionally found. Targets should be agreed for C:AVA and GLCI activities that balance participation between men and women in activities, along with a separate set of activities to work with women to address their specific constraints.
- Activities that aim to increase women’s access, maintenance and control over physical assets pertaining to C:AVA and GLCI interventions should be prioritised. Access to credit should be enhanced for C:AVA areas.
- Extend production opportunities to women and vulnerable groups through varietal improvement and training

- Recognise the multiple demands on women's income and develop affordable approaches to cassava crop improvement
- Develop labour saving tools and machinery to reduce drudgery and provide training to increase women's employment
- Identify and address marketing constraints for women
- Encourage good sanitary practices and provision of facilities
- Capacity building in gender is essential for partners. The aim of this should be to improve overall competence of staff in addressing gender issues in participation, access, ownership and equal benefits. In the interim, providers may explore other learning sources such as the internet and shared-learning platforms such as online discussion groups and partner meetings.



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.

Key findings

- There was a general understanding of women's empowerment and strategic gender needs among partners. However, there were differences and inconsistencies between approaches, understanding and application of this within organisations. There was some resistance to women's empowerment and strategic needs by some partners.
- In general, women in most organisations were either working in fields that related to their gender or in areas that were stereotypically female, such as horticulture, home economics, processing etc.
- Some organisations evidenced good representation of women at different organisational levels, where there were at least one or two women in top management positions.
- Partners felt that their activities were having an impact on women's empowerment, particularly with regard to poverty reduction, confidence, challenging gender roles and improving access to resources.
- Areas that could be improved were addressing community power structures, improving control and ownership among women and increasing women's opportunities in leadership positions.

Organisation

Understanding and approach to strategic gender needs and women's empowerment

There was a general understanding of women's empowerment and what might facilitate meeting strategic gender needs. Partners cited a number of areas of empowerment, including decision making, leadership and access and control over resources and assets.

"CARITAS is using the Tanzania Women and Gender Policy that provide general guidelines with regard to gender equality issues in terms of employment and overall women empowerment. It also emphasizes the need to improve women's access to credit, education and decision making at all levels" (NGO manager).

However, there was less of an understanding of structural and systematic barriers that perpetuate inequality and the important role they could play in challenging gender discrimination. Partners' understanding also excludes issues of men and masculinities. This is commonly overlooked in organisations due to the severity in some cases of women's subordinate position.

There was also limited understanding and application of gender empowerment approaches among partners. Some partners felt that the concept was problematic in particular contexts and they felt uncomfortable with addressing what is seen to encroach on value systems and challenging customary ways of doing things. Other partners did want to have greater impact on women's empowerment, but lacked the skills to apply the concept to their work or the funds for specific projects. Both the lack of understanding and commitment to women's empowerment could reduce the strategic gender and poverty impact of the C:AVA and GLCI projects unless appropriate actions are taken.

There were differences between approaches and application of gender within organisations. For the majority of partners, targeting women was part of a larger strategy for poverty reduction, necessary for meeting donor requirements, or practical (for example, women are often targeted with microcredit because they are more likely to pay back), which does not necessarily incorporate an empowerment approach. The approach of many partner organisations was a 'family-based' approach or a 'women in development' approach. Although one DALDO stated they were using a 'gender and development' approach it was not evident that their approach was significantly different than the others. The first focuses on the welfare of families and women's intrinsic role in household wellbeing by providing food, and being responsible for the education and health of children and elderly. The second approach also accepts the premise of the first, but extends that to argue for the need to target women specifically in interventions to address poverty. While these approaches have significant merit, they 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.

"The intention of our work is to improve the family and not individuals. If you promote the family the whole family will grow" (male government extension manager).

Relationship with donors

A number of partners explained that gender issues are addressed in their work if it is a stated requirement by donors. A number of organisations had worked on projects in the past where a gender equity approach was adopted and have gained skills, but these approaches ended with the project. This reveals that partners need to increase their awareness of gender and of the benefits of addressing gender issues in their organisations and in their work. In addition, adopting a strategic approach to how gender is addressed in their work will help staff to build on their skills, experience and commitment over the long term.

Need for a strategic approach to gender

There is a need for partners to establish a clear gender framework on which to base activities alongside existing agricultural or poverty reduction strategies. This would form the basis of gender capacity building for staff. 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).

By moving from a ‘women in agriculture’ approach for example, to a ‘gender and development’ approach, it will emphasise the relational quality of gender, and the roles, responsibilities, benefits and rights of men and women that could support change. This approach could also allow greater space for men in its programmes.

Service providers should examine their assumptions about men and women’s gender roles and other gender issues within their approach to activities, which is often not explicit. Many service providers assumed women’s roles were located primarily in the domestic sphere and ignored women’s productive contributions and individual agency, for example, such as in production activities, agricultural processing and marketing. At the same time there are also perceptions among extension staff that male farmers do not contribute to the household and are ‘lazy’, which is also an unhelpful understanding of male roles in agriculture. Even on that premise, respondents should have been more proactive in addressing the issue. The concept of male gender roles should be explicitly addressed as it is core to redressing power relations and inequality.

Partners will also need to examine their language in their approaches, as there was some ambiguity in concepts such as ‘active poor’ or ‘marginalised’, which can have a number of different meanings and implications for whom it will include and exclude from activities. For example, women’s work is often considered non-productive (domestic chores, raising children, cooking etc), so it could imply that they are non-active. This re-emphasises the need for gender training for C:AVA and GLCI partners.

A gender strategy does need to be supported by management commitment, human resources and financial commitment along with long-term monitoring and evaluation to inform activities. This will help to a greater and more sustainable impact for women.

Women in decision-making within partner organisations

A key method of meeting strategic gender needs and promoting women’s empowerment within organisations is to promote women in management. While it doesn’t automatically translate to the integration of gender issues, it can help provide greater confidence for individual women and provide role models for other women. The extent to which C:AVA and GLCI partners had women in management positions, however, varied (refer to the table below).

Table 12 Representation of women in managerial positions in partner organisations

Region	Institution type	Number of females among core management
	Learning/research institution	2 Deputy Director General Level (Head of Administration and Head of Research)
Mtwara	Public extension service 1	1/9
Masasi	Public extension service 2	3/11
	NGO 1 Kimas	0
	NGO 2 SADACA	0/2 supervisors
	NGO 3 SIDO	0
Mwanza	NGO 4 MRHP	0
	NGO 5 Ruddo	1/11
	NGO 6 Tahea	1/1

As a result, staff felt that there was an inadequate number of women and other groups among their managerial staff. According to the self-assessment survey of

staff and management, over 40 per cent of staff felt that there was 'insufficient' or no representation of women and other groups at the managerial level. Despite these results, most management and staff were enthusiastic about encouraging more women's leadership.

Table 13: Is there adequate representation of women and other groups among staff at the managerial level?

	Total %
Not at all	5.6
Insufficient	36.1
Sufficient	47.2
Excellent	11.1

Total count: 36

Responsibility for gender in partner organisations

Having a person responsible for gender or equality in an organisation is important to ensure the consistency and long-term commitment to gender in all activities. It also allows for more strategic placement of these issues within the organisation. Although mainstreaming gender is a responsibility of all staff members and department heads, it is important for there to be guidance and a role to oversee activities that staff can access.

Overall, three partner organisations had leadership or a person responsible in their organisations for gender. Two were the two DALDOs in Masasi and Mtwara, and one NGO in Masasi. This leaves a significant capacity gap in Mwanza where there is no NGO with leadership on gender, but the district DALDO could provide guidance in this area.

Segmented workforce

An area of opportunity is to encourage female staff to participate in sectors that are not traditionally associated with their gender. In general, women in most organisations were working in fields that were stereotypically female (such as horticulture, home economics, processing etc). This is important for female staff to work in other areas of their expertise and to counter the assumption that, because they are a woman, they are able to understand and/or address gender issues better than men. This may challenge long-held stereotypes of gender capabilities and contribute to more transformative change.

Partners can perhaps take special measures, such as targeted advertising, to encourage greater numbers of women into fields with low female representation. The aim is not to deflect from a merit-based approach but to use it in conjunction with measures to encourage gender equitability.

Operations

Impact on women's empowerment

Despite the absence of a strategic commitment to gender among partners, partners did feel that their activities were having an impact on women in a strategic way (92% of those consulted). Partners also felt that wider societal changes were making it more acceptable for men and women to expand and challenge their traditional gender roles.

Table 14: Do you consider that your work has helped empower women or help them to make strategic life changes?

	Total %
Never	2.6
Insufficiently	5.1
Sufficiently	76.9
Completely	15.4

Total count: 38

The identified impacts of partners activities addressing strategic gender needs and women's empowerment in their activities as a whole (they felt it was too early for partners to comment on C:AVA or GLCI activities) are detailed below.

Change in gender roles and working with men: the increased focus of women in agricultural extension activities in the last decade has led to a change in gender roles for both men and women, which may indicate that processes of empowerment are currently taking place and strategic gender needs are being met. There were a number of examples of men taking on some householder responsibilities, such as cooking and childcare, and women's household decision making power increasing with higher monetary household contributions. Importantly, some of these changes were reported from organisations working in the Southern region, which was noted for having particularly stringent gender roles. Service providers should encourage these changes and support men in adapting to these new roles and assist their wives. This activity is very important as it can help disband stereotypes of men being 'lazy'.

"Men are sharing most domestic responsibilities with their wives, such as taking children to clinics/ hospitals when they are sick or ordinary clinic checkups" (male NGO manager).

There was also an example where women were becoming more involved in work that was traditionally seen as for men: *"We have two women groups who are involved in brick making which used to be a man's job" (NGO).*

Some service providers are currently opening up their programmes to men that were previously for women only, to help encourage shared responsibility. Some SILC groups also included men. While this removes some of the pressure from women and allows more opportunity for the negotiation of responsibilities, service providers must ensure that women maintain some separate space for personal development. C:AVA and GLCI will need to encourage other partners to use these strategies to ensure that the workload and responsibilities of women do not increase.

Improved livelihoods: Many partners felt that they had increased men and women's incomes through their work, which has improved livelihoods and contributed to a reduction of poverty. This was mainly through training activities targeted at male and female farmer groups and also credit provision, particularly through the GLCI SILC groups. In addition, organisations promoting cassava processing have also helped to create a new source of income for women and ownership of new assets, which shows the positive impact that C:AVA can make in this area.

"Women have opened accounts, they have money. We teach them farming and training is spreading. People that are not involved in groups want to join, and we don't advertise. After selling produce, women are making money" (female government extension agent – southern region).

“Cassava processing machinery was given to women to help improve their income. Machines are owned by women and charged out for a fee to the whole village” (female government extension agent).

“Women are operating their own income generating activities, whereas in the past they were not allowed to do so” (female NGO staff).

Health: Some partners had stated that their activities in food preparation and nutrition have improved health outcomes for people. Also more individuals are able to go to the hospital instead of being treated at home due to sensitisation and the ability to pay fees.

Education: Partners also felt that these activities had helped to encourage more families to send their girl children to school as well as boys.

Increased confidence for women: Importantly, partners felt that their past work has increased the confidence of women. This was done through the provision of leadership opportunities, training and community sensitisation. The leadership positions in particular have helped to build women's confidence and self-esteem, and institutionalise their views into decision-making processes.

“Women were not allowed to express themselves but now they are quite outspoken” (male NGO manager)

“Some village extension workers (volunteers) are women. They work with the two village extension staff and village government and follow up on activities. They see themselves as supervisors for village extension staff” (male government extension manager)

Areas to improve

As stated above, there were a number of positive impacts for women that partners have encouraged in their field activities. However there are also areas of improvement that partners should work on as the C:AVA and GLCI programmes develop.

Ownership and control: To increase opportunities for women's empowerment, women should be encouraged to purchase and manage technology through investment opportunities. This is a key area as it is where practical and strategic gender needs intersect. Ownership can address women's need for important inputs and technology to increase their productivity and income, but it can also provide more strategic access to resources that can provide the opportunity for longer term empowerment. Emphasis also has to be on outputs and control over income.

Increasing women's control over resources is not a focus of the majority of service providers but there were some examples, such as a women's borehole management project and training in women's entrepreneurship. However, as crop commercialisation and mechanisation processes continue it could threaten women's participation. Partners will need to establish how and when they can ensure women remain in a position to benefit.

Leadership opportunities: In some cases, women's leadership was compromised by a lack of women volunteering or women taking more administrative positions in

farmer groups. Partners said this was mainly due to the high prevalence of illiteracy among women and lack of confidence to be in leadership positions. Contributing to this is the pervasive stereotypes and social norms generally constraining women in rural communities, which at present, most partners are not addressing directly. This can reduce the positive impacts for women as it is uncertain whether women will benefit or remain in a position to benefit from activities. To address these issues, some partners had implemented targets in decision-making positions for women, which are presented in the table below.

Table 15 Implementing partner targets for women's participation in decision making

Region	Implementing partner	Leadership targets
Mtwara	DALDO	1/3 must be women and try to promote women's leadership for women's groups.
	UPT	No.
Masasi	DALDO	2/3 in cooperatives
	Caritas	No but capacity building for female leaders
	JEBA	No.
	Kimas	No.
	SADACA	No.
	SIDO	No.
Mwanza	MRHP	Women are encouraged
	KIMKUMAKA	No but secretaries are mostly women because they are seen as more trustworthy
	RUDDO	n/a
	Tahea	No.

It is important to consider along with leadership quotas for women, that training is provided for women and male leaders to ensure their effective participation and that women are not only filling administrative positions. Staff also need to be skilled in negotiating the different priorities of men, women and the existing village leadership, that may arise with greater representation of women.

"There is no mechanism for ensure that women's priorities stay priorities – they will have to argue for the priorities and compete against men to get them taken on board. Also, it is essentially up to village leadership to moderate the discussion and take plans forward. If there is a male bias in village leadership, as the case in some villages, women's interests might be usurped" (male NGO manager).

"SILC groups have notably more women but in other GLCI activities there are mostly with men. Women are also mostly secretaries of groups because they are seen to be more trustworthy" (male NGO manager)

Lack of skills in social relations and intra/inter household dynamics: Most of the partners have vast experience working with farmers' groups but their skills could be improved particularly with regard to power relationships and structures that prevent certain groups, particularly women, from achieving equality. Partners were aware that their activities, whether explicit or not, were changing gender roles in the household, and had caused conflict in some cases. Staff generally felt uneasy in these situations because gender roles were equated with culture, which they felt should be respected and not interfered with.

Some key capacity skills required in conducting field work are:

- Gender and social difference, how it affects group dynamics and project outcomes

- Leadership skills and group management, as some partners reported that they lacked skills in keeping groups from dismantling. Partners often felt that groups would lose interest when they are not seeing benefits quickly.
- Some partners, particularly NGOs, felt that they required capacity-building in terms of gender-based conflict resolution. In particular, staff wanted capacity in communicating the importance of women's involvement, dealing with situations when there is conflict between men and women's priorities in the household or community and understanding how to empower men to take on household responsibilities.
- Skills in intra-household and inter-household dynamics to understand roles in the household and cooperation/conflict and social organisation of community and how this impacts on livelihoods.
- Working in challenging contexts: staff working in southern Tanzania felt that oppressive gender norms were very pervasive and they had difficulty challenging these norms.

Partners were aware of the increasing time and labour constraints faced by women in managing their productive and household activities and skewed use of women's income for family upkeep and welfare. C:AVA and partners should assist redress these issues and help promote greater shared-responsibility among women and men; the rights of women to their own personal development and leisure; household labour saving, child development, health and wellness issues. It is envisaged that gender training for partners will equip their staff enhance their understanding of underlying concepts of gender and development and their operationalisation at the field level.

Monitoring and evaluating gender

As the chapter on equal opportunities discussed, it is important for partners to ensure that their monitoring and evaluation processes are comprehensive and that gender and diversity is mainstreamed, which is not currently being done by most partners. Partners will need to establish gender objectives with a set of gender indicators to measure progress. Gender indicators that are particularly relevant to both C:AVA and GLCI are:

- Number of women and men participating in the activity (receipt of cassava stems, cassava processing groups, producers)
- Number of women in leadership or decision making positions
- Number of women and men receiving training
- Number of women and men receiving technological support
- Number of women and men having access to additional support through other programmes

It is also important for gender impacts to be drawn out in evaluation procedures. Most partners were able to identify the impacts their programmes have had on men and women, but the methods to acquire this information were not applied in a rigorous or systematic way. Partners may want to adopt gender indicators that are measured consistently over time, gathering evidence through one to one interviews with men and women or participatory evaluations.

Recommendations

- Develop and implement a gender strategy that establishes an approach to gender, a framework of capacity building and action and mainstream it. This

process should examine organisational assumptions, values and culture and firmly establish a budget for activities and monitoring and evaluation.

- Create partnerships with women's organisations to feed into organisational gender strategy and learning processes.
- Increase the number of females in management positions and male-dominated sectors, and provide training, mentorship and support for women to move up.
- Partners should undertake capacity building in gender issues for a greater impact on strategic gender needs and women's empowerment for the present service providers.
- The C:AVA and GLCI projects as a whole should recruit more females in positions such as the country manager or desk officer positions.
- Promote ownership among women, such as by providing investment opportunities through the SILC credit provision.
- Recognise the importance of women farmers in their own right.
- Actively encourage the participation and leadership of women and vulnerable groups and address barriers to participation,
- Build women's capacity in leadership and decisions making for sustained women's leadership and for men and village leaders in gender-sensitivity. This could be done through formal training sessions or informally through exiting capacity building initiatives.
- Encourage shared responsibility of men and women to ensure women's workload and time isn't further constrained by C:AVA/GLCI activities, while maintaining women's direct benefit from participation in the projects.
- Increase staff skills in understanding rural power structures and institutional analysis from a social relations perspective, focusing on managing conflicts, group management, intra and inter-household dynamics and understanding empowerment and social difference.
- Develop a set of gender indicators that measure quality of participation and performance through the project lifecycle. Link with reporting and communication.
- Develop case studies based on success stories to work as role models. Within the beneficiary and neighbouring communities there may be women role models who will be willing to share their experiences and mentor project beneficiaries. Alongside, there may be male mentors who are averse to the traditional power relations that are detrimental to women's empowerment.

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.

Key findings

- Generally there was low awareness of diversity as a social concept but a high appreciation for the insight it provides.
- Partners did not have any policies or strategies on diversity, but they were positive about including it in their work.
- In field activities, service providers are participating in activities that address some key diversity issues, especially regarding youth and HIV/AIDS, but the concept can be applied and mainstreamed into all activities.
- Other areas that need to be addressed are: the lack of suitable technology for disabled people, how to work with different religious/cultural groups and monitoring and mobilising different groups.
- Monitoring and evaluation of diversity was not undertaken in a systematic way and diversity indicators were not in place for most partners. This had led to a gap in knowledge about the participation of vulnerable groups in partner activities.

Organisation

Understanding of diversity

Overall there was low awareness of diversity as a social concept but a high appreciation for the insight the concept provides. Partners did not have any policies or strategies on diversity, but they felt they were addressing some diversity issues already and would like it to be enhanced in their work. However, staff had an easier time applying the concept to their field activities than to their workplace, which was also the case with the concept of gender.

Partners would benefit from using a diversity approach to critically analyse their effectiveness in reaching different groups. This may mean examining a number of areas of social difference such as marital status, tribe, age, disability, language, national origin, etc. This will help to identify groups that may be more prone to exclusion, particularly if multiple characteristics interact (such as gender, age or tribe). By striving to improve services with different groups in mind, it will help to create more effective services and support for all.

Diverse workforce

A diverse workforce is increasingly being recognised as a valuable asset for organisations and businesses. Taking a diversity approach can help to build a workforce with a range of skills and experience that can ultimately improve activities,

such as outreach, or even competitiveness. A diverse workforce also gives rise to a number of different staff needs; therefore it is essential that there are opportunities for staff to communicate their needs in the workplace to management.

The practices of some service providers did not reveal explicit attention to diversity with regard to their workforce, as they felt that hiring was strictly merit-based, which was similar to the reason why women were not targeted in recruitment. This reinforces the finding that partners feel that providing equal opportunities can run contrary to a merit-based approach. However, HIV/AIDS was found to be an important issue among staff and management showed commitment to retaining employees with long-term illness.

"No one has been chased away because of problems" (male manager, DALDO).

"Instead of chasing them away there are teachers here with HIV and they have a reduced workload so they can still get a salary" (male, researcher, learning institution)

Operations

Programmes targeting diverse groups

All partners were participating in some activities that addressed diversity issues. The main diversity focus for service providers, both NGOs and public extension organisations, was on youth unemployment, the poor, women-headed households and people with HIV/AIDS. This was conducted through both targeted and mainstream programmes. However, staff felt this could be improved. There was a lack of information in how partners were ensuring that these groups were participating and benefiting, as there was limited reporting on the impact of their activities on different groups. Staff felt that there could be more projects that address specific diversity areas such as specific tribal groups, disability and migrants.

Table 16: To what extent do you consider and include diversity in your work?

	Total %
Not at all	0
To some extent	25
To a great extent	60
Completely	15

Total count: 40

Diversity issues that need to be addressed

Staff raised a number of issues that will need to be addressed in C:AVA and GLCI activities to ensure equal distribution of benefits in communities. The issues that were identified are as follows:

- There was a lack of suitable cassava technology for disabled people.
- How to work with difficult religious or cultural groups
- Female and male extension workers find it difficult working in Islamic communities where women were generally more secluded
- Monitoring different groups included and excluded in activities
- Social mobilisation of diverse groups

Monitoring and evaluation

As discussed in previous chapters, monitoring and evaluation systems were in place for partners, particularly among GLCI partners, but improvements should be made to include diversity and gender indicators. Without this, some partner management felt that they had very little information on their clients and the impact of their activities on different groups. Examples of diversity indicators that should be incorporated into monitoring and evaluation systems are: age, nationality, tribe, language group etc. Based on a study of the communities it works in, partners can select the most relevant indicators and include them into baseline surveys, monitoring and needs and impact assessments. Close attention should be paid to the characteristics of those included and not included in programme activities.

Recommendations

- Improve understanding of diversity and provide capacity for staff on how diversity issues can be addressed, and how activities could be extended or improved for different groups.
- Develop a set of tools or add to existing tools for staff to use to help apply diversity in their work and investigate how their programmes reaching out to different groups,
- Ensure staff are equipped with group negotiation and conflict resolution skills to help mitigate circumstances where the interests of different groups conflict.
- Address issues of non-indigenes, various faith groups, disabled people and youth.
- Involve young people in profitable cassava farming and processing activities through training in modern methods.
- Research institutions should also investigate technologies or modifications to existing technology (e.g. cassava peelers) that reduce the drudgery of work and that work effectively for groups such as the disabled or people with long-term illness. Facilitate linkages for community groups to access processing and other technology.
- Integrate diversity characteristics into monitoring and evaluation systems such as: gender, age, tribe, disability, or country of origin, marital status etc.

7. Enabling participation

Participation in socio-economic and political life is widely seen as a crucial tool for achieving greater equality and overcoming poverty, and is an intrinsic part of development processes and business innovation (Sen, 2001; Chambers, 2007). Subsequently, the Gender and Diversity Audit includes an analysis of participation among C:AVA and GLCI partners both internally and with their clients. There are a range of processes and mechanisms for participation; therefore 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.

Key findings

- There was a high understanding of participation and its importance among partners, but there was some indication that participatory approaches were not mainstreamed throughout all activities.
- Internal participation was mainly conducted through staff meetings, where staff could learn, problem-solve and discuss issues with other staff. The majority of staff felt that the opinions and views of women and diverse groups were sought out in their organisations; however, there is room for improvement.
- Partners had a wide range of partnerships with other organisations. In some respects this was helping to contribute to greater innovation and organisational learning; however, partnerships between NGOs and public extension, and partners and donors, need to become more equitable, supportive and long-term.
- Staff used a range of participatory methods and approaches in their field activities, such as the O&OD approach undertaken by DALDOs. However, staff require capacity building in a greater range of participatory approaches that recognise issues of gender and diversity.
- Partners face some constraints in promoting participation by using village power structures to engage and mobilise communities. This may limit the scope of people who are exposed to activities, particularly vulnerable groups.
- Partners incorporated methods that enhanced the participation of women in their activities, such as working with women's groups and setting targets for women's participation. However, some partners had eligibility criteria that were restrictive to female farmers, such as requiring a member to own land.
- Some GLCI partners did not use specific methods to ensure equal distribution of cassava planting material for men and women and it was felt that women would be reached *de facto* through the multiplication effort; however, it was questionable whether this could be assured.
- Attention to men's participation is also required to ensure that they have access to benefits and are encouraged to share-responsibilities with women.

Organisation

Understanding participation

All partners felt that participation was crucial to their organisations and external activities, whether their work involved business, extension services, rural development or education. The general understanding of participation was that it was a process to include the views, experiences and knowledge of staff and/or clients.

This was conducted in a variety of ways, as this chapter will illuminate; however, a more nuanced understanding of participation could increase the quality of activities. A gender analysis of participatory approaches for instance, reveals that the general understanding of participation lacked attention to power relationships or complex social circumstances that influence the participation of different groups. Moreover, participatory approaches were understood and applied only in particular contexts and not mainstreamed throughout organisations.

Means of participation within organisations

Internally, organisational participation was mainly conducted through staff meetings, field visits and networking with other organisations. The majority of partners felt that meetings were an effective way for staff to share their difficulties and learning from the field, which fed into the overall direction of the organisation. According to the self-assessment questionnaire distributed to staff and management, 87 per cent of staff felt that participation within their organisations was ‘good’ to ‘excellent’.

Table 17: Ratings effectiveness of partner’s encouraging participation with staff

	Total %
Very poor	0
Poor	0
Satisfactory	13.2
Good	55.3
Excellent	31.6

Total count: 38

Caritas showed good practice in encouraging staff participation by building camaraderie between staff. They organise regular meetings where staff members discuss issues freely. They also have management meetings in every unit where issues concerning staff and projects are discussed and organise a Family Day event once a year, which bring together all staff members and their families.

The majority of staff among partner organisations felt that the opinions and views of women and diverse groups were sought out and that these contributed to organisational change. The self-assessment survey of staff and management indicated that ‘the opinions and views of women and diverse groups’ were ‘usually’ or ‘always’ sought out (86 per cent). However, 11 per cent of staff still felt that this seldom occurs, which was more prominent from public extension organisations, indicating that there is room for improvement in consulting with different groups internally for some organisations.

Table 18: Are the opinions and views of women and different groups actively sought out by your organisation?

	Total %
Never	2.8
Seldom	11.1
Usually	44.4
Always	41.7

Total count: 36

Women’s participation in strategic decision making of partner organisations was less evident, due to the low numbers of women in management positions. Some staff reported that women colleagues did not often participate in organisational activities

and were usually quiet. Therefore it is important for partners to consider different methods of participation in staff activities to get the most out of staff. For example, management felt that meetings were an opportunity to hear staff views; however, this environment may be intimidating as they are typically male dominated and hierarchical.

Operations

Current participatory methods in field activities

Among staff and management, 95 per cent reported that they used participatory methods in planning and conducting their work (refer to the table below). There was a good understanding of participatory methods among partners and it was evident that staff had skills to apply these methods in the field. A mix of consultative and collaborative approaches were used. Public extension agents, for example, utilised the Opportunities and Obstacles to Development (O&OD) framework for participatory engagement with communities, including needs identification and information dissemination. Other partners utilised farmers' field schools, wealth-ranking, problem-tree activities, participatory rural appraisal and participatory variety selection. Another popular strategy was the farmer group approach, which shifts focus from working with individual farmers to group work, which is cost effective, can reach a higher number of people, and contribute to social capital.

"Most of activities are on farm. During evaluations we work with extension workers. We also have annual planning meetings with the farmers and NGOs" (male researcher, learning institution).

Table 19: Do you use participatory methods with different community groups when planning and conducting your work?

	Total %
Never	0
Seldom	5
Usually	22.5
Always	72.5

Total count: 40

However, partners may want to increase the range of tools they use for their activities. Approaches using the farming systems concepts and the sustainable livelihoods framework (Carney, 1998), assist in identifying problems and issues for a range of rural actors in a holistic way. These can be used to develop multi-faceted solutions to problems that stem from a range of issues. Partners may want to undertake learning in a range of participatory methods in order to apply tools that best fit a situation. Furthermore, methods incorporating greater emphasis on 'who' is participating', as well as issues of access, power structures and inequality would be beneficial. Participatory exercises should also be integrated into all project stages, in planning, implementation and monitoring evaluation, not just in the initial phases of the project.

Addressing power structures in initial community engagement

Partners need to examine their relationship with existing community power structures and understand its effect on participation, as the majority of C:AVA and GLCI partners were using existing political structures or village authorities to mobilise clients. While this has been a very effective way for gaining legitimacy and entry into

rural communities, it can limit the scope of partners in engaging with the rest of the community and even reinforce structures of inequality.

Currently, many service providers start the planning phase of their programmes by communicating through the village authority and asking leaders to form groups based around the ‘common interests’ of villagers. Village authorities are typically an older male, but could be in some cases, female. This contact is required in order to conduct work and gather people together in the village, and was seen by both staff and management as being important to community relations. Alternatively, partners rely on existing groups, which are usually of a political nature. However, partners also recognised the consequences that this contact would have on equal participation in their activities for women and vulnerable groups. For example, one partner stated that a consequence of approaching only male village leaders was that they would only invite their friends, in order to restrict the benefit of programmes to their circle of friends.

The GLCI project has created a volunteer field agent position which helps facilitate community engagement through a locally embedded agent. However, it was reported that many of these volunteers are men, which may make it difficult to engage with women. In addition, extension agents that work in their own villages of origin may be situated within local hierarchies and be more influenced by existing power structures, resulting in privileging some groups or families. Given this, partners and voluntary field agents would benefit from capacity strengthening in participatory methods and an opportunity to examine their own position in order to provide more inclusive services to rural people.

Barriers to participation

Partners incorporated methods that enhanced the participation of women in most of their activities, such as working with women’s groups and setting targets for women’s participation. However, some partners had eligibility criteria that were restrictive to female farmers, such as requiring member to have land or ownership of other assets, to be a head of household or literacy requirements. Partners should look critically at their requirements for participation in their activities and to reduce them.

Partners also need to ensure that participation is considered throughout all their activities. For example, many GLCI partners did not use specific methods to ensure equal distribution of cassava planting material for men and women as it was felt that women would be reached *de facto* through the multiplication effort; however, it was questionable whether this could be assured. This shows that partners tasked with distributing new technology require capacity-building in gender sensitivity in distribution methods, (in particular), and gender mainstreaming, (in general).

Partners also felt that there was need to encourage men to participate in their programmes, as the focus was sometimes too focused on women. For example, some partners felt that in some activities open to both sexes, women participated to a greater extent than men such as in processing (washing, peeling) or health-related activities and men were excluded from benefiting from these projects. While this finding is important, and women-targeted initiatives must be balanced with attention to male participation, it must also be kept in mind that women have been traditionally excluded from extension support and require focused support and space for their participation.

Participation in monitoring and evaluation

There were a number of partners, particularly public extension partners and learning institutions, who were using participatory evaluations to identify the effectiveness of programmes from a farmer perspective. One GLCI partner in particular had a very effective anonymous feedback system with farmers, which allowed men and women to write their views on a card and submit them anonymously to staff, (in the case of illiterate staff, these views would be communicated via a mediator). This information was used for organisations to design effective programmes responding directly to the needs of community members. Practices such as this should be encouraged among partner organisations.

Recommendations

- Promote shared learning among partners on participatory methods to improve the effectiveness and range of participatory tools for partners. Methods should include greater emphasis on understanding power relationships and the complex social circumstances to address gender and diversity issues.
- Develop more creative ways to encourage individual and collective staff participation, such as interdepartmental or external field visits, theatre and role-playing, staff presentations and external partnerships to increase learning and enhancing performance.
- Review and adjust current approaches to incorporate participation throughout planning, implementation and monitoring evaluation and improve access to services and programmes. For example:
 - Communicate with other community members after community authorities have been contacted and/or contact female leadership or elderly women
 - Train local facilitators to act as a link between the organisation and communities (such as the voluntary field agent) to exchange information and ideas and build capacity their capacity in equitable participation
- Instate a range of communication gender- and diversity-friendly communication methods, such as radio programmes with female announcers, presentations in local languages and limiting, if not omitting, written materials.
- Address or support others in addressing systemic barriers to female participation, such as female illiteracy, control over resources, gender stereotypes and lack of trust towards development workers.
- Partners should undertake capacity strengthening in group dynamics and conflict management to work more effectively with groups and encourage their participation.
- Undertake regular participatory evaluations with clients such as through community monitoring committees.

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.

Key findings

- Innovation was largely understood as the production and introduction of new technologies, which was an essential part of most partners' work.
- Most organisations possess an organisational culture that supports innovation and has an openness to try new things. But the understanding of innovation could be extended to look at processes of shared learning between organisations and more informal ways of learning.
- Staff meetings were the tool that was most often stated for knowledge sharing. However, the majority of staff reported that they needed to develop their skills to innovate, but felt this was not possible due to funding constraints.
- Knowledge sharing also occurs through partnership and external communication, which is critical for gaining new insight, influencing, and even gaining additional funding. Some of these partnerships need to become stronger.
- Other barriers to innovation include inadequate incentives, lack of ownership and rigid management structures.
- In field activities, there was evidence of innovation, particularly among NGOs. NGOs may be more likely to be innovative in their field activities, which is most likely due to their independence from Government and more flexible structure.

Understanding and level of innovation among partner organisations

Innovation was largely understood as the production and introduction of new technologies, which was an essential part of most partners' work. Most organisations strive to be innovative but in a structured way. There were some partners that had a more in-depth understanding of innovation and saw it in terms of internal processes and opportunities for learning and communication.

Partners felt that their organisations valued and promoted innovation in their workplace. Over 84 per cent of staff and management surveyed felt that the value and promotion of innovation in their workplace was 'sufficient' or more, which indicates that staff feel they are in a supportive environment to try new ways of doing things.

Table 20: Is innovation (new ideas and ways of doing things) valued and promoted in your organisation?

	Total %
Never	5.4
Insufficient	10.8
Sufficient	67.6

Very sufficient	16.2
Total count: 37	

Partners felt similarly about applying innovative methods to their fieldwork with regard to gender and diversity. There were some examples of partners using new innovative methods in addressing gender issues, particularly with regard to female entrepreneurialism. This work should be enhanced, as innovative practices are core to addressing gender and diversity issues in the midst of social change and particularly changing roles and responsibilities. It was evident that some of the programmes and structures of partner organisations were directed primarily towards traditional gender roles; however, organisations need to be aware and adapt to changing roles to deliver more effective services.

Table 21: Do you feel that you use new and innovative methods in your work regarding gender and diversity?

	Total %
Never	2.5
Once or twice	2.5
Sometimes	67.5
Often	27.5

Total count: 40

External partnerships

Partners were engaging with the external environment in many ways, which staff felt contributed to innovation and learning. Partners had a number of external partnerships with the national government, local government, civil society organisations and private companies. The table below demonstrates that 85 per cent of staff and management felt that these partnerships were 'effective' or 'very effective'.

Table 22: Does your organisation have effective partnerships with external organisations?

	Total %
Not at all	0
Ineffective	14.3
Effective	54.3
Very Effective	31.4

Total count: 35

However, there is an issue particularly for NGOs who felt they had little independence from donors or were working in an unequal partnership. Other individuals consulted felt that partnership between NGOs and government extension needed to be improved in order to share learning and experience. However this was difficult as the short-term nature of projects for NGOs often does not facilitate ongoing partnership.

With regard to GLCI, some partners expressed their wish to be more involved in the planning and strategic direction of GLCI in partnership with CRS. Partners wanted to be able to feedback into the project's direction, and to represent the needs of farmers to make the project more responsive and effective. Despite this, partners felt that interaction with other organisations has been increasing through the GLCI project, particularly between research institutions and service providers. Participation within organisations and between partners could be improved to include more creative methods to encourage innovation and problem-solving for GLCI. It is also important

for GLCI to cultivate relationships with its new partners and facilitate shared learning platforms between old and new partners for effective project delivery.

Barriers to innovation

Partners showed high capacity in being innovative; however, there were a number of barriers that prevented staff and management from being more innovative. Some ‘innovation barriers’ for partners were lack of motivation and inadequate incentives (bonuses, training, and management support) and rigid management structures. NGOs were particularly innovative in field activities, which is most likely due to their more flexible structure.

Recommendations

- Improve understanding of ‘innovation systems’ as an approach to innovation, which focus less on the production of new technologies and more on partnerships and information sharing.
- Undertake a review of organisational and project structures and processes to identify their conduciveness for innovation (e.g. bureaucracy, rigid rules etc).
- Encourage staff development through skill and confidence building and incentives using bonuses, training opportunities, bottom-up participatory approaches and management support. Also encourage greater ownership in the organisations, giving staff responsibility over budgets and trying new methods.
- Facilitate more participatory processes between staff and with external partners for shared learning, new ideas and information dissemination. A number of shared-learning platforms can be used, such as regular discussion groups, sharing contact information of partners, online discussion groups etc, which can help increase knowledge transfer between organisations. This is particularly important between research and field operations, which are critical for gaining new insight, influencing, and even gaining additional funding.



References

- Carney, D. (1998) Sustainable Rural Livelihoods. What contribution can we make? London DFID.
- Chambers, Robert (2007) "Participation and Poverty," in *Development*. Palgrave Macmillan Journals, vol. 50(2), pages 20-25, June.
- Department for International Development (2008) Rwanda gender audit project: synthesis of pilot phase. London (unpublished).
<http://www.dfid.gov.uk/countries/africa/gender-synthesis.pdf>
- Hall, A., L. Mytelka and B. Oyeyinka (2004) 'Innovation Systems: Concepts and Implications for Agricultural Research Policy and Practice', United Nations University, Maastricht.
- Jayasinghe and Moore 2003 URL:
<http://www.genderdiversity.cgiar.org/publications/WP40HRSurvey.pdf>
- Kabeer, N. and Subrahmanian, R. (eds) (2001) Institutions, Relations and Outcomes: A Framework and Case Studies for Gender-Aware Planning. London: Zed Books.
- Moser, C. (1987) 'Approaches to Community Participation in Urban Development Programmes' in M. Bamberger, A. Subramanian and E. Shield (eds.) *Community Participation and the Role of International Aid Organisations*, EDI, Washington, DC, The World Bank.
- Moser, C. (1989) 'Gender Issues in Development: Briefing Note' for the World Bank Executive Directors' Board Seminar.
- Moser, C. (1993) 'Gender Planning in the Third World: Meeting Practical and Strategic Gender Needs' in Grant, R. and K. Newland, *Gender and International Relations*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Moser, C. (2005) An introduction to gender audit methodology: its design and implementation in DFID Malawi. London: Overseas Development Institute.
- Owen, M. (1994) "The world of the widow", in *People and the Planet*. Vol 3, pages 2–17.
- Sen, Amartya. (2001) *Development is Freedom*. New York: Anchor.
- Sossou, M-A. (2002) "Widowhood practices in West Africa: the silent victims", in *International Journal of Social Welfare*. Blackwell, vol. 11, pages 201–209.
- Underwood, T. (2000) Developing a revised gender audit strategy for ACORD: Review and Recommendations. London (unpublished).
<http://www.acord.org.uk/Gender%20Audit%20Report%20-%20T%20Underwood.doc>

World Bank (2006) gender equality as smart economics: a World Bank Group gender action plan 2007-2010. Washington: World Bank Group.
<http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTGENDER/Resources/GAPNov2.pdf>