



**FAO OFFICE OF EVALUATION**

**EVALUATION OF FAO'S ROLE AND WORK RELATED TO GENDER AND  
DEVELOPMENT**

**FINAL REPORT**

**Rome, June 2011**

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgements .....	4
Composition of the Evaluation Team.....	5
Acronyms .....	6
Executive Summary .....	9
I. Introduction .....	20
A. Evaluation background.....	20
B. Structure of the report .....	20
II. Evaluation purpose and methodology .....	21
A. Purpose and scope of the evaluation .....	21
B. Evaluation conceptual framework and definitions .....	22
C. Methodology .....	24
III. FAO's mandate on Women and Gender and Development.....	26
A. Women and Gender and Development in FAO .....	26
B. FAO structure for Women and Gender in Development.....	32
C. FAO resources for Women and Gender and Development.....	33
D. Conclusions .....	35
IV. Assessment of work by ESW related to GAD .....	35
A. Introduction .....	35
B. Projects and programmes including TCP.....	36
C. Global Public Goods .....	38
D. Support to mainstreaming Gender and Development .....	40
E. Role of ESW and related corporate perceptions.....	46
F. Conclusions .....	46
V. Assessment of FAO's work related to HIV and AIDS .....	48
A. Introduction .....	48
B. Resources for implementing work on HIV and AIDS: staff and non staff .....	48
C. Projects and programmes including TCP.....	49
D. Global Public Goods .....	50
E. Conclusions .....	51
VI. The relevance of gender equality in FAO's projects and the use of gender qualifiers .....	52
A. Gender-sensitive desk-study of FAO projects not identified as gender or women related .....	52
B. Gender qualifiers .....	54
C. Conclusions .....	56
VII. Assessment of gender mainstreaming in FAO's technical work .....	57
A. FAO field programme resources for Gender and Development.....	58
B. Gender mainstreaming in FAO's technical work.....	63
C. Gender mainstreaming in FAO's Global Public Goods.....	67
D. FAO staff competence on gender.....	71
E. Conclusions .....	72
VIII. FAO collaboration with UN agencies on gender equality and mainstreaming .....	73
A. Background .....	73
B. ESW contribution to interagency work .....	74
C. FAO collaboration with UN agencies on gender issues.....	76
D. Conclusions .....	78
IX. FAO mechanisms for implementing GAD-PoA and SO-K.....	78
A. Gender Focal Point network.....	78
B. Project and Programme Review Committee and TCP approval criteria .....	80
C. Drivers for gender mainstreaming in FAO's work.....	81
D. Gender mainstreaming in FAO evaluations .....	83
E. Conclusions .....	85
X. Contribution to MDGs, FAO global goals and core functions .....	86

A.	MDG 1 and MDG 3 .....	86
B.	FAO Global Goals.....	86
C.	Core functions .....	87
XI.	Corporate culture .....	89
XII.	Main conclusions and recommendations .....	92

#### Web Annexes

Annex 1.	Terms of Reference
Annex 2.	Evaluation tools
Annex 3.	Profile of Team members
Annex 4.	Inventory of FAO projects related to GAD and to HIV and AIDS
Annex 5.	List of institutions and stakeholders met during the evaluation process
Annex 6.	Inventory of FAO Global Public Goods related to GAD and HIV and AIDS
Annex 7.	Gender-sensitive analysis of FAO projects not identified as gender or women related
Annex 8.	FAO Gender Sensitive Outputs in GAD Plans of Action and Plans of Work and Budget
Annex 9.	FAO's work in Animal Production and Health and gender issues
Annex 10.	FAO's work in Disaster Risk Management and gender issues
Annex 11.	FAO's work in Fisheries and gender issues
Annex 12.	FAO's work in Forestry and gender issues
Annex 13.	FAO's work by several units and gender issues
Annex 14.	FAO's work in Region Africa and gender issues
Annex 15.	FAO's work in Region Asia and the Pacific and gender issues
Annex 16.	FAO's work in Region Europe and Central Asia and gender issues
Annex 17.	FAO's work in Region Latin America and the Caribbean and gender issues

---

### **Acknowledgements**

The team of the Evaluation of FAO's role and work related to Gender and Development is deeply grateful to the many individuals who made their time available for discussion and answering numerous questions.

In particular, the team benefited extensively from the generous information provided by staff in FAO headquarters, regional and sub-regional offices, as well as by staff in the FAO Representations and in the Governments of Armenia, Bangladesh, Bolivia, the Republic of Congo, Dominican Republic, Ghana, Kenya, Nicaragua, Niger, Panama, Somaliland, Thailand, The Philippines, Turkey, Uganda and Zambia. We also deeply appreciate the assistance of the development partners and men and women in the communities in these countries, as well as the partner organizations in FAO's Member Countries.

Finally, the team extends its gratitude to the support staff in the FAO Office of Evaluation, who supported the team with administrative assistance, patience and good humour.

---

## Composition of the Evaluation Team

### Evaluation team

- Ms Marcia Brewster, Team Leader
- Mr Anthony Chibudu, Gender and Livestock expert
- Ms Esther de Jong, Gender and Agriculture expert, Gender and Water Alliance
- Dr Mariame Maiga, Africa region and HIV and AIDS expert
- Ms Emily Obonyo, Gender and Forestry Expert
- Ms Vasudha Pangare, Asia Region and Water and Gender expert
- Ms Karla Priego, Latin America and Caribbean Region expert
- Prof. Roderick L. Stirrat, Gender and Fisheries and Natural resources expert

### FAO Office of Evaluation

- Ms Tullia Aiazzi, Evaluation Manager
- Mr Bernd Bultemeier, Evaluation Officer
- Ms Beatrice Gerli, Evaluation Assistant
- Ms Emily Mowchan, Research Assistant

### Advisor for Gender Equality

- Ms Joke Muylwijk, Executive Director, Gender and Water Alliance

### Acronyms

AGA	Animal Production and Health Division
AGAH	FAO Animal Health Services
AGAP	FAO Animal Production Services Dairy Projects
AGN	Nutrition and Consumer Protection Division
AGP	Plant Production and Protection Division
AGS	Rural Infrastructure and Agro-Industries Division
ALCSH	Initiative for Latin America and the Caribbean without Hunger
APO	Associate Professional Officer
BH	Budget Holder
CFS	Committee on World Food Security
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
COAG	Committee on Agriculture
COFO	Committee on Forestry
CPF	Country Programming Framework
CSH	Human Resources Management Division
CSW	Commission on the Status of Women
DOs	Decentralized Offices
EB	Extra-Budgetary
EC	European Commission
ECOSOC	UN Economic and Social Council
ES	FAO Economic and Social Development Department
ESA	Agricultural Development Economics Division
ESN	Food and Nutrition Division
ESS	Statistics Division
EST	Trade and Markets Division
ESW/SDW	Gender, Equity and Rural Employment Division (SDW until December 2006)
FAOR	FAO Representation
FFS	Farmers Field School
FFLS	Farmer Field and Life Schools
FI	Fisheries and Aquaculture Department
FIE/FIP	Fisheries and Aquaculture Policy and Economics Division
FII	Fish Products and Industry Division (until December 2009)
FIR	Fisheries and Aquaculture Resources Use and Conservation Division
FO	Forestry Department
FOE	Forestry Economics, policy and products division
FOI	Forest Products & Industry (until December 2009)
FOM	Forest Assessment, Management and Conservation Division
FON	Forestry Policy and Planning Division (until December 2009)
FOP	Forest Products Division (until December 2009)
FOR	Forest Resources Division (until December 2009)
FPMIS	Field Programme Management Information System
GAD	Gender and Development
GAD-PoA	FAO Gender and Development Plan of Action
GCP	Government Cooperative Programme
GPG	Global Public Goods
GeMO	Gender Mainstreaming Output of the Plan of Action
GFP	FAO Gender Focal Point
GSPS	Gender Sensitive Products and Services in PWB
GWA	Gender and Water Alliance
HIV and AIDS	Human Immunodeficiency Virus/Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome
HQ	FAO Headquarters
IASC	Inter-Agency Standing Committee

IDWG	Interdepartmental Working Group
IANWGE	Interagency Network on Women and Gender Equality
IEE	Independent External Evaluation
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IFIs	International Finance Institutions
ILO	International Labour Office
IP	Integrated Support to Sustainable Development and Food Security Programme in FAO
JFFLS	Junior Farmer Field and Life School
LEGN	Legal Office
LoA	Letter of Agreement
LONY	FAO Liaison Office in New York
LTU	Leading Technical Unit
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MO	Missed Opportunity
MTP	Medium Term Plan
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NMTPF	National Medium Term Priority Framework
NR	FAO Natural Resources Department
NRC	Climate, Energy and Tenure Division
NRL/AGL	Land and Water division (AGL until December 2006)
OCE	FAO Office of Corporate Communications and External Relations
OECD/DAC	Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OED	FAO Office of Evaluation (formerly PBEE)
OEK/KCE	FAO Office of Knowledge Exchange, Research and Extension (KCE until December 2009)
OR	Organizational Result
PC	Programme Committee
PEMS	FAO Performance Evaluation and Management System
PWB	Programme of Work and Budget
RAF	FAO Regional Office for Africa
RAP	FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
RBM	Results Based Management
REU	Regional Office for Europe and Central Asia
RLC	Regional Office for Latin America and Caribbean
RNE	Regional Office for Near East and North Africa
RP	FAO Regular Programme of work
SAP	FAO Sub-regional Office for the Pacific Islands
SC	Steering Committee
SD	FAO Sustainable Development Department (merged into ES and NR Departments in January 2007)
SDAR	Rural Development Division
SDRE	Research, Extension and Training Division
SEAGA	Socio-economic and Gender Analysis Programme
SEC	FAO Sub-regional Office for Central Asia
SEU	FAO Sub-regional Office for Central and Eastern Europe
SF	Strategic Framework
SFC	FAO Sub-regional Office for Central Africa
SFE	FAO Sub-regional Office for Eastern Africa
SFS	FAO Sub-regional Office for Southern Africa
SFW	FAO Sub-regional Office for West Africa
SLC	FAO Sub-regional Office for the Caribbean
SLM	FAO Sub-regional Office for Central America
SLS	FAO Multidisciplinary Team for South America

---

SNE	FAO Sub-regional Office for North Africa
SNG	FAO Sub-regional Office for the Gulf Cooperation Council States and Yemen
SNO	FAO Multidisciplinary Team for Oriental Near East
SPFS	Special Programme for Food Security
TC	Technical Cooperation
TCA/TCS	Policy and Programme Development Support Division
TCE	Emergency Operation and rehabilitation division
TCI	FAO Investment Centre
TCP	FAO Technical Cooperation Programme project
TCPF	FAO TCP Facility
TF	Trust Fund
ToR	Terms of Reference
ToT	Training of Trainers
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNIFEM	United Nations Development Fund for Women
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNJP	United Nations Joint Programmes
UTF	Unilateral Trust Fund
WID	Women in Development
WB	World Bank



## Executive Summary

### Information about the evaluation

1. The Evaluation of FAO's role and work related to Gender and Development was requested by the FAO Programme Committee (PC) in October 2008 and planned to take place in 2010. In April 2010, the Committee requested that the Evaluation should be carried out in parallel and coordinated with a Gender Audit managed by the Gender, Equity and Rural Employment Division (ESW) with the support of UNIFEM (now UN Women).

2. The Office of Evaluation (OED) and ESW agreed that the Audit would focus on the institutional analysis of FAO at the time that Strategic Objective K (SO-K), 'Gender equity in access to resources, goods, services and decision-making in the rural areas' became operational within FAO's new Strategic Framework 2010-19. The Audit was to include an in-depth assessment of the staffing situation, procedures, mechanisms and broad organizational capacity for gender analysis and mainstreaming.

3. The Evaluation, instead, would assess FAO's performance between 2002 and 2010 in implementing the two Gender and Development Plans of Action (GAD-PoA) and the one year under SO-K. It would assess the Organization's technical and advocacy work at national, regional and global level. Additional aspects to be evaluated were: ESW's work aimed at facilitating the gender mainstreaming process in FAO; the work of FAO in improving gender equality and women's empowerment; and the work done by FAO in addressing the impact of HIV and AIDS on food security and livelihoods.

4. The Terms of Reference of the Evaluation established that it would analyze FAO's past performance with the aim of being forward-looking and striving to be a useful and timely tool to inform decision makers in their planning role. The main purposes were formulated as follows:

- Accountability to FAO management and Member States on FAO's role, work and performance in the implementation of the Gender and Development Plans of Action and in contributions to Millennium Development Goal (MDG) 1 and MDG 3;
- Identification of lessons learnt and formulation of recommendations for improving FAO's role, work and performance in the pursuit of gender equality and women's empowerment.

5. In addition to the standard international criteria of evaluation, the Evaluation also adopted the ECOSOC definition of gender mainstreaming and the notion of empowerment defined as "a process by which the vulnerable become able to make strategic life choices which determine the course of their lives" as overarching criteria against which to assess all FAO's work.

6. An additional step was to establish four qualifiers for FAO's initiatives and products, for both projects and Global Public Goods (GPGs) to classify FAO's work in broad categories. These were: Gender and Development (GAD); Women in Development (WID); Non-GAD; and Missed Opportunity (MO).

7. The Evaluation methodology was based on several elements and tools. The Evaluation team was multi-disciplinary and inter-regional, including gender experts from Africa, Asia and Latin America and in Agriculture, Economics, Fisheries, Forestry, Food Security, HIV and AIDS, Livestock and Water. The team was supported in its work by OED as evaluation manager and team member, and by the international NGO and network Gender and Water Alliance, in the role of specialized advisory body on gender issues.

8. The team visited 16 countries, selected by taking into account the number of relevant projects implemented, variety of technical sectors covered by the projects, the presence of a regional or sub-regional office and other factors, such as security, accessibility and absence of country evaluations. The countries were:

- Asia: Bangladesh, Philippines and Thailand, including the Regional Office for Asia and Pacific;
- Africa: Congo (Republic), Ghana, including the Regional Office for Africa (RAF), the Sub-regional Office for West Africa (SFW) and the country office in Accra; Kenya, Niger, Somaliland, Uganda and Zambia;
- Latin America and the Caribbean: Bolivia, Dominican Republic, Nicaragua, and Panama, including the Sub-regional Office for Central America;
- Europe and Central Asia: Budapest, Hungary for the FAO Regional Office for Europe and Eastern Europe (REU/SEU), Armenia and Turkey, including the Sub-regional Office for Central Asia (SEC).

9. The Evaluation was carried out over the period September 2010 to May 2011. This final report and the related Management Response are expected to be discussed by FAO Programme Committee at its October 2011 session.

10. This Executive Summary aims at informing busy readers about the key findings of the Evaluation, by bringing together the conclusions for each section of the report on the basis of which the 16 recommendations addressed to FAO were formulated. The Evaluation confirmed to a large extent the findings of the Gender Audit and broadly supports its recommendations, although some differences exist about recommended steps that FAO should take for fully contributing to the UN goals of gender equality within its own mandate.

#### Key findings and conclusions

##### Overview of FAO's work in Gender and Development: responsibilities, organization and budget

11. During the period under evaluation, FAO had two Gender and Development Plans of Action: 2002-2007 and 2008-2013. Both gave clear responsibility for gender mainstreaming to all the units in the Organization, while ESW was mandated to facilitate and support the process across FAO units and in Member countries, by developing tools and capacities for this purpose.

12. As a follow-up to the Independent External Evaluation of FAO and the Immediate Plan of Action, the new Strategic Objective K was formulated and became operational within FAO's new Strategic Framework 2010-19. The second GAD-PoA was phased out in 2009.

13. The comparison of FAO's performance under the GAD-PoA and SO-K was one of the key evaluation questions. By May 2011, the following conclusions could be drawn:

- i. The two GAD Plans of Action were not well 'internalized' by FAO despite efforts to prepare the second Plan in an inclusive and participatory manner. This was partly due to their separation from the overall planning and budgeting process. In general, the Plans left very little mark on the Organization, but ESW could not be held solely responsible for this;
- ii. there was little concrete evidence that in the first year of its implementation, SO-K was a stronger driver for gender mainstreaming in FAO. Further, SO-K left open a gap in terms of corporate policy on gender mainstreaming and a related accountability mechanism;
- iii. the Regular Programme resources allocated to GAD work had not increased yet with SO-K and remained in the order of 1% of the Organization's Net Appropriation; while improved knowledge of the planning system might facilitate the cross-allocation of resources in PWB 2012/13, in the absence of an accountability mechanism, incentives would still be weak;
- iv. the quantity of gender-sensitive products and services in the planning process had improved in the Organization, but the process was not uniform and reasons for 'weak spots' would require detailed assessment, in HQ and DOs;
- v. the information received from FAO indicated that 13% of the field programme resources had been allocated to gender and women's initiatives; this appeared to be a very low

share considering the role women play in the areas within FAO's mandate and how gender relations can impact on food and nutritional security for all.

*Work by ESW on Gender and Development*

14. Between 2002 and 2010, ESW carried out a substantial amount of work with Regular Programme and Voluntary resources to meet its mandate as specified by the GAD Plans of Action and by SO-K. Evidence of positive results and impacts was found in some projects, among which DIMITRA appeared to be one of the most outstanding in terms of moving beyond economic empowerment.

15. Other initiatives such the LinKS programme and support for the generation of sex-disaggregated data were also worthy of note. In particular, the latter was provided through advisory services and regional and national workshops in all the regions. A recent and very positive example of this had been the Agri-Gender database developed by RAF.

16. In general the quality of the GPGs produced by ESW was high, in particular in terms of relevance and technical quality. However, several sub-standard outputs were also assessed. In addition, some products displayed analytical weaknesses. There were also failures in ensuring the satisfactory distribution of products and dissemination of results: this resulted in the impact of ESW's GPGs being short of potential.

17. The flagship Socio-Economic and Gender Analysis (SEAGA) tool was produced before the period covered by this evaluation. Since 2002, SEAGA had been further developed, capacity development and technical advice were provided to Member States, and direct and indirect support was provided to women in rural areas of the world. There was good evidence that SEAGA was widely used, though mostly outside FAO. Within the Organization, the momentum behind its creation has been lost and the tool requires revision and re-vamping.

18. Through SEAGA, capacity development on gender was an on-going activity for ESW, with several initiatives aimed at FAO staff. More recently, a joint IFAD-FAO programme aimed at developing capacities on gender issues for staff of the two organizations and partners at country level appeared to be effective. However, when ESW provided training support, this was often was not tailor-made to the needs of certain technical units, leading to reluctance to ask for ESW support for other initiatives.

19. Two main reasons for the mixed performance of ESW can be identified. The first, and one frequently mentioned by ESW staff, was lack of resources. Throughout the period under evaluation, the Division was being asked to perform across a wide spectrum of activities with limited resources and capacity to meet the needs of training, advisory services and information in each area within FAO, as well as in monitoring the implementation of projects in regions and countries.

20. The Regional Office for Africa (RAF) was the only Decentralized Office that still had a Senior Gender and Development Officer in post at the time of the Evaluation. This contributed to make a visible difference to the attention being paid to gender at the regional level; in RAP and REU, recent decisions by respective Regional Representatives had led to the appointment of Gender Focal Point in 2010 or early 2011. In Latin America and the Caribbean, since the regional ESW officer had retired, almost no communication or exchange had taken place with HQ on gender issues.

21. But perhaps of more importance was the lack of a clear understanding within FAO and ESW itself about what was its main role and responsibility. So for instance, it was unclear to most outside ESW, and possibly to some within ESW itself, whether the Division was responsible for leading the effort to mainstream gender in FAO and facilitate gender awareness and competency within the Organization or whether it should aim at working to mainstream gender in the work of other units in the Economic and Social Development Department and beyond. An alternative option proposed was that it could serve as an in house think-tank with the primary responsibility of producing cutting edge analysis and policy recommendations for FAO and other agencies.

### HIV and AIDS

22. FAO's work on the relationship between agriculture and HIV and AIDS has assisted a number of African governments to develop gender-sensitive agricultural strategies when addressing the HIV and AIDS crisis. The most successful results were in the Junior Farmer Field and Life School (JFFFLS) projects, which made a difference in empowering young women and men. SEAGA tools related to HIV and AIDS were assessed as of very good quality, although their use was limited.

23. Despite the visible efforts and results, overall resources, both from the Regular Programme and Voluntary, have been limited, considering the extent of the negative impact of the epidemic on food security in the region.

24. The Evaluation considered that FAO's decision to phase out work on HIV and AIDS will increase African countries' vulnerability to HIV and AIDS in rural areas and jeopardize investments made so far by FAO to mitigate the epidemic's impacts on food security in Africa. Thus, it formulated one key recommendation on this aspect, aimed at maintaining a capacity within FAO to work at country level in relation to HIV and AIDS and food and nutrition security.

### Relevance of gender into FAO's work and use of gender qualifiers

25. The Evaluation analyzed what was and what should have been the extent of gender mainstreaming in FAO's projects. Two sets of data were developed, based on the analysis of a random and statistically valid sample of FAO projects that had not been identified as GAD/WID related, and on the validation of project gender qualifiers at country level. Besides confirming the low level of accuracy in the use of gender qualifiers within FAO, a few key findings emerged on the degree to which a gender perspective had been integrated into the work of FAO, what it should have been and what was reported, in terms of numbers of projects. The following conclusions could be drawn:

26. FAO integrated gender concerns and included women in approximately 40% of its projects operational in the period 2002-2010; the extent of gender mainstreaming varied widely, but a GAD approach was more frequently followed than a WID approach;

27. A gender perspective was not required in approximately 20% of FAO's projects: this confirmed that some of the work of the Organization was really 'gender-neutral', although this applied to a much smaller share of the field programme than what was usually stated by FAO technical officers and what had been identified during the Evaluability Assessment (91% of the total);

28. The share of projects where gender should have been integrated but was not, was found to be rather large: approximately 35-40% of FAO projects across the two samples were assessed as Missed Opportunities in terms of recognizing the relevance and importance of gender equality concerns to their stated objectives. This will be the real challenge to FAO, how to decrease substantially the number of projects wherein gender is not taking into account despite the need to do so;

29. Thus, FAO should have integrated gender issues in approximately 75-80% of its projects; this was almost twice as much as what happened in practice and almost ten times the number of project that FAO had identified as GAD/WID.

### Assessment of gender mainstreaming in FAO's technical work

30. The relevance, effectiveness and sustainability of FAO GAD and WID projects varied hugely. In most regions, with few exceptions at country level, there was a disconnect between regional and national gender priorities and policies and FAO's products and services.

31. Although a number of initiatives contributed to improve food security and incomes of men and women, and in many cases specifically women, there was little evidence that these interventions were sustainable and that the gains accrued would benefit the women for whom they were meant. Social and gender analysis were rarely done before projects were started and few projects were informed at formulation phase by a gender perspective.

32. Also when dealing with gender issues, FAO tended to take the “safe road” and was unwilling to push the gender agenda. Women were treated as a homogenous group and were targeted as recipients of inputs, and not as collaborators or contributors. As a result, many FAO interventions had a WID approach rather than a GAD approach and, while this might be fine as an entry point, the ultimate goal of gender equality in access to resources could not be achieved without a GAD approach. At best interventions would result in improved incomes, and therefore economic empowerment, but not in socio-cultural or political empowerment.

33. Overall, actual implementation and integration of gender concerns in field projects varied and depended largely on field staff competences and skills in this area. Technical officers in HQ and DOs were on average less aware and competent about gender issues than project staff in the countries, although skills and experience in gender issues and social development were never among the staff selection criteria for posts other than gender experts, thus missing the opportunity to improve over time the corporate skills in these areas.

34. Although FAO was not usually perceived as a gender champion in the countries visited, in some circumstances FAO Emergency Coordination Units played this role and gender mainstreaming had been achieved to a certain extent. This mainly occurred in those offices with staff of a sufficient size to warrant the existence of a full-time gender expert.

35. As with projects, the extent and quality of gender mainstreaming in FAO’s Global Public Goods varied hugely; although relevance of gender to the topics discussed was in most cases high to very high, the technical quality of the gender contents was adequate but innovativeness and links between gender and social inclusion were poor. With some notable exceptions, this was also the case for FAO flagship publications SOFA, SOFI, SOFIA and SOFO. SOFA 2010-11 may become a milestone in making publicly available information on gender and women in agriculture; one of the challenges ahead is more in-depth analysis on intra-household sex-segregated data on contributions to agricultural production. Unrelated to the quality of the individual products, the diffusion and use inside and outside FAO of its GAD GPGs was very limited.

36. Awareness about the importance of gender issues among FAO staff was usually good, but competence to integrate a gender perspective in projects and GPGs rather poor. In most instances, FAO staff felt reluctant and/or uncertain about applying gender-sensitive approaches.

*FAO collaboration with UN agencies on gender equality and mainstreaming*

37. FAO worked with other UN agencies to produce new and innovative approaches to policies concerning gender and development. ESW, the corporate gender focal point for FAO, is well appreciated in this context at the global level.

38. Collaboration in the areas of gender and statistics and gender and emergencies has been commendable and could be expanded in those and emerging areas such as climate change.

39. Most of the work carried out by ESW with the Interagency Network on Women and Gender Equality (IANWGE), the Commission on the Status of Women (CSW) and other bodies on gender issues was supported by the Liaison Office in New York (LONY), but unrelated to and unsupported by Senior Management and other units of FAO. Similarly, these linkages had only a limited impact on the ways in which FAO as a whole interacted with other UN agencies on gender issues. This was particularly clear at the national level where FAO was frequently absent from the UN country teams and in particular from coordination mechanisms related to gender. At this level, cooperation with other UN agencies had been most successful in the context of UNJPs where other UN agencies have handled gender issues.

40. Clearly, FAO must cooperate with other UN agencies in gender related matters, defining roles and responsibilities based on respective competence and comparative advantage, and it is in the Organization’s best interest to reach out and establish meaningful relations with groups representing women farmers and with UN Women. The leadership of FAO had not so far recognized this from a strategic point of view.

### FAO mechanisms for implementing GAD-PoA and SO-K

41. Through the GAD Plans of Action, FAO had set up two main operational mechanisms to facilitate gender mainstreaming in the work of the Organization. These were the ‘gender criterion’ in the check-lists elaborated by the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC) and the Gender Focal Point network. The review and approval mechanism for the TCP had also integrated gender as a criterion for approval and in late 2008, gender qualifiers were included to the FPMIS qualifiers tag. None of these mechanisms appeared to have fully achieved its purpose.

42. The PPRC improved its effectiveness over time, although in the absence of monitoring and accountability frameworks, its recommendations in the area of gender were still ignored in a number of cases. This calls into question wider issues of compliance with rules and procedures and relevant accountability within the Organization, and more specifically the level of understanding among some units and staff of FAO’s mandate and responsibility regarding gender issues.

43. The TCP review system fell dramatically short of its potential in so far the gender criterion was concerned, for a number of reasons that did not seem to depend on the TCP unit itself. The low level of integration of a gender perspective in these projects reinforced the broader evaluative evidence that gender received at best only formal and cursory attention in FAO’s political vision and strategy at the highest level.

44. The GFP network, in the view of the Evaluation, had not been effective so far, largely due to a lack of enforcement of accountability at the senior divisional and departmental level. This however was not the only reason: appointees often did not have the qualifications, the experience and sometimes the personal commitment to lead change in their units on a topic like gender mainstreaming. There was still deep resistance to the concept of gender mainstreaming embedded in the corporate culture and values as discussed in Chapter 11 below. Despite recent adjustments and incentives, and the further low-cost improvements already planned such as appointing GFPs in all sub-regional and country offices and a better communication strategy between ESW and the GFPs, the Evaluation considers that the GFPs will not be able to ‘break through’ within their respective units and ensure that a gender perspective is systematically integrated in all FAO’s work, as required by the Strategic Framework and Global Goals.

45. The two main external drivers that were identified, Member States and resource partners, were effective but only to some extent. In both cases, evidence available of negotiations and decision-making process was not strong enough to draw conclusions about the locus of responsibility for not insisting on adequate gender-mainstreaming. However, there is rather strong evidence that in general FAO was not pro-active in proposing gender-sensitive approaches in its projects, even when governments and/or donors were committed to gender equality. FAO Governing Bodies gave attention to the topic through the governance mechanisms but these did not allow any immediate impact on the Organization. The only option left to some was withdrawal of their voluntary contributions and this does not seem to have happened because of FAO’s gender-blindness.

46. The analysis of the internal drivers underlines the casual attitude within FAO to mainstreaming gender: when an officer was committed and understood the issue, gender would be mainstreamed. When neither factor were there, nothing would happen and nobody in FAO – or nobody influential enough – would take any remedial action. This applied also to the Evaluation function, which for several years missed the opportunity to call attention to the poor level of gender mainstreaming throughout the Organization.

### Overall conclusions

47. The Evaluation has analyzed the work by FAO aimed at implementing the corporate commitments made to its Member States, through the adoption of the Gender and Development Plans of Action in 2002 and in 2008 and the integration into Strategic Objective K, ‘Gender equity in access to resources, goods, services and decision-making in rural areas’ in 2010.

48. The findings showed that achievements were short of plans and expectations. To some extent, the work of the Organization in relation to GAD contributed to MDG 1 and 3, to the corporate

Global Goals 1 and 2 and to several of its Core Functions. However, at best 40% of FAO's projects have integrated, to a variable degree, a notion of gender equality during their implementation whereas the Evaluation has shown that this figure should be 75-80% of the whole field programme. This means that in around 35-40% of all FAO projects, the gender dimension was ignored, even though gender equality was relevant to achieve the stated project objectives. Not taking gender into account undermined the effectiveness and sustainability of many projects and initiatives. Overall, this weakness was also mirrored in FAO's Global Public Goods. They too lacked a social and gender perspective even when those aspects were relevant and important to most of the topics discussed.

49. Corporate mechanisms for mainstreaming gender, ranging from the Project and Programme Review Committee to the Gender Focal Points, have broadly failed. A paramount factor in this failure has been identified by the Evaluation as the lack of attention to and accountability about gender mainstreaming at the highest levels of the Organization. FAO, using catchy jargon, "did not walk the talk", and the talk was limited in any case.

50. The corporate culture and staff competence on gender reflected and reinforced each other: gender was not recognized as a technical specialization in its own right. However it had to be dealt with at least formally, so it became the task of junior female colleagues who had by definition no possibility of making any changes to a hierarchical, technical and male-dominated organization like FAO. Further, internally the Organization did relatively little to deal with a major imbalance in the employment of men and women. And in terms of its policies and practices, it failed to shift its priorities and remained an organization which valued commodities over people. Within FAO, gender remained culturally marginalized

51. Improvements have been ongoing, triggered by the Gender Audit managed by ESW in 2010 and finalized in early 2011. The Evaluation is well aware of the actions already taken in April-May 2011 by ESW and FAO as a follow up to that exercise, in particular in the areas of the GFP terms of reference and accountability at the most senior level through mandatory activities in their PEMS agreements. These are commendable, as they show the renewed corporate commitment to mainstreaming gender equality in the work of the Organization.

52. However, FAO still needs to recognize at all levels that gender mainstreaming requires much more than simply involving women as beneficiaries of projects. Gender mainstreaming for gender equality is a transformative process involving men and women and their control over resources and decision making.

53. In this context, the Evaluation identified core principles that FAO should integrate and internalize to improve the relevance, effectiveness, sustainability and impact of most of its work at the broader level, as "people" are the true stakeholders of the Organization and "equality among them" will be the path to food security for all.

54. Further, the Evaluation has formulated 17 recommendations, some of which contain multiple actions, informed by these principles and based on the evidence illustrated throughout the report. Recommendations are set out following an order of priority; however the Evaluation strongly urges the Organization to take all of them in consideration for action in the short to medium term.

### *Recommendations*

#### **Recommendation 1 To FAO Senior Management, on commitment to Gender Equality**

- a) FAO should re-state strongly at the most senior level, its full commitment to gender equality and mainstreaming gender as a corporate responsibility and not of one division only.
- b) FAO should establish an accountability mechanism at senior management level including Division Directors and FAO Representatives, through Results Based Management and PEMS;
- c) Gender should become a regular item on the agenda of senior management;
- d) FAO Governing Bodies should receive regularly reports stemming from the accountability mechanism and recommend actions when compliance is not fully satisfactory.

**Recommendation 2 To FAO Senior Management, on a Policy for Gender Equality**

FAO should elaborate a corporate policy on Gender Equality that will guide how gender equality goals will be mainstreamed throughout the Organization and all its technical and advocacy work, and will provide a path for the achievement of SO K. The policy formulation process should be led by the Deputy Director General for Knowledge, with a small team selected from among the Assistant Directors General and Division Directors, including the Director of ESW.

**Recommendation 3 To FAO Senior Management, on the structure and contents of the Policy for Gender Equality**

FAO policy on Gender Equality should contain a strategy and provision for Action Plans at divisional levels. The strategy must go beyond perpetuating existing gender roles and improving livelihoods, to achieving empowerment and gender equality in decision making and access to and control over resources. Women in Development initiatives can be part of the strategy and action plans, as entrypoints towards achieving gender equality.

**Recommendation 4 To the Human Resources Management Division, on gender balance among staff**

FAO should take steps to ensure a more equal gender balance for staff at all levels of the Organization. This should involve, among other possible actions:

- a) Adopting a proactive policy to recruit more women at professional and higher levels of staff;
- b) Establishing more family-friendly policies including flexible working hours and childcare provisions and a clear recognition of the importance of a satisfactory life/work balance;
- c) Increasing the number of men employed in General Services;
- d) Including the standard UN invitation for female candidates to submit their applications in all FAO vacancy announcements at national and regional level, for staff and consultants.



### **Recommendation 5 To FAO Senior Management, on corporate culture**

FAO should take steps to establish a corporate culture which encourages and supports gender equality in all aspects of the Organization. This should include:

- a) Gender awareness sessions for all levels of staff, including upon recruitment;
- b) Counselling and support for those who feel most threatened by cultural and organizational change;
- c) Greater recognition for the varied and complementary contributions made by all staff to the workings of the Organization;
- d) Involvement of external specialists in supporting this process of cultural change.

### **Recommendation 6 To FAO, on structure for gender mainstreaming**

a) Each technical division should have in HQ a senior technical staff member who also has expertise in social/gender issues (divisional gender advisors). Time allocation will vary between divisions, on average it will be around 30%. This will be achieved through new recruitments when senior posts fall vacant.

b) Gender/social development expert posts should be restored in all regional offices.

c) Staff competences at sub-regional level should be adjusted either through recruitment or upgrading of policy officers' competence in the areas of gender and social development.

d) At country level, FAO Representations should include advocacy for gender equality in rural development among their responsibilities and:

- recruit part/full time gender experts depending on the size of the country portfolio to support projects and represent FAO within interagency mechanisms; or
- recruit gender/social development expert for consultancy support in mainstreaming gender in Country Programming Framework and upcoming projects, should resources be limited.

### **Recommendation 7 To the Emergency Operations and. Rehabilitation Division, on gender expertise in Emergency Coordination Units**

It is recommended that where warranted by the size of the emergency programme and by the type of emergency being tackled a dedicated gender specialist should be recruited for Emergency Coordination Units.

### **Recommendation 8 To FAO, on competence on gender mainstreaming of staff and consultants**

FAO should integrate competence and skills on gender issues as a selection and appraisal criterion in all its recruitment and appraisal processes, for both staff and consultants. The weighting given to this competence will depend on each specific job description.

**Recommendation 9 To FAO Senior Management, on the role of ESW on Gender and Social Equality**

Building on existing strengths, ESW should be the think-tank in FAO on social equality issues, including gender. In this capacity, it will:

- i) be the LTU of and contribute to projects with a strong focus on social equality and gender issues; ii) continue to develop normative products in support of improving the integration of social and gender equality aspects in FAO's work.

### **Recommendation 10 To ESW on its role in gender mainstreaming in FAO**

ESW should facilitate gender mainstreaming in the rest of the Organization in an advisory role. For this purpose, it should:

- i) assign or recruit a senior staff member to work full time with a more junior staff member on SO-K and provide expert advice and guidance on gender mainstreaming, gender tagging, reporting and production of relevant normative products;
- ii) maintain a network linking FAO divisional gender advisors and gender experts in decentralized offices, to keep them updated and canvass their experience and expertise for normative products and inter-departmental work;

- iii) provide assistance to FAO staff engaged with flagship normative products and field programmes to ensure that they integrate a gender equality perspective in their outputs and outcomes, both at country and global level;
- iv) monitor the progress by FAO on gender integration through FPMIS, evaluation reports and any other indicator it will develop or identify with other units in the Organization;
- v) collaborate with PPRC to integrate lessons learned on gender mainstreaming in new projects;
- vi) provide assistance to FAO at large on how to incorporate gender disaggregated information into projects and normative products, upon request;
- vii) provide assistance at country level to FAO's Country Programming Frameworks, in FAO's contribution to UNDAF and in United Nations Joint Programme initiatives, upon request and with cost recovery.

**Recommendation 11 To FAO, on capacity development in gender mainstreaming within FAO**

- a) CSH and ESW should develop templates for gender-awareness raising sessions for all FAO staff also at project level to be used in the orientation sessions for new staff and which include FAO's gender policy and mainstreaming mechanisms and tools;
- b) Capacity development on GAD should be specific and focused on the needs of different units and divisions including practical 'how to' guidelines for mainstreaming gender in the field programme and the normative work of each unit;
- c) Under the responsibility of each technical division and decentralized office all FAO internal and external capacity development programmes including orientation programmes for new staff and project personnel and whenever gender would be a relevant aspect of the topic should integrate social inclusion and gender equality in their curricula.

**Recommendation 12 To FAO and its Member States on capacity development of Members States on gender mainstreaming**

FAO should carry out capacity development on gender mainstreaming in Member States only when sufficient voluntary funds are made available. When requests for support in this area will be presented to FAO they will be directed to the unit in the best position to meet the specific demand.

**Recommendation 13 To FAO, on commitment to work in HIV and AIDS**

FAO should maintain the commitment to work with HIV and AIDS affected and infected people in its field programmes and projects in countries where the epidemic has an impact on rural population. This should be achieved through partnership with UNAIDS and other agencies and through some capacity in the regional or subregional offices where the pandemic has a stronger impact on rural livelihoods and food security to backstop these projects.

**Recommendation 14 To FAO, on project effectiveness**

In all projects - emergency, rehabilitation and development - that have an impact on people FAO should:

- a) carry out a social analysis at the design or inception stage; cost effective approaches include use of pre-existing studies and analysis and scoping studies;
- b) develop a clear road map for gender concerns within each project, including indicators for its monitoring;
- c) integrate social development and gender expertise in project design, formulation and inception and a budget line for a gender specialist wherever possible;
- d) integrate the perspectives of male and female project participants on needs, goals and indicators in project design and implementation;
- e) design regional and national projects within agreed frameworks of reference in terms of targets and indicators, that allow adaptation to address gender differences depending on the local context.

**Recommendation 15 To FAO, on Partnerships and alliances**

- a) FAO should develop partnerships and alliances with those organizations – national, regional and international NGOs, associations and governmental institutions – that are competent in gender and social development for project design and implementation.
- b) FAO should participate in UN Joint programmes aiming at gender equality, supporting women’s productive role in agriculture, and ESW support should be secured through adequate cost-recovery mechanisms;
- c) FAO at country level should participate in the UNCT gender working groups to raise the profile of the productive role of rural women.

**Recommendation 16 To FAO, on Partnership with UN Women**

- a) FAO should establish a partnership with UN Women at corporate level to capture support at regional and country level in furthering empowerment of rural women;
- b) ESW should work with UN Women based on respective comparative advantage in support to rural women in particular but not exclusively in the areas of land rights and food security and nutrition mapping.

**Recommendation 17 To FAO, on operationalizing gender mainstreaming**

- a) FAO must systematically include in its reporting systems, sex disaggregated information on project participants and on achievements on gender equality;
- b) The Office of Corporate Communications and External Relations and the Office of Knowledge Exchange, Research and Extension should ensure that all FAO publications, leaflets, briefs and communication materials should be revised before finalization and printing to ensure that they do not convey sexist messages – in words or images in relation to women’s and men’s roles and responsibilities.
- c) ESW and TCDM should develop gender qualifiers for FAO projects, compatible with the gender markers system made mandatory by the InterAgency Standing Committee for the emergency and rehabilitation sector, and related guidelines for their use in the corporate information systems, to enhance its accuracy and reliability. The guidelines should be distributed throughout the Organization, followed by support through a help desk system. The new PPRC mechanism should be brought into the process of assigning gender markers to the projects it revises.

## I. Introduction

### A. Evaluation background

55. The FAO Programme Committee (PC) at its 100th session in October 2008, commenting on proposed evaluations for 2010, noted that “No evaluation of FAO’s work related to gender has been undertaken in recent years. Given the recent adoption of a new Gender and Development Plan of Action for 2008-13, it is considered that this evaluation should be initiated in 2010”.<sup>1</sup> The Office of Evaluation (OED) planned this strategic evaluation to start in early 2010.

56. In late 2009, in view of the creation of Strategic Objective K (SO-K) ‘Gender equity in access to resources, goods, services and decision-making in rural areas’ within FAO’s new Strategic Framework 2010-2019, the Gender, Equity and Rural Employment Division (ESW)<sup>2</sup> decided to carry out in 2010 a Gender Audit, in partnership with UNIFEM (now UN Women). This had the aim of raising awareness about the Strategic Objective itself and contributing to the development of a baseline for measuring progress on gender mainstreaming in the Organization and an accountability framework.

57. Although the Gender Audit and the Evaluation of FAO’s role and work related to Gender and Development (referred to as the Evaluation hereinafter) had different purposes and methodology, a certain degree of overlapping, in particular in the groups of stakeholders involved, appeared unavoidable. Extensive consultation between ESW and OED and a discussion at the PC at its 103rd session in April 2010 led to the decision that the two exercises would be run in parallel, coordinated and complementary in so far as possible. Their respective scopes were defined as follows:

- the Audit would focus on the institutional analysis of FAO at the time SO-K became operational, including an in-depth assessment of staffing situation, procedures, mechanisms and broad organizational capacity for gender analysis and mainstreaming;
- the Evaluation would assess FAO’s performance between 2002 and 2010 in implementing the two Gender Plans of Action (GAD-PoA) and SO-K, throughout the Organization’s technical and advocacy work at national, regional and global level, against the international criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. It would also analyze all work by ESW to facilitate the gender mainstreaming process in FAO and any specific work aimed at improving gender-equality and women’s situation.

58. The Evaluation also provided the opportunity to assess the work done by FAO in addressing the impact of HIV and AIDS on food security and livelihoods during the period 2002-2010, in consideration of the strong role played by ESW in it and the decision to phase out this area of work as of 2010.

59. The Gender Audit was completed by the end of 2010. The Evaluation was carried out in the period September 2010-May 2011. This final report and the related Management Response are expected to be discussed by FAO Programme Committee in its October 2011 session.

### B. Structure of the report

60. In consideration of the complexity of the topic and the amount of information collected through the Evaluation, it was decided that the main report would contain the synthesis of the findings resulting from some of the sectoral analysis. More detail on most technical work by FAO by department or region is contained in the specific annexes.

61. Chapters 1 and 2 describe the background for the Evaluation, its purpose and the Evaluation methodology. In Chapter 2, also the definitions of gender and empowerment that have guided the work of the Evaluation are discussed.

---

<sup>1</sup> PC 100/ 3 b), FAO

<sup>2</sup> In 2007, the division was moved from the Sustainable Development Department to the Economic and Social Development Department and changed acronym. For ease of reference, ESW will be used through the report to indicate both SDW and ESW, unless otherwise specified.

62. Chapter 3, FAO's mandate on Women and Gender and Development (GAD), illustrates the Organization's formal plans and commitments to GAD, and provides information on the structure FAO set up for gender mainstreaming and the resources made available through the Regular Programme (RP) and Voluntary contributions to the work of the Organization on GAD. Key conclusions on the findings illustrated in the chapter are also included.

63. Chapters 4 and 5 illustrate the work by ESW on gender and on HIV and AIDS. They include information on resources, both RP and Voluntary and on the quality of both the work carried out through the field programme and the Global Public Goods issued by the Division on these two main topics.

64. Chapter 6 synthesizes the 'Gender sensitive analysis of FAO projects not identified as related to gender or women', in full in Annex 7. It also includes the findings of the Evaluation on the use of gender qualifiers in FAO. Overall, it underpins one of the main findings of the Evaluation, i.e. the extent of the relevance of gender equality in FAO's technical work.

65. Chapter 7 illustrates how gender was mainstreamed in the work of FAO's technical divisions. It builds heavily on Annexes 9 to 17 and highlights recurrent findings that are discussed in detail in the Annexes. Chapter 8 illustrates FAO's work on gender at the interagency level and Chapter 9 analyzes the corporate – and ad-hoc – mechanisms for mainstreaming gender in the organizational work. These included also Member States and resource partner's policies as well as the effectiveness of the evaluation function in calling attention to weak gender mainstreaming in FAO.

66. Chapter 10 analyzes FAO's contribution through its GAD/WID work to FAO Global Goals and Core Functions and to Millennium Development Goal (MDG)1 and MDG3. Chapter 11 discusses FAO's corporate culture from a gender perspective. Finally, in Chapter 12 the Evaluation draws its conclusions and presents its 17 recommendations, addressed to FAO or to specific units in the Organization. They are presented following their strategic importance but they all are important and necessary.

67. The Evaluation has also formulated a few Suggestions in the main report and in the Annexes, to convey detailed technical proposals to some specific units. Suggestions will not be taken into consideration in the Management Response to the Evaluation.

68. The annexes are part and parcel of the report and have been referenced throughout the text and footnotes, as appropriate. They include: the ToR of the Evaluation (Annex 1); the Evaluation tools (Annex 2); the profile of team members (Annex 3); the inventory of FAO projects related to GAD, Women in Development (WID) and HIV and AIDS and portfolio analysis (Annex 4); the list of institutions and people met by the Evaluation (Annex 5); the inventory of FAO Global Public Goods related to GAD and WID and those assessed by the Evaluation team (Annex 6); the Gender-sensitive analysis of FAO projects not identified as related to gender and women (Annex 7); a comparative analysis of FAO Gender sensitive outputs in the GAD-PoA 2008-13 and in PWB 2010-11; and, the detailed analysis through a gender perspective of FAO's technical work in several areas of FAO's work and in the regions where it operates (Annexes 9 to 17).

## **II. Evaluation purpose and methodology**

### **A. Purpose and scope of the evaluation**

69. The Terms of Reference (ToR)<sup>3</sup> of the Evaluation established that this would analyze FAO's past performance with the aim of being forward-looking and striving to be a useful and timely tool to inform decision makers in their planning role. The main purposes were formulated as follows:

- Accountability to FAO management and Member States on FAO's role, work and performance in the implementation of the Gender and Development Plans of Action and in contributions to MDG 1 and MDG 3;

---

<sup>3</sup> See Annex 1, Terms of Reference of the Evaluation

- Identification of lessons learnt and formulation of recommendations for improving FAO's role, work and performance in the pursuit of gender equality and women's empowerment.

### **B. Evaluation conceptual framework and definitions**

70. The Evaluation adopted the ECOSOC<sup>4</sup> definition of gender mainstreaming, illustrated in Box 1, as its overarching evaluation criterion against which to assess all FAO's work.

#### **Box 1. Gender mainstreaming**

Mainstreaming a gender perspective is the process of assessing the implications for women and men of any planned action, including legislation, policies or programmes, in all areas and at all levels. It is a strategy for making women's as well as men's concerns and experiences an integral dimension of the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies and programmes in all political, economic and societal spheres so that women and men benefit equally and inequality is not perpetuated. The ultimate goal is to achieve gender equality.

*Source: United Nations, 1997, 'Report of the Economic and Social Council for 1997', A/52/3, September 18, 1997*

71. A closely interrelated concept to gender equality is the notion of empowerment. The Evaluation defined this as "a process by which the vulnerable become able to make strategic life choices which determine the course of their lives"<sup>5</sup>, articulated in four different dimensions that should not be separated: physical, economic, political and socio-cultural empowerment. These are defined with FAO-relevant examples in Box 2. The definition entails that successful empowerment is achieved when two or more of these dimensions are attained.

<sup>4</sup> ECOSOC: UN Economic and Social Council

<sup>5</sup> Source: Gender and Water Alliance

### Box 2. The four dimensions of empowerment

Physical empowerment leads to full control over one's own body, sexuality and fertility; in its food security projects, FAO addresses this dimension by ensuring enough food for a healthy body;

Economic empowerment leads to equal access to and control over means of production and economic independence; in its projects dealing with production and/or management of natural resources, FAO addresses this dimension by increasing income through more and more diversified production and related marketing; it also entails dealing with access to and control over means of production.

Political empowerment leads to political self-determination and the creation of a power base in a self-determined direction; FAO could address this dimension by involving the final users in the decision making on projects themselves; also, when users are involved in the management of project outputs, for example in water users associations or farmers cooperatives where decision making takes place on a regular basis, FAO has an extra opportunity to address this dimension of empowerment;

Socio-cultural empowerment leads to one person's own identity, worth and self-respect; all FAO capacity development initiatives could address this dimension, by strengthening participants' self-respect and increasing respect from others; specific opportunities for addressing this dimension of empowerment are initiatives aimed at the re/integration of refugees in their old or new communities.

*Source: Gender and Water Alliance*

72. In compliance with the United Nations Evaluation group (UNEG) Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the UN, the Evaluation had to assess FAO's work also against the standard international criteria of evaluation. Due to the complexity required for the rigorous analysis of impact, this was assessed mostly as potential-for-impact rather than verified actual attribution and/or contribution to goals. Further, the sustainability concept was assessed in terms of institutional sustainability of gender related work.

73. The scope of the Evaluation was defined as "the work carried out by FAO to implement the GAD-PoA 2002-2007 and 2008-13 and parallel Medium Term Plans (MTP) and Programmes of Work and Budget (PWB), as well as Strategic Objective K through PWB 2010-2011." This required analyzing all the work by the Organization in the period 2002-2010, given the cross-cutting approach of the GAD Plans of Action and SO-K.

74. Thus, the Evaluation's analytical framework integrated the evaluation criteria with the work identified in the scope and the evaluation questions formulated in the ToR. In the framework, the contribution to gender equality and to the four dimensions of empowerment were the key parameters of analysis, which were articulated through the five criteria of relevance; efficiency; effectiveness; sustainability; and impact.

75. An additional step by the Evaluation was to establish four qualifiers for FAO's initiatives and products, informed by the concepts above and that would help in classifying FAO's work in broad categories. The qualifiers were used for assessing both projects and Global Public Goods. They are listed in Box 3.

### Box 3. Evaluation qualifiers

Gender and Development (GAD): initiatives and products in line with the ECOSOC definition, which recognize that the relational nature of gender, the socially-constructed nature of gender and the initiative/product itself may impact differently on men and women;

Women in Development (WID): initiatives and products that focus on women alone rather than on the implications of these interventions for both women and men;

Non-GAD: initiatives and products which do not have an immediate and direct impact on either men or women;

Missed Opportunity (MO): initiatives and products that have direct potential or actual gender implications, but that ignored these gender dimensions.

*Source: Evaluation team*

## C. Methodology

76. The Evaluation adopted a participatory approach, seeking and sharing opinions with stakeholders at different points in time and assessing FAO's role and work also from the point of view of clients and users of its products and services, as well as of its partners. Triangulation by Evaluation team members of information gathered from stakeholders was a key tool for the validation of evidence and information gathered. The process was fully informed by the principles of independence and rigour of analysis and the UNEG Norms and Standards for evaluation in the UN System.

77. The evaluation used a range of quantitative and qualitative tools and methods: stakeholder consultation through group and individual semi-structured interviews with specific check-lists for FAO staff, Member States and UN agencies; country visits; corporate systems search for projects, Global Public Goods (GPGs), planning and budgeting documents; evaluation matrix; outlines for country and project reports; project scoring criteria; matrix for GPG assessment with six criteria and descriptors. The evaluation adopted a six-point scale for scoring projects and GPGs.<sup>6</sup>

78. Systematic use was made of previous evaluations, including project, country, thematic and strategic exercises, that were carried out in recent years by OED and included the analysis of FAO's performance in gender mainstreaming in different contexts. Also, in parallel to the Gender Evaluation, OED was conducting the Evaluation of FAO's Role and Work in Nutrition. The GAD Evaluation relied for its analysis of the extent of gender mainstreaming in FAO's work on nutrition on: i) its direct assessment of some projects at country level; ii) interviews in AGN; and iii) the findings of the nutrition evaluation itself.

79. The Evaluation team was multi-disciplinary and inter-regional, including gender experts from Africa, Asia and Latin America and in Agriculture, Economics, Fisheries, Forestry, Food Security, HIV and AIDS, Livestock and Water. It comprised eight women, including the Team Leader, and three men.<sup>7</sup> Individual Terms of Reference were prepared for each team member, indicating specific areas of work and evaluation issues to be assessed.

80. Initial meetings with ESW and other staff in FAO HQ, supported by lessons learned from previous evaluations, suggested that corporate system indicators for identifying projects that integrated a gender perspective and/or included a significant number of women among their participants - for example the corporate Field Programme Management Information System (FPMIS) qualifiers - were not reliable. Further, no gender qualifier existed for FAO GPGs. Thus, OED requested all FAO units, including technical divisions and decentralized offices, to provide a list of projects and products that they considered to be gender-related and/or with 30% or more women among participants.<sup>8</sup> The

<sup>6</sup> See Annex 2 for some of the evaluation tools used by the Evaluation team.

<sup>7</sup> See Annex 3, Profiles of the Evaluation team members

<sup>8</sup> The threshold for 'significant participation' was set at 30%, which appeared to be the most frequent empirical target for women's participation in FAO projects. A higher threshold or a more articulate definition of 'participation' risked excluding too many projects.



process produced a list of 209 projects and 489 Global Public Goods. Indirectly, it also provided some initial information on the general understanding within FAO of the concepts of gender equality and women's participation.

81. In addition, the Evaluability Assessment team carried out a detailed search in FPMIS for projects operational in the period January 2002-December 2010, that responded to the following criteria: led by ESW as Lead Technical Unit; project title including women and/or gender (in three languages); PWB/Programme Entity code and Strategic Objective K (SO-K). This led to the addition to the initial list of 386 projects, including 15 projects evaluated by OED in the period 2002-2010, wherein gender equality had been adequately integrated in the project approach.

82. The final list included 595 projects that were operational between 2002 and 2010 and that had paid specific attention to a gender perspective or to women among participants.<sup>9</sup> On the basis of this list, 16 countries were selected taking into account number of GAD/WID<sup>10</sup> projects implemented, variety of technical sectors covered through these and the presence of a regional or sub-regional office. Other factors, such as security, accessibility and absence of country evaluations, were also taken into account. The team visited:

- Asia: Bangladesh, Philippines and Thailand, including the Regional Office for Asia and Pacific;
- Africa: Congo (Republic), Ghana, including the Regional Office for Africa (RAF), the Sub-regional Office for West Africa (SFW) and the country office in Accra; Kenya, Niger, Somaliland, Uganda and Zambia;
- Latin America and the Caribbean: Bolivia, Dominican Republic, Nicaragua, and Panama, including the Sub-regional Office for Central America;
- Europe and Central Asia: Budapest, Hungary for the FAO Regional Office for Europe and Eastern Europe (REU/SEU), Armenia and Turkey, including the Sub-regional Office for Central Asia (SEC).

83. During the country visits, the team canvassed the opinions and perceptions of national stakeholders on the role and work of FAO on GAD/WID issues, the performance of the field programme and the use of some selected normative products. In each country, the team also analyzed ongoing projects that had not been identified as GAD/WID, selected on the basis of the technical skill mix of the visiting team for comparison purposes in terms of attention to gender issues. In total, the team analyzed 152 projects and revised their gender qualifiers.

84. Throughout the whole Evaluation process, more than 600 stakeholders were interviewed,<sup>11</sup> including:

- FAO staff at HQ: ESW; senior managers; officers in other units backstopping projects in selected countries;
- FAO staff at decentralized level: 3 Regional offices; 3 sub-regional offices; 16 country offices;
- Government staff in selected countries from ministries of agriculture, food security, women's affairs, etc.;
- FAO projects' participants in communities and households;
- Partners at country level: United Nations Country Team (UNCT) members, donors, NGOs and associations;
- UN agencies: senior staff in UN Women, UNICEF, UNDP, UNEP, UN-Habitat and others;

<sup>9</sup> See Annex 4, Inventory of FAO projects related to GAD and to HIV and AIDS

<sup>10</sup> The report uses indifferently the acronyms GAD and GAD/WID to indicate both categories of projects.

<sup>11</sup> See Annex 5, List of institutions and stakeholders met during the evaluation process

- Major FAO donors for GAD/WID initiatives.

85. During the Evaluability Assessment, a list of 489 GAD/WID Global Public Goods was compiled with information from FAO units<sup>12</sup>. Out of these, the team analyzed in detail and scored on a six-point scale a total of 158 GAD/WID GPGs (60%) as well as 106 GPGs (40%) picked up randomly from the FAO Web site. Further, recent corporate strategies and all reports by FAO Programme Committee and Regional Conferences that took place between 2002 and 2010 were also searched to identify references and requests to FAO on gender issues.

86. The Evaluability Assessment also showed that only a minority of FAO projects and field programme resources were considered as being GAD/WID by FAO staff. This raised the question whether gender equality concerns were relevant to the remaining 91% of FAO projects or not. A desk study therefore was carried out to analyze through a gender lens, a statistically valid sample of 200 projects randomly selected from the complete list of FAO's projects operational in the period 2002-2010 and their project documents, progress and terminal reports.<sup>13</sup>

87. Close exchange and interaction took place with ESW and other FAO stakeholders throughout the process. The draft ToR were circulated to all concerned within FAO, for comments and suggestions, which were integrated as appropriate. Extensive meetings took place during the Evaluability Assessment and during the Evaluation, with the Gender Audit team and FAO staff. At the end of the data-gathering phase, the Evaluation team presented to FAO stakeholders its preliminary findings and recommendations, for initial validation and discussion. The draft report was also circulated for comments and suggestions.

88. Last, the Evaluation process was supported by the international NGO and network Gender and Water Alliance, in the role of specialized advisory body on gender issues. GWA participated in the briefing and de-briefing sessions in FAO HQ and revised the draft ToR and advanced draft report.

### **III. FAO's mandate on Women and Gender and Development**

#### **A. Women and Gender and Development in FAO**

89. Rural women, intended as a social group, have always had a stake in the work of FAO, due to their significant involvement as producers in agriculture, forestry and fisheries activities in all regions of the world, as well as because of the links between their reproductive and social roles and natural resources management.

90. Indeed, since very early on the Organization included women among its beneficiaries, although the development model that it advocated and supported in the first two to three decades of its existence was one where women were seen as beneficiaries of support in the areas of nutrition and home economics exclusively. For a long time, the Organization did not seem to question whether this model corresponded to the prevalent pattern of gender roles in agricultural production across the variety of its Member States.

91. Over time, the corporate acknowledgment and understanding of women's role in agriculture evolved to some extent with the shift in focus of the international agenda from women as care-takers to women as economic actors and rights-holders and from women's to gender issues. An in-house change from home economics to Women in Development took place through the 1970s and 1980s that led in 1989, in the wake of the UN commitment to the Nairobi Forward-looking Strategies (NFLS), to the approval of the first Plan of Action for the Integration of Women in Development (WID-PoA), for the period 1990-1995. Through it, women were supported in their roles as producers and workers in agriculture, including livestock, fishery and forestry. The FAO Socio-Economic and Gender Analysis (SEAGA) programme was first developed during this period and large numbers of FAO staff attended SEAGA training events in the 1990s.

---

<sup>12</sup> See Annex 6, Inventory of FAO Global Public Goods related to GAD and HIV and AIDS

<sup>13</sup> See Annex 7, Gender-sensitive analysis of FAO projects not identified as gender or women related

92. The second WID-PoA, operational in 1996-2001, was developed by integrating the mandate of the Beijing Platform for Action to 'ensure that a gender perspective is reflected in all our policies and programmes'. The responsibility for gender mainstreaming in FAO started to become a corporate commitment, no longer confined to one specific unit only.

93. In 1999, FAO prepared its first Strategic Framework (SF) for the period 2000-2010. The Framework made explicit that the Global Goals of FAO's Member States and the purpose of the Organization aimed at benefiting 'all people'. The SF was structured in thematic Strategic Objectives (SOs); in SO 'A.1-Sustainable rural livelihoods and more equitable access to resources', gender disparities were to be addressed in the context of promoting equitable access to resources. The SO relied, among other areas of focus, on "promoting gender-sensitive, participatory and sustainable strategies and approaches to improve the skills of the rural poor as well as local, civil society and rural people's organizations". Also within SO 'C1- Policy options and institutional measures to improve efficiency and adaptability in production, processing and marketing systems', focus was again among others on "giving due importance to gender-based and other inequalities". The same SOs also mentioned women and their role. No other reference to gender or women was made in the text of the six SOs that comprised the SF.

94. At the end of the second WID-PoA, a third plan called the Gender and Development Plan of Action (GAD-PoA) was approved for the period 2002-2007. Like its predecessors the GAD-PoA was approved by FAO Conference, which was at the same time the recipient of specific biennial reports on the plans' implementation and progress. At the same time, Gender Mainstreaming had also become one of the 16 Priority Areas for Interdisciplinary Action (PAIA)<sup>14</sup> in the Medium Term Plan (MTP) 2002-2007.

95. The GAD-PoA clearly assigned responsibility to each FAO Assistant Director General, for gender mainstreaming in all the work of the Organization, making each of them accountable within their respective mandates. The Plan also mandated Division directors to appoint Gender Focal Points and included terms of reference for the appointees. However, responsibility for reporting to Conference rested with the Gender, Equity and Rural Employment Division (ESW), thus weakening the pressure for accountability outside the reporting division. Also, importantly, none of the Plans of Action were budgeted for, as they were not considered part of the planning and budgeting process and were parallel to the Strategic Framework.

96. Content-wise, the GAD-PoA 2002-07 aimed to "promote gender equality in the access to sufficient, safe and nutritionally adequate food; access to, control over and management of natural resources and agricultural support services; participation in policy and decision-making processes at all levels in the agricultural and rural sector; and in opportunities for both on- and off-farm employment in rural areas". The PoA emphasized a transformed partnership based on equality between men and women being an essential condition for people-centred sustainable development.

97. A step forward towards results-based planning came with the new plan formulated in 2007 through a process defined by many stakeholders as inclusive and participatory at divisional level. The GAD-PoA 2008-13 defined itself as an 'Organization-wide strategy' through which "accountability ...was a shared responsibility". A Gender Network including "gender focal points, gender experts and other staff members at FAO involved in gender activities" was to become one of the key actors in mainstreaming gender in the work of FAO, supported through capacity development and partnerships development. A monitoring and evaluation mechanism was also foreseen, based on progress indicators. However, resource allocations and budgeting were not integrated into the PoA and the Plan remained an 'add-on' rather than an integral part of FAO's work.

98. The second GAD-PoA focused on four key global issues: Emergencies; Climate Change and Bio-energy; Human, Plant and Animal Diseases; and Globalization - Trade and Changing Institutional Structures. These were to be examined with regard to the four strategic gender objective areas: Food and Nutrition; Natural Resources; Rural Economies, Labour and Livelihoods; and Policy and Planning.

---

<sup>14</sup> PAIAs were discontinued around 2005; most of them never really effective due to lack of resources.

99. The Plan included 91 specific Targeted Gender Mainstreaming Outputs and Progress Indicators, to monitor performance. These were distributed among a number of FAO technical units across the main technical departments, including the Emergency and Rehabilitation Division, the Investment Centre and the Legal Office.

100. In parallel with the GAD-PoA, ESW maintained a leading role on gender within the Organization, expressed, through the corporate Programmes of Work and Budget (PWB).

101. In PWB 2002-03, ESW's focus in gender was on policy advice, technical assistance and training to countries and civil society partners to support the mainstreaming of gender and population issues in agricultural, environmental and rural development policies, programmes and projects, as well as in agricultural censuses and surveys, and in relevant legislation. It also aimed at addressing several emerging issues, such as the impact on agricultural productivity and food security of the HIV and AIDS pandemic and of progressive rural ageing; and the gender-differentiated impact of globalization, on agricultural trade and on access to new technology. Finally, ESW's function as corporate focal point regarding the Priority Area for Interdisciplinary Action (PAIA) on Gender Mainstreaming was also included.

102. In 2004-05, the scope of action was downsized also due to significant reductions in UNFPA<sup>15</sup> funding resources. The Revised PWB stated that *"required further staff reductions will negatively impact on the gender and development programme in the European region, and reduce capacity to meet demands from countries for training workshops and networks to mitigate the impact of HIV and AIDS and food security. The planned thematic and geographical expansion of capacity building and training efforts in gender disaggregated data collection and analysis, case studies on gender and resource management, and SEAGA workshops will all be reduced"*.

103. In PWB 2006-07, the Programme's thrust was based upon the "twin pillars of capacity-building and policy assistance to countries" in the core areas of gender, HIV and AIDS and other related diseases, and their relation with rural poverty and food insecurity. The programme was to build capacity and provide tools and policy advice towards the accomplishment of the MDGs, in particular regarding the role of gender equality and mitigation of HIV and AIDS in the reduction of rural poverty and food insecurity.

104. In PWB 2008-09, 'Programme 3F - Gender and equity in rural societies' was included under ESW's responsibility. It aimed at the following:

- keeping the main accent on strengthening national capacities to mainstream gender in policies and programmes, within the framework of the Gender and Development Plan of Action;
- continuing the analysis of the nexus between agriculture, gender equality, social equity, household food security, rural development and poverty reduction;
- enabling ESW to serve as corporate focal point on HIV and AIDS, indigenous peoples, population issues, particularly migration, rural ageing and disability;
- acting as convenor within the Global Coalition of Women and AIDS and leading on issues within the UN-Wide Interagency Network on Women and Gender Equality.

105. A few other units in FAO included specific references to gender in the wording of their Major Programmes or Programme Entities; this was the case in relation to youth in agriculture, land tenure and statistics, although a larger number of units marked several of their Products as gender-sensitive.<sup>16</sup>

106. The Independent External Evaluation of FAO (IEE), finalized in 2007, analyzed in detail gender mainstreaming across the Organization: a specialized team launched a corporate level survey, several interviews focused on gender issues and all country visits included gender issues in their

<sup>15</sup> The United Nations Population Fund was a donor of FAO in the 1990s, until the early 2000s.

<sup>16</sup> See Annex 8, FAO Gender Sensitive Outputs in GAD Plans of Action and Plans of Work and Budget

analysis. Based on this team's findings, the final report included Gender Mainstreaming and Women's Empowerment among the 16 High Possible Priorities for resource allocation and formulated Recommendation 3.19 in Box 4 below:

**Box 4. IEE Recommendation 3.19**

The Gender Plan of Action should be fully integrated into FAO's programme cycle (including integration of the GDPA into FAO's main strategic and/or medium-term plans, rather than as a separate plan) and reported on specifically as part of that cycle, and:

- a) gender should receive a priority in the funds reserved for interdisciplinary action and facilitating action on the three goals of member countries;
- b) gender focal points should have selection criteria, clear terms of reference included in their job description and the necessary seniority;
- c) staff training in gender and women's empowerment should receive renewed priority, with a particular priority to FAOR professionals and gender focal points; and
- d) possibilities for greater partnership with other organizations should be explored.

*Source: IEE final report, 2007*

107. The Immediate Plan of Action (IPA) prepared as a follow-up to the IEE, made provisions for ensuring gender balance in the Organization's Human Resources structure and fully accepted Recommendation 3.19; this resulted in the new 'gender equity focused' Strategic Objective K (SO-K) in FAO Strategic Framework 2010-2019. The GAD-PoA 2008-2013 was phased out by being integrated into SO-K and as of mid-2009, progress monitoring and reporting on the PoA was discontinued.

108. The narratives for SO-K, its Organizational Results (ORs) and Primary Tools are shown in Box 5.

**Box 5. Strategic Objective K: Gender equity in access to resources, goods, services and decision-making in the rural areas**

Relevance of SO K	The Objective addresses the critical gaps in embracing more gender and socially inclusive policies, capacities, institutions and programmes for agriculture and rural development. It also helps to mainstream this approach across all of FAO's Strategic Objectives.
Organizational Result	Primary tools
K1 - Rural gender equality is incorporated into UN policies and joint programmes for food security, agriculture and rural development	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Assess current mechanisms, tools and approaches to gender mainstreaming within the One UN framework with the view of identifying needs, gaps and entry points for FAO's technical support in this field.</li> <li>2. Develop tools and methodologies to inform UN System common approaches based on identified gaps and entry points.</li> <li>3. Develop more effective partnerships within the UN system and with other relevant stakeholders, building on existing National Medium Term Priority Frameworks, One UN</li> </ol>
K2 - Governments develop enhanced capacities to incorporate gender and social equality issues in agriculture, food security and rural development programmes, projects and policies using sex-disaggregated statistics, other	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Assess current and emerging capacity building needs in order to identify areas requiring FAO intervention in gender mainstreaming in agriculture, food security, and rural development.</li> <li>2. Support efforts of governments and other stakeholders to design and provide training that develops skills for gender and socio-economic analysis, participatory policy making and programme development.</li> </ol>

relevant information and resources	<p>3. Provide technical support for the collection, analysis and dissemination of sex-disaggregated data and statistics in policy-making.</p> <p>4. Develop, revise and/or adapt materials and resources including tailor-made training modules to address rural gender issues in specific technical areas (e.g. nutrition, forestry, fisheries, livestock, etc).</p> <p>5. Provide training focused on the "how to" of gender mainstreaming both within FAO and among countries based on the SEAGA approach and tools.</p>
K3 - Governments are formulating gender-sensitive, inclusive and participatory policies in agriculture and rural development	<p>1. Strengthen national government efforts to use gender sensitive information and to formulate, implement, and revise policies and programmes that are gender sensitive, socially inclusive and legally empowering of the rural poor.</p> <p>2. Assist national governments, civil society organizations and research institutions to enhance gender and socio-economic analysis of emerging issues which have the potential to undermine gender and social equity in food security and rural development.</p> <p>3. Collect, analyse and disseminate information and statistics on the social and gender equality dimensions of emerging social, economic and environmental issues (e.g. climate change, environmental degradation, bioenergy, population dynamics, emerging diseases (i.e. AIDS), undernutrition, property rights' regimes, and employment opportunities) to support policymaking and implementation processes.</p> <p>4. Disseminate participatory tools and approaches relevant to agriculture and rural development to countries and partners through the FAO Participation website and other information channels.</p>
K4 - FAO management and staff have demonstrated commitment and capacity to address gender dimensions in their work	<p>1. Upgrade the gender analysis skills of FAO staff at headquarters and decentralized levels using SEAGA-based gender mainstreaming modules or through catalytic technical support.</p> <p>2. Develop a new monitoring and reporting mechanism which allows divisions and Gender Focal Points to report periodically on gender mainstreaming activities.</p> <p>3. Facilitate the appointment of senior staff as Gender Focal Points (GFPs) of FAO technical units as an essential mechanism in the Organization's effort to mainstream gender in its technical programme.</p> <p>4. Advocate for the allocation of regular programme and extra-budgetary resources to ensure commitment and delivery on agreed gender targets.</p>

*Source: FAO Strategic Framework 2010-2019*

109. SO-K calls upon the whole Organization to contribute to achieving gender equity in the access of rural women and men to resources, services and decision making. In this, it falls short of the equality target – including in control of resources - that was contained in the GAD-PoA. In continuity with the Plan of Action, however, it implicitly adopts the two-pronged strategy, like UNIFEM and UNFPA, that entails: i) promoting the concept and principles of gender mainstreaming; and ii) retaining projects and programmes targeted specifically for empowering women and girls (a WID approach). This also meant continuity in maintaining the double role of ESW as a technical unit in itself and as a service/backstopping provider to the rest of the Organization.

110. The role of ESW is very strong in the narratives of three among SO-K's four Organizational Results<sup>17</sup>, which is undoubtedly justified as the division is the Lead Unit on gender in FAO. Still, a call on the rest of the Organization to achieve a common goal through one approach such as gender mainstreaming requires a shared understanding in detail of how this can be done and a Strategic Objective does not appear strong enough to provide policy and strategic guidance at the level required. It is also worth noting that, whereas in the first FAO Strategic Framework 2000-2015 'gender' was mentioned in relation to three Strategic Objectives and the Strategies to address cross-organizational issues, in SF 2010-19 'gender' and 'women' were mentioned exclusively in SO-K.

111. All these factors seem to have contributed to making SO-K more isolated and less "cross-cutting" than was surely the initial intention. In practice, as debated throughout the IPA process among Member States, the establishment of a Strategic Objective dedicated to gender equity jeopardized so far the 'mainstreaming' feature that it wanted to promote. This was heard during the Evaluation from senior staff in FAO, who not infrequently considered that with SO-K gender had 'disappeared' or 'become invisible'.

112. In the attempt to quantify what changed with the transition from GAD-PoA to SO-K, the Evaluation compared FAO's commitment to produce Gender Sensitive Products by searching for links between Gender Mainstreaming Outputs (GeMOs) of the PoA and Gender Sensitive Products and Services (GSPS) in PWB 2010/11, as well as how many of such products had been planned in three biennia.<sup>18</sup> Key findings were as follows:

- a) there was a limited overall increase in HQ GSPS in the Plans of Work and Budget between 2002/03 and 2010/11, due to the increase of gender products in some units;
- b) excluding DOs from the calculation, the sum of GeMOs in GAD-PoA 2008/13 and GSPS in PWB 2008/09 was 28% higher than the number of GSPS in 2010/11; this suggests that in 2008/09, the corporate commitment to gender-related products was higher than in 2010/11;
- c) a link could be established for 35% of GeMOs in the GAD-PoA with GSPS in 2010/11; an additional 11 GeMOs seemed to be linked to products in PWB 2010/11 that had not been tagged as GSPS.
- d) in PWB 2010-11, 18% of the products were gender tagged; SO-K had the highest percentage (66%) followed by SO-H (food security) with 35% and SO-G (market improvement) with 24%. At regional/sub-regional level, a similar pattern was observed: SO-K ranked first followed by SO-H and the third best was SO-B, Sustainable livestock production. ESW had the highest absolute number of products within SO-K, as expected;
- e) the Decentralized Offices (DOs) which developed GSPS for the first time in 2010/11, became responsible for 60% of the total GSPS in this biennium; the highest percentage of gender focused products in DOs was in SNO (Multidisciplinary Team for Oriental Near East), with 50% of their products being gender focused; second ranking was equal for SAP (Sub-regional Office for the Pacific) and REU (Regional Office for Europe), with 41%; and third was SFC (Sub-regional Office for Central Africa), with 39%. The Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean had no gender-focused products and the Sub-regional Office for the Caribbean had only 7% of its products and services tagged as gender-sensitive, thus being the second lowest DO in this perspective.

113. These figures should be taken as indicators of trends in planning, and as such, can help in identifying significant gaps or changes in approach that may deserve attention. The Evaluation was also aware that the complexity of the planning process in 2010/11 may have led to inaccuracies in entering the data and this may have affected the overall attribution of gender-tags.<sup>19</sup> Last, in the absence of mechanisms in place to monitor implementation, the fact that a product is flagged as gender sensitive does not necessarily indicate that it will actually be 'produced' with a gender equality perspective.

<sup>17</sup> OR 1, 2 and 4 are very much in the realm of ESW and could be contributed to with difficulty by other units in FAO.

<sup>18</sup> See Annex 8. Budget-related considerations are discussed in Section 3.3.

<sup>19</sup> For example, some SO-K products are clearly gender focused by their description but were not registered as such in PIRES. It is reasonable to believe that in future, this type of mistake will be greatly reduced.

## **B. FAO structure for Women and Gender in Development**

114. For several years, the Home Economics initially and the Women and Development Service later on were located in the Rural Extension and Education Division. The 1994 reform process integrated the Women and Development Service into a newly created Women and Population Division in the Sustainable Development Department (SD).

115. In January 2004, the unit merged with the Population and Development Service to form the Gender and Population Division (SDW) in SD. When the latter was dismantled in January 2007 following the Director General's Reform Proposal in 2005<sup>20</sup>, the Division moved into the Economic and Social Department and became the Gender, Equity and Rural Employment Division (ESW). The Division was now composed of 3 different services from the ex-SD Department – the Women and Development Service, the Population and Development Service and the Rural Development Service. This did entail changes in the Division's staffing structure. Until late 2008, ESW was structured in four groups, dealing with Gender, population issues (including HIV and AIDS), institution building and rural employment.<sup>21</sup>

116. The staffing of the Division also changed following the organizational adjustments. ESW information on human resources showed four categories: staff in HQ, staff in Decentralized Offices (DO), Consultants and Associate Professional Officers (APO).

117. Over the 2002-2010 period, ESW benefited from an increase in the Division's human resources, with a doubling of professional posts and a variable number of consultants and APOs. These changes reflected the integration of responsibilities on HIV and AIDS, Education and Communication and Rural Employment.

118. According to job titles, specific resources working on gender issues were as follows: the Division had a P-5 Senior Officer for Gender and Sustainable Development and a P-4 Officer for Gender and Natural Resources throughout the whole period; and from 2002 to 2008 a P-5 Officer was responsible for Women in Development. Another P-4 Gender and Development Officer was responsible for much of the work on sex-disaggregated data, from May 2002 to May 2010, when he retired.<sup>22</sup> A consultant on Gender and Rural Development from 2002-2008 became a P-3 officer in 2009 and currently remains in the Division. Since March 2010 a P-1 Gender and Development officer has also been recruited.<sup>23</sup> These officers were responsible for managing and backstopping both Regular Programme and voluntary funded activities within and outside the Division.

119. In addition to these core staff at Headquarters, ESW had five P-4 level officers responsible for Women in Development posted to the Regional Offices for the first half of the period. Except for the officer at RAF in Accra, who is now at P-5 level, all of the posts for officers in regional offices were abolished between 2007 and 2009. The decisions to abolish these posts appear to have been made after approval by the Director General, for budgetary reasons.

120. Consultants were responsible for much of the gender-related work of the Division. There was a consultant for gender mainstreaming posted to HQ from 2002-2005 and consultants on gender and rural development, gender and social inequality and gender and rural employment throughout the period. Finally 12 APOs were recruited to work on issues of gender and sustainable development, gender in agriculture and rural development, gender and biodiversity and gender and participatory processes. Several of them were also assigned to work in the area of HIV and AIDS along with their

---

<sup>20</sup> In August 2005, FAO Director General launched a reform proposal that was approved by the 33 FAO Conference in November 2005 and became operational in January 2007. Among others, it created a number of Sub-Regional offices and dismantled the Sustainable Development Department creating the Natural Resources Department.

<sup>21</sup> This Evaluation included in the overall analysis the projects by ESW in the area of Rural Employment but did not assess this work in detail.

<sup>22</sup> The Evaluation team was informed that this post has recently been filled.

<sup>23</sup> The Evaluation team was informed through the comments to the draft report in June 2011, that more posts had been filled in 2010 and another recruitment process was on-going.



specific areas of expertise. They were posted to Headquarters, to Regional offices in Bangkok and Accra, and to FAORs in Mozambique, Malawi, Nepal, PDR Laos, Tanzania and Vietnam.

121. The analysis showed that in ESW, the responsibility for leading the gender mainstreaming effort at the corporate level was given to a consultant for a three-year period in the first half of the Decade. The Senior Officer for Women in Development retired in May 2007 and was not replaced. Clearly, ESW did not have the capacity to assist other units in FAO to mainstream gender in their programmes and projects.

122. The other major structure for mainstreaming gender equality objectives in the work of the Organization in HQ outside ESW was the Gender Focal Points Network. In 2002, Gender Focal Points (GFPs) were appointed, usually with an alternate, at unit level, either divisions or service, to 'ensure continuity in...efforts to mainstream gender...to facilitate the coordination of the PoA within their Units and...to liaise with SDW to seek assistance/guidance'.<sup>24</sup>

123. In mid-2008, ESW had requested that GFPs be appointed at a senior officer level (P5 or above), as until then most GFPs were junior professionals including APOs, often with very limited influence on the work of colleagues. The 2010 lists that included 26 GFPs, showed that the request was only met in half of the cases.

### C. FAO resources for Women and Gender and Development

124. As mentioned above, the GAD Plans of Action were not assigned financial resources as they were not an integral part of the MTP-PWB structure and no information was available on RP resources devoted to the production of Gender Mainstreaming Outputs. Thus, the analysis of Regular Programme resources was done through the gender-related Programme Entities (PEs).

125. Since 2002, ESW led and managed PEs within two Programmes: Gender and Population (2002-2005) and Gender and Equity in Rural Societies (2006-2009). These Programmes are listed in Box 6 with respective budgets; they received on average 1% of the Organization's Net Appropriation.<sup>25</sup>

Programmes and Programme Entities related to GAD since 2002

Major Programme	Programme Entity	Regular Programme budget (USD 000); Percentage of RP Net Appropriation <sup>26</sup>
PWB 2002-03, Programme 2.5.2: Gender and Population	2.5.2.A2, Inter-relations between Gender, Population and Food Security 2.5.2.A3, Gender and Natural Resources Management 2.5.2.P1, Promotion of Gender and Population in Policies, Legislation and Civil Institutions 2.5.2.S1, Technical Support to Member Nations and the Field Programme	5,596/6,404 0.8%
PWB 2004-05 revised, Programme 2.5.2: Gender and Population	2.5.2.A3, Gender and Natural Resources Management 2.5.2.A4, Analysis and Mitigation of the Impact of HIV and AIDS on Food Security and Rural Development 2.5.2.P1, Promotion of Gender and Population in Policies, Legislation and Civil Institutions	6,058 0.8%

<sup>24</sup> Gender and Development Plan of Action 2002-2007.

<sup>25</sup> All figures are at nominal value, and they were not adjusted for inflation or exchange rates fluctuations.

<sup>26</sup> PWB net appropriation is the sum of the mandatory contributions to FAO by the Member Countries.

	2.5.2.S1, Technical Support to Member Nations and the Field Programme	
PWB 2006-07, Programme 3F Gender and Equity in Rural Societies	3FA02, Mitigation of the Impact of Diseases in Rural Societies 3FP01, Promoting Gender Equality, Social Equity, Education and Communication in Rural Development 3FS01, Technical Support Services to Members and the Field Programme	9,400 1.2%
PWB 2008-09, 3F Gender and equity in rural societies	3FA02, Mitigation of the Impact of Diseases in Rural Societies 3FP01, Promoting Gender Equality, Social Equity, Education and Communication in Rural Development 3FS01, Technical Support Services to Members and the Field Programme	8,928 1.1%

Source: *Plans of Work and Budget since 2002 to 2008*

126. In addition to the ESW resources illustrated above, no other Programme Entity had a strong gender focus, thus any attempt at calculating a share of those resources devoted to gender-focused work would be impossible. Until 2010, the one known quantifiable resource outside ESW was the number of the Gender Focal Points. They varied over time, from 42 in 2002 to 49 in 2006 and 26 in 2010. Alternates were always present and in the 2006 list, also four GFPs were included from among staff in FAO Regional Offices. However, there was no record available about time devoted by each GFP to GAD work.<sup>27</sup> Findings from the interviews in HQ indicated that it was rather limited, below 5% on an annual basis, if any at all. The effectiveness of the GFP is discussed later in the report (see Chapter 9).

127. In PWB 2010-11, the allocation to each SO was based on the work identified and planned by each Strategy team. Another important innovation in the new budgeting process was the possibility that one unit could contribute, through its Unit Results, products and services, to an Organizational Result led by another unit. The guidelines for the new process also contained instructions and allowed marking unit results and products as ‘gender sensitive’, without accruing funds to SO-K.<sup>28</sup>

128. Through this process, SO-K was allocated about 1% of the Net Appropriation for the biennium, in line with the allocations in previous biennia. This amount reflected work to be carried out by ESW and by some other units, both at HQ and DOs level. The search of PWB 2010/11 for Gender Sensitive Products and Services<sup>29</sup> showed that besides DOs and ESW, only six technical units contributed to SO-K with budgetary support. These were AGA, ESA, ESS and EST, LEG and TCI. Thus, only limited budget resources outside ESW were allocated to SO-K.

129. Undoubtedly, one contributing factor was a certain lack of clarity at the beginning of the planning and budgeting process. However, the Evaluation was told that some Division directors did not want to commit activities or products to SO-K and that the Organization had not put in place any accountability mechanism that would ensure that products and services outside ESW would accrue to SO-K.

130. Last, one additional initiative was the creation in 2010 of a multi-disciplinary awards fund: “Improved knowledge management and coordination of FAO's work on gender and food security”. In 2010-11 a total of USD 420,000 was granted within this umbrella for gender-related

<sup>27</sup> The only possible exception would be the GFP in the Investment Centre, as this division has accurate time-keeping procedures. For lack of possible comparison, this was not pursued.

<sup>28</sup> For example, the Office of Evaluation had two Unit Results within respective Organizational Results, both of them containing ‘gender sensitive’ products, but these do not accrue as resources to SO-K.

<sup>29</sup> See Annex 8.

initiatives, based on proposals by individual units. It was granted to AGA, AGPM, ESA, EST, ESW, FIP and NRL.<sup>30</sup>

131. In relation to the financial resources allocated to GAD/WID field programme initiatives, funded through Voluntary and TCP resources, full project budget values had to be used, as FAO's financial reporting did not allow any more detailed assessment of how much was actually spent for GAD/WID activities within each project.

132. The Evaluability Assessment identified 595 GAD/WID projects, with a total budget slightly above USD 944 million. This amount represented 13% of FAO field programme resources for the same period and 9% of the number of projects. As Lead Technical Unit, ESW managed only 1.2% of these resources, and the work on HIV and AIDS was carried out with 0.5% of the total field programme portfolio. In practice, the Evaluation identified a larger share of FAO's projects that integrated a GAD/WID approach. This is discussed more in detail in Chapters 6 and 7.

## **D. Conclusions**

133. The comparison of FAO's performance under the GAD-PoA and SO-K was one of the key evaluation questions. By May 2011, slightly above one year into the process of SO-K implementation, the following could be stated in relation to gender mainstreaming in FAO planning and strategic documents:

The two GAD Plans of Action were not well 'internalized' by FAO despite efforts to prepare the second Plan in an inclusive and participatory manner. This was partly due to their separation from the overall planning and budgeting process. In general, the Plans left very little mark on the Organization but ESW could not be held solely responsible for this;

There was little concrete evidence that in the first year of its implementation, SO-K was a stronger driver for gender mainstreaming in FAO. Further, SO-K left open a gap in terms of corporate policy on gender mainstreaming and a related accountability mechanism;

the Regular Programme resources allocated to GAD work had not increased yet with SO-K; improved knowledge of the planning system might facilitate the cross-allocation of resources in PWB 2012/13, though in the absence of an accountability mechanism, incentives will still be weak;

the quantity of gender-sensitive products and services in the planning process had improved in the Organization, but the process was not uniform and reasons for 'weak spots' would require detailed assessment, in HQ and DOs;

the information received from FAO indicated that 13% of the field programme resources had been allocated to gender and women's initiatives; this appeared to be a very low share considering the role women and gender relations play in the areas within FAO's mandate.

## **IV. Assessment of work by ESW related to GAD**

### **A. Introduction**

134. During the period under evaluation, the work of ESW on Gender and Development was strongly informed by the Gender and Development Plans of Action 2002-2007 and 2008-13, albeit the latter was operational only for 2008 and 2009. Since 2010, the Divisional GAD work was incorporated under the new corporate Strategic Objective K, 'Equity in access to resources, goods, services and decision making in rural areas'.

135. The core concept throughout this period was that mainstreaming gender was the responsibility of each unit and division in the Organization, with ESW playing a facilitating role. Through the GAD-PoA, the mandate of ESW on gender was defined as "to support FAO's efforts to promote the economic and social well-being of the rural poor. In addition to coordinating FAO's work

---

<sup>30</sup> During the interviews of the Evaluation team with these units, no specific mention was made of these funds and related activities.

on sustainable rural development and population issues, the Division assists FAO and its member governments in addressing gender, equity and rural employment issues”.

136. Thus, the role of the Division became strongly oriented to providing advisory services, capacity development to both FAO staff and national partners and producing methodological tools in the area of Gender and Development, besides having some responsibility for direct intervention at country level and reporting to Conference and to the Interagency Network on Women and Gender Equality on the GAD-PoA progress.

137. This chapter describes the work carried out and its main products and outcomes; it also analyzes the role of ESW and the corporate perceptions about it.

## **B. Projects and programmes including TCP**

138. During the period under evaluation, ESW led 98 projects, including those related to gender, employment and HIV and AIDS. Seventy-two of the projects were technical cooperation and 26 were emergency interventions. Together they represented 1.6% of FAO’s total number of projects and 1.2% of total project budgets. Of those, 20% were TCPs, funded by FAO; all others were funded by donors. Virtually all of them were GAD related (98%).

139. The ESW-led GAD identified projects, excluding HIV and AIDS initiatives that will be discussed in the next chapter, represented 11% of the FAO projects identified as GAD in terms of numbers (emergency and technical cooperation). Budget wise, ESW GAD projects were 1.2% of the whole FAO project portfolio and 9.2% of the GAD identified projects, with USD 51 million in technical cooperation and USD 35 million for emergency projects.

140. ESW projects were concentrated in a few areas that will be described in more detail in this chapter. Among the largest ESW projects were the Belgian-funded DIMITRA; the Norwegian-funded LinKS; the Swedish-funded global project on Gender, Development and Livelihoods (IP) and the Joint IFAD/FAO Grant Programme for Regional Gender Capacity and Knowledge.<sup>31</sup> LinKS and IP phased out in the mid-2000s and DIMITRA and the Joint IFAD/FAO programme were on-going at the time of the Evaluation.

141. ESW was also the LTU for 18 out of 53 UN Joint Programmes identified as GAD and HIV and AIDS related, many of which were funded by Spain and in which FAO was one of the partners.

142. There were also a number of emergency projects aimed at improving livelihoods for female-headed households and youth in the West Bank and Gaza, with funding from Belgium, Italy, Norway and Spain for different components from 2008-11. Some of the projects were executed in cooperation with UN Women (formerly UNIFEM).

143. Most of the other projects overseen by ESW were quite small. The work on sex-disaggregated data and agricultural censuses was significant overall, and covered all the regions, with advisory services and capacity building workshops led by ESW staff in HQ and RAF. Other projects focused on gender and adaptation to climate change, national policies for rural women, food security and gender based violence.

144. There were a series of initiatives undertaken during the evaluation period on land and water tenure issues which were not led by ESW, but demonstrated extensive collaboration with the Development Law Service (LEGN), the Climate Energy and Tenure Division (NRC) and the Land and Water Resources Division (NRL). These are discussed in Section 6.5.

145. Here below, DIMITRA and LinKS projects are discussed in detail.

### **DIMITRA project**

146. The DIMITRA project is a rural information and communications project funded by Belgium. The project was coordinated from Brussels until mid-2010, when it was re-located to FAO

---

<sup>31</sup> See Annex 4 for administrative and financial details on each project.

HQ. It aimed to empower rural women and improve their living conditions through extensive networks of rural women's organizations in Africa and the Near East. The project provided support to rural women to use rural radio and other media to exchange information on gender and rural development issues.

147. Capacity building was a strong element of the project. National capacity building workshops were facilitated by ESW during 2002-2003 in Burundi, DR Congo, Madagascar, Rwanda, South Africa, Tunisia and Uganda. Capacity building related to rural communication and rural radio projects had been conducted in Kenya, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal and Togo from 2004 to 2010, in some cases several times in one country. Moreover, in 2005, 22 of DIMITRA's rural women's group partners were brought together in Brussels to exchange information and experience. Overall, about 375 people participated in the workshops, two-thirds of whom were women.

148. The evaluation found that in Niger the rural community-based listening clubs under the DIMITRA project provided space for women to develop their leadership and empowerment skills. Organized women's groups had access to and shared information on agriculture, livestock, food and nutrition security, sanitation and children's care. The projects had contributed to building self-confidence, and to some extent had contributed to reducing gender-based violence within households. DIMITRA was one of four components of the FAO Knowledge Management and Gender Programme in Niger. The Evaluation considers that its approach could be used for replication through adaptation to other regions of the world, for example in Latin America to foster food security initiatives among women, youth and ethnic groups. Box 7 provides more information on DIMITRA.

#### **Box 7. DIMITRA project**

The DIMITRA project was launched in 1994 by the European Commission, with Belgian funding from the King Baudouin Foundation. It is an information and communication project that aims to empower rural women and to improve their living conditions and status by highlighting the extent and value of their contribution. Its guiding principles are: (i) partnership - working closely with local partner organisations to highlight local knowledge; ii) participation - active participation of civil society organisations; and iii) networking - supporting the exchange of good practices, ideas and experiences.

The 2005 evaluation of Phase 2 that run from 2002 to 2004 found that the DIMITRA network had made impressive growth of 62% to 1414 member organizations in 49 countries - of which 43 are in Africa - and a 432% increase in community based organizations as members. It was found to have provided a relevant and cost-effective service as well as improvement in the status of rural women. The evaluation also recommended actions to improve integration of the project into FAO.

DIMITRA has been using the medium of the listeners' clubs to break the isolation of rural women in access to information and means of communication for social integration and development.

The Evaluation visited the project in Niger, where it offered capacity building for illiterate women on information and communication, to improve food and nutrition security. It provided each club with a solar wind-up radio and a mobile phone fitted with a solar charger to enable the radio stations and clubs to work together, so that clubs gathered to listen to programmes on radios and provide their input to a topical debate on agriculture, livestock, food and nutrition security, sanitation or child care. They used mobile phones to interact with and share experience with their fellows in other clubs involved in the debate. Facilitation was provided by the rural radio stations. The majority of beneficiaries were women who had never owned a radio. They found the world opened up for them; using the solar mobile phone gave them the feeling that their status had improved. In Gassedra, thanks to the listening club programmes, action was taken up by men and women together to clean up the village. Women gained in terms of increased self-confidence and self-respect and respect from their families and communities. The networks gave space to women to share private problems and experiences to address gender-based violence within their households. Testimony was given on how the clubs helped several women to overcome gender-based violence at home. Radio stations have influenced people's attitudes on girls' early marriage and girls' education in rural Niger.

*Source: Evaluation team*

### **LinKS**

149. The LinKS project on gender, biodiversity and knowledge was a sub-regional effort in Southern Africa, under the technical responsibility of ESW, aimed at raising awareness about how rural men and women use and manage biological diversity. Phase II of the Norway-funded project ran from 2002-06; it sought to help development practitioners learn from farmers' knowledge, practices and skills that are sustainable and respectful of natural ecosystems. The project was launched in 1998 and operated in Mozambique, Tanzania and Zimbabwe. The first phase of the project ended in March 2002, and the second phase ended in 2006.

150. The project worked to strengthen the ability of local governmental and non-governmental institutions to recognize and value local knowledge and to use gender-sensitive and participatory approaches in their work. It worked with indigenous people, such as the Maasai, to derive knowledge related to plant and animal genetic resources and their management. The project also provided advisory services in the areas of knowledge generation on agro-biodiversity, capacity development and activities to promote farmers' knowledge in Mozambique, Swaziland and Tanzania.

151. Using SEAGA training tools, LinKS sponsored a series of ToT workshops in Mozambique, Swaziland and Tanzania during its life. The purpose was to build a core group of resource persons who were able to integrate the training approach in their own programmes and institutions. The training efforts were very intense, especially in Tanzania where 18 different workshops were held from 2002-2005. During the same period four workshops each were held in Mozambique and Swaziland. Workshops were held in different locations with different target groups. Such groups included farmers, NGOs, government staff, extension workers, university researchers and private seed companies.

### **C. Global Public Goods**

152. The Evaluability Assessment identified 226 Global Public Goods produced by ESW in the period 2002-2010, including publications, guidelines, fact-sheets, brochures, e-news and tool-kits. These products covered subjects ranging from gender analysis, rural women, rural employment and land reform to the impact of HIV and AIDS on agriculture. The evaluation team assessed in total 60 ESW products, that discussed gender across different sectors, such as HIV and AIDS, livestock and emergency interventions. Their assessment was done through each sector of focus (see Annexes 9 to 17 and Box 21). Box 8 below reports the average scoring of 22 of those, which focused on broad gender and agriculture issues.

**Box 8. Assessment of ESW GPG: average scoring**

Criteria Type of products	Relevance of GAD to the topic (1-6)	Technical quality of GAD contents (1-6)	Innovativeness on GAD (1-6)	Potential impact as advocacy tool (1-6)	Potential impact as capacity development tool (1-6)	Links between GAD and social inclusion (1-6)	Number products
ESW	5.4	4.3	3.9	4.3	4.0	4.2	22

*Source: Evaluation team*

153. Most of the products were highly relevant to gender and development, and that criterion averaged 5.4 out of 6. In fact, 14 of the products rated a score of 6 for relevance, including one SEAGA study, a DIMITRA workshop report, the Gender in Agriculture Sourcebook, two documents on gender and climate change, and one on the West Bank and Gaza Farmer Field School (FFS). Those that received low ratings were basically lists of FAO activities or computer programs to meet various needs.

154. The technical quality of the GAD contents is very uneven. Some were well-researched and written, while others looked like poor and incomplete first drafts. Others paid inadequate attention

to gender despite their relevant topics, e.g. youth rural employment, indigenous people and biodiversity, land reform. The average score was 4.3, which indicates an adequate quality of gender contents. The lowest rating across the board (3.9) was given to innovativeness in terms of GAD. Only the SEAGA and DIMITRA products, as well as a study on the West Bank and Gaza, received a top rating on the innovativeness criterion.

155. Along with technical quality, the second highest rank (4.3) went to ‘Potential impact as an advocacy tool’. Several GPGs showed promise as both advocacy tools and capacity building tools related to GAD. These would include SEAGA, DIMITRA, guidelines on local institutions and livelihoods, Fact-sheets on FAO Action for rural women and on Water and people. The document ‘Does gender make a difference in dealing with climate shifts?’; a study on ‘Investing in skills for socio-economic empowerment of rural women’; and a study on ‘Improving gender equity in access to land’ all got high rankings for potential as both advocacy and capacity development tools.

156. Regarding the links between GAD and social inclusion, the studies and guidelines that ranked well in other areas also scored well for this criterion. The GPGs that were of high quality ranked quite well across the board, and those that were of poor quality had low rankings throughout. There were some exceptions however. Three of the studies assessed were important pieces of research on indigenous people and biodiversity, local institutions and livelihoods, and agricultural labour and land reform. They were extremely well researched, were written with partners and were very useful from a technical point of view. However, they missed the opportunity to mainstream a gender perspective, disaggregate data or discuss gender concerns, even though their topics were related to social inclusion.

157. The Gender in Agriculture Sourcebook, a collaborative production by the World Bank, FAO and IFAD published in 2009, received a high average score of 4.8 across all criteria. Several interlocutors met, in particular UN, government and NGO partners, considered it an important reference work, and appreciated and used it. They were aware of it through Internet searches when looking for information on gender aspects of agriculture. Another widely known product was SEAGA and its training materials.

158. ESW also made a substantial contribution, through financial and technical support and through commissioning some of the preparatory research and background to the preparation of ‘The State of Food and Agriculture 2010-11. Women in Agriculture: Closing the Gender Gap for Development’. This important document is discussed in detail in Section 7.3 below.

159. In terms of diffusion of its products for wider use, besides maintaining its Web site, until 2005 ESW circulated to GFPs and other staff a gender newsletter that presented FAO gender activities and resources. More recently, FAO also made available information on its publications related to gender and agriculture through the UN’s corporate Women Watch Web Portal ([www.womenwatch.org](http://www.womenwatch.org)), OECD’s Wiki Gender ([www.wikigender.org](http://www.wikigender.org)) and ‘Gender in Ag’ ([www.genderinag.org](http://www.genderinag.org)), a community of practice Web page jointly managed by the World Bank, IFAD and FAO.

160. These initiatives notwithstanding, and despite the good quality of publications such as the SEAGA guides, the Gender in Agriculture Sourcebook and other documents cited above, many staff in HQ and in DOs within FAO were not aware of what ESW had been producing and some stated that it was difficult to access the GPGs through the Web site. ESW did not seem to a strategy or a mechanism for disseminating publications within the Organization and even Gender Focal Points were sometimes unaware of new publications. It is true that flagship publications have been shared with the HQ-based GFP network, and tools that should be used at country level were usually mailed to FAO Representations. In most countries, however, they did not seem to have gone beyond the country office registry. For example, very few FAO staff in country offices were aware of the very recent 2011 publications ‘Country Programming Framework: Integrating Gender Issues’ and ‘UN Joint Programmes: Integrating Gender Issues in Food Security, Agriculture and Rural Development’.

161. The Evaluation acknowledges that absence of diffusion strategies for FAO’s GPGs is a common weakness to many FAO divisions, with notable exceptions, e.g. the Fisheries Department.

This issue was raised in several other FAO evaluations: evidence showed that posting a publication on a divisional or organizational Web site is not enough for the document to be known and used. There is no doubt that the major efforts devoted to diffusing SOFA 2011 could not be easily repeated for all ESW publications. Nevertheless, in consideration of the absence of gender experts in many FAO divisions and in the great majority of DOs and of the usually low attention given by FAO at large to gender issues, ESW should have developed more effective means of reaching out to intended users.

#### **D. Support to mainstreaming Gender and Development**

162. Capacity development on Gender and Development in Member States had been a key element of ESW's mandate in the implementation of the GAD Plans of Action.<sup>32</sup> This was maintained in two of SO-K Organizational Results (OR) related to assistance to governments, namely:

- K2 - Governments develop enhanced capacities to incorporate gender and social equality issues in agriculture, food security and rural development programmes, projects and policies using sex-disaggregated statistics, other relevant information and resources;
- K3 - Governments are formulating gender-sensitive, inclusive and participatory policies in agriculture and rural development.

163. Most of the capacity development effort by ESW has been carried out through workshops and seminars in countries where ESW was responsible for TCP or emergency projects. In general participants in training events were government counterparts and field and project staff. Some were carried out with a specific government office, normally the department of agriculture or statistics, and others were regional, including specialists from several different countries. Typically, workshops would include 20-30 participants, although specific information on their profiles, and male/female breakdown, was not available.

164. The main areas where ESW has concentrated its capacity building assistance to national level partners were:

- Socio-economic and gender analysis (SEAGA) for gender mainstreaming;
- Sex-disaggregated data – information collection, analysis and dissemination;
- Rural information and communications (including DIMITRA);
- Gender and access to land and water resources; and
- Gender and disease control (HIV and AIDS and HPAI).

165. More recently, capacity building programmes have been provided in the areas of gender and emergencies and gender and climate change.

#### *Socio-Economic and Gender Analysis (SEAGA)*

166. The Socio-Economic and Gender Analysis (SEAGA) tool, which was developed by FAO over the last 20 years, is the main training tool used for gender mainstreaming and social analysis in the countries where FAO has projects or programmes. SEAGA is aimed at mainstreaming gender and incorporating gender considerations into development programmes and projects. Its purpose is to ensure that development efforts address the needs and priorities of both men and women. It provides a participatory methodology and tool for development workers to do social analysis and to enable them to incorporate gender issues in their projects, including identifying women's and men's development priorities, which would be expected to lead to better outcomes. More information on SEAGA is in Box 9 below.

---

<sup>32</sup> The list of ESW's led training events as provided by the Division is to be found in Annex 6.



### Box 9. The Socio-Economic and Gender Analysis - SEAGA

The Socio-Economic and Gender Analysis (SEAGA) was initially developed by FAO as lead agency, ILO, the World Bank and UNDP. During the period of the evaluation, FAO has been implementing SEAGA independently as part of its Regular Programme, and in collaboration with projects, cost-sharing with national institutions and sometimes UN agencies. It has undertaken a series of regional and national training of trainers' workshops and sensitization sessions. The overall objective was to strengthen socio-economic and gender analysis capacities at regional, national and local levels.

SEAGA targets field workers, development planners and decision-makers. The SEAGA tools are adapted to work at different levels and focus on grassroots level development processes; structures, institutions and services; or on national policies and legislation.

SEAGA materials consist of:

- \* Basic Documents: reference guides and handbooks;
- \* Training Materials: training of trainers manual and training modules;
- \* Technical Guides: specific guides on irrigation, nutrition, livestock, fisheries and plant genetic resources, Disaster Risk Management; and
- \* Information and Communication Materials: brochures, leaflets, CD-ROM.

Over the years, the SEAGA package has been adopted by other UN agencies, governments and NGOs, through cost-sharing and independent follow-up, and has been adapted to many different environments and purposes.

SEAGA has probably become FAO's best-known gender-related Global Public Good. However, its effects are possibly more widely felt outside of FAO. Within FAO, many FAO staff are aware of SEAGA: some have received a briefing on SEAGA tools, but very few have been trained. Many staff expressed being uneasy about using SEAGA on their own.

*Source: Evaluation team*

167. ESW conducted a total of 117 capacity building workshops in 50 developing countries using SEAGA as a training tool from 2002-10. Most of these workshops were held on a small scale for groups of national or regional experts or project partners from 2002-10. Some examples are the following:

- SEAGA regional Training of Trainers (ToT) workshops were held in South Africa in 2002 and for Lusophone countries in Mozambique and Cape Verde several times in 2002-2004 and then again in 2009-10;
- For European countries, ESW held a regional ToT in Slovenia in 2003. In 2007 two training programmes in SEAGA and participatory rural appraisal (PRA) were offered in Bari, Italy for Mediterranean and Balkan countries. SEAGA workshops were also held occasionally in France, Italy and Belgium over the period;
- Sub-Regional training programmes were held in Trinidad and Tobago and Barbados in late 2003, with nine Caribbean countries participating. ESW carried out the SEAGA training for all Central America SPFS projects in 2009, with a five-day event supported by IFAD. This was well appreciated and a few of the current FAO project directors attended it;
- A comprehensive effort was made in Namibia, Uganda, Zambia, and Zimbabwe in the early years of the decade with funding from Norway under the Integrated Support to Sustainable Development and Food Security project (IP). In Uganda, over several months in 2003-04, ESW staff and consultants provided technical support to the Ministry of Agriculture (MAIFF) in Uganda, which was in the process of developing a gender strategy for the agriculture sector, on the SEAGA guide to household resource management. They then prepared case studies, and carried out surveys in selected rural areas. Some of the staff

trained at that time were currently working in other organizations and were still using SEAGA tools, adapted to their current working context;

- Other national capacity building workshops were held - for one or two weeks each - in 2003 and 2004 in Cameroon, Ghana, India, Japan (for JICA staff) and South Africa;
- SEAGA and Emergency training programmes were held in Indonesia and Afghanistan in 2005.

168. Up until the year 2007-08 FAO kept a database of all SEAGA trainings, listing the type of training, names of trainees, their contacts and country information. From 1999-2008 ESW prepared a SEAGA annual progress report. It seems that most of the SEAGA training was held in the early part of the decade and then again in 2009 and 2010. Most of the workshops were one-time events, although there is evidence of follow-up with national experts in countries such as Madagascar, the Philippines and Uganda. In those countries, national participants formed SEAGA networks and did their own training, using the SEAGA tool. A newsletter was issued to participants in the workshops until 2002.

169. Despite the importance of the SEAGA work and its use by gender specialists in a number of agencies, the majority of people interviewed were not aware of the SEAGA guidelines and handbooks. In 2005 it was stated that over 3800 development practitioners were using SEAGA; the Evaluation could not find evidence supporting these figures, although there was no doubt that other organizations such as IFAD and UNAIDS were using SEAGA as a training tool.

170. SEAGA has its own interactive Web site that is currently being revised, and has developed a large number of partners who apparently use its handbooks and guides in their work.

#### *Gender and sex-disaggregated data and agricultural census*

171. Capacity building on sex-disaggregated data and agricultural censuses was conducted consistently by ESW over the period at both national and regional levels. Twenty workshops were held during the period with participation by about 450 people from 20 countries, over 60 % of whom were female. Much of the support for this work was provided by Norway, Sweden and the EC. During 2002-2010, the training events included the following:

- national workshops in Mozambique, Tanzania, Uganda and Zimbabwe;
- regional and sub-regional programmes for the Central Asian countries in the Kyrgyz Republic in 2003 and for the Asian Region in Thailand in 2004;
- several sub-regional training events for Central and Eastern Europe: in Hungary (2002 and 2005); Moldova and Georgia (2004); and the Czech Republic (yearly from 2005 to 2008 and again in 2010).<sup>33</sup> In 2004 a workshop on gender statistics was held at the Economic Commission for Europe in Geneva;
- Sub-regional workshops in Ecuador (2005) and St. Lucia (2008) for the Eastern Caribbean.

172. Further, individual project support was also provided to national statistics bureaus in Vietnam, PDR Laos and Cambodia in 2008 and 2009 for the re-tabulation of census data and in testing of the Gender and Agricultural Statistics Framework (GASF). Project support was on-going in Nicaragua and Dominican Republic in 2010/11.

173. The work carried out by HQ staff was considerably enhanced in Africa by the senior gender specialist based at FAO Regional Office for Africa in Ghana. She provided support to TCP and GCP projects in the area of agricultural surveys and censuses in the following countries: Benin (2008-2009), Burkina Faso (2005), Cape Verde (2006), Cameroon (2003-2004), Côte d'Ivoire (2001), Gambia (2001), Ghana (2010-2011), Guinea (2002-2003), Lesotho (2011), Mali (2011), Mozambique (2005-2011), Niger (2004-2007), Senegal (2009-2010), Tanzania (2005-2007), Togo (2011) and Uganda (2008).

---

<sup>33</sup> A workshop was also held in Prague in late 2010, after the Evaluation had visited REU.

174. Stemming from the above, a number of studies were also prepared, including ‘Agricultural Censuses and Gender: Lessons Learned in Africa: Key Findings’ in 2005 and statistical profiles for several countries (Tanzania and Niger, with Mali and Senegal forthcoming). RAF’s technical support to FAO’s field operations in the region formed the basis for the preparation of the ‘Agri-Gender Statistics Toolkit’, available on the Web since 2009. This normative toolkit and critical lessons learned document provides a framework for the production of sex-disaggregated data and includes a CD, brochure and other tools. The gender specialist also contributed to statistics user-producers workshops and briefed the two-yearly statutory meetings of the African Commission of Agricultural Statistics (AFCAS) on new developments related to the collection and dissemination of gender relevant sex-disaggregated agricultural data.

175. Most recently, ESW has strengthened its relationship with the Statistics Division in FAO (ESS, see Annex 13), which should contribute to enhancing further the effectiveness of the efforts made so far. Given the importance of evidence-based information for supporting studies such as SOFA 2010-11 and other analytical studies by FAO and the UN system in general, FAO’s work on sex-disaggregated data is considered crucial in developing member countries’ capacity to generate, analyze and use sex-disaggregated data on the agriculture sector.

#### Other capacity building activities

176. ESW also conducted training events in the area of gender, water resources management and food security. Two regional training programmes were held for African countries in South Africa in 2003, while a regional workshop on gender analysis and water management for Asia was held in Cambodia in 2003. In addition, a consultation on gender, irrigation and water management was held at the Mediterranean Agronomic Institute of Bari (Italy) in 2004 with experts from 13 countries. This created the GEWAMED (Mainstreaming Gender Dimensions into Water Resources Development), that held a meeting of its regional coordinators in the Mediterranean Region in Cyprus in 2007, sponsored by the EC. Consultative meetings were subsequently held several times at FAO HQ, although GWAMED was not an FAO project.

177. Regarding Gender Mainstreaming, an expert group consultation was held on this topic in Turin (Italy) in 2010 with all concerned UN agencies, and a workshop in Malawi in 2010. These few examples would seem to indicate that aside from SEAGA, gender mainstreaming was not a major focus of capacity building by ESW.

178. Capacity building programmes on Gender in Emergencies were held in Swaziland and Mozambique in 2007. A regional Workshop on SEAGA in Emergencies was provided for Emergency Coordinators in Bangkok in 2009, and a similar workshop was held in Vietnam the same year. Support was provided by Sweden.

179. The regional gender specialist for Asia and the Pacific organized a number of regional expert consultations from 2002 to 2006. These mainly related to rural women and knowledge development. These consultations did not seem to have been directly related to the work by RAP or ESW.

180. An important initiative aimed to “promote regional knowledge sharing and capacity building for gender analysis, and for promoting women’s participation and empowerment in rural development work”<sup>34</sup> was on-going at the time of the Evaluation, through the IFAD/FAO Grant Programme for Regional Gender Capacity and Knowledge (2009-2011). Staff from both agencies at HQ and country level, and national partners were participating in the programme’s activities, which included several activities, including participatory research on gender issues, capacity building on gender issues in relation to specific themes, and training for rural women to share their knowledge and experience. A wiki site and a monthly bulletin circulated to Gender Focal Points and other units had been created to facilitate knowledge management and sharing information on gender in agriculture. The programme offered the opportunity to develop closer relationships between IFAD and FAO and

---

34 Project GCP/GLO/233/IFA, IFAD/FAO Grant Programme for Regional Gender Capacity and Knowledge, Methodologies and tools; see <http://genderlearning.wikispaces.com/>

across units within FAO, including between TCI and ESW. Through the grant, a training workshop focused on investment in agriculture was organized in Ethiopia, attended by many FAO staff and facilitated by TCI staff, both from HQ and an out-posted officer.

181. The capacity building support of ESW to government partners through TCPs and donor-sponsored projects was found to have had an impact where the work was reinforced over time, such as SEAGA training in Uganda, the LinKS work in Mozambique, Swaziland and Tanzania, DIMITRA in Niger, and agricultural censuses and sex-disaggregated data in Europe and Central Asia. The Gender and Land Rights database and the SEAGA training related to access to land and water in the Lusophone countries and Tajikistan had supported women's empowerment and access to resources. This was an area where ESW had demonstrated its competence and its productive collaboration with other units.

182. However, aside from positive feedback from ESW's collaborators at Makerere University in Uganda, and from some earlier evaluations, the Evaluation was not able to verify the results of ESW's capacity building programmes on the ground, as most of the work was carried out in countries that were not visited.

#### Capacity development within FAO

183. Through the GAD Plans of Action, ESW had also been expected to lead FAO's efforts to mainstream gender throughout its programmes and projects and to assist other technical units to do so through training and advice in the area of gender mainstreaming. This holds true for SO-K: Organizational Result K-4 is 'FAO management and staff have demonstrated commitment and capacity to address gender dimensions in their work'.

184. Most of the training for FAO staff in the area of WID and GAD was carried out in the 1990s. In recent years (2009-2010) ESW had supported training for staff members in FAO Investment Centre (TCI) and the Emergency and Rehabilitation Division (TCE) from HQ. In 2008-2009, ESW also organized three one-day training events for Gender Focal Points in FAO HQ. This was not usually sufficient to enable GFPs to provide support on gender mainstreaming to their colleagues on how to mainstream gender into divisional programmes and projects.

185. Former participants in ESW training programmes reported that these had been too general to have a concrete impact on their capacity to integrate a gender perspective in their work. The surveys of FAO staff by the IEE in 2007 and the Gender Audit in 2010 indicated that FAO staff felt they did not have the competence to mainstream gender into their programmes. This was confirmed through the Evaluation's country visits in all regions. All the officials interviewed believed that capacity development training in gender should be designed with the help of a gender specialist in their own technical area, as ESW might not have the level of technical knowledge required to tackle specific gender concerns in each technical context.

186. The situation in RAP was a useful case study: the Office had had an ESW regional gender officer until August 2007, but staff at RAP indicated that much of her work had been done without the broad participation of the staff of RAP; workshops had been held with partners outside of FAO, and had little connection with the RAP programme. By the time of the Evaluation (early 2011), the Regional Office did have an active Gender Focal Point, a senior officer who had good working relations in the office and, due to his seniority, was able to discuss gender issues with colleagues.

187. Within PWB 2010-11, one of the Gender-Sensitive Products and services related to SO-K aimed to sensitize RAP officers to gender mainstreaming and to include gender components in the work of RAP. Work aimed at contributing to this result had already started in February 2009, with a training for the FAO Representatives in the region. More recently, in February 2011, a gender sensitization workshop for the professional staff at the RAP Office in Bangkok was also carried out.

188. For the latter, the GFP for RAP worked closely with ESW to discuss what would be appropriate in the local context – how to orient the material and what would be acceptable. The feedback following the workshop was largely positive, especially on the first day; staff appreciated that the trainer was from ESW and not an outside consultant. This combination of factors appears to be

an effective way to raise awareness among staff at the DOs. The key element was development of the session by a FAO ESW staff in close consultation with the GFP in the concerned office, to tailor it to the needs of the specific DO.

189. Individual interviews with five units in HQ, excluding ESW and GFPs, showed that none of the interviewees seemed to have ever asked ESW for support or benefited from it, directly or indirectly, in their work. One person mentioned SEAGA, as a vague reference. Sometimes, admittedly, work had been done by ESW with a person in one unit who either left or did not share it with colleagues. The question this raises is why this work on gender was not better shared in the respective units.

#### Advisory services

190. The advisory services provided by ESW to national partners were related to the projects the Division carried out in certain countries, many of which have been summarized above. Advisory services were also provided directly to governments with RP budget funds, sometimes in the form of policy assistance and support to development of statistical systems and other times in terms of capacity building and methodological tools.

191. As reported in other evaluations,<sup>35</sup> some of the policy research studies, such as that on land tenure at Makerere University, were carried out without informing and involving the local FAOR office, preventing the possibility of developing more sustainable links at country level with other FAO initiatives, and thus undermining the effectiveness of FAO's work.

192. Other relevant support was provided to projects where ESW was not the Lead Technical Unit:

- advisory services in sex-disaggregated data provided to the Andhra Pradesh Farmer Managed Groundwater Systems (APFAMGS) project in 2006-07 and to a project in Hyderabad on adaptation to climate change (2009);
- technical backstopping to Farmer Field and Life Schools (FFLS) and Junior Farmer Field and Life Schools (JFFLS) projects in Mozambique, Swaziland, Tanzania, Uganda and Zambia; this is discussed more in detail in Chapter 5 on HIV and AIDS;
- technical backstopping to emergency projects in Afghanistan and in the West Bank and Gaza;
- in the context of the HPAI epidemic, ESW provided assistance, using SEAGA tools, to: Indonesia (2005); Vietnam (2006-07); Cambodia (2006-07); and Turkey (2006). A concept paper on gender and socio-economic issues in avian influenza control and other studies was carried out; in 2008 a national workshop was held in Vietnam to train national experts in gender and HPAI issues;
- policy advice to Cambodia, Ecuador, Malawi, Morocco, Sierra Leone, Suriname and Tunisia, among others. Finally, advisory services were offered to Angola, Cape Verde, Mozambique and Timor Leste in the area of gender and land rights, as discussed in Annex 13.

193. It is difficult to assess the specific outcomes – let alone impact – at large of these services, as the uptake of this type of advice depended largely on such factors as the institutional context, type of partners, and possibilities for follow-up, etc. Policy advice tends to leave very few marks, unless it is provided consistently over long periods of time and with resources that allow production of useful and specific outputs at country level.

194. Evidence from previous evaluations in Mozambique and Tajikistan showed that some of the projects to which ESW provided support performed well in terms of integrating a gender perspective and sustainability of the initiatives. In the case of support to HPAI initiatives, the Second Real Time Evaluation of FAO's work on HPAI stated that FAO's studies and research on gender

---

35 See evaluations of FAO's collaboration with India, Brazil, etc.

issues within the epidemic "...had provided greater insights, but with the exception of Cambodia and Indonesia they have apparently not led to discussions or changes to FAO advice in the field". Thus, although ESW provided support and studies and research were carried out, they had limited effects on FAO's modus-operandi in that major operation.

### **E. Role of ESW and related corporate perceptions**

195. As stated above, ESW was to have a facilitator's role on gender mainstreaming, besides its own technical mandate in GAD. However, although the preparatory process for the second GAD-PoA included extensive consultation with several units at HQ and at the regional level, ESW remained the 'owner' of the GAD Plans of Action. The debate on the formulation of SO-K – whether to have a gender dedicated SO or to mainstream gender throughout all strategic objectives – was also very intense among member countries and the Immediate Action Plan Secretariat, but it appeared that the rest of the organization was less involved.

196. The Evaluation's findings about ESW's internal communication and coordination mechanisms were that although staff in the Division had several opportunities to communicate, discuss and share information – partly because each of them was on more than one 'Organizational Results' team - there was limited substantive coordination, let alone sharing of information, among ESW senior officers on work done by each of them with different units outside ESW. Also, although ESW had a divisional Vision and Mission statements, these did not emerge as a sufficient contribution to create a common understanding among staff about ESW itself. f. On the contrary, staff clearly held diverging visions about the role of the Division, current and future, including on whether gender was a technical specialty, a vision or a perspective. In this respect, the main options ranged from taking the lead on gender mainstreaming, to supporting other units to do so, to focusing on normative work by being a think-tank on GAD in agriculture.

197. Outside ESW, the findings of the Evaluation indicated that despite SO-K, technical and senior officers strongly believed that the corporate responsibility for doing gender work and for mainstreaming gender in FAO belonged primarily to ESW. In general, there was limited understanding outside ESW about what the real mandate of the division was.

198. The level of interaction between staff in other divisions and ESW seemed to be based mainly on personal relationships and individual contacts. Staff who did not have a personal contact in ESW, including some GFPs, did not know whom to contact for guidance or support. One suggestion was that there should be a contact person in ESW to provide assistance on accessing support and information.

199. Some officers felt that ESW could be more helpful to FAO technical units in identifying their gender-relevant areas of work, and developing a systematic plan of support to fill their capacity gaps through the provision of tailor-made capacity development. One request was for identifying 'good examples of gender mainstreaming' and standardized methodology for integrating gender in the work of each technical division. Others said that concrete improvements were possible only through a consistent self-analysis at division level, identifying activities which could have a gender component and, in a second stage, calculating the cost of carrying it out. All these suggestions indicated that the "How to" appeared very important: people expected ESW to help with answering how to incorporate gender disaggregated information and gender analysis into a project or activity.

### **F. Conclusions**

200. Over the period under evaluation, ESW carried out a substantial amount of work with Regular Programme and voluntary resources in order to meet its mandate as specified by the Plans of Action and more recently, by SO-K. Evidence of positive results and impacts was found in some projects, among which DIMITRA appeared to be one of the most outstanding in terms of moving beyond economic empowerment: in Niger it had a positive impact on women's social-cultural empowerment, and it may be assumed that it also achieved good results in other countries where it was operating.

201. Other initiatives such the LinKS programme and support for the generation of sex disaggregated data were also worthy of note. In particular, support to wider efforts to record sex-disaggregated data was provided through advisory services and regional and national workshops in all the regions. A recent and very positive example of this was the Agri-Gender toolkit developed by RAF. Advisory services on other aspects of gender issues and mainstreaming did not appear as effective and sustainable.

202. In general the quality of the GPGs produced by ESW was high, in particular in terms of relevance and technical quality. However, several sub-standard outputs were also assessed. In addition, some products displayed analytical weaknesses. There were also failures in ensuring the satisfactory distribution of products and dissemination of results: this resulted in the impact of ESW's GPGs being short of potential.

203. The flagship tool, SEAGA, was produced before the period covered by this evaluation. Since 2002, SEAGA was further developed and capacity development and technical advice were provided to Member States, and direct and indirect support was provided to women in rural areas of the world. There was good evidence that SEAGA was widely used, though mostly outside FAO. Within the Organization, the momentum behind its creation has been lost and the tool requires revision and re-vamping.

204. Through SEAGA, capacity development on gender was an on-going activity for ESW, with several initiatives aimed at FAO staff. More recently, a joint IFAD-FAO programme aimed at developing capacities on gender issues for staff of the two organizations and partners at country level appeared to be effective. However, when ESW provided training support, this often was not tailor-made to the needs of certain technical units, leading to reluctance to ask for ESW support for other initiatives.

205. Two main reasons for the mixed performance of ESW can be identified. The first, and one frequently mentioned by ESW staff, was lack of resources. Throughout the period under evaluation, the Division was being asked to perform across a wide spectrum of activities with limited resources and capacity to meet the needs of training, advisory services and information in each area within FAO, as well as in monitoring the implementation of projects in regions and countries.

206. The Regional Office for Africa (RAF) was the only Decentralized Office that still had a Senior Gender and Development Officer in post at the time of the Evaluation. This contributed to make a visible difference to the attention being paid to gender at the regional level; in RAP and REU, recent decisions by respective Regional Representatives had led to the appointment of Gender Focal Point in 2010 or early 2011, whereas in Latin America and the Caribbean, since the regional ESW officer had retired, no communication or exchange had taken place with HQ on gender issues.

207. But perhaps of more importance was the lack of a clear understanding within FAO and ESW itself about what was its main role and responsibility. So for instance, it was unclear to most outside ESW, and possibly to some within ESW itself, whether the Division was responsible for leading the effort to mainstream gender in FAO and facilitate gender awareness and competency within the Organization or whether it should aim at working to mainstream gender in the work of other units in the Economic and Social Development Department and beyond. An alternative option proposed was that it could serve as an in house think-tank with the primary responsibility of producing cutting edge analysis and policy recommendations for FAO and other agencies.

208. In the opinion of the Evaluation, the think-tank option would also have the following advantages: i) reinforcing the technical legitimacy of the work on GAD and of professionals working on the subject, in a very "technical" organization; ii) limiting the frustration of "forcing gender" on other units in the Organization which are neither interested in nor accountable for gender matters; and iii) simplify setting goals, objectives and targets for the unit.

## V. Assessment of FAO's work related to HIV and AIDS

### A. Introduction

209. The HIV and AIDS situation in Africa remains the most alarming in the world in respect to the epidemic. In the region, particularly in Sub-Saharan Africa, regardless of the large amounts of human and financial resources allocated, the epidemic is still challenging the global efforts to reverse it. The region remains the most affected in the world, with two-thirds (67%) of all people living with HIV worldwide. In 2008, 72% of all AIDS deaths occurred in this region; more than 14 million African children have been orphaned by the epidemic, while women and girls continue to be disproportionately affected by the disease. They account for 60% of all HIV infections in the region.

210. The complex, diverse and dynamic impacts of HIV and AIDS on livelihoods, food security, rural development and rural poverty are not gender-neutral. Women's vulnerability to HIV and AIDS has a considerable impact on food security, as they are the main food producers as well as the main care givers in the AIDS context. The AIDS epidemic continues to impact rural agricultural-based livelihoods, especially in southern Africa where the disease is said to be 'hyper-endemic' and its long-term effect may be felt for decades to come. In this context and in consideration of the impact of the epidemics on food security in terms of both availability and access, FAO has an important role to play in the global fight against HIV and AIDS.

211. The Evaluation held extensive discussion in FAO HQ with staff involved in this area of work and analyzed directly six projects tackling HIV and AIDS, all of them led technically by ESW.<sup>36</sup>

### B. Resources for implementing work on HIV and AIDS: staff and non staff

212. ESW has led and coordinated FAO's efforts to understand and mitigate the impacts of HIV and AIDS and other diseases on agriculture and rural areas. In PWB 2002-03, addressing the impact of the HIV and AIDS pandemic on agricultural productivity and food security was among the priorities. In 2004-05, the scope of action was downsized, partly because of significant reductions in UNFPA funding, which reduced the capacity of ESW to meet demands from countries for capacity building workshops and outreach to mitigate the impact of HIV and AIDS and food security.

213. In PWB 2006-07, the Regular Programme's thrust on HIV and AIDS was based upon the "twin pillars of capacity-building and policy assistance to countries" in the core areas of gender, HIV and AIDS and other related diseases, and their relation with rural poverty and food insecurity. The programme aimed to build capacity and provide tools and policy advice towards achieving the MDGs, with particular regard to the role of gender equality and the mitigation of HIV and AIDS in the reduction of rural poverty and food insecurity. Programme 3F of the PWB 2008-09 - Gender and equity in rural societies – gave ESW the corporate responsibility for HIV and AIDS, indigenous peoples and population issues, particularly migration, among others. The programme also gave responsibility to ESW to act as convenor for FAO within the Global Coalition of Women and AIDS and within the UN-wide Interagency Network on Women and Gender Equality.

214. In the GAD-PoA 2002-07, HIV and AIDS emerged as one of the key issues and featured in some programmes, in particular in relation to emergency situations. In the 2008-13 Plan, HIV and AIDS was part of the human diseases area of work and was mentioned in the context of food and nutrition safety.

215. Despite these formal plans and commitments, in 2009, ESW's work on HIV and AIDS started to be phased out: the main reason appeared to be lack of resources and the need for ESW to focus on a limited number of specific areas of work

216. ESW resources for implementing work on HIV and AIDS were as follows: two senior officers worked on HIV and AIDS issues from July 2003 until the end of 2010, plus one P-3 in the

---

<sup>36</sup> The Evaluation assessed the FFLS and JFFLS only through a gender and HIV and AIDS perspective., as per its mandate. It acknowledges that ESW's work on this under the lead of the Rural Employment team, is much broader and that the JFFLS approach is being promoted to foster rural youth opportunities. For more information, see also: <http://www.fao-ilo.org/fao-ilo-youth/fao-ilo-jffls/en>



period 2003-09. These staff were supplemented by a number of Associate Professional Officers (APOs) stationed in Malawi, South Africa, Tanzania and Zambia. It appeared that senior officers did not work full time on HIV and AIDS related activities after 2007, although APOs both at HQ and in the field made an important contribution to FAO's work on the epidemic, including advisory services to member countries and to other UN agencies in the field. Virtually no non-staff resources from the RP budget were made available and most if not all the work was carried out with Voluntary resources.

217. Thus, although apparently ESW had quite a solid presence in terms of staff to implement work on HIV and AIDS, this was not enough with regard to the scope of the epidemic's impacts on food security in Africa.

218. During the period 2002-2010, FAO implemented 39 projects focusing on HIV and AIDS, 26 of which were technical cooperation projects, and 13 emergency projects. Their total budget amounted to slightly above USD 35 million, representing 0.3% of total FAO technical cooperation projects and 0.7% of total emergency projects for the same period. Five implemented TCPs represented 9% of total Technical Cooperation resources for HIV and AIDS.

### **C. Projects and programmes including TCP**

219. Most FAO projects in HIV and AIDS were led by ESW, with a few led by AGN, FAO's Human Nutrition unit. In this area, FAO divisions collaborated with UN agencies such as UNAIDS, WFP, UNESCO, WHO, ILO and IFAD, in developing broad-based responses to HIV and AIDS in relation to agricultural development and food security in Africa.

220. The Evaluation assessed directly six projects in Kenya, Uganda and Zambia. Although their qualifiers in FPMIS were not accurately assigned, with one exception that appeared to be a Missed Opportunity, all were assessed as GAD.

221. Support on HIV and AIDS was provided to countries in East and Southern Africa to establish and scale up the Farmer Field and Life Schools (FFLS) and the Junior Farmer Field and Life Schools (JFFLS) to expand awareness and knowledge of basic livelihoods, agricultural and life skills with particular focus on HIV and AIDS transmission and prevention. Other initiatives were carried out in support of the formulation of agriculture sector strategies on HIV and AIDS in Malawi, Mozambique, Tanzania, Uganda and South Africa.

222. The FFLS offered rural men and women, boys and girls, training in basic life skills, such as developing innovative rural savings and credit schemes, training in income generating activities and business skills, establishing social support networks. These schools promoted social support networks, such as group labor and childcare facilities, to overcome constraints and barriers to women's participation. The JFFLS aimed to empower AIDS-vulnerable children, boys and girls equitably, by assisting them to grow up with good agricultural practices, entrepreneurship and life skills for their future livelihoods and for food security.

223. Several projects had been implemented through UN Joint Programmes on HIV and AIDS to establish and scale up FFLS and JFFLS. However, it appeared that partners were not involved in project monitoring and evaluation.

224. In Kenya, Uganda and Zambia, the evaluation found that both FFLS and JFFLS had contributed to some improvement in income-generation and livelihoods for the participants. The projects also provided a way to promote gender equality and to empower girls in particular, and also developed strategies for productive work for youth. The schools were gender-sensitive as they recruited adult men and women, boys and girls equitably. They addressed a wide range of issues, such as education and business skills, health, nutrition, hygiene, sanitation, child protection, HIV and AIDS awareness and psycho-social support. FFLS and JFFLS activities included training in group dynamics and skills development in areas such as small livestock husbandry, crops, vegetable gardens and orchards.

225. A few weaknesses were also noted. In some cases the projects had not been properly designed: in some JFFLS schools in Kenya participants were unable to access markets for their produce and in Zambia, no resources were available to provide the technical support for participants'

graduation and delivery of kits for income generating activities as the projects originally intended. Moreover, training on gender, human rights and good governance was missing in the curriculum.

226. Looking at the capacity building and advisory services on HIV and AIDS provided by ESW, it was reported that in 2002-03, assistance had been provided to build a baseline in Namibia and Uganda; and in 2003 workshops were held in South Africa and Namibia for national stakeholders on HIV and AIDS, agriculture and food security. National workshops were also held in Zambia in 2003 and in Kenya and Tanzania in 2005. Technical backstopping was provided to HIV and AIDS related projects in Tanzania and Kenya during 2005-07; to Burundi, Malawi and Nepal in 2007; and to Zimbabwe in 2010.

227. In some countries severely affected by the pandemic, ESW has conducted training on the use of SEAGA with donors' support,<sup>37</sup> which helped to develop capacities in gender analysis.

#### D. Global Public Goods

228. During the Evaluability Assessment, 72 Global Public Goods were identified that aimed at raising awareness and political commitment on the impact of HIV and AIDS on food and livelihoods security; at reducing the impact in terms of food insecurity and malnutrition; and at promoting the gender-sensitive and participatory responses for maintenance and strengthening of rural livelihoods in the face of the epidemic. Several of those GPGs were prepared in partnership with UN institutions such as IFAD, ILO, UNAIDS, UNICEF, UNDP and WFP, as well as national and other international institutions and research centres.

229. The Evaluation assessed 11 GPGs against six criteria on a six-point scale. Box 10 below illustrates the average scoring by criteria.

**Box 10. Assessment of FAO Global Public Goods on HIV and AIDS: average scoring**

Criteria Type of products	Relevance of GAD to the topic (1-6)	Technical quality of GAD contents (1-6)	Innovativeness on GAD (1-6)	Potential impact as advocacy tool (1-6)	Potential impact as capacity development tool (1-6)	Links between GAD and social inclusion (1-6)	Number products
Average scoring all GPGs	5.5	5.3	4.2	5.5	5.4	4.9	11

Source: Evaluation team

230. The Evaluation concluded that throughout, GAD issues had been mainstreamed and integrated holistically, with reference to GAD theory. The GPGs were clearly written with clear arguments, well-chosen case studies and awareness of target audience. Most had good potential as either capacity building materials or background material for capacity development tools. In addition, the GPGs presented material that could be used as advocacy tools. The weakest criterion was Innovativeness, which however also resulted satisfactory.

231. ESW's major flagship training tool, SEAGA, provided good gender-sensitive tools to incorporate HIV and AIDS considerations within agriculture extension services, to assess the impact of AIDS on livestock, and as guidelines for home-based nutritional care for use by local service providers. The publication 'Building Capacity for the Agriculture Sector's Response to AIDS: A Training Manual for Agriculture Sector Workers' produced with the support of Sweden and released as a CD-Rom in May 2011, represents the major legacy of the Organization in this area of work.

232. SEAGA related documents on the JFFLS made an innovative contribution to understanding GAD in the mitigation of HIV and AIDS. In the context of HIV and AIDS GPGs, the evaluation found that GAD issues were mainstreamed very well into discussions of social inclusion,

<sup>37</sup> For example, the Integrated Support to Sustainable Development and Food Security Programme (IP)

particularly in the SEAGA documentation, as well as in GPGs on women's and children's property rights and livelihoods.

233. Even though some work was carried out also in West Africa and in some parts of Asia, including in low HIV prevalence countries where the impact of the disease on agriculture takes very specific forms, such as in Nepal, most ESW products related to HIV and AIDS concentrated almost exclusively on countries of East and Southern Africa. Other African sub-regions and other parts of the world that are also affected by the epidemic should have been included in the analysis and studies. As Voluntary funds were made available only for Africa, ESW could not expand this work. Furthermore, the assessment of the GPGs showed that FAO's gender mainstreaming approach in the study of HIV and AIDS neglected the socio-cultural dynamics that shaped multi-level AIDS impacts in specific cultural contexts. In other words, FAO research studies did not address cultural gender inequalities which increased women's vulnerability to HIV and AIDS and had negative impacts on food and livelihoods security. Although from a food security perspective this might appear reasonable, when the consequences rather than the complex causes of the epidemics are scrutinized from a gender perspective, FAO's products might be short of identifying a more effective strategy for food and nutrition security.

234. Further, the dissemination of relevant studies and tools has not been adequate to address the serious problems of the epidemic's impacts on agriculture and rural development in Africa. Despite the efforts in diffusing it, only few agricultural extension workers and decision makers had been trained in using SEAGA. Evidence from past evaluations also showed that FAO emergency staff in the Southern African region were not aware of, let alone conversant with, SEAGA or any other similar analytical and planning tool.<sup>38</sup>

## **E. Conclusions**

235. FAO is the main UN Organization that has started to examine the relationship between agriculture and HIV and AIDS and has worked fairly strategically on HIV and AIDS. Focus was on three main areas: i) knowledge generation to document the linkages between the disease and rural livelihoods and to show the magnitude of the impact in various rural contexts; ii) policy assistance to help HIV-affected countries formulate appropriate gender-sensitive policy responses; and iii) capacity development to support implementation and monitoring of those responses.

236. FAO assisted a number of African governments to develop gender-sensitive agricultural strategies when addressing the HIV and AIDS crisis. It has initiated studies, programmes and projects in the area of agriculture and food security to respond to the complex, diverse and dynamic impacts of the epidemic on livelihoods and food and nutrition security in Africa. The most successful results were in the JFFLS projects, which made a difference in empowering young women and men. SEAGA tools related to HIV and AIDS have been assessed as of very good quality, although their use was limited.

237. Despite the visible efforts and results, overall resources, both from the Regular Programme and Voluntary, have been limited, considering the extent of the negative impact of the epidemic on food security in the region. This notwithstanding, available resources were used strategically.

238. In the light of the above and of the foreseeable long-term impacts of the pandemics on food and nutrition security, the Evaluation considered that FAO's decision to phase out work on HIV and AIDS will increase African countries' vulnerability to HIV and AIDS in rural areas and jeopardize investments made so far by FAO to mitigate the epidemic's impacts on food security in Africa.

239. The Evaluation formulated a few suggestions on this important topic, while one key recommendation will be included in the final chapter.

---

<sup>38</sup> Project evaluation of 'Strengthening Livelihoods through Food and Nutrition Security in Vulnerable SADC Countries-OSRO/RAF/510/SAF', 2006.

### **Suggestion 1. Steps forward in the work on HIV and AIDS**

It is suggested that FAO:

- a) promote and extend the JFFLS initiatives and projects in countries affected by the HIV and AIDS epidemics;
- b) Institutionalize the JFFLS in African countries' school curricula;
- c) Promote and disseminate efficiently the GPGs related to HIV and AIDS and particularly the SEAGA tools;
- d) Develop GPGs on HIV and AIDS, food security and rural development with an emphasis on qualitative anthropological research that may address the socio-cultural causes of women's vulnerability to HIV and AIDS and their resilience to cope with the systemic impacts of the disease on food security;
- e) Continue developing labour saving technology to overcome labour shortages in HIV and AIDS context.

## **VI. The relevance of gender equality in FAO's projects and the use of gender qualifiers**

240. As discussed above,<sup>39</sup> during the Evaluability Assessment both the responses from FAO units and the search in FPMIS through the so-called gender qualifiers indicated that the information that FAO was able to provide on the degree of gender mainstreaming in its projects was rather poor. This meant that: a) any aggregate information on gender mainstreaming in FAO would be undermined by the lack of reliable – and easily retrievable – information and data; b) the Evaluation would not be able to scale up its findings at country level on a broader corporate level, as the 'universe' identified was far too small. Two evaluation tools were thus developed to tackle these issues and are discussed in the sections below. They were:

- a desk study that analyzed projects NOT defined as GAD through a gender perspective;<sup>40</sup>
- a revision of the gender qualifiers of all projects assessed to some degree at country level by the Evaluation team.

### **A. Gender-sensitive desk-study of FAO projects not identified as gender or women related**

241. The desk-study had a double purpose:

to verify to what extent the frequently heard statement “a gender perspective is not relevant to the work of my Division” was correct; and

to provide evidence on the actual integration of a gender perspective in a wider sample of FAO's projects,<sup>41</sup> considering the low accuracy noted in the use of the existing gender tags and qualifiers in FPMIS.

242. Between January 2002 and September 2010, FAO implemented a total of 6125 projects of which only 555 were identified as GAD through the Evaluability Assessment. This meant that information available in FAO showed that for 5570 FAO projects, or 91% of FAO's Field Programme work over eight years, women and/or gender had NOT been considered a relevant issue. A random sample of 200 projects - statistically representative and stratified by technical department according to the number of projects each had led during the period - was thus extracted from the list of the 5570 projects.

<sup>39</sup> See Section 2.3.

<sup>40</sup> See Annex 7, Gender-sensitive analysis of FAO projects not identified as gender or women related. The figures for total number of projects differ slightly from those reported elsewhere in the report, which include the last few months of 2010.

<sup>41</sup> The term 'project' includes all voluntary funded and TCP initiatives at global, regional and country level.

243. Projects in the sample were led by all technical units and DOs in FAO, including ESW-led projects in the area of Rural Employment. 79 initiatives, or 40%,<sup>42</sup> had been funded within the Emergency umbrella. The analysis was done through any relevant documentation available in FPMIS: Project Documents (ProDoc), Country Appraisals, Project Appraisals, Project Proposal Review Committee (PPRC) documents, project outlines and agreements, technical reports, Back to Office Reports, terminal statements, and evaluation reports. No personal interviews were conducted, but for some projects additional information became available from contact persons.

244. The first step was assessing whether a project should have addressed gender based on its goal and purpose; if so, the analysis verified up to what level this was done. It was outside the scope of this desk-study to indicate the success of gender mainstreaming of the projects, as it could only analyze whether an effort had been made to address gender issues through available documents and reports.

245. The 200 projects that were assessed were classified initially in two major groups: 'A-Gender perspective was not required' and 'B-Gender perspective was required'. Group A- comprised 52 (26%) projects and group B the remaining 148 (74%). The projects were then classified along the gender definitions adopted by the Evaluation, i.e. GAD, WID, Missed Opportunity and non-GAD. Box 11 illustrates the number and percentage of projects in each category.

**Box 11. Projects in the sample by Group and gender category**

Gender categories Groups	GAD	WID	MO	Non GAD	Total	Percentage of grand total
Sub-total Group A – Gender perspective was not required	0	0	0	52	52	26%
Sub-total Group B - Gender perspective was required	39	16	93		148	74%
Grand Total	39	16	93	52	200	100%
Percentage of Grand Total	20%	8%	47%	26%	100%	

*Source: Evaluation team*

246. At the same time, the projects were also grouped through a finer level of analysis, which is discussed in detail in Annex 7. Here only the key findings and observations are reported.

247. For the 52 projects in Group A that represented 26% of the grand total, the Evaluation considered that it was acceptable that gender would not be addressed and that it would not be mentioned in the available documentation. This confirmed that some projects in FAO do not need to integrate a gender perspective; however, the actual number of projects that may forgo a gender perspective is much smaller than what happened in practice during the period under evaluation.

248. For the 148 projects in Group B that represented 74% of the grand total, their goals and approach required that gender be addressed fully in project design and implementation. However, only 26% of Group B projects – or 20% in the grand total - integrated a gender perspective to some extent, while 11% of them – or 8% of the grand total - were classified as WID.

249. Within the 93 projects classified as Missed Opportunity that were 47% of the grand total, gender should have been integrated as its inclusion was instrumental in achieving established goals, but this did not happen even when interventions were clearly aimed at people. An example of this specific point were the 35 emergency initiatives, all of them aimed at providing direct assistance to people and that represented 27% of Sub-group B and 18% of the grand total. This raises doubts about the shared understanding of the mandate of the Organization and its capacity to comply with it. It is an

<sup>42</sup> The FAO portfolio 2002-2010 included 43% of projects funded through the Emergency modality.

issue that requires urgent action, at all levels, from political commitment to capacity development and accountability measures.

250. In the case of 11 projects in the Missed Opportunity group which represented 6% of the grand total, the PPRC had issued substantive comments for corrective action on gender issues, which were totally ignored during implementation according to the documentation available. Ten of these projects were TCP projects and were implemented without having to respond to any instance in the Organization on the compliance with PPRC recommendations. This raises major questions as to the understanding by some FAO staff of the corporate mandate and responsibility, as well as the significance of internal mechanisms of oversight and advice. Although it could be argued that these were isolated cases, this appears to warrant the urgent definition and application of accountability measures on compliance with FAO procedures and mandate.

251. The 39 projects that mainstreamed gender completely or partly, or 20% of the grand total, focused on the physical and economic empowerment of women. In their approach, Women were perceived as Farmers, with the focus mainly on their traditional roles and responsibilities in agriculture. Only eight of those projects - 4% of the grand total - focussed on capacity building and only three aimed at involving women in decision making processes. Thus, despite efforts to mainstream gender and equality, political and socio-cultural empowerment issues were hardly ever addressed.

252. The analysis also noted strong differences in the attention paid to gender issues among different reports relating to the same project. Examples came from both regional and national projects: some reports were totally gender-blind whereas others provided plenty of sex-disaggregated data and used gender-sensitive language. While divergence in implementation can be understood in the case of the regional project, this appears unjustified within one national project. This seemed to be caused by lack of quality assurance and accountability mechanisms on gender mainstreaming, so that it was left to individuals to take the initiative to report on gender or not. Other projects in this group did have a specific gender component in the project, but it was not clear how the gathered information was used in the other parts of the project.

253. The projects that mentioned women as a specific target group for their activities seemed to originate from the WID approach, defined women as part of the “most vulnerable groups” and not as farmers or actors who can change a situation and have solutions for problems. Apart from mentioning women as a specific target group, the language used was gender blind.

254. Last, from an empowerment perspective the analysis showed that FAO mainly focused on physical and economic empowerment of women when it did make an effort to mainstream gender in their work. Political empowerment or socio-cultural empowerment issues were hardly ever addressed. The work of the Organization resulted in some cases in women and men benefiting equally from its projects, but did not contribute to the involvement of both women and men in decision making or in political and socio-cultural empowerment. This meant that gender mainstreaming took place only partly and implications of planned actions for men and women were assessed only up to some extent. The concerns and experiences of women and men were not made an integral dimension of the design and implementation of FAO's projects. Therefore the risk of perpetuating inequality was high, as power balances did not shift much and the ultimate goal of gender equality was not achieved.

## **B. Gender qualifiers**

255. The second tool consisted in systematic revision of the projects assessed by the team at country level, against the Evaluation's definitions. This served as a ‘ground-truthing’ or validation of FAO's own use of qualifiers and of the findings of the desk-study.

256. Gender qualifiers for TCP were available in FPMIS throughout the evaluation period. In 2008, the unit dealing with TCPs (TCOT) and ESW agreed on detailed definitions of four gender qualifiers to be entered in FPMIS upon approval of a TCP, depending on the relevance of gender for the project and the extent of integration of a gender perspective. The qualifiers were: gender equality focus; gender mainstreamed; gender affirmative action; gender neutral.

257. The qualifiers were issued with a descriptor. This was not available in FPMIS and was not circulated to Budget Holders and technical officers, as the qualifiers were to be entered only by the TCP unit in HQ for TCP and Telefood projects. Still, the Evaluation also found two UNJP projects in FPMIS approved before 2010 with a gender qualifier, as most probably some project managers decided to use it, although they had no access to the full information required for a proper attribution of qualifiers. In any case, the system was put in place for the use of one category of project and no efforts were made within the TC department to scale it up to all project groups.

258. In early 2010, when the TCP formulation and approval system was decentralized fully (see Section 9.2), all Budget Holders and technical officers had been informed about the qualifiers through the TCP Manual. By the time of the Evaluability Assessment, it was too early to notice a strong change in trend to have comparable data.

259. The evaluation found that in practice, out of 152 projects<sup>43</sup> assessed directly at country level, only 36% of the projects assessed by the Evaluation (46 GAD and 11 non-GAD) had been tagged correctly, either GAD or non-GAD. All other qualifiers, either by addition or omission, were incorrect. These results are shown in Box 12 below.

**Box 12. Gender - sensitive assessment of 152 projects: revised gender qualifiers**

Evaluation qualifiers FAO qualifiers	GAD	WID	Missed Opportunity	Non GAD	Total
Identified as GAD/WID	46	12	9	13	80
Percentage within GAD	58%	15%	11%	16%	100%
Not identified as GAD/WID	22	14	25	11	72
Percentage within non GAD	31%	19%	35%	15%	100%
Grand Total	68	26	34	24	152
Percentage of each group within grand total	45%	17%	22%	16%	

Source: Evaluation team

260. Arguably, the use of gender qualifiers should have improved since late 2008, when they were better defined. The analysis of the projects assessed did not confirm this hypothesis, as qualifiers in the period October 2008-December 2010 were confirmed as accurate in 24 out of 83 cases, or 28% of the total, which was a lower average than for the overall period.

261. Typical cases of inaccurate qualification were projects in the area of Food Safety or Animal Health: their qualifier in FPMIS was 'Gender mainstreamed' when it should have been 'Gender neutral' using the options available in the system.<sup>44</sup> Other projects that were clearly integrating a gender perspective based on their stated objectives or implementation, for example a TCP for the improvement of cassava production in the Republic of Congo, or a TCP in support of the agricultural census in Nicaragua where gender was fully mainstreamed, were not tagged as gender focused in FPMIS.

262. In 2008 there was a dramatic increase in the number of projects – including GCP, OSRO and TCP - tagged as gender related in FPMIS: from an average of 38 projects qualified as gender

<sup>43</sup> These included GCP, GCPS, OSRO, TCP, UNJP and UTF.

<sup>44</sup> In the Evaluation's terminology, this corresponds to non-GAD

related in the period 2002-2007, the number grew to 106. The number increased again in 2009 by 20% and then dropped by 50% to 62 in 2010.<sup>45</sup>

263. There were no clear reasons for such variations though three potential causes were identified: i) a requirement to report to ESW on the contribution of the TCP to the gender outputs of the Organization; ii) the introduction of the gender qualifiers, i.e. a tool was eventually available at least for some to classify the projects in relation to gender issues; and iii) an enhanced level of attention across the Organization to gender issues, following the consultations in 2007 for the preparation of GAD-PoA 2008-13. All these processes called attention at corporate level to the need to integrate a gender perspective in the field programme of the Organization. Thus, although no specific weighting can be attributed to each of those potential factors, what emerged from the evidence available was that requirements on reporting and corporate-level discussions on gender issues do result in improved attention to gender equality issues, including at project level.

264. Further, there is little doubt that FAO should urgently simplify the gender qualifiers in FPMIS, publicize them and clarify to all project managers in FAO their use. The accuracy of the information needs to be monitored when entered in the system.

### C. Conclusions

265. The two Evaluation tools described above contributed with solid evidence to the analysis of what was and what should have been the extent of gender mainstreaming in FAO's projects. The two sets of data have been illustrated separately as they cannot really be compared in mathematical terms with each other given the different composition of respective samples – the first completely random and statistically representative of a universe of projects considered as non-GAD by FAO and the second fully purposive from among projects identified as GAD by FAO.

266. For example, the lower share of Missed Opportunities among the projects assessed at country level (22% against 47%) was undoubtedly due to the choice of the countries to be visited: they were selected based on a larger number of GAD/WID initiatives and this was also a consequence of strong national policies in favour of gender equality, which impacted on all projects. Further, the use of gender qualifiers in FPMIS affected up to 26% of the projects identified as GAD/WID during the Evaluability Assessment.<sup>46</sup>

267. This having been said, the Evaluation team decided to show the two sets of findings together so as to provide what appear to be broad indicators of trends in the integration of gender concerns in FAO's field programme has been over the period 2002-2010. Box 13 below illustrates the result of this merging.

---

<sup>45</sup> A similar increase was noted in percentage terms when compared against the total number of projects initiated in each year.

<sup>46</sup> Within the list of 595 projects identified as GAD/WID, 155 projects were selected in FPMIS through gender qualifiers.



**Box 13. Gender - sensitive assessment of 352 FAO projects: revised gender qualifiers**

Evaluation qualifiers FAO qualifiers	GAD	WID	Missed Opportunity	Non GAD	Total
Identified as GAD/WID	46	12	9	13	80
Percentage within GAD	58%	15%	11%	16%	100%
Not identified as GAD/WID	61	30	118	63	272
Percentage within non GAD	22%	11%	43%	23%	
Grand Total	107	42	127	76	352
Percentage within grand total	30%	12%	36%	22%	

Source: Evaluation team

268. On the basis of these data, a few key findings emerged on the degree to which a gender perspective had been integrated into the work of FAO, what it should have been and what was reported, in terms of numbers of projects<sup>47</sup>. The following conclusions could be drawn:

FAO integrated gender concerns and included women in approximately 40% of its projects operational in the period 2002-2010; the extent of gender mainstreaming varied widely, but a GAD approach was more frequently followed than a WID approach;

A gender perspective was not required in approximately 20% of FAO's projects: this confirmed that some of the work of the Organization was really 'gender-neutral', although this applied to a much smaller share of the field programme than what was usually stated by FAO technical officers and what had been identified during the Evaluability Assessment (91% of the total);

The share of projects where gender should have been integrated but was not, was rather large: approximately 35-40% of FAO projects across the two samples were assessed as Missed Opportunities in terms of recognizing the relevance and importance of gender equality concerns to their stated objectives. This will be the real challenge to FAO, how to decrease substantially the number of projects wherein gender is not taken into account despite the need to do so.

Thus, FAO should have integrated gender issues in approximately 75-80% of its projects: this was almost twice as much as what happened in practice and almost ten times the number of project that FAO had identified as GAD/WID.

269. Last, an important point that emerged was that the FPMIS gender qualifiers fell short of their potential: the main cause was the absence of their application to all projects by FAO, supported by a clear communication strategy on their use and a quality assurance and monitoring mechanism as a follow-up. This may have been caused partly by FAO's generic inadequate attention to proper reporting and information sharing, which was highlighted by other evaluations. However, it appears to be mainly linked to the fact that there was little understanding within the TC Department about the importance of being able to retrieve reliable information on gender mainstreaming across the field programme of the Organization.

## VII. Assessment of gender mainstreaming in FAO's technical work

270. This Chapter assesses the extent and quality of FAO's efforts to mainstream gender throughout its technical work excluding ESW, although in some cases ESW contributed to it at different levels. The Chapter builds on the evidence and detail provided in the sectoral and regional

<sup>47</sup> For the sake of simplicity, the analysis was done on the number of projects. It should be intended as indicative also for budgets.

annexes to the report, namely on Animal Production and Health, Disaster Risk Management, Fisheries, Forestry and other units, as well as for Africa, Asia and the Pacific, Europe and Central Asia and Latin America and the Caribbean.<sup>48</sup> It also provides an overall picture of Regular Programme and Voluntary resources allocated to GAD and of the quality of FAO Global Public Goods from a gender perspective. Finally, it includes the synthesis of the assessment of FAO staff awareness about gender mainstreaming and their competence in this area.

#### **A. FAO field programme resources for Gender and Development**

271. The FAO field programme is funded through the Technical Cooperation Programme (TCP), with resources allocated within the corporate biennial Net Appropriation, and through Voluntary contributions from resource partners. It comprises what is usually known as ‘operational work’, ‘field programme’ or ‘projects and programmes’. As already mentioned, during the Evaluability Assessment, 595 GAD projects were identified for a total budget slightly above USD 944 million. These were the figures taken for a broader analysis of the GAD portfolio, in consideration of the caveats discussed in Section 6.3 above. Also, as only 1.2% of the resources identified as GAD was absorbed by ESW-led projects, the analysis here includes ESW funds as well.

272. Within the total GAD portfolio amount, 73% of the budget resources were for Technical Cooperation (TC) initiatives and 27% for Emergency. GAD TC initiatives represented a higher share of resources within the overall TC resources than GAD Emergency projects within the overall Emergency portfolio (17% and 8% respectively).

273. In terms of numbers of projects, GAD projects were 9% of the total number of initiatives; within the TC portfolio, the percentage rose to 12% but among the emergency projects, the share was 5%. For HIV and AIDS, number of projects was below 1% for both TC and emergency groups. Box 14 and Box 15 illustrate these data, for financial resources and number of projects respectively.<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>48</sup> See Annexes 9 to 17

<sup>49</sup> See also Annex 4, Inventory of FAO projects related to GAD and HIV and AIDS

**Box 14. Field programme resources (budget) identified as GAD/WID and HIV and AIDS related in the period 2002-2010**

Project categories/budget and project numbers	FAO total Field programme portfolio (million USD)	% within total	GAD related project portfolio (million USD)	% within total	HIV and AIDS related project portfolio (million USD)	% within total
Total FAO projects operational in 2002-2010	7,119	100%	944.0	13%	35.0	0.5%
Total FAO technical cooperation projects operational in 2002-2010	4,080	57%	693.0	17%	14.0	0.3%
Total FAO emergency projects operational in 2002-2010	3,039	43%	251.0	8%	22.0	0.7%
<b>All GAD related projects</b>						
All GAD related projects			944.0	100%		
All technical cooperation projects			693.0	73%		
All emergency projects			251.0	27%		
<b>Technical cooperation projects GAD and HIV and AIDS related, 2002-2010</b>						
All technical cooperation projects			693.0	100%	14.0	100%
TCP projects 2002-2010			73.0	10%	1.3	9%
Voluntary funded projects 2002-2010			621.0	90%	12.0	89%
<b>Emergency projects GAD and HIV and AIDS related, 2002-2010</b>						
All emergency projects			251.0	100%	22.0	100%
TCP projects 2002-2010			10.0	4%	0	
Voluntary funded projects 2002-2010			240.0	96%	22.0	100%

Source: FAO, elaborated by Evaluation team

**Box 15. Field programme resources (number of projects) identified as GAD/WID and HIV and AIDS related in the period 2002-2010**

Project categories/budget and project numbers	FAO total project number	% within total	Number of GAD related projects	% within total	Number of HIV and AIDS related project	% within total
Total FAO projects operational in 2002-2010	6,283	100%	595	9%	39	0.6%
Total FAO technical cooperation projects operational in 2002-2010	3,920	62%	471	12%	26	0.7%
Total FAO emergency projects operational in 2002-2010	2,363	38%	124	5%	13	0.6%
<b>All GAD related projects</b>						
All GAD related projects			595	100%	39	100%
All technical cooperation projects			471	79%	26	67%
All emergency projects			124	21%	13	33%
<b>Technical cooperation projects GAD and HIV and AIDS related, 2002-2010</b>						
All technical cooperation projects			471	100%	26	100%
TCP projects 2002-2010			227	48%	5	19%
Voluntary funded projects 2002-2010			244	52%	21	81%
<b>Emergency projects GAD and HIV and AIDS related, 2002-2010</b>						
All emergency projects			124	100%	13	100%
TCP projects 2002-2010			26	21%	0	
Voluntary funded projects 2002-2010			98	79%	13	100%

Source: FAO, elaborated by Evaluation team

274. In terms of budget, Voluntary funded projects represented the overwhelming share of both GAD and HIV and AIDS portfolios, ranging from 90% to 96% for GAD/WID technical cooperation and emergency interventions respectively and from 89% to 100% for HIV and AIDS technical cooperation and emergency interventions respectively. Resource partners' contributions to GAD technical cooperation or emergency projects and HIV and AIDS initiatives varied quite widely. In the case of HIV and AIDS, the Republic of South Africa was the largest donor by far, followed by Germany, Sweden and Belgium. The European Commission, the USA and the United Nations

Development Group were the largest partners: this reflected their overall contribution to FAO's Emergency and Rehabilitation work. Spain and the United Kingdom were the largest contributors to GAD technical cooperation projects as well as with funds specifically in support of ESW-led initiatives.

275. FAO's contributions through the TCP programme for GAD initiatives represented 9% of the total GAD resources and 3% for HIV and AIDS. This represented approximately 20% of the TCP total portfolio during the period 2002-2010; also, the TCP contribution was the second largest after Spain - and before the UK - for GAD technical cooperation initiatives, the fourth in rank for GAD emergency projects and the seventh in rank for HIV and AIDS.

276. Resource allocation to GAD and HIV and AIDS initiatives varied hugely across units and between the TC and Emergency portfolios. Within the Technical Cooperation portfolio and excluding ESW from the ranking, the unit leading the Special Programme for Food Security (TCSF/TCOS) had the largest share of GAD/WID project resources corresponding to 37% of the TC divisional resources. The second and third largest shares were within ESS (33%) and AGA (28%).

277. When looking at emergency resources, all Regional Offices together had the largest share of GAD projects within their own resources. Box 16 below illustrates these data for those units that had the largest share of GAD/WID projects. Respective values for ESW were also included for comparison purpose.

**Box 16. Share of GAD and HIV and AIDS financial resources within the field programme portfolio 2002-2010 of some selected units**

Selected FAO Units as LTU	Percentage of GAD projects budget within the technical cooperation portfolio 2002-2010	Percentage of GAD projects budget within the emergency portfolio 2002-2010	Total share of GAD and HIV and AIDS projects budget within divisional field programme portfolio
AGA (AGA, AGAL, AGAP, AGAS)	28%	7%	15%
AGAH	3%	12%	11%
AGN/ESN (including HIV and AIDS projects)	12%	18%	13%
AGP	8%	7%	8%
AGS	13%	20%	17%
ESS	33%	0%	33%
EST	16%	0%	15%
ESW/SDW (including HIV and AIDS projects)	98%	99%	98%
Fisheries Department	18%	10%	16%
Forestry Department	9%	0%	8%
NRLW/AGLW	9%	2%	5%
Regional Offices	17%	71%	18%
Sub-regional Offices	19%	2%	10%
TCI (Investment Centre)	11%	3%	7%
TCSF/TCOS (Special Programme for Food Security)	37%		37%

*Source: Evaluation team*

278. Thus, the Evaluability Assessment indicated a broad variability in the extent of gender mainstreaming in FAO's projects across technical departments and organizational levels. These are discussed partly below and partly in other sections of the report.

279. As already discussed, the absence of a reliable corporate systems for marking GAD/WID projects was a major cause for the different capacity of FAO's units to report on this type of work.

280. Further, despite the existence of the GAD Plans of Action and SO-K, the advocacy work by ESW within the Organization and the PPRC criteria for project appraisal, in most cases the decision about whether and how to mainstream gender in the technical work of the Organization was made by individual officers responsible for formulating and backstopping projects or by individual project managers at field level. In this respect, there were very few cases of Division Directors who encouraged, let alone required, that gender be systematically taken into account across the work of their division and supported the divisional Gender Focal Point in this effort. The Evaluation came across several cases at country level, for example in Bolivia, Central America, The Philippines and Uganda, where project managers made an effort to modify approaches and plans of work and recruit

gender specialists, to mainstream gender and enhance the effectiveness and sustainability of their projects.

281. The limited competence of FAO staff to integrate a gender perspective in their work was another key factor affecting gender mainstreaming in the field programme; this is discussed in detail in Section 7.4 below.

## **B. Gender mainstreaming in FAO's technical work**

282. The range of field programme initiatives that FAO had identified as GAD/WID related was quite varied. Despite the overall limited numbers, all departments and most technical divisions had carried out one or more projects wherein women were participants or a gender perspective had been taken into account at some point in time. However, a common factor in projects across all sectors and regions was the virtually total absence of information, references and data in project reports and terminal statements on sex-disaggregated composition of participants, actions that may have led to improvements of women's and men's livelihoods and empowerment and any other gender-relevant observation. This confirmed the finding of the desk-study discussed in Chapter 6, about gender-blind language.

283. At the operational level, differences in working modality between Technical Cooperation and Emergency initiatives led the team to analyze these two groups separately, even if some commonalities were eventually found. Also, the team carried out regional and sectoral analysis, and both perspectives are synthesized here.

284. The analysis at regional level showed that in general, FAO's performance in GAD/WID work had not matched the policy commitments of some of its Member States at national level, nor the statements of FAO's Member States in the Regional Conferences. This happened even in a country like the Philippines, where the political environment favoured a strong affirmative action. On the other hand, there were positive examples of efforts to meet governments' policies in Uganda and Nicaragua, where the FAO Representatives made specific efforts to integrate gender across all the Organization's work at country level.<sup>50</sup> In other countries, such as the Dominican Republic and Bolivia, efforts were made but achievements were still limited.

285. The regional strategic frameworks for Africa and for Asia and the Pacific reflected gender relations as a factor to be taken into account to achieve food security; however, apart from a few exceptions, the FAO Country Programming Frameworks and sub-regional plans or visions that were analyzed had not integrated this at all. The Evaluation of the Regional Office for the Near East and North Africa came to the conclusion that on gender issues, FAO had been passive and unable to take the lead on the topic. Overall, in none of the countries visited by the Evaluation team was FAO perceived as a champion in promoting gender equality for rural women despite its mandate.

286. In all regions, FAO's performance in GAD/WID initiatives was variable. There were projects that had integrated gender appropriately. Those included: the SPFS in Nicaragua; Rice yield improvement in the Philippines and APFAMGS in India; Good practices Capitalization in support of food production and food security project with the Inventory credit (warrantage) component in Niger and National strategy for the dairy sector in Uganda; and Afforestation and Reforestation in Armenia, to mention only a few. In these projects, the positive achievements in gender mainstreaming depended on a variable mix of good ProDoc, committed staff in FAO and always very committed and competent project managers. For example, in the case of APFAMGS in India, for example, the project's good performance in gender mainstreaming was due to a strong commitment to gender equality of the NGO consortium implementing it. In Nicaragua SPFS, the commitment of the project director made a significant difference in FAO's role in the preparation of the national strategy for food and nutritional security, which fully integrated a gender perspective.

287. Equally, in all regions a number of WID projects were found, where women participated in different proportions, but little attention was paid to gender relations or how the project would affect those or be affected by them. Usually, traditional divisions of gender roles were reinforced,

---

50 See Box 24 later in the report on Nicaragua.

including unequal ones. Positive examples included the Urban and Peri Urban Agriculture projects in Latin America, where women could be up to 90% of the participants and their immediate needs in terms of food and nutritional security were well met; a less positive example was the Yunttagi project in Turkey, which proposed support for female traditional activities, without realizing they were farmers with needs like any other small producer for inputs and technical assistance.

288. Missed Opportunity projects were also identified in all regions. Among these, regional projects tended not to take into account differences among countries on gender issues and missed the opportunity to enhance their effectiveness in each country. Last, a minor percentage of non-GAD projects was also noted, across different technical sectors.

289. Through the team's scoring of projects, some differences were noted across regions. In particular, Africa performed substantially better than any other region in integrating gender in its field programme. Two factors may have played a role: in this region, women's contribution to agriculture is by far the highest in the world, which may contribute to making gender equality an important political and economic factor; and the presence of an ESW regional officer who could have an influence, albeit limited, on colleagues and possibly on project formulation. In other regions, the lack of accountability at corporate level on gender mainstreaming appeared to be a major cause of weak performance.

290. When taking the sectoral perspective, the Emergency and Rehabilitation work represented 27% of the GAD portfolio. The Evaluation noted that in general, in the countries visited efforts had been made by Emergency Coordinators to include women as beneficiaries. An internal TCE review for the period 2004-2010 produced a list of 17 projects assessed as Good Practice examples, a number of which came from the Emergency Coordination Units of Niger and Somalia: three of these projects<sup>51</sup> were assessed by the Evaluation which confirmed that they had mainstreamed gender adequately in design and implementation. For example, the Somalia Emergency Coordination Unit (ECU) established a Gender Desk in its Programme Development and Support Unit in September 2007, which had resulted in improved staff efforts in designing projects with stronger gender components, and which had also strengthened the collection and analysis of gender statistics.

291. In other cases, in particular for the input-distribution type of interventions, and similar to what happened within the TC portfolio, the competence and awareness on gender issues of the local project manager was the key factor making the real difference in the level of women's participation and attention to gender issues in the projects. An exemplary case was visited in the Dominican Republic, where the same project operated in two neighbouring provinces with two different regional coordinators and achieved completely different results for local women who had been equally affected by tropical storms.

292. Also in the GAD Technical Cooperation group, projects were assessed and identified within all categories, and findings were not too dissimilar overall from those at regional level.

293. The analysis of projects in the Fisheries and Aquaculture Sector concluded that although half of the projects could be classified as GAD and WID, failure to institutionalize satisfactory understanding of gender in project design and implementation severely limited the potential effectiveness of interventions in the fisheries sector. One good example in this sector is described in detail in Box 17 below.

---

51 In Niger, projects were OSRO/NER/802/BEL; OSRO/NER/803/EC; in Somalia, it was OSRO/SOM/601/DEN.



### Box 17. Regional Fisheries Livelihood Programme for Southeast Asia

The regional fisheries livelihood programme (RFLP) was a four year programme concerned with improving the livelihoods of small-scale coastal fisheries communities and contributing to the sustainable management of aquatic resources in Cambodia, Indonesia, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, Timor-Leste and Viet Nam. Although gender was not the primary interest of the RFLP and received relatively little attention in the project planning stage, during implementation team members quickly recognized that gender had to be seen as a major focus of any fisheries and livelihoods programme. Thus gender analysis had been included in the baseline studies carried out in all participating countries and each had appointed a gender focal point to liaise with project management. An APO had been appointed to provide gender advice to the project and act as the Gender Focal Point of the regional team who was based in Bangkok.

In the absence of suitable gender tools for the fisheries sector, an international consultant was employed to produce a handbook on gender mainstreaming in the project cycle with special reference to artisanal fisheries. In November 2010 a workshop was held in Siem Reap, Cambodia which brought together representatives from participating countries and external specialists to discuss the draft of this handbook and other issues relevant to gender in the small-scale fisheries sector.

The project was still at an early stage of implementation but it showed an awareness of the importance of gender that was frequently absent in the fisheries sector. Given the range of gender relations in fishing communities through Southeast Asia, the recognition of the need for competent gender inputs was laudable. However, it is also worth noting that this was the second time FAO had attempted to produce a guide on gender in small-scale fisheries (the first was a SEAGA guide relating to fisheries in Uganda), and that the officer charged with overseeing gender aspects of this project was relatively very junior.

*Source: Evaluation team*

294. Findings in the other technical areas tended to confirm that few projects had internalized gender appropriately, if at all, in their Project Documents. However, in a number of cases project managers and field staff had been able to adjust strategy and approach and strived to enhance effectiveness and sustainability. Competence and interest of the concerned LTU officer also made a difference: within the Animal Production and Health sector, support to livestock related policy work received very different type of inputs from AGAH officers located in different Sub-regional offices, gender-focused in one case and gender-blind in the other.

295. Only a few SPFS projects were analyzed, and this limited the validity of the conclusions. However, based on earlier evaluations, in the case of this flagship programme of the Organization, gender mainstreaming was not a corporate requirement and the few projects that had succeeded, for example in Central America, Ghana, Laos and Sri Lanka, did so mostly thanks to the commitment of project managers and FAO Representatives.

296. A clear and recurrent finding that emerged from the Evaluation was that when project implementation was done through partnerships with national women's associations and organizations, both governmental and non governmental, effectiveness and sustainability were strongly enhanced. This was noted in several countries, and the UNJP model discussed in Chapter 8.3 should be also included as a positive example. Box 18 below illustrates the case of a TCP in the Dominican Republic where women's needs in terms of economic and social empowerment were properly met and resulted in improved food security and social empowerment of the participants.

**Box 18. TCP/DOM/3004 Cassava production and use rehabilitation of women farmers organizations to support food security.**

The project was managed by the National Confederation of Rural Women (CONAMUCA) in the Dominican Republic. The confederation was formed in 1986 and currently had 10,000 members. Ninety women and 10 men had directly benefited from the project, and women had been able to gain access to land through a project that supported negotiations with male owners, and productivity and production improvements as well as marketing and access to micro-credit. Two greenhouses had been set up as well as a cassava processing plant.

The project paved the way for later support through Spanish cooperation for literacy education and apparently also facilitated better coordination with the Secretary of Agriculture and the Ministry of Education. Recently Veterinaires Sans Frontières had provided further support, visibility and empowerment for the women participating in the initiative.

Overall, this was a good opportunity to address women's needs in terms of economic and social empowerment, using agricultural production and food security as an entry point for more wide-ranging empowering initiatives.

The project showed that it was beneficial to all stakeholders when FAO developed partnerships with women's organizations that had technical capacity, in the role of project implementing partner.

*Source: Evaluation team*

297. A different case was AGN, FAO's Nutrition unit. Most nutrition and in particular nutrition education projects run by AGN had high numbers of women participating. However, they tended to be WID rather than GAD in terms of approach as they 'excluded' men in their role as fathers and husbands from project activities, usually for cultural reasons and the safe approach of not challenging traditional gender roles. The Evaluation of FAO's role and work in Nutrition identified innovative initiatives in Bangladesh and Cambodia, involving male household members and community male leaders in nutrition education. Lessons should be learned from these cases and efforts focused to adapt and upscale them elsewhere in future, in particular in urban and peri-urban areas where family roles are undergoing dramatic changes, and fathers are increasingly called upon to be responsible for food preparation in the households.

298. Last, as discussed in Chapter 6, the Evaluation team revised directly the gender qualifiers of 152 projects in total. Of these, 118 were classified as Technical Cooperation, with 65 identified as GAD and 53 non-GAD, and 34 had been implemented within the Emergency and rehabilitation modality, 15 of which had been identified as GAD and 19 Non-GAD.<sup>52</sup> Besides other analytical parameters, the Evaluation also re-classified them in terms of the gender definitions adopted by the Evaluation, i.e. GAD, WID, Missed Opportunity and non-GAD. Box 19 and Box 20 illustrate the scoring by FAO and by the team for Technical Cooperation and for Emergency projects.

**Box 19. Gender-sensitive assessment of technical cooperation projects: revised gender qualifiers**

Evaluation qualifiers FAO qualifiers	GAD	WID	Missed Opportunity	Non GAD	Total
Identified as GAD/WID	38	9	8	10	65
Not identified as GAD/WID	15	9	22	7	53
Total	53	18	30	17	118
Percentage within total	45%	15%	25%	14%	

*Source: Evaluation team*

<sup>52</sup> See section 2.3 for the methodology for the project selection criteria and Section 6.3 for a detailed analysis of the gender qualifiers mechanism. Percentage values should be taken as indicative of trends.

**Box 20. Gender - sensitive assessment of emergency projects: revised gender qualifiers**

Evaluation qualifiers FAO qualifiers	GAD	WID	Missed Opportunity	Non GAD	Total
Identified as GAD/WID	8	3	1	3	15
Not identified as GAD/WID	7	5	3	4	19
Total	15	8	4	7	34
Percentage within total	44%	24%	12%	21%	

*Source: Evaluation team*

299. These figures, as explained in more detail in Chapter 6, reflect the sample composition, skewed in favour of GAD projects and of countries where national policies may have played a role in integrating a gender perspective. Thus in both groups, projects assessed as GAD were the relative majority and when summed up with WID initiatives, reached the large majority.

300. In relative terms the Emergency portfolio in the sample performed slightly better than the TC group of projects, in particular the WID category. The Emergency non-GAD projects mostly included AGAH initiatives, aimed at capacity development at the institutional level on transboundary disease surveillance.

301. Other non-GAD projects within the TC group were identified across most FAO units and no clear pattern could be identified in terms of units or divisions with projects mostly in one category or the other within this sample. Annex 4 illustrates the revised qualifiers on a project by project basis: this analysis may be a first step for FAO units to revise the way they perceive gender should be mainstreamed in their activities.

### **C. Gender mainstreaming in FAO's Global Public Goods**

302. The Evaluation team assessed GPGs identified as GAD by several FAO units and Decentralized Offices. All sectoral and regional annexes discuss in detail their GAD and non GAD GPGs<sup>53</sup> and chapters 4 and 5 discuss GPGs produced by ESW on gender and HIV and AIDS issues respectively.

303. However, it was considered that the overall picture of non-ESW GPGs would be useful, as it broadly illustrates how FAO integrated a gender perspective in one of its main modalities of work. Box 21 illustrates the following:

- the scoring for 22 ESW GPGs focused on general gender and agriculture topics, excluding those on HIV and AIDS, for ease of comparison;
- the average scoring of 58 GAD GPGs produced by FAO technical units in HQ, with or without ESW involvement;
- the average scoring of 40 GAD GPGs produced by the Regional Offices, most of them produced with the full or partial involvement of ESW officers in the office;
- the average scoring of 103 non-GAD GPGs produced by FAO technical units in HQ;
- the average scoring of FAO's flagship publications SOFA, SOFI, SOFIA and SOFO.

<sup>53</sup> It was decided to analyze only GAD GPGs produced by the Regional offices.

**Box 21. GAD and non-GAD GPGs produced by FAO HQ technical units excluding ESW, in 2002-2010: average scoring**

Criteria Type of products	Relevance of GAD to the topic (1-6)	Technical quality of GAD contents (1-6)	Innovativeness on GAD (1-6)	Potential impact as advocacy tool (1-6)	Potential impact as capacity development tool (1-6)	Links between GAD and social inclusion (1-6)	Number products
ESW	5.4	4.3	3.9	4.3	4.0	4.2	22
Average scoring GAD GPG	5.4	3.9	3.3	3.9	3.1	3.3	58
Regional Offices	5.2	4.5	3.8	4.4	4.4	3.9	40
Average scoring non-GAD GPG	4.3	2.1	1.9	2.3	2.2	1.9	103
Average scoring SOFA	4.3	2.9	2.6	3.1	2.4	2.7	7
Average scoring SOFI	5.0	3.8	3.1	3.5	3.4	3.3	8
Average scoring SOFIA	4.4	2.8	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.8	5
Average scoring SOFO	3.5	2.3	1.5	4.3	4.0	2.3	4

Source: Evaluation team

304. The analysis showed that gender had been an important element in the understanding and discussion of the topics treated in most groups of products, although as expected, relevance was higher for the GAD products, including those produced by the regional offices. For the non-GAD products, gender was also an element that should have been taken into account in most flagship publications, with the exception of SOFO where it was slightly less relevant.

305. The scores attributed to the products issued by the regional offices were very similar to those by ESW. Across all regions, the highest score went to relevance. The products issued by RLC received the highest scoring on average, though they tended to be somewhat out-dated, in particular a number of country fact-sheets that had been published between 2003 and 2005. One of the best scoring products from RAF was the Agri-Gender Toolkit, along with a study on land tenure in Ghana and one HIV and AIDS related analysis on Eastern and Southern Africa. Products from RAP and REU received lower scoring. The analysis for RAP products highlighted that attention to gender and women tended to be superficial, mostly informed by a WID rather than GAD approach and not innovative. Products by REU were very few and mostly related to the expert meetings of a FAO statutory body, the Working Party on Women and the Agricultural Family in Rural development.

306. The average scoring of all criteria other than relevance for the sectoral GAD products was between 3 and 4, i.e. between inadequate and adequate. A higher scoring was assigned to technical quality of the GAD contents and to their potential as advocacy tools, but innovativeness, potential as capacity development tool and the links between GAD and social inclusion were closer to 'inadequate'.

307. Although a few good GPGs had been produced in all areas analyzed, those receiving a higher score at sectoral level related to Food Security and had been prepared by ESA: they were well written, well informed by theory and based on solid data. They could also be used effectively as advocacy tools. Also GPGs related to forestry were well appreciated, as they analyzed appropriately issues of gender in access to and control of forest resources.

308. On the other hand, GAD GPGs for the fisheries sector and on Animal Production and Health were rated as of lower quality. More than half of the AGA products mentioned gender only in passing, despite the high relevance of the theme to the topics. The fisheries products often failed to recognize the importance of women as producers and how technology change, for example, could impact differently on men and women depending on gender relations.

309. These findings show that in many cases, although the relevance of a gender perspective was high for most topics, the competence and/or interest of technical units outside ESW to integrate a gender perspective in the normative products they considered GAD/WID was limited.

310. The scoring of GPGs selected randomly from the FAO Web site that had not been identified as GAD confirmed this trend even further. With the exception of the Animal Production and Health products whose average score for relevance was 3.8, for all other non-GAD GPGs gender appeared relevant or very relevant. However, aside from relevance, all other criteria scored below adequate, including for the flagship publications SOFA, SOFI, SOFIA and SOFO.

311. A notable exception was the recently issued 'The State of Food and Agriculture 2010-11. Women in agriculture: Closing the gender gap for development' (SOFA 2010-11)<sup>54</sup> The publication provides hard data and empirical evidence on gender and on those aspects, it may become a milestone of information on gender. The report was the result of an intensive and wide-reaching inter-departmental and interagency cooperation effort on gender. A deliberate corporate decision was to choose the business case, or 'instrumentalist approach' as opposed to a 'rights-based approach' for addressing gender issues in agriculture as it was considered that the former would be a more effective argument to motivate agricultural policy makers. Admittedly, also within FAO, the business case approach seemed to be a stronger argument: this is discussed later in Chapter 11 on Corporate Culture.

312. FAO as a whole with the other Rome-based agencies, and ESA and ESW in particular, launched the report on International Women's Day, 8 March 2011, with extensive press coverage. In Latin America, RLC organized a video conference with all sub-regional and country offices in the region to present it and give the opportunity to FAO staff to discuss its core findings and message. Box 22 below discusses SOFA 2010-11 in detail.

---

54 FAO, 2011. The State of Food and Agriculture 2010-11. Women in agriculture: Closing the gender gap for development. Rome. ISBN 978-92-5-06768-0: <http://www.fao.org/docrep/013/i2050e/i2050e00.htm>.

**Box 22. The State of Food and Agriculture 2010-11. Women in agriculture: Closing the gender gap for development**

SOFA 2010-11 is a praiseworthy effort. It makes a good case on this crucial problem and has been long overdue. It raises the importance of gender in FAO's flagship reports. The Evaluation considers the following as its main positive features:

It pulls together various research studies on gender and agriculture from around the world in an attempt to make the case for closing the gender gap convincing and reliable;

It is a rich source of information, data and statistics on the productivity of men and women in agriculture and also on the constraints faced by women in agriculture;

It has noted a large number of parameters, productive and strategic, that can constrain the productivity of women in agriculture and rural development and it attempts to estimate the gains from closing the gender gap.

However there were some weaknesses or missing links in the analysis of how these gains can be achieved that would need to be addressed in order to close the gender gap. A few suggestions are offered below for future work, on how the analysis and calculation of the gains from closing the gender gap could be improved.

1) SOFA 2010-11 does not include access to and control over water for agriculture in the analysis, although this is a key element in the gender gap in agriculture. Any calculation of a percentage increase in productivity and yields in agriculture as a result of closing the gender gap is incomplete if water is not taken into account. Although land, improved seeds, fertilizers and education impact agricultural yield and productivity, farmers' decisions on how to use these resources and inputs are often influenced by the availability of water for irrigation. There is a growing body of knowledge on the relative productivity of rainfed and irrigated agriculture and its gender implications, as well as on the implications of climate change for rainfed agricultural productivity and gender. These would need to be taken into account in order to calculate the gender gap and gender gains.

2) SOFA 2010-11 has not provided a detailed analysis of intra-household data on the relative productivity of men and women in farming households. The difficulty in obtaining relevant data is well acknowledged. While it is assumed that the document intends to compare women's access to resources with men's access to resources, by using the terms male-headed households vs. female-headed households, it actually compares households that contain men with households that do not contain men. These data are not comparable: they are biased in favour of the male-headed households, which contain productive men and women, and which would have better access to resources than households without men. In future efforts it would be important to explain clearly what type of data are being compared and for what purpose. It is clear that intra-household data are not available and therefore the document does not take into account the important contribution of productive women in male-headed households or, as the document describes, households that contain men. Thus, the challenge ahead is how to recognize and measure the significant contribution that women make to agricultural production and decision making as family members and when they themselves manage the farms belonging to their families. It will be necessary to put an economic value to the contribution of men and women within households in the context of access and control over resources and decision making power in order to fully understand the gender gap. For example, comparison could be made between how men and women farmers use the resources and assets available to them and what type of decisions they are likely to make in terms of crops and inputs, considering that these decisions have an impact on productivity and yields.

*Source: Evaluation team*

313. The whole Evaluation team also scored SOFA 2010-11 as it did with the other SOFA products issued during the period under evaluation. Box 23 below illustrates the average result.

**Box 23. The State of Food and Agriculture 2010-11. Women in agriculture: Closing the gender gap for development: average scoring**

Criteria Type of products	Relevance of GAD to the topic (1-6)	Technical quality of GAD contents (1-6)	Innovativeness on GAD (1-6)	Potential impact as advocacy tool (1-6)	Potential impact as capacity development tool (1-6)	Links between GAD and social inclusion (1-6)
SOFA 2010-11	6.0	4.9	4.3	5.4	4.1	4.4

*Source: Evaluation team*

314. Regarding the GPGs overall, there were a number of issues common to most FAO GPGs, namely:

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

315. Similarly to the finding about the ESW GPGs, with the exception of SEAGA and the Gender in Agriculture Sourcebook, very few if any at all of these products were known by FAO staff in the countries visited or external stakeholders. In Latin America, only one person in Nicaragua mentioned her frequent use of an RLC analysis of women's conditions in the country. Admittedly, limited knowledge and use of FAO's documents and publications outside the Organization, and sometimes even within the house itself, is a common weakness of probably the majority of FAO's GPGs with few exceptions. This however should not prevent the Evaluation from voicing its concerns, and calling attention to this gap in diffusion and communication of corporate products. This is not only a matter of corporate image; poor attention and diffusion and use of FAO's GAD related GPGs affects negatively their relevance as well as the effectiveness and efficiency of a substantial part of the Organization's work and raises legitimate questions on its purpose and role.

#### **D. FAO staff competence on gender**

316. The Evaluation held extensive meetings with FAO staff in HQ and decentralized offices, including previous and current Gender Focal Points and managers of the GAD and non-GAD projects that were planned for assessment in the countries. This information was triangulated with data from the staff surveys conducted by FAO Independent External Evaluation in 2007 and the Gender Audit in 2010.

317. The picture was quite varied; awareness of the importance of gender issues tended to be good to high, with a few notable negative exceptions also in units working at field level. However, as discussed more in detail later in the report (see Chapter 11), awareness of the relevance of gender to FAO's work was often not matched by equal understanding and competence in integrating a gender perspective in technical work.

318. Some units in HQ had started in recent years to devote visible efforts to raising awareness and capacity across their staff on gender issues: examples were the Investment Centre, the Emergency and Rehabilitation Division, the Animal Production and Health Division, and the regional offices for Africa and for Asia and the Pacific. These initiatives did not seem to have translated yet in substantive

improvements in the level of gender mainstreaming in their projects and products, and gaps in some staff's understanding were noted during the Evaluation. Admittedly, longer time spans are necessary for outcomes and impacts of this type of initiative to be brought to bear.

319. Virtually none of the FAO officers interviewed outside these units, in HQ and at country level, had received training on gender issues since they had joined the Organization. A few had participated in workshops on SEAGA in the first half of the 2000s, or even before, but had not really ever used it in their work. None of the project managers at country level had ever received any technical support from FAO on this topic.

320. Most of the competent staff on gender issues in different units had developed this understanding and knowledge in their earlier professional experiences. For example, one staff member explained that he had worked in the field for many years before joining FAO and came from a farming background himself. Therefore he knew from experience the different tasks of men and women within the farming system and paid attention to gender aspects of his work automatically. In another case, a senior male officer was appointed GFP in 2010; he was knowledgeable about gender issues as he had worked with an international NGO and had participated in training courses. Other project staff, in Bangladesh and Bolivia for example, had been trained in gender and social inclusion in their earlier careers by international NGOs.

321. Even in units where gender awareness was good and integrated to some extent in their work, for example the Fisheries Division, there was still a tendency to view gender as being solely a matter concerning women, and to take a WID rather than GAD approach to development issues. Equally, the tendency was to focus on the household and not on the wider set of social relationships – including gender – within which the household is set. These were indeed common features in the perception of staff across the whole Organization.

322. In general, technical officers in HQ and in DOs tended to be less aware and knowledgeable about gender issues, whereas some project managers in a few countries were competent and capable of integrating a gender perspective in the projects they were running, often despite gender- and people-blind ProDocs. None among them however had been selected because of his or her competence also in gender issues; therefore the added value they were providing was due to their personal commitment and was a bonus to FAO's *modus operandi*.

323. Many staff members indicated that they needed practical assistance and guidance on how to incorporate gender and social concerns into their projects and programmes. Some staff also showed an interest in receiving targeted training to mainstream gender in their respective areas of work, specifically tailored to the needs of their technical unit. Many expected ESW to help on these issues, rather than being pro-active and mobilizing resources and consensus for this purpose.

324. At the same time, in some of the countries visited, a number of male FAO staff and long-term consultants had a patronizing and domineering attitude towards women that affected their professional effectiveness. This would happen, for example, at two levels: disregard for women's productive roles in the farms and for the potential contribution of a female professional colleague – not to mention a gender expert - to their projects. Also, the gender mainstreaming concept was often misunderstood and conceptualized by many people interviewed as a massive challenge and costly exercise.

325. The limited competence of FAO staff in gender issues appeared to have particularly acute consequences at regional and sub-regional level. Since the abolition of the ESW regional posts that took place between 2008 and 2009, staff willing to integrate a gender perspective in their work had no access to sources of advice. In HQ, at least, through personal relations and the GFP network, access to ESW appeared to be easier. This also meant that contacts with any gender network at regional level had been lost and would have to be re-established from virtually zero by any future gender specialist.

## **E. Conclusions**

326. The relevance, effectiveness and sustainability of FAO GAD and WID projects varied hugely. In most regions, with few exceptions at country level, there was a disconnect between regional



and national gender priorities and policies and FAO's products and services. Also, when analysing FAO's performance in mainstreaming gender in its field programme over time, the Evaluation did not notice any substantive difference in the implementation of projects in the early or late years of the past decade.

327. Although a number of initiatives contributed to improve food security and incomes of men and women, and in many cases specifically women, there was little evidence that these interventions were sustainable and that the gains accrued would benefit the women for whom they were meant. Social and gender analysis were rarely done before projects were started and few projects were informed at formulation phase by a gender perspective.

328. Also when dealing with gender issues, FAO tended to take the "safe road" and was unwilling to push the gender agenda. Women were treated as a homogenous group and were targeted as recipients of inputs, and not as collaborators or contributors. As a result, many FAO interventions had a WID rather than a GAD approach and, while this might be fine as an entry point, the ultimate goal of gender equality in access to resources could not be achieved without a GAD approach. At best interventions would result in improved incomes, and therefore economic empowerment, but not in socio-cultural or political empowerment.

329. Overall, actual implementation and integration of gender concerns in field projects varied and depended largely on field staff competences and skills in this area. Technical officers in HQ and DOs were on average less aware and competent about gender issues than project staff in the countries, although skills and experience in gender issues and social development were never a staff selection criteria for posts other than gender experts, thus missing the opportunity to improve over time the corporate skills in these areas.

330. Although FAO was not usually perceived as a gender champion in the countries visited, in some circumstances FAO Emergency Coordination Units played this role and gender mainstreaming had been achieved to a certain extent. This mainly occurred in those offices with staff of a sufficient size to warrant the existence of a full-time gender expert.

331. As with projects, the extent and quality of gender mainstreaming in FAO's Global Public Goods varied hugely; although relevance of gender to the topics discussed was in most cases high to very high, the technical quality of the gender contents was adequate but innovativeness and links between gender and social inclusion were poor. With some notable exceptions, this was the case also for FAO flagship publications SOFA, SOFI, SOFIA and SOFO. SOFA 2010-11 may become a milestone in making information on gender and women in agriculture publicly available; one of the challenges ahead is more in-depth analysis on intra-household sex-segregated data on contributions to agricultural production. Unrelated to the quality of the individual products, the diffusion and use inside and outside FAO of its GAD GPGs was very limited.

332. Awareness about the importance of gender issues among FAO staff was usually good, but competence to integrate a gender perspective in projects and GPGs rather poor. In most instances, FAO staff felt reluctant and/or uncertain about applying gender-sensitive approaches.

## **VIII. FAO collaboration with UN agencies on gender equality and mainstreaming<sup>55</sup>**

### **A. Background**

333. Gender mainstreaming remains the principle approach in the UN system and at FAO to reaching Millennium Development Goal (MDG) 3, 'Gender equality and the empowerment of women'. The United Nations system has been attempting to mainstream gender throughout its funds, programmes and agencies since the Fourth World Conference for Women in Beijing (1995) and in

---

<sup>55</sup> The Evaluation focused its analysis of interagency work on the UN system, mostly in consideration of the common mandate for gender equality and women's empowerment. Also, the UN system comprises the major partners of FAO.

response to the Beijing Platform for Action and resolution 1997/2<sup>56</sup> of the ECOSOC. ESW's work related to gender mainstreaming is part of the UN system-wide effort and benefits from the policy experience and good practices in other UN agencies. As the mandate on gender issues comes from the UN system as a whole, ESW works closely with other UN agencies and coordinates with them through the Interagency Network on Women and Gender Equality (IANWGE). ESW considers the UN system one of its 'client groups', as it is FAO that is expected to contribute inputs to interagency work on gender related to agriculture and rural populations.

334. Both FAO's GAD Plans of Action explicitly called for ESW to coordinate its gender mainstreaming efforts with external partners and networks and ESW was expected to take the lead in informing other agencies of FAO's work related to gender issues. Under Strategic Objective K FAO was expected to continue the process of gender mainstreaming, in collaboration with other members of the UN system. Under Organization Result K1, more effective partnerships were to be developed within the UN system on gender equality, food security and rural development. Technical support was to be provided to selected "One UN" pilot projects and UN Joint Programme initiatives in countries to reduce gender inequalities.

## **B. ESW contribution to interagency work**

### *Interagency Network on Women and Gender Equality (IANWGE)*

335. IANWGE has been in existence in some form or another since the 1970s and was tasked by ECOSOC to monitor progress in gender mainstreaming in the UN system. The chair recently (February 2011) passed from the Special Adviser on Gender Issues and the Advancement of Women to the Executive Director of UN Women. Members of the Network are gender focal points in the UN funds and programmes, the UN Secretariat and the specialized agencies. The Network meets annually just prior to the Commission on the Status of Women (CSW) session.

336. FAO has attended every annual session of IANWGE and has always been represented at the highest level in this body with participation of its focal point, the Director of ESW. FAO has consistently played a leadership role, as evidenced by its highly visible role in 2002 and 2003 in the Network's workshops on capacity building for gender mainstreaming, using the SEAGA tool. Although FAO has played a less visible role since 2004, it should be noted that in recent years, the FAO representative chaired a number of sessions during the annual meeting at the request of the Special Adviser.

337. FAO's work on the GAD-PoA in 2002 and its gender budgeting and gender markers<sup>57</sup> were considered innovative models by the Network. In 2006, the Task Force on Gender Budgeting presented its final report to the IANWGE. FAO's GAD-PoA was still being cited as good practice in mainstreaming gender into programming. A successor Task Force on gender mainstreaming in programming, monitoring, evaluation and reporting for results based management systems was established by the IANWGE to follow up the work on gender budgeting. FAO is still a member of this successor task force, but its work on gender budgeting did not seem to have penetrated the organization to any significant extent. Unfortunately, there was no systematic follow up by the Network or even within FAO.

338. Further, ESW has participated in many of task forces established by IANWGE over the years to deal with specific interagency concerns related to gender. It was currently serving on seven of the nine task forces. At the Joint IANWGE-OECD/DAC Workshop held in Nairobi in 2006, FAO's Regional Senior Gender Specialist made a joint presentation with ILO on a paper entitled 'A Programme-based Approach to Gender Equality: Steps taken by UN agencies to systematically mainstream gender in technical cooperation'. Agriculture was among the sectors identified as strategic for women. These joint meetings expanded support for the work of both networks and provide UN system gender focal points with valuable contacts in the bilateral aid agencies

---

<sup>56</sup> ECOSOC resolution 1997/2 on mainstreaming a gender perspective into all policies and programmes in the United Nations system

<sup>57</sup> Gender markers have become compulsory in 2011 in the context of humanitarian interventions.

339. In 2006 IANWGE also discussed the need for system-wide approaches to gender mainstreaming in response to a directive from the Secretary General in the follow up to the 2005 World Summit (related to the Millennium Development Goals). The directive called for further steps to be taken to mainstream a gender perspective in the policies and programmes of the UN system. The Strategy was then endorsed by the UN Chief Executive Board for Coordination (CEB) in 2006. FAO played an active role in the discussions on the strategy, and was still serving on the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Gender Action Plan for the UN system-wide policy and strategy on gender mainstreaming.

#### Commission on the Status of Women (CSW)

340. Under the ECOSOC, the main intergovernmental body on gender issues is the CSW. It sets the normative agenda for the UN on gender equality and women's empowerment. FAO regularly attends both the CSW and the ECOSOC coordination segment. FAO representation at CSW is consistently handled by the corporate gender focal point, while attendance at other meetings is often handled by the FAO Liaison Offices in New York or Geneva.

341. At its 2011 session, CSW decided that at its 56th session in 2012, it would consider as its priority theme 'The empowerment of rural women and their role in poverty and hunger eradication, development and current challenges'. FAO proposed to co-organize an Expert Group Meeting on rural women in Rome in preparation of the upcoming event, and an IANWGE Task Force on rural women, to be led by FAO and IFAD, was established for a one-year period to prepare for the session. This was a strategic decision of CSW, for which the three Rome-based agencies played a major role.

#### UN Women

342. FAO is a member of the UN Development Group (UNDG) Task Team on Gender Equality chaired by UN Women (formerly UNIFEM). In 2003, FAO presented preliminary research results on gender-related approaches to rural development from Namibia, Uganda and Zambia at a roundtable convened by UNIFEM in preparations for the ECOSOC high-level session on Integrated Approaches to Rural Development.

343. ESW and UNIFEM have collaborated on various projects, including the land reform initiative in Tajikistan and livelihoods projects in Palestine and Liberia; UNIFEM also supported ESW in carrying out the FAO's Gender audit in 2010. At country level, FAO Representations and FAO technical officers from different divisions worked with UN Women through a number of UN Joint Programmes.

344. A senior representative of UN Women suggested that ESW be more of an advocate for women farmers and their rights to land and water. It was suggested that ESW should assist country teams to understand the main issues facing rural women, especially poverty. FAO could play a useful role in helping UN Country Team gender working groups establish accountability systems. It was also suggested that FAO needed to work with others to develop indicators and clear results to show impacts on women, for example, in the food and vulnerability mapping database and the Gender and Land Rights database. Further, UN Women expressed an interest in working closely with FAO to update and expand the Gender and Land Rights database.

#### Rome-based agencies

345. The three Rome-based agencies - FAO, IFAD and WFP - have closely collaborated with each other on gender issues. Their corporate Gender Focal Points met every month and discussed ways to collaborate and exchange information. Respective liaison offices in New York also worked closely together in reporting to CEDAW,<sup>58</sup> CSW and ECOSOC. The FAO Liaison Officer acts as a GFP in New York and works with IFAD and WFP all the time. The three agencies advocate for each other and represent each other in the area of gender and outreach. Also, collaboration between the FAO New York Liaison Office (LONY) and ESW appeared to be very good.

---

58 CEDAW: Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women

346. The three New York liaison offices work together on gender issues and have something similar to a joint work programme on gender. For example, they prepared a joint launch of SOFA 2011 on International Women's Day on 8 March 2011. For any integrated processes, they participate sometimes jointly or individually. They need each other as "*Not to work together would be a policy suicide.*"

347. As already discussed in Section 4.4, the Joint IFAD/FAO Grant Programme for Regional Gender Capacity and Knowledge (2009-11) was another good example of effective partnership between the two agencies, based on their long-standing common focus. The initiative, that was coming to a close in mid-2011, was informed by the framework and good practices contained in the Gender in Agriculture Sourcebook and built on previous collaboration between IFAD-supported programmes in West and Central Africa and the FAO's Socio-Economic and Gender Analysis (SEAGA) training programme.

348. In New York, FAO often joined forces with WFP and IFAD to prepare inputs to ECOSOC on issues such as poverty, nutrition, and rural development. A good example of their collaboration was a joint effort in 2010, when the ECOSOC theme was gender equality and women's empowerment. A brainstorming session was organized during the global preparatory meeting for ECOSOC (29 April 2010) to raise consciousness on rural women, and the result was included in the ECOSOC High-Level Segment. A strong statement on gender was then incorporated into the MDG summit outcome. They had received support from FAO and IFAD headquarters for this work.

### **C. FAO collaboration with UN agencies on gender issues**

349. The work by FAO with the World Bank and IFAD on the Gender in Agriculture Sourcebook has already been mentioned above.

350. FAO through TCE also participated in other interagency mechanisms, such as the Interagency Standing Committee (IASC) sub-working group on Gender and Humanitarian Action. The IASC produced in 2006 two publications, 'Guidelines on Gender-Based Violence Interventions in Humanitarian Settings' and 'Women, Girls, Boys and Men: Different Needs, Equal Opportunities'. FAO contributed resources and substantial technical inputs for its development.

351. In the same area of work, collaboration between ESW, TCE and WFP had earlier led to the production of 'Passport to Mainstreaming a Gender Perspective in Emergency Programmes, a SEAGA-based approach to DRM', to help humanitarian workers and coordinators identify specific target groups who could play a crucial role in their country's rebuilding. These tools aimed at better including women and men on an equitable basis in every phase of the emergency and rehabilitation operations. The Passport has been translated into several languages and was widely disseminated.

352. FAO, ILO and IFAD organized an Expert Group meeting on Gender and Rural Employment in Rome in April 2009, which resulted in the joint publication 'Gender Dimensions of Agriculture and Rural Employment: Differentiated Pathways out of Poverty'. The publication was issued in 2010 and included many of the case studies presented to the workshop. The outputs also included seven policy briefs, which linked SO-K with SO-G on improving markets and rural livelihoods. By pooling resources, the three agencies have been able to attract more high-level expertise to provide inputs into this work.

353. Another good example of FAO's collaboration with other United Nations agencies was the work being done to improve the availability of statistical data to reflect gender differences in agriculture, rural development and food security. FAO has fostered a partnership with the UN Statistics Division to include gender-specific data on the economically active (agricultural/non-agricultural) population in the FAOSTAT database. In 2006, FAO participated in the UN Interagency and Expert Group Meeting on the Development of Gender Statistics organized by the Statistics Division, the World Bank and the UNFPA. FAO also participated in an Expert Group Meeting on Gender Disaggregated Data in Water and Sanitation, organized by the Interagency Task Force on Gender and Water in New York in December 2008.

354. In Nairobi, UNEP worked with FAO and UNDP in the programme Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (UN-REDD), which was part of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change. Recently a Joint UN-REDD Gender Working Group was set-up, which included the three agencies. The Working Group was expected to provide inputs to and coordinate with the Interagency Task Force on Gender and Climate Change, chaired by UNESCO, and the Global Gender and Climate Alliance. FAO was a member of both the Task Force and Alliance, and an ESW staff member had participated in the global meetings on climate change. The Task Force was looking at developing some indicators on gender and climate change. UNEP and FAO are also collaborating on a project in the Mau Forest complex in Kenya.

355. UN-Habitat, also located in Nairobi, mentioned its Global Land Tool Network (GLTN), of which FAO is a member. GLTN's main objective is to contribute to poverty alleviation and the Millennium Development Goals through land reform, improved land management and security of tenure. FAO made important contributions to the Network's gender-related work, including to the study 'Gendering Land Tools: Secure Land Rights for All' and to the 'Training Package on Improving Gender Equality and Grassroots Participation through Good Land Governance' published in 2010. FAO Land and Water Division and UN-Habitat collaborated on a Land Tenure series of studies which were used as case studies and training materials in the package.

356. Other interagency initiatives in which FAO participated, offered opportunities to address gender issues. While there was some evidence that in some of these forums FAO representatives advocated for gender concerns, this was not done in any systematic way and often depended on the personal commitment of the FAO staff involved in each initiative.

#### Joint programmes at country level

357. At a decentralized level, FAO is supposed to be working with other agencies in the "Delivering as One" framework, and to bring in its expertise on rural areas and on production aspects. At regional level, with the loss of all but one ESW regional gender officer, this had been difficult although the regional focal point for Asia in RAP participates in the Regional Interagency Thematic Working Group on Gender.

358. Among the UN staff visited in country offices, most stated that FAO was not active in UN Country Team gender working groups. Most of the UN partners at the country level were unaware that FAO had a gender strategy or considered gender a priority. FAO had occasionally been involved in the Common Country Assessments, UNDAFs or UNPAFs<sup>59</sup>, but ESW did not participate and FAO's contribution was not related to the gender teams. FAO was a member of the interagency working group on gender in Nicaragua and of UNAIDS in Uganda, and participated in gender discussions there.

359. In general, FAO's participation in the UNCT tended to be strongly constrained by the reduced human resources the Organization has at country level, and its participation in the UNCT working groups on gender was more an exception than a rule: the Evaluation identified cases of good visibility on this only in the Dominican Republic, Nicaragua and Somalia.

360. Despite poor participation in gender working groups, FAO's participation in the UN Joint Programmes had been quite active. In total the Organization took part in 146 UNJPs, 71 of which were technical cooperation initiatives and 75 emergency projects. During the Evaluability Assessment 43 GAD and 10 HIV and AIDS related UNJPs were identified, almost all of them technical cooperation initiatives. ESW was the LTU for eleven and seven respectively. The Evaluation analyzed several of them in different countries.

361. Overall, the Evaluation considered that these UNJPs paved the way to a different manner for FAO to work with other UN agencies, each agency contributing in terms of its specific comparative advantage. Through them, FAO could also develop better understanding of gender equality issues and could bring its broad experience and technical knowledge in agricultural and rural

---

<sup>59</sup> UNDAF: United Nations Development Assistance Framework; UNPAF: United Nations Partnership Framework

development to agencies that tended to have more experience with urban populations and rights-based approaches.

362. Last, in 2010 ESW developed under OR K1 a series of checklists for UNJPs called ‘Joint UN Programmes for Food Security, Agriculture and Rural Development’. Checklists were on: Food and Nutrition Security, Livestock, Fisheries and Aquaculture, Forestry, Crops, Natural Resources, Climate Change, Emergencies, Value Chains and Employment and Livelihoods. Finalized after testing in Malawi, they were circulated to the FAO DOs in January 2011, thus no feedback on their usefulness was available by the time of the Evaluation’s country visits. The Evaluation noted they were not well known among FAO staff. It should also be stated that the work was neither comprehensive nor innovative; the checklist being much the same for each sector. The exception was disaster management and emergency preparedness, where the checklist seemed to be more useful.

## **D. Conclusions**

363. During the period under evaluation FAO worked with other UN agencies to produce new and innovative approaches to policies concerning gender and development. The corporate gender focal point for FAO, i.e. ESW, is well appreciated in this context at the global level. Also, the interaction between the Interagency Network on Women and Gender Equality and the OECD/DAC Gender Network offers valuable opportunities for mutual learning and support and helps individual agencies develop allies and gain visibility in both networks.

364. Collaboration in the areas of gender and statistics and gender and emergencies has been commendable and could be expanded in those and emerging areas such as climate change.

365. There was evidence that the Gender in Agriculture Sourcebook was well known by other agencies and that SEAGA tools had been used at the global level within IANWGE. The nature of collaboration under IANWGE seemed to be more conducive to using gender tools such as SEAGA, as all the members are involved in gender mainstreaming in their own agencies, than in Joint Programmes at the country level, where participants may not be familiar with gender analysis.

366. Most of the work carried out by ESW with IANWGE, CSW and other bodies on gender issues was supported by LONY, but unrelated to and unsupported by Senior Management and other units of FAO. Similarly, these linkages had only a limited impact on the ways in which FAO as a whole interacted with other UN agencies on gender issues. This was particularly clear at the national level where FAO was frequently absent from the UN country teams and in particular from coordination mechanisms related to gender. At this level, cooperation with other UN agencies had been most successful in the context of UNJPs where other UN agencies have handled gender issues.

367. Clearly, FAO must cooperate with other UN agencies in gender related matters, defining roles and responsibilities based on respective competence and comparative advantage, and it is in the Organization’s best interest to reach out and establish meaningful relations with groups representing women farmers and with UN Women. The leadership of FAO had not so far recognized this from a strategic point of view.

## **IX. FAO mechanisms for implementing GAD-PoA and SO-K**

### **A. Gender Focal Point network**

368. The Gender Focal Point Network in FAO was launched in 2002 as part of the mechanisms for the implementation of the Gender and Development Plan of Action 2002-2007. Terms of Reference were included in the Plan, articulated around three main areas of work: Strategic Planning, Programming and Reporting; Project and Programme Formulation and Appraisal; Training and Networking. No minimum required qualifications were suggested for potential candidates and it was proposed that the function would “*rotate every two years among regular staff in order to foster learning by doing and gradually broaden the network of staff with an understanding of gender issues and with skills in applying the gender analysis tools and methodologies*”.

369. The ToR called in fact for someone with solid competence in gender issues, enough seniority to revise the work of colleagues and assist the divisional senior management in ‘Strategic

planning, monitoring and reporting' on gender at divisional level. Time allocation was not specified but the work-description was rather heavy. From the interviews with former GFPs, it emerged that many had been appointed GFP when in a very junior position, freshly recruited and not yet competent. Moreover, the appointee's interest to work on gender issues was not considered; at the same time, there were cases of GFPs asking to be trained on gender issues and this was not granted by their supervisors, possibly because in their supervisor's perception it was of limited relevance.

370. Over the years, meetings of the GFP network have been held and some activities were carried out. Information available showed that in 2005, a questionnaire survey was sent to the GFP to gather information on their work as GFP, constraints and achievements. In 2008/2009, three of four one day training sessions were organized by ESW for GFPs, which proved to be useful, though clearly not enough to strengthen participants' capacity.

371. As discussed above (see Section 3.3), the number of GFPs varied over time: they were 42 in 2002, 49 in 2006 and 26 in 2010. In the 2006 list, four GFPs were also included from among staff in FAO Regional Offices. The Terms of Reference were revised in collaboration with the GFPs, at least in 2006 and in 2008. These versions introduced desirable qualifications for GFPs such as personal interest, academic background and seniority, raising the minimum level to P4 in 2006 and P5 in 2008. No strong pressure was made however by ESW through corporate mechanisms to enforce the measures for raising the profile of GFPs to a higher seniority level as it was considered that enthusiasm shown by many young colleagues in the role should not be lost. Admittedly, personal commitment was and remains a strong driver, but experience had already shown that this was not enough to achieve meaningful results.

372. The findings of the Evaluation were that since no GFP had been appointed at DO level, except for a GFP in REU and one in RAP, the latter appointed in 2010, and since all regional ESW posts had been abolished except for RAF, all DOs had received very little information, communication or support whatsoever on gender issues from HQ. On the other hand, SOFA 2011 was very well promoted at the level of the FAO Representations.

373. In 2010 half of the GFPs were senior officers, which by default gave more visibility to the topic within the house. However, the Evaluation found out that most of them did not have the time, the capacity or the authority to work with peers or more senior colleagues and help them integrate a gender perspective in their work. In the many cases where the Director or Chief of the unit was not supportive of gender mainstreaming, the role of GFP was limited to attending meetings called by ESW and being a passive recipient of communications on gender. Also, the FAO Performance Evaluation and Management System (PEMS) in 2010 did not offer an incentive to add the GFP tasks to one's work plan, as there was a minimum threshold of 20% for an activity to be added to that plan.

374. In 2011, in the wake of the Gender Audit, ESW proposed that GFPs allocate 20% of their time to the task: the reaction of many confirmed that their availability of time was really limited. A new draft of the ToR for GFPs, again discussed with the GFP network, was also proposed. Moreover, the 20% minimum threshold principle was abolished from PEMS, thus as of mid-2011, new PEMS agreements could accommodate GFP related activities.

375. This progress notwithstanding, and acknowledging that this conclusion goes against one of the Gender Audit's recommendations, the Evaluation's assessment of the GFP is that the mechanism in itself cannot be effective even in a context of stronger accountability at senior level. Experience from other UN agencies also confirmed that similar mechanisms often failed. Although several current GFPs could perform more effectively in an institutional context that is more favourable to gender mainstreaming, for several others there is a question of commitment and interest in dedicating more time to this task, as well as to the need for capacity development.

376. Furthermore, there is a strong likelihood that the GFP role would always be perceived as an add-on to one's professional 'persona' rather than being something fully embedded in the self-perception, qualifications and terms of reference of a "gender and livestock" or "gender and fisheries" expert. Equally, the Organization itself would continue to have the attitude of 'whenever you have time' in assessing the performance of these professionals in their role as GFP.

## **B. Project and Programme Review Committee and TCP approval criteria**

377. The Programme and Project Review Committee (PPRC) in FAO has the mandate to appraise all new technical cooperation projects once funding has been secured as well as to recommend major revisions of on-going projects. In 2000 its Terms of Reference were revised and six guiding principles were established to ensure compliance of all new projects with ‘*..the general orientation and goals of the Organization*’. Principle ‘v’ states: “*Promote gender equality and equity through the systematic compliance with FAO’s stated commitment to and policy on mainstreaming a gender perspective into its normative work and field activities*”<sup>60</sup>. Through the PPRC all FAO technical departments, including the Technical Cooperation Department, are asked to provide a technical opinion on each new project.

378. From an early stage on, there were recommendations mostly by ESW that the PPRC review process should encourage a more in-depth gender analysis so as to avoid blanket references to gender equality and equity. In 2002, SDW suggested that Gender Focal Points should be more closely associated with the project formulation and review process, as laid out in their terms of reference.

379. The ‘gender principle’ was consistently the second most commented upon aspect in project appraisals, after the ‘food security principle’. The reports on the implementation of the GAD-PoA to FAO Conferences in 2005 and 2007 stated that different departments – and not only ESW - had commented on the absence of attention to the gender principle in the projects submitted to the PPRC; they also stated that “*71% of projects were considered gender relevant by the PPRC*”. This corresponds to the findings of this Evaluation, through the desk study and the review of project gender qualifiers, discussed in Chapter 6.

380. PPRC comments frequently related to the following aspects: i) lack of social/gender analysis; ii) absence of gender-sensitive information systems; iii) neglect of policy frameworks for gender mainstreaming at country level; iv) inadequate appraisal of the effects of new technologies, or no consideration of technologies to reduce women’s workload; and v) lack of specific arrangements to address gender imbalances.

381. In 2004, the PPRC Secretariat observed that more general comments on gender were declining in number, and had been replaced by more specific comments including detailed recommendations, for example, on targeted training/capacity building, better organization, consideration of time constraints, economic empowerment, land rights and gender indicators for monitoring and evaluation systems.

382. Overall, the PPRC comments had indeed become more specific and relevant. However, the Evaluation found a number of projects where the PPRC recommendations regarding gender aspects had been ignored during implementation, with negative consequences on project performance but no consequences for the project managers. Thus, poor monitoring and accountability mechanisms at corporate level had undermined the efforts made at PPRC level to improve integration of gender equality aspects in project documents.

383. In the case of the Technical Cooperation Programme projects (TCP), until January 2010<sup>61</sup> project proposals would go through an accurate revision and appraisal process well before they reached the PPRC level. After the PPRC’s clearance, they were also approved by the most senior level in the Organization. The management of this process was the responsibility of the TCP unit within the Technical Cooperation Department. Among other criteria, project proposals were to be assessed also against gender integration. In late 2004, the Independent Review of the TCP concluded that “*..in spite of appropriate measures having been taken at the strategic level, mainstreaming of gender issues in FAO TCPs requires further efforts*”. A recommendation was formulated that was accepted through the

---

<sup>60</sup> Director General’s Bulletin 2000/17.

<sup>61</sup> FAO’s reform led to full decentralization of the TCP and project documents were no longer submitted to the PPRC in HQ. TCOT was the HQ-based unit that managed the approval process before the reform, when it was transformed into a TCP team.



Management Response.<sup>62</sup> The Evaluation's findings in late 2010 were that the lack of adequate integration of a gender approach in a TCP proposal had never been a reason to reject a TCP project, as had happened on the contrary in the case of other criteria. However, it is also important to note that although the TCP unit made efforts to comment on project proposals for improved strategic and operational soundness, the projects would often be completed and submitted to the PPRC in haste and without sufficient revision.

384. The share of GAD/WID TCPs in the total TCP portfolio was 20%, not a very high proportion for a funding modality which responds to Member States' request but on which the Organization tends to have full technical and methodological say. Also, 10 out of the 11 projects identified through the desk-study which had ignored the PPRC recommendations on gender (see chapter 6) were TCP projects.

385. At the time of writing this report, FAO was revising its procedures for project appraisal in the context of issuing a new Field Programme Manual; initial drafts available had fully integrated the gender dimension. Equally, the TCP team was carrying out an analysis of the level of compliance with the TCP criteria and other rules within the new decentralized approval mechanism. The gender dimension was part of the analysis.

### **C. Drivers for gender mainstreaming in FAO's work**

386. The Evaluation found evidence that the most effective external drivers for integrating a gender perspective in FAO's projects had been national policies of Member States. In those countries where government policies existed explicitly requesting that gender issues be addressed in development or emergency projects, FAO's performance tended to be more gender-sensitive. Positive examples were Nicaragua and Uganda, where in response to a clear political commitment, FAO Representations had a gender expert or more among their staff, raised attention to gender issues in project formulation when they had the leeway to do so and participated in the inter-agency working groups on gender. Box 24 illustrates the case of Nicaragua in detail.

---

<sup>62</sup> See OED website, Independent Review of the Technical Cooperation Programme, February 2005 and related documents

### Box 24. Nicaragua: gender mainstreaming in a FAO Representation

The Government of Nicaragua has been consistently committed to food and nutritional security and more recently, it also made the improvement of rural women's livelihoods one of its priorities. All partners were therefore asked to support the government in this effort.

In 2009, the FAO Representative decided, after consultation with the Government, to recruit for the SPFS the gender expert who was then working for the National Institute of Agrarian Technology (INTA), one of its key partners. The selected candidate was an agronomist, with background as an extension worker and gender specialist.

The gender expert moved on gradually to be the FAOR gender specialist, providing advice to a large number of projects. She had produced a leaflet on gender in FAO, and the FAOR had Gender as the 2010 theme for FAO in Nicaragua. She participated intensively in all gender interagency mechanisms, and the Organization's visibility on the theme had gone from zero to very high. She backstopped colleagues at different levels, had developed a kit on gender for new project directors, had organized an internal FAO Gender Committee to discuss and develop capacity on the theme and at the time of the Evaluation mission, she was going to start participating in the selection panels of any/most new FAO staff to ensure that they have some understanding of gender issues.

The FAO Representation was giving strong visibility and importance to the role, a clear necessity in a highly 'male and technician' dominated FAO environment in the country. All FAO project directors and field level staff were well aware that they had to take gender into account. Actual willingness and capacity to do so varied, with very few people among directors and field staff being open and able to do so.

The FAO portfolio in the country was rather large and the gender expert was currently paid through contributions from various projects, without jeopardizing any budget. At the same time, the experience was highly effective in terms of impact on the quality of FAO projects and image of the Organization in the country.

*Source: Evaluation team*

387. Nevertheless, there were also countries where national policies were clearly committed to gender equality and there was a national conscience about it, such as in the Philippines which had a Magna Carta for Women, but where FAO did not take a pro-active attitude in mainstreaming gender in its projects.

388. The second important external driver for gender mainstreaming in FAO had been resource partners' requirements and the availability of funds. When a resource partner insisted that a project should have a strong gender focus, the FAO unit usually made an effort and included adequate attention to gender issues. A good example of this came from the FAO Investment Centre, where the gender policy of the IFI paying TCI to provide project formulation services made a difference to the level of gender mainstreaming in FAO's contribution.

389. Resource partners committed to gender equality goals made available budget allocations in the projects sufficient to cover human and financial resources to make a serious effort to mainstream gender. For example, the PATSARRD project in the Philippines had a budget for gender specialists and training workshops to mainstream gender in agrarian reform; in that project, women and men participated equally in the benefits of land distribution. In Central America, the Spanish funded national SPFS had resources for project gender specialist and over time, this allowed integrating gender effectively in project implementation. Also, donors and partner organizations built gender considerations into project objectives and activities, as in the UN Joint Programmes. This did not happen systematically, however and more than one project from traditionally gender-sensitive partners were approved and implemented without specific attention to gender issues.

390. At the corporate governance level, gender was often discussed by FAO Programme Committee, which among the different governing bodies of the Organization is responsible for discussing FAO's technical work across all themes, as well as evaluations. Since 2002, gender had

been discussed in 10 out of 17 sessions; in four of these, the discussion was linked to an evaluation report, either because it had reported on gender or because it had not. In all other sessions, however, the discussion was related to substantive aspects of FAO's work on gender, on the best institutional location for ESW, and similar issues.

391. FAO Conference regularly received the progress reports on the GAD Plans of Action, and some of these made strong statements on the limited improvements in their implementation. However, any follow-up action challenging the status quo would have been very difficult at governance level.

392. In relation to internal drivers, the Evaluation assessed to what extent gender equality or gender concerns had been integrated in FAO Corporate Strategy on Capacity Development that was finalized in 2010. The document never mentions gender, and overlooks aspects of social inclusion and diversity. It is articulated on the three dimensions of enabling environment, organizations and individuals, but apparently gender has no place in any of these.<sup>63</sup>

393. Another major driver was the individual commitment of FAO officers, be they GFPs or not. Some staff had a personal interest in the topic and addressed gender 'by default' in their work. This was the case with specific respondents working in the areas of agrarian reform, climate change adaptation and communications for development projects. Staff members who had some background in gender or the social sciences felt that it was important to integrate gender considerations in their work to achieve better results on the ground. The driver here was personal interest, commitment and desire for better results. Very closely related to this was the personal experience of FAO staff, discussed above in Section 7.4. In general, committed officers felt there was little room in their divisions for a stronger effort on gender, as the senior managers were not interested. Only in a few cases, directors or chiefs showed commitment to and facilitated the allocation of resources to gender mainstreaming.

394. Some officers also noted that when a female had headed a project, there was a much better chance of having gender mainstreamed in project activities. In Thailand the FAO staff responsible for a UN Joint Programme in Mae Hong Son was a woman. Although she was not a gender specialist, she was very receptive to bringing a gender approach to the FAO portion, in line with the other UN agencies. Equally, having a balanced project professional staff of men and women appeared to help in ensuring that both women and men participated in projects activities and shared benefits.

#### **D. Gender mainstreaming in FAO evaluations<sup>64</sup>**

395. Between 2002 and 2010, OED completed 39 major evaluations of various sorts: thematic, strategic, country and large emergency operations. There were references to women and/or gender issues in 29 of these, even if at times this was only to state that no attention had been paid to these issues or that no meaningful work had been done. Of the 10 evaluations that contained no reference to women or gender, six appeared to be Missed Opportunities in terms of evaluative evidence on gender issues. Sixteen reports included one recommendation on gender issues to FAO, usually to improve the integration of a gender perspective in projects and programmes. None of these recommendations was rejected, but only a couple of Follow Up reports had commented on progress on these recommendations.

396. Over the same period, OED participated in or backstopped 186 project evaluations. A search for the words 'women' and 'gender' was done on 163 of these, and showed that approximately 85% of these evaluations contained some relevant observations. This high rate was achieved thanks to

---

<sup>63</sup> Another major driver should be the new Human Resources Gender Action Plan, that was supposed to be issued by late 2010. By the time this evaluation report was being prepared, it had not been circulated yet broadly within the Organization.

<sup>64</sup> The Evaluation considered that evaluation in FAO should be one of the drivers for improvement of corporate practices and that the assessment of OED's role on gender mainstreaming was due. The analysis of the performance of the evaluation unit in contributing to mainstreaming gender was also part of the Corporate level IFAD's Efforts and Achievements in Gender Equality and Women Empowerment Evaluation of Gender.

a specific request in the template ToR for project evaluations since late 1990s, to assess gender issues. Comments ranged from a simple ‘gender was not taken into account in the Prodoc’ to articulate analyses of how the project had impacted on gender relations or how gender considerations had been integrated into project design and implementation. However, in most cases comments were brief and lacked depth. Of those evaluations which mentioned gender or women, 31% contained clear recommendations on how to improve the integration of a gender perspective into projects.

397. There was some change in the gender composition of FAO evaluation teams between 2002 and 2010. In 2002 only 9% of team members were women, rising to 31% in 2010 with a peak of 38% in 2006. Women provided 20% of international team members, 18% of international team leaders and 17% of national consultants. When team leaders or team members were OED staff, in 24% and 43% respectively of the cases they were women. Also, the inclusion of a gender specialist in evaluation teams and/or the assessment of FAO’s performance on gender equality and mainstreaming had increased since 2007, though not systematically.

398. The Evaluation assessed in more detail a group of 15 randomly chosen evaluation reports, seven of which were from among the group of major evaluations, against seven evaluative questions and a six-point scoring scale.<sup>65</sup> The quality of these evaluation reports in terms of gender was rather low, as shown in Box 25 below. Furthermore, there were no sign of any improvement over time. The highest scoring evaluation was from 2005; one of the lowest scoring evaluations was completed in 2010.

**Box 25. Assessment of OED evaluations in a gender perspective<sup>66</sup>**

Scoring points	1	2	3	4	5	6
Number of evaluation reports by average scoring	5	4	3	2	1	0

*Source: Evaluation team*

399. Management responses and follow-up reports were only available in three cases. In one case the evaluation ignored gender and thus there was nothing for Management to comment or act upon; in a second the gender element in the recommendations was presented as a lesson learned rather than a recommendation, so again there was no response or action; and in the third the gender recommendations were fully accepted and acted upon.

400. There were a number of common features in these evaluations which were worth commenting on:

- Unless gender issues or issues concerning women were very obvious in the project being evaluated, there was a tendency to ignore gender. Most evaluation reports verged on the category of Missed Opportunity in terms of evaluative evidence on gender issues or treated gender issues in a cursory fashion;
- In more than half of the reports, gender was equated with women. Thus in one otherwise excellent evaluation, the focus on women led to ignoring men and the relationship between men and women entirely;
- The level of social analysis and thus gender analysis in these evaluations was generally low, even when sociologists were included in the team. Complex issues of causation were generally ignored and at times it appeared that accepted stereotypes were accepted rather than checked out through validation in the field.

401. In 2005, OED Gender Focal Point had carried out a similar analysis and, on the basis of findings very close to those above, had made specific recommendations for gender to be more consistently assessed in all evaluations. There was no formal uptake of this until 2010, when OED decided to include ‘gender mainstreaming’ as an evaluation criterion in all its evaluations, along with

<sup>65</sup> See Annex 2, Evaluation tools.

<sup>66</sup> Score 1 is the lowest, 6 is the best.

the international standard evaluation criteria. The Office however had not set up yet by the time of this Evaluation, a formal mechanism for ensuring that this happened systematically.

402. While it was recognized that some improvements were taking place, the Evaluation considered that OED had the potential to be a much stronger driver for gender mainstreaming in FAO and had missed several opportunities to highlight organizational weaknesses in this respect.

## **E. Conclusions**

403. Through the GAD Plans of Action, FAO had set up two main operational mechanisms to facilitate gender mainstreaming in the work of the Organization. These were the ‘gender criterion’ in the check-lists elaborated by the Project and Programme Review Committee and the Gender Focal Point network. The review and approval mechanism for the TCP had also integrated gender as a criterion for approval and in late 2008, gender qualifiers were included to the FPMIS qualifiers tag. None of these mechanisms appeared to have fully achieved its purpose.

404. The PPRC improved its effectiveness over time, although in the absence of monitoring and accountability frameworks, its recommendations in the area of gender were still ignored in a number of cases. This calls into question wider issues of compliance with rules and procedures and relevant accountability within the Organization, and more specifically the level of understanding among some units and staff of FAO’s mandate and responsibility regarding gender issues.

405. The TCP review system fell dramatically short of its potential in so far the gender criterion was concerned, for a number of reasons that did not seem to depend from the TCP unit itself. The low level of integration of a gender perspective in these projects reinforced the broader evaluative evidence that gender received at best only formal and cursory attention in FAO’s political vision and strategy at the highest level.

406. The GFP network, in the view of the Evaluation, had not been effective so far, largely due to a lack of enforcement of accountability at the senior divisional and departmental level. This however was not the only reason: appointees often did not have the qualifications, the experience and sometimes the personal commitment to lead change in their units on a topic like gender mainstreaming. There was still deep resistance to the concept of gender mainstreaming embedded in the corporate culture and values as discussed in Chapter 11 below. Despite recent adjustments and incentives, and the further low-cost improvements already planned such as appointing GFPs in all sub-regional and country offices and a better communication strategy between ESW and the GFPs, the Evaluation considers that the GFPs will not be able to ‘break through’ within their respective units and ensure that a gender perspective is systematically integrated in all FAO’s work, as required by the Strategic Framework and Global Goals.

407. The two main external drivers that were identified, Member States and resource partners, were effective but only to some extent. In both cases, evidence available of negotiations and decision-making process was not strong enough to draw conclusions about the locus of responsibility for not insisting on adequate gender-mainstreaming. However, there is rather strong evidence that in general FAO was not pro-active in proposing gender-sensitive approaches in its projects, even when governments and/or donors were committed to gender equality. FAO Governing Bodies gave attention to the topic through the governance mechanisms but these did not allow any immediate impact on the Organization. The only option left to some was withdrawal of their voluntary contributions and this does not seem to have happened because of FAO’s gender-blindness.

408. The analysis of the internal drivers underlines the casual attitude within FAO to mainstreaming gender: when an officer was committed and understood the issue, gender would be mainstreamed. When neither factor were there, nothing would happen and nobody in FAO – or nobody influential enough – would take any remedial action. This applied also to the Evaluation function, that for several years missed the opportunity to call attention to the poor level of gender mainstreaming throughout the Organization.

## **X. Contribution to MDGs, FAO global goals and core functions**

### **A. MDG 1 and MDG 3**

409. MDG 1 focuses on eradicating extreme poverty and hunger. Target 1B explicitly recognizes women in terms of achieving full and productive employment for all, including women. MDG 3 seeks to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women. The two are closely related in FAO's goals and objectives.

410. In the context of its work on gender and female empowerment (MDG 3), FAO has probably made a positive contribution to an improvement in livelihoods and to some extent in decision making. Regarding hunger and poverty, a distinction has to be made between short term and long term impacts. WID-focused interventions had a positive impact on standards of living and the nutrition of poor women in various parts of the world (e.g. Bangladesh, Uganda) but these have done little to transform the more general structures of production and distribution which give rise to extreme poverty and hunger. GAD-focused interventions have had less immediate impact on levels of extreme poverty but promised more sustainable transformations of economic structures in the long run through enhancing the economic empowerment of women, which contributed to MDG 3. In the longer term it is more likely that interventions which focus on gender relations and female empowerment will have a more lasting effect.

411. The picture with regard to MDG3 was mixed and to a certain degree contradicted FAO's progress under MDG 1. There were elements in FAO's activities which focused on gender relations and which led to some degree of female empowerment. Admittedly, there were cases in which a simplistic ethnocentric approach to gender led to a misunderstanding of local situations but in general where a GAD approach had been adopted, there were indications of some success in furthering women's empowerment. This however was almost always in the realms of economic and physical empowerment and seldom addressed issues of social and political empowerment.

412. Moreover, GAD projects were not the majority. Much of the WID-style interventions reinforced existing gender differentials, reinforced distinctions between male and female and reaffirmed existing inequalities and power differentials. These, coupled with the large number of interventions classified as Missed Opportunity, suggest that overall FAO's contribution to the attainment of MDG 3 was much less than could have been achieved if the Organization had adopted a more gender sensitive and gender informed approach.

### **B. FAO Global Goals**

413. Box 26 below summarizes the global goals of FAO in the period covered by this Evaluation. Although there are differences in the global goals defined in the two Strategic Frameworks, there are also commonalities; Goal 1 in both plans focuses on nutrition, Goal 2 on social and economic development, and Goal 3 on sustainability.

**Box 26. FAO Global Goals in Strategic Frameworks 2000-2015 and 2010-2019**

	Goal 1	Goal 2	Goal 3
Strategic Framework 2000-2015	Access of all people at all times to sufficient nutritionally adequate and safe food, ensuring that the number of undernourished people is reduced by half by no later than 2015.	The continued contribution of sustainable agriculture and rural development, including fisheries and forestry, to economic and social progress and the well-being of all.	The conservation, improvement and sustainable utilization of natural resources, including land, water, forest, fisheries and genetic resources for food and agriculture.
Strategic Framework 2010-2019	Reduction of the absolute number of people suffering from hunger, progressively ensuring a world in which all people at all times have sufficient safe and nutritious food that meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life.	Elimination of poverty and the driving forward of economic and social progress for all with increased food production, enhanced rural development and sustainable livelihoods.	Sustainable management and utilisation of natural resources, including land, water, air, climate and genetic resources, for the benefit of present and future generations.

Source: FAO Strategic Framework 2000-2015 and Strategic Framework 2010-2019

414. The contribution of FAO's policies and activities relating to gender and the role of women were probably greatest in the context of Goal 1. There was evidence that gender-related activities did increase poor people's access to food by enhancing their abilities, and particularly the abilities of poor women, to gain access to food resources both through increasing levels of production and through encouraging access to food. However, women remain over-represented amongst the malnourished of the world, although SOFI does not report sex-disaggregated data on malnourished people.

415. Goal 2 focuses on 'economic and social progress'. Here the picture was mixed. FAO's activities in gender related activities did in some cases reinforce existing forms of inequality between men and women. In others, there had been insufficient attention to issues concerning empowerment and the need to focus on gender rather than women. However, there were cases where FAO's interventions had a positive impact on gender relations and created opportunities for previously excluded social categories (including women) to improve their social and economic position.

416. As far as Goal 3 was concerned, there was little evidence suggesting that FAO's work in the area of gender had a major impact on environmental sustainability or the conservation of natural resources. With a few exceptions, gender concerns have not been integrated with those which focused on environmental sustainability issues.

### C. Core functions

417. The Terms of Reference asked that the Evaluation analyzed the "extent to which FAO's work related to Women/GAD contributed and fulfilled FAO Core Functions as formulated in the SF 2010-19".<sup>67</sup> The Core Functions are an important element of FAO's current Strategic Framework and reflect major expectations of the Member States vis-à-vis the Organization. Thus, the analysis of how FAO's work contributed to and fulfilled its Core Functions is part of the overall assessment of the relevance and effectiveness of the Organization's work.

<sup>67</sup> See Annex 1, Paragraph 41.M

418. The Evaluation considers that FAO, through its work on GAD, contributed to most of the Core Functions, as illustrated in Box 27 below.

**Box 27. Contribution of FAO's work related to Gender and Development to its Core Functions**

Core Functions	Contribution
a. Monitoring and assessment of long-term and medium-term trends and perspectives	The key product contributing to this function was SOFA 2011. The publication will be a milestone in the analysis of gender and agriculture.
b. Assembly and provision of information, knowledge and statistics	<p>ESS, ESW and other units in FAO, for example NRL, are making efforts to improve the quantity and quality of sex-disaggregated data in the corporate statistics databases; some of these initiatives are very promising, for example the Gender and Land Rights database and the Agri-Gender database; however, more investment and time will be required before substantive advances will be available to end users.</p> <p>Some GPGs on HIV and AIDS, agriculture and climate change by ESW as well as others by ESA, Fisheries, Forestry, RAF and RLC, were notable example of how the Organization can develop relevant products that integrate gender in an innovative and good quality manner.</p>
c. Development of international instruments, norms and standards	<p>The most successful product in this area has been SEAGA and its several thematic and sectoral manuals. It is well known and other UN agencies use it more extensively than FAO itself does.</p> <p>FAO's Gender and Development Action Plan 2002-2007 and its gender budgeting and gender markers were considered innovative models among UN agencies in the early 2000s. Since then, the Organization has not been pro-active in this area.</p>
d. Policy and strategy options and advice	This is one of the functions that ESW fulfilled more systematically over time through advisory services to Member Countries. However, given the limited resources available through RP and Voluntary contributions, the actual scope of action was rather limited and more would be required. Very limited evidence existed of similar support at sectoral level to Member States by other units in the Organization.
e. Technical support to promote technology transfer and build capacity	Work in this area was carried out by ESW when part of the Sustainable Development Department on gender and natural resources management in particular. During the same period, development capacity on gender and agriculture through SEAGA achieved impacts that were still notable today, as well as ESW's normative work on HIV and AIDS. More recent positive achievements were attained in the integration of a gender perspective in FAO's work on HPAI, Emergency and Rehabilitation and land tenure initiatives. Also, some very good though limited in number SPFS and water management projects were implemented, that integrated gender appropriately and in a sustainable manner.
f. Advocacy and communication	Despite press-releases and public statements, FAO remained virtually invisible to its peers in the UN system and to its Member States in promoting gender equality for the rural world. Even widely-read publications on gender produced in partnerships such as the Gender in Agriculture Sourcebook, are not usually attributed to FAO. Although few exceptions were found, FAO at country level was never perceived as an active partner on gender issues and the gap left for rural women was lamented by most partners.



h. Partnerships and alliances	The examples identified by the Evaluation of partnerships on gender issues between FAO, UN agencies and national women's associations and NGOs have been very successful, including in several UNJP initiatives. In all these cases, FAO could bring its comparative advantage in technical production and marketing related issues, whereas partners contributed and informed with their competence and experience on gender equality. Similar positive examples were found for the production of GPGs, among which the Gender in Agriculture Sourcebook stands out but was not unique. More partnerships and alliances should be developed in this area to improve overall effectiveness and sustainability of FAO's work in favour of rural women and gender equality.
-------------------------------	---

*Source: Evaluation team*

419. Thus, positive achievements were attained but much more remain to be done if FAO is to fulfil its mandate, meet the expectations and needs of its Member States and all their citizens, both men and women, and contribute to fighting poverty, improving food security and livelihoods for all.

## **XI. Corporate culture <sup>68</sup>**

420. As the IEE of FAO and its Gender Audit pointed out, corporate culture is the key to the success or failure of an organization. Without a culture which supports gender mainstreaming throughout the organization, it is unlikely that FAO's stated goals on gender will be achieved. Furthermore, corporate culture is not simply about numbers, but also about perceptions. If gender is to be mainstreamed then perceptions as much as mechanisms and quantifiable indicators have to be changed.

421. Over the period covered by the Evaluation, the stated policies of FAO formally supported gender mainstreaming throughout the Organization in terms of its employment pattern, personnel policies and development interventions. FAO fully subscribed to UN policies on gender mainstreaming while the two Gender and Development Plans of Action covering the evaluation period made strong statements as to the centrality of gender mainstreaming in the Organization. But the evidence found by the Evaluation raises doubts about the extent to which gender has been mainstreamed in the corporate culture of FAO, how far gender considerations have become integral to the ways in which the Organization planned and designed its activities and how far attitudes towards gender have changed in practice.

422. It was certainly true that men outnumbered women in professional posts in FAO. At the senior level this disparity was particularly marked. According to figures presented in the Gender Audit, only 14% of senior managers in HQ were female. Among professionals as a whole, women made up around 32% of the total, but there was a marked bias towards HQ-based posts. Female representation among professionals was much lower in FAO offices outside Rome. Where women were over-represented was in the General Services category, where they comprised around 65% of the total. In comparison with other UN agencies, the Gender Audit reported that FAO ranked 23rd out of 30 UN organizations in terms of women as a percentage of professional and higher categories of staff.

423. The marked gender division of labour in FAO has obvious implications for how men and women are conceptualized. Statistically, the women employed by FAO are at a lower seniority level than men and are predominantly employed as support staff. As one moves up the FAO hierarchy so the proportion of female employees declines, and at the highest levels staffing is overwhelmingly male. Thus what it means to be a 'normal' man in FAO is radically different to what it means to be a 'normal' woman. This has implications for constructs of identity and eventually affects the degree to which female advancement threatens male identities.

<sup>68</sup> This chapter is based on the observations of the Evaluation team, that also included interviews with more than 150 FAO staff at all levels.

424. There are of course various ways in which the predominance of men at professional and senior levels in FAO is understood, at least by men. The most popular public argument couches it in terms of an ‘employability lag’. Here the argument is that historically there were relatively few qualified women for posts in FAO, and this is reflected in the current predominance of men in senior and professional positions. However, as changing educational systems around the world are producing larger and larger numbers of qualified women, over time the gender disparities will be ironed out. Unfortunately the evidence does not bear this out, at least as far as staff from non-OECD countries are concerned. A few others presented a more essentialist view of gender relations: women’s roles as mothers and nurturers precluded them from having the time, interests or skills to be successful in organizations such as FAO. These rare claims clearly lacked any evidential basis.

425. More often among interviewees at all levels, there was a degree of complacency amongst men as to the extent of implementation of gender policies within FAO. Thus questionnaire data presented by the IEE and the Gender Audit indicated that in general men saw these policies as working effectively and in an egalitarian fashion. And indeed, there is clear evidence that the number of women in senior and professional positions has grown over the last decade. But this figure did not grow as fast as might be expected, and in particular, women from non-OECD countries were grossly under-represented in the professional and higher levels of FAO. Admittedly, there was a tendency to have fewer suitable female than male candidates from under-represented countries, but it is unclear whether this depended on poor vacancy advertising strategies or other factors.

426. Although there has been a slow trend towards a greater proportion of women in senior and professional positions in FAO, there was still much unease among women working for the Organization as to the degree and speed of gender mainstreaming. The Gender Audit and the IEE presented evidence indicating that there was widespread dissatisfaction with senior management over its handling of gender issues and a major gap between public rhetoric and intra-organizational practice. Put bluntly, senior management failed to practice what it preached. At the same time, female members of staff frequently felt that male networks worked in informal ways to ensure that men rather than women had access to jobs and promotion. Equally, it was noted that the current sex-distribution of senior manager meant that men were those who controlled processes throughout the Organization and that their views prevailed.

427. Finally, many women and some men saw FAO as “family unfriendly”, making few if any compromises in the work/life balance and creating situations where it was extremely difficult for women to manage both careers and families. Again, despite the rhetoric, FAO was seen by many as an organization where men dominate the professional grades and women provide the support. This principle was mirrored in a large part of FAO’s technical work, with men being the farmers and producers and women their wives.

428. Yet even if FAO’s internal processes were to become more family-friendly and even if the gender balance were more equal, it was by no means clear that this would lead to gender being mainstreamed in its projects, programmes and GPGs. Comparative evidence indicates that equitable gender practices in the workplace are a necessary but not a sufficient condition for an organization such as FAO to mainstream gender in its policies and interventions. Indeed, given the focus of FAO activities, changes in its internal organization and culture would only be a first step.

429. As an organization, FAO prioritizes the availability aspect of food security, basically production. Overwhelmingly it focuses its work on technical activities: how to increase production through technical innovations; how to design systems of production which are technically sustainable. Most units in FAO are defined by technical criteria: forestry; livestock; fisheries and aquaculture for instance. Even a cursory glance at the GPGs produced by FAO indicates the predominance of technical issues couched in terms of scientific knowledge. The dominant ideology is one which stresses technical solutions to technical problems, social factors including gender being considered as secondary issues. The focus on technical issues means that staff members are employed on the basis of their technical capacities and this includes women as much as men. Female professionals freely – and correctly – admit they are not gender specialists but rather sylviculturalists, pest control specialists or nutritionists.

430. Simply employing more women in technical roles is not necessarily going to lead to gender mainstreaming in FAO's development interventions. In many ways the history of ESW exemplifies the dominance of specific forms of technical knowledge in the Organization. Because it is charged with supporting gender mainstreaming - and social analysis more generally - ESW has in effect become the repository of all things related to gender. Rather than informing the activities of all departments in FAO, gender mainstreaming and social inclusion more generally have become something that ESW does. ESW's activities have become marginal to FAO's work as a whole.

431. The predominance of technical departments and technical interests creates something of a tension at the heart of FAO as far as gender is concerned, and generates a series of different ways in which gender mainstreaming is understood. In most, gender is a secondary issue. These include:

An approach to gender which focuses on women as a marginal category in need of special assistance. Here women as an undifferentiated category are frequently lumped together with other marginal groups, e.g. youth, the elderly and indigenous groups. Such an approach equates gender with women; there is no attempt at a gender analysis; and interventions often reinforce existing gender differentials. Frequently such interventions appeared to be add-ons, resulting from donor requirements to include a gender component, but did not demand the integration of gender analysis or a cultural shift in understandings.

- i. An approach to gender which focuses on the untapped and potential role of women as producers. Running through much of FAO's thinking is a focus on people as factors of production. Much of this thinking stresses the role of men as breadwinners and women as wives. In this context gender mainstreaming focused on how women might be converted into productive assets. SOFA 2011 made the case for women as producers, although it focused almost entirely on the productive potential of women heads of households, not on the productive role of women in agriculture when they are members of their households, as wives or daughters or mothers. Although presented as gender-aware, this approach had little to say about gender relations.
- ii. An approach to gender which sees it as a 'problem', often as part of a wider set of social factors. Here, technical issues are prioritized and gender or women are seen as an issue which has to be addressed in order to facilitate the technical solution. This entails at least some sort of gender analysis, but gender is still seen as a secondary issue.
- iii. An approach to gender which recognizes the importance of gender and social analysis and sees people rather than commodities as central to FAO's mission. Here, the focus is on producing situations in which men and women have more equitable access to resources and decision making, and where the proceeds of productive activities are shared in a more equitable fashion. Such an approach recognizes that gender is not simply about women but about women and men; that men and women do not form homogeneous entities; that in different situations power is distributed between the genders in different ways; and that change involves both men and women.

432. In practice, most of FAO's activities fall into the first two categories where gender is synonymous with women and where technical goals and means are prioritized. The third understanding of how gender is to be integrated into the development process at least acknowledges the importance of gender, but still subordinates it to the technical. Few if any of FAO's activities fit into the final category which most closely approximates to a full appreciation of what 'gender mainstreaming' implies. But this was not surprising, for it involves a reversal of priorities in the organization's culture: a change in culture which requires that technical and scientific knowledge are understood as a means of achieving social and development objectives.

433. This reversal of values is crucial in understanding why there was so much resistance to gender mainstreaming in FAO. Admittedly, this also happened in many other organizations. The worth of the Organization as a whole was seen as its contribution in terms of a particular set of technical skills and inputs to agricultural development. The existing hierarchy was and is predicated on the ownership of particular sorts of knowledge and skills. Staff members' identities and self-esteem are in large measure dependent upon their roles as scientists or technical specialists. Gender mainstreaming

threatens these certainties by introducing a new set of values in which people rather than commodities are central, and in which a completely new set of skills, competencies and knowledge sets are required.

434. Some of the more reflective members of staff were well aware of the issues that gender mainstreaming raised. They stressed that for all their sympathy to a person-centred, gender-aware approach they lacked the necessary skills: after all they were ‘scientists’. Furthermore, they pointed to the difficulties of integrating two very different intellectual traditions, the scientific/technical on the one hand; the sociological/interpretive on the other.

435. One of the ways in which attempts had been made to bridge this gap between the two cultures was through the use of handbooks, checklists and simple guides to gender and social analysis. In effect these were attempts to make one culture accessible to members of another, equipping a forester or a plant scientist or a fish disease specialist with the means to carry out simple sociological or gender analyzes. Yet there is a major question as to how far this could lead to gender mainstreaming or a reversal of cultural priorities. In effect it perpetuated an existing hierarchy in which technical expertise was valued above social analytical skills.

436. In conclusion, during the evaluation period, the culture of FAO was found to be antithetical to gender mainstreaming. Internally the Organization appeared to have done relatively little to deal with a major imbalance in the employment of men and women. In terms of its policies and practices, it failed to shift its priorities and remained an organization which valued commodities over people. Within FAO, gender remained culturally marginalized.

## **XII. Main conclusions and recommendations**

437. The Evaluation has analyzed the work by FAO aimed at implementing the corporate commitments made to its Member States, through the adoption of the Gender and Development Plans of Action in 2002 and in 2008 and the integration into Strategic Objective K, ‘Gender equity in access to resources, goods, services and decision-making in rural areas’ in 2010.

438. The findings showed that achievements were short of plans and expectations. At best, 40% of FAO’s projects have integrated, to a variable degree, a notion of gender equality during their implementation, whereas the Evaluation has found that this figure should be 75-80% of the whole field programme. This means that in around 35-40% of all FAO projects, the gender dimension was ignored, even though gender equity in access to resources and decision making was relevant to achieve the stated project objectives and not taking it into account undermined the effectiveness and sustainability of the initiative. Overall, this weakness was also mirrored in FAO’s Global Public Goods. They too lacked a social and gender perspective even when those aspects were relevant and important to most of the topics discussed.

439. Corporate mechanisms for mainstreaming gender, ranging from the Project and Programme Review Committee to the Gender Focal Points, have broadly failed. A paramount factor in this failure has been identified by the Evaluation in the lack of attention to and accountability about gender mainstreaming at the highest levels of the Organization. FAO, using catchy jargon, “did not walk the talk”, and the talk was limited in any case.

440. The corporate culture and staff competence on gender reflected and reinforced each other: gender was not recognized as a technical specialization in its own right. However it had to be dealt with at least formally, so it became the task of junior female colleagues who had by definition no possibility of making any changes to a hierarchical, technical and male dominated organization like FAO.

441. Improvements have been ongoing, in particular for the implementation of several of the recommendations by the Gender Audit managed by ESW in 2010 and finalized in early 2011. The Evaluation is aware of some of the actions already taken since early 2011 by ESW and FAO as a follow up to that exercise, in particular in the areas of the GFP terms of reference and accountability at the most senior level through mandatory activities in their PEMS agreements. These are

commendable, as they show the renewed corporate commitment to mainstreaming gender equality in the work of the Organization.

442. These were initial positive steps that have to be followed by further and deeper change, in staffing, culture, competence in gender issues. FAO will need to recognize at all levels that gender mainstreaming requires much more than simply involving women as beneficiaries of projects. Gender mainstreaming for gender equality is a transformative process involving men and women and their control over resources and decision making.

443. In this context, the Evaluation identified core principles that FAO should integrate and internalize to improve the relevance, effectiveness, sustainability and impact of most of its work at the broader level, as “people” are the true stakeholders of the Organization and “equality among them” will be the path to food security for all. The principles could be embedded in the FAO policy and strategy on gender equality recommended below. They are illustrated in Box 28.

**Box 28. Core principles for FAO to integrate gender equality in its work**

- a) People are central to FAO’s core mission of ensuring food security for all. Through its member states, the primary beneficiaries of FAO’s work are both men and women, especially those living in rural areas. FAO’s work is central to meeting the intersection between Millennium Development Goals 1, to reduce by half the proportion of people who suffer from hunger by 2015, and MDG 3, to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women;
- b) Integrating a gender perspective fully into the Organization’s work is instrumental to achieving its objectives for both pragmatic and ethical reasons. Pragmatically, gender differentials work to exclude women from access to productive resources and decision making and thus discourage the full realization of women’s potential in achieving food security. Ethically, FAO fully subscribes to the United Nations principles on gender equality, including MDG 3. Working towards gender equality is not only good for business; it is also morally imperative;
- c) FAO must ensure that its main and ultimate focus is on people rather than on commodities and that this gets reflected in the new Results Based Management approach;
- d) Achieving gender equality in staffing within FAO is a necessary step on the road to gender mainstreaming throughout all the activities of the Organization. However, achieving such a balance is only one step in this direction. Ensuring that gender considerations are thoroughly integrated into all FAO’s activities requires a transformation in how the Organization conceptualizes and implements its work. Gender awareness has to be instilled at all levels throughout the Organization;
- e) For FAO to effectively mainstream gender, gender expertise must be given due recognition as a professional discipline in its own right.

444. Informed by these principles and based on the evidence illustrated throughout the report, the Evaluation has formulated 17 recommendations, some of which contain multiple actions. Recommendations are set out following an order of priority; however the Evaluation strongly urges the Organization to take all of them in consideration for action in the short to medium term.

445. The Evaluation is fully aware that there will be a cost attached to the implementation of the recommendations. Mainstreaming gender – in staffing, in its normative products and in projects – will not be inexpensive and the Evaluation has included a simple costing exercise later in the report. However, in the long run investing in competence on gender issues within FAO will result in higher effectiveness and greater impact in achieving the objectives of the Organization.

446. Following the repeated observations and evidence throughout the report that the absence of an accountability framework has been a major obstacle to gender mainstreaming in FAO, the Evaluation formulated Recommendation 1, articulated in four sub-items. This recommendation reinforces parts of recommendations n. 2 and 3 by the Gender Audit.

447. It is implicit that the recommended accountability mechanism will include monitoring and reporting, as well as measures of enforcement and follow-up actions in case of non-compliance. A possible additional action suggested to implement Recommendation 1 would be the creation of a post

for senior adviser on gender and social development issues in the Cabinet of the Director General or in the Office of the Deputy Director General for Knowledge. In short, leadership and commitment towards GAD have to be developed and sustained and made strongly visible within the institution.

**Recommendation 1. To FAO Senior Management, on commitment to Gender Equality**

- a) FAO should re-state strongly at the most senior level, its full commitment to gender equality and mainstreaming gender as a corporate responsibility and not of one division only.
- b) FAO should establish an accountability mechanism at senior management level including Division Directors and FAO Representatives, through Results Based Management and PEMS;
- c) Gender should become a regular item on the agenda of senior management;
- d) FAO Governing Bodies should receive regularly reports stemming from the accountability mechanism and recommend actions when compliance is not fully satisfactory.

448. In relation to point d) in Recommendation 1, a possible mechanism would be for ESW to present synthesis reports on progress about gender mainstreaming in FAO to the Joint Session of the Programme and Finance Committee, on a yearly basis. These synthesis reports should provide quantitative and qualitative evidence of progress, or lack of it; they should be based on the evidence provided on progress in gender mainstreaming by each division in FAO through the corporate RBM system (mid-term and final reviews, gender sensitive outputs, etc.), as well as on the direct measurement by ESW of some key indicators such as gender markers and PPRC reports, among others to be developed yet.

449. In order to make explicit the corporate commitment recommended in Recommendation 1, and as proposed by the Gender Audit in its recommendations n.2 and n.8, a formal FAO policy on gender equity and equality appears urgently necessary, through which the Organization can receive guidance on how to transform a concept into real actions and products and inform fully its work. The rather weak contribution to SO-K in 2010-11 also depended on the lack of guidance within FAO of what to do, and how to do, in terms of gender mainstreaming, as discussed in Chapter 3. Thus, the policy should also contain a strategy, relevant guidelines and gender-sensitive planning instruments that provide enough support to mainstream gender in FAO's work. Recommendations 2 and 3 address the need and features of the recommended policy.

**Recommendation 2. To FAO Senior Management, on a Policy for Gender Equality**

FAO should elaborate a corporate policy on Gender Equality that will guide how gender equality goals will be mainstreamed throughout the Organization and all its technical and advocacy work, and will provide a path for the achievement of SO-K. The policy formulation process should be led by the Deputy Director General for Knowledge, with a small team selected from among the Assistant Directors General and Division Directors, including the Director of ESW.

**Recommendation 3. To FAO Senior Management, on the structure and contents of the Policy for Gender Equality**

FAO policy on Gender Equality should contain a strategy and provision for Action Plans at divisional levels. The strategy must go beyond perpetuating existing gender roles and improving livelihoods, to achieving empowerment and gender equality in decision making and access to and control over resources. Women in Development initiatives can be part of the strategy and action plans, as entry-points towards achieving gender equality.

450. FAO must recognize that in order to mainstream gender both the culture of the Organization has to change and the corporate gender imbalance has to be addressed. As far as the gender imbalance is concerned, time-bound targets must be set and integrated into the corporate Human Resources Gender Action Plan under preparation. Cultural change is not an easy process and is often highly stressful for those involved, especially those who will lose most in terms of self-esteem. This process has to be managed and systems put in place to support those threatened by these changes. Recommendations 4 and 5 address these issues. To support both these recommendations, a senior manager should be appointed to oversee the process of change.

**Recommendation 4. To the Human Resources Management Division, on gender balance among staff**

FAO should take steps to ensure a more equal gender balance for staff at all levels of the Organization. This should involve, among other possible actions:

- a) Adopting a proactive policy to recruit more women at professional and higher levels of staff;
- b) Establishing more family-friendly policies including flexible working hours and childcare provisions and a clear recognition of the importance of a satisfactory life/work balance;
- c) Increasing the number of men employed in General Services;
- d) Including the standard UN invitation for female candidates to submit their applications in all FAO vacancy announcements at national and regional level, for staff and consultants.

**Recommendation 5. To FAO Senior Management, on corporate culture**

FAO should take steps to establish a corporate culture which encourages and supports gender equality in all aspects of the Organization. This should include:

- a) Gender awareness sessions for all levels of staff, including upon recruitment;
- b) Counselling and support for those who feel most threatened by cultural and organizational change;
- c) Greater recognition for the varied and complementary contributions made by all staff to the workings of the Organization;
- d) Involvement of external specialists in supporting this process of cultural change.

451. As shown in Chapters 3, 7 and 9 and in the annexes, despite the prominence of gender equity as a cross-cutting goal in FAO's Plans of Action and in the new Strategic Framework of FAO, the resources allocated were far too low to achieve to any meaningful degree the goal of gender equity in access to resources, goods, services and decision making in rural areas. More staff resources are required, either additional or by changes to job descriptions when posts for senior officers become vacant. Also, better capacity in gender is required across the organization at all levels. In the meantime, Gender Focal Points will retain their functions in each division until divisional gender advisors take on their responsibility. In this area as well, as for Recommendation 4, the relevant aspects of the recommendations should be integrated in the corporate Human Resources Gender Action Plan under preparation. Recommendations 6, 7 and 8 address these aspects. The Gender Audit addressed these issues, with focus on the regional level, in its recommendation n.1.

### **Recommendation 6. To FAO, on structure for gender mainstreaming**

- a) Each technical division should have in HQ a senior technical staff member who also has expertise in social/gender issues (divisional gender advisors). Time allocation will vary between divisions, on average it will be around 30%. This will be achieved through new recruitments when senior posts fall vacant.
- b) Gender/social development expert posts should be restored in all regional offices.
- c) Staff competences at sub-regional level should be adjusted either through recruitment or upgrading of policy officers' competence in the areas of gender and social development.
- d) At country level, FAO Representations should include advocacy for gender equality in rural development among their responsibilities and:
- recruit part/full time gender experts depending on the size of the country portfolio to support projects and represent FAO within interagency mechanisms; or
  - recruit gender/social development expert for consultancy support in mainstreaming gender in Country Programming Framework and upcoming projects, should resources be limited.

### **Recommendation 7. To the Emergency Operations and. Rehabilitation Division, on gender expertise in Emergency Coordination Units**

It is recommended that, where warranted by the size of the emergency programme and by the type of emergency being tackled, a dedicated gender specialist should be recruited for Emergency Coordination Units.

### **Recommendation 8. To FAO, on competence on gender mainstreaming of staff and consultants**

FAO should integrate competence and skills on gender issues as a selection and appraisal criterion in all its recruitment and appraisal processes, for both staff and consultants. The weighting given to this competence will depend on each specific job description.

452. The Evaluation elaborated on the required additional resources that would be required to cover Recommendation 6. These are indicated in Box 29. It is important to stress that if all of these measures will be implemented, the corporate allocation to gender equality in terms of staffing will be approximately 2% of FAO Net Appropriation, well below the share of resources that most other UN agencies dedicate to gender mainstreaming. Thus, this should be considered as a basic minimum target to be achieved over the next two biennia. Once this system is in place, there should be an automatic increase in resources accruing to SO-K because of more systematic integration of gender equality aspects in FAO's technical work. Should there be more needs identified, these should be put forward and negotiated within the PWB process for more resources. The Evaluation is also aware that given the permanent nature of the increase in budget recommended, this will have to come from the RP Net Appropriation and will require decrease in other areas of the Organization. However, the team is also fully convinced, as stated above, that these changes will pay back the investment in terms of increased effectiveness, sustainability and impact of FAO's work at large.



**Box 29. Additional staff resources for gender mainstreaming in FAO per biennium**

Location in the Organization	Staff resources	Incremental Cost (USD)	Notes
ESW gender staff	One P5 and one P4	1 million	As recommended also by the Gender Audit, to facilitate gender mainstreaming in FAO
Regional staff	Five P5 level	2 million	Additional resources will be required for four of them in comparison with current ROs staffing
Divisional gender advisors	Approximately 30% of 30 staff at P5 level = 10 senior officers	5 million	Re-allocation of resources to SO-K for divisional gender advisors
Sub-regional offices	Approximately 30% of 10 policy officers= 3 senior policy officers.	1.5 million	Re-allocation of resources to SO-K for divisional gender advisors
Country offices			Two options were suggested, depending on the FAO portfolio in the country; it will be mostly charged directly or through Administrative and Operation Support costs from Voluntary funded initiatives
Total new allocation to SO-K		9.5 million	Approximately 2% of FAO Net Appropriation per biennium

453. The role and performance of ESW in gender was discussed in detail in Chapters 4, 5 and 8. The Evaluation considers that ESW must continue to be a key player in FAO's revamped efforts to mainstream gender equality. The Division should enhance its primary role as think-tank on gender and social equality issues and maintain its advisory and facilitator role to the rest of the Organization to fully integrate a gender perspective in their work. The responsibility for asking this support will however rest with the technical units, as well as any related cost. ESW will also maintain the responsibility to monitor the progress made by FAO on gender mainstreaming, through analysis of the implementation of PPRC recommendations and use of gender qualifiers in FPMIS. On these aspects, it is suggested that ESW should report to the Joint session of the Finance and Programme Committee once per year (see above). Last, the Gender Officers in ESW responsible for gender mainstreaming will also foster and facilitate exchanges and learning opportunities among the current Gender Focal Points, the future Divisional Gender Advisors and gender experts in all decentralized offices as foreseen in Recommendation 6, either at regional or global level. Recommendations 9 and 10 address the multiple functions and role of ESW. The Gender Audit tackled similarly some aspects of ESW staffing, in its own recommendation n. 4.

**Recommendation 9. To FAO Senior Management, on the role of ESW on Gender and Social Equality**

Building on existing strengths, ESW should be the think-tank in FAO on social equality issues, including gender. In this capacity, it will:

- i) be the LTU of and contribute to projects with a strong focus on social equality and gender issues; ii) continue to develop normative products in support of improving the integration of social and gender equality aspects in FAO's work.

### **Recommendation 10. To ESW on its role in gender mainstreaming in FAO**

ESW should facilitate gender mainstreaming in the rest of the Organization in an advisory role. For this purpose, it should:

- i) assign or recruit a senior staff member to work full time with a more junior staff member on SO-K and provide expert advice and guidance on gender mainstreaming, gender tagging, reporting and production of relevant normative products;
- ii) maintain a network linking FAO divisional gender advisors and gender experts in decentralized offices, to keep them updated and canvass their experience and expertise for normative products and inter-departmental work;
- iii) provide assistance to FAO staff engaged with flagship normative products and field programmes to ensure that they integrate a gender equality perspective in their outputs and outcomes, both at country and global level;
- iv) monitor the progress by FAO on gender integration through FPMIS, evaluation reports and any other indicator it will develop or identify with other units in the Organization;
- v) collaborate with PPRC to integrate lessons learned on gender mainstreaming in new projects;
- vi) provide assistance to FAO at large on how to incorporate gender disaggregated information into projects and normative products, upon request;
- vii) provide assistance at country level to FAO's Country Programming Frameworks, in FAO's contribution to UNDAF and in UNJP initiatives, upon request and with cost recovery.

454. There is no doubt that FAO staff competences in the area of gender equality are far from satisfactory at corporate level, as discussed in Chapters 6, 7, 9 and 11 and in the annexes. One key question was whether it was realistic to expect that all professional staff in the Organization should receive adequate training to become capable of integrating gender meaningfully in their work. The Evaluation's answer was no, although it fully acknowledged that a certain level of awareness on the relevance of gender issues in FAO's work among all staff was highly desirable. Equally, FAO does not seem to have strong comparative advantage in developing capacities on gender issues within Member States and this area of work should not be considered a priority to be addressed through FAO's Regular Programme. In this light, Recommendations 11 and 12 were formulated. The Gender Audit tackled similar issues to Recommendation 11, in its own recommendation n. 9.

### **Recommendation 11. To FAO, on capacity development in gender mainstreaming within FAO**

- a) CSH and ESW should develop templates for gender-awareness raising sessions for all FAO staff, also at project level, to be used in the orientation sessions for new staff and which include FAO's gender policy and mainstreaming mechanisms and tools;
- b) Capacity development on GAD should be specific and focused on the needs of different units and divisions, including practical 'how to' guidelines for mainstreaming gender in the field programme and the normative work of each unit;
- c) Under the responsibility of each technical division and decentralized office, all FAO internal and external capacity development programmes, including orientation programmes for new staff and project personnel and, whenever gender would be a relevant aspect of the topic, should integrate social inclusion and gender equality in their curricula.

### **Recommendation 12. To FAO and its Member States on capacity development of Members States on gender mainstreaming**

FAO should carry out capacity development on gender mainstreaming in Member States only when sufficient voluntary funds are made available. When requests for support in this area will be presented to FAO, they will be directed to the unit in the best position to meet the specific demand.

455. With respect to staff-training events and building on the on-going experience among the Rome-based agencies on staff capacity development, joint events aimed at expanding knowledge and awareness on gender issues for staff from the three agencies would be a cost-effective and mutually enriching approach.

456. The analysis in Chapter 5 provided strong evidence for the need that FAO, despite its decision to phase out its normative work on HIV and AIDS, maintains open its commitment to work with HIV and AIDS affected people in rural areas, in those countries where the pandemic has a strong impact on food security at household and local level. Recommendation 13 addresses this issue.

**Recommendation 13. To FAO, on commitment to work in HIV and AIDS**

FAO should maintain the commitment to work with HIV and AIDS affected and infected people in its field programmes and projects in countries where the epidemic has an impact on rural population. This should be achieved through partnership with UNAIDS and other agencies and through some capacity in the regional or sub-regional offices where the pandemic has a stronger impact on rural livelihoods and food-security to backstop these projects.

457. Chapter 7 and the Annexes provided detail and discussed the common weaknesses noted across most of FAO projects in relation to mainstreaming gender and social inclusion concerns. It will be of paramount importance that FAO devotes more attention and ‘intelligence’ to the preparation of its projects, so as to ensure that they fully integrate a gender and social inclusion perspective from the very first steps of formulation and implementation Recommendation 14 illustrates the key elements to be taken into account to improve the quality of FAO’s projects.

**Recommendation 14. To FAO, on project effectiveness**

In all projects - emergency, rehabilitation and development - that have an impact on people FAO should:

- a) carry out a social analysis at the design or inception stage; cost effective approaches include use of pre-existing studies and analysis and scoping studies;
- b) develop a clear road map for gender concerns within each project, including indicators for its monitoring;
- c) integrate social development and gender expertise in project design, formulation and inception and a budget line for a gender specialist wherever possible;
- d) integrate the perspectives of male and female project participants on needs, goals and indicators in project design and implementation;
- e) design regional and national projects within agreed frameworks of reference in terms of targets and indicators, that allow adaptation to address gender differences depending on the local context.

458. As illustrated in Chapters 7 and 8, the Evaluation found strong evidence that the effectiveness of FAO’s projects on gender equality was greatly enhanced when the Organization collaborated with UN agencies, associations and NGOs that had a mandate on gender advocacy and a strong capacity in integrating gender issues in field initiatives. These were clear win-win situations, where each partner contributed its comparative advantage in favour of rural women.

459. Since January 2011, moreover, UN Women has the authority to hold other agencies in the UN accountable for gender mainstreaming and is developing a capillary network of UN Women representations at country level. This represents a key opportunity for FAO, in particular at country level, for developing partnerships with UN Women and integrating a gender perspective in its Country Programming Frameworks and actual project implementation. Recommendations 15 and 16 address these issues.

**Recommendation 15. To FAO, on Partnerships and alliances**

- a) FAO should develop partnerships and alliances with those organizations – national, regional and international NGOs, associations and governmental institutions – that are competent in gender and social development for project design and implementation;
- b) FAO should participate in UN Joint programmes aiming at gender equality, supporting women’s productive role in agriculture, and ESW support should be secured through adequate cost-recovery mechanisms;
- c) FAO at country level should participate in the UNCT gender working groups to raise the profile of the productive role of rural women.

**Recommendation 16. To FAO, on Partnership with UN Women**

- a) FAO should establish a partnership with UN Women at corporate level, to capture support at regional and country level in furthering empowerment of rural women;
- b) ESW should work with UN Women based on respective comparative advantage in support to rural women, in particular, but not exclusively, in the areas of land rights and food security and nutrition mapping.

460. The Evaluation also identified a number of weaknesses in Chapters 6, 7 and 9 that negatively impacted on the image of the Organization in terms of its gender awareness and on its capacity to report on achievements in gender mainstreaming. These apparently minor but in fact key issues are tackled in Recommendation 17 below.

**Recommendation 17. To FAO, on operationalizing gender mainstreaming**

- a) FAO must systematically include in its reporting systems, sex-disaggregated information on project participants and on achievements on gender equality;
- b) The Office of Corporate Communications and External Relations and the Office of Knowledge Exchange, Research and Extension should ensure that all FAO publications, leaflets, briefs and communication materials should be revised before finalization and printing to ensure that they do not convey sexist messages – in words or images - in relation to women’s and men’s roles and responsibilities.
- c) ESW and TCDM should develop gender qualifiers for FAO projects, compatible with the gender markers system made mandatory by the Inter-Agency Standing Committee for the emergency and rehabilitation sector, and related guidelines for their use in the corporate information systems, to enhance its accuracy and reliability. The guidelines should be distributed throughout the Organization, followed by support through a help-desk system. The new PPRC mechanism should be brought into the process of assigning gender markers to the projects it revises.

461. Other possible actions undoubtedly exist to operationalize gender throughout the Organization, in particular at the decentralized level. For example, a potentially effective means would be to include as an item for discussion in the agenda of the regular meetings for FAO Representatives and sub-regional project directors at the regional and sub-regional level, the exchange of experiences on gender mainstreaming. Other possible options should be identified at regional and sub-regional level directly by stakeholders.

462. Last but not least, the Evaluation team analyzed in depth the work of FAO in a number of thematic areas through a gender perspective. The annexes to the main report illustrate this in detail. Through that analysis, a number of ‘steps forward’ were formulated for the specific departments and units and are to be found in the respective annexes. Those will not be included in the Management Response and will not be reported against in the Follow-up Reports; they should be taken as professional advice by independent external peers who had an in-depth insight in the work of FAO.