CCAFS Gender Research Strategy

Gender Analysis in CRP Priority Setting and Research

Gender research has substantially influenced the direction of CCAFS in all four areas identified by Lipper et al (2014) (see Section 1.0.4), as well as in FPs. Gender research in Phase I included: modelling yield gaps to identify and prioritize adaptation measures that benefit women farmers (2014); baseline surveys in all CCAFS sites that include a gender component (2013); systematic review of gender issues in climate risk management and gender-disaggregated field-based analysis of local use of climate information (2012); and training, models, tools and approaches to collect gender and social differentiated information on climate analogues, climate information, institutions, mitigation, and adaptation and risk (2011).

FP1: Priorities and Policies for CSA. The Linking Knowledge to Action theme (2011-2014) influenced the integration of gender into the CCAFS MELIA and MARLO frameworks. This contributed in 2014 to RBM that substantively integrated gender into all Flagship research. The social learning approach also prompted expansion of the gender approach to include social "differentiation" (Kristjanson et al. 2014; Jost et al. 2015a). GSI was highlighted as a key strategy through which CCAFS research (including the Gender and Inclusion Toolbox) would help next users both inside and outside of the CRP to champion changes in CSA adoption approaches, policies and institutions (Jost et al. 2014). Work by Meinzen-Dick et al. (2012) and Beuchelt and Badstue (2013) highlighted the centrality of gender and women's empowerment for nutrition and food security and the fact that women play different roles in attaining food security. As a result the FP focuses on the role of climate-smart institutions to increase women's ability to control and make decisions around the use of resources to improve child health, enhance food and nutrition security, and increase education, all of which contribute to poverty reduction. In relation to climate policy, research has highlighted the low representation of gender in national and global policy and the importance of gender equality to achieve food and nutrition security and climate objectives (Gumucio and Tafur, 2015; Huyer 2016).

FP2: Climate-Smart Technologies and Practices. Gender research in this FP has highlighted the lack of data and evidence on how CSA practices will impact women and men, and analysed gender benefits in CA. Findings include that men and women have different priorities for CSA, and that an enabling environment (policy, incentives, etc.) for gender and CSA considers strategic gender needs in addition to practical gender needs (Acosta et al. 2015; Gumucio and Tafur, 2015). The Gender Household Survey (CCAFS et al. 2013) provides differentiated data at baseline and subsequent stages which has been crucial to understand the gender aspects of climate vulnerability. Analysis of the survey has helped to inform the agendas of all FPs, but most specifically FP2 and FP4 (particularly in relation to accessing CSA information). Main findings are that across sites in Africa and Asia, women tend to be less aware of CSA practices and that they receive less information than men about climate change and agriculture (Twyman et al. 2014; Jost et al. 2015; Mittal, forthcoming). This research has also influenced an understanding that research and action need to be taken to the individual rather than the

household/farm level to understand intra-household dynamics and decision making processes (Twyman et al. 2015), and the implications for CSA adoption of out-migration to urban areas. Greater understanding of women's non-traditional activities is needed, along with changes occurring in gender roles as a result of environmental and social factors (Twyman, 2015; Gonda, forthcoming).

FP3: Low Emissions Development. FP3 has set research priorities and identified high impact research for specific mitigation options in the regions. A gender and LED strategy developed in 2013 (Edmunds et al. 2013) identified three priority topics: (1) increasing awareness of norms of power, control and influence between men and women in decisions about LED practices; (2) improving innovation systems to value women's needs and knowledge to support new management practices, and providing women with information; and (3) assessing the impacts of LED practices on women to provide early warning about potential inequities, identify where change is needed and contribute to the design of more successful interventions. Action research in three countries with Prolinnova has informed recognition of the need for community-level action in scaling up and using innovation approaches that create spaces for exchange of views to support changes in gender relations. In Honduras women worked with men to select agroforestry species (Hottle, 2015). Focusing on priority sectors and regions for mitigation, research in 2015-2016 synthesized existing knowledge, analysed opportunities for improving gender outcomes, and developed gender workplans with project leaders for fertilizer use, rice and livestock (Farnworth 2015, forthcoming a, b, c, d).

FP4: Climate Services and Safety Nets. Patterns of unequal access to climate information and advisory services exist according to who can or cannot make use of these services to manage climate risks and strengthen resilience. Phase I provided insights into the differing needs of women and men for climate information and related services. FP4 research has found that the farmers who tend to be most vulnerable to climate change stresses are resource-poor, female and lower caste, marginalized by community sociocultural norms, and invisible to many outsiders (Tall et al. 2014). However, FP4 research also demonstrates that women farmers value climate and agricultural information when they have access to it, and that it is an important factor in the adoption of CSA by women (Kristjanson et al. 2015; Twyman et al. 2014). Gender-specific and -tailored climate services are required that take into account women's agricultural tasks. The nature of communication channels required to reach the most vulnerable groups will differ according to sociocultural and gender differences (Kristjanson et al. 2015; Tall et al. 2014). FP4 research on index insurance indicates that trends in adoption also reflect gender differences in access to resources (Kumar forthcoming).

Operationalizing gender in the CRP research agenda

Research to date in CCAFS has demonstrated that integrating GSI into the program is critical for it to achieve its objectives. Program management recognized in 2014 that even greater emphasis on gender was needed and a new cross-cutting theme on gender was established, with the hiring in 2015 of a Global Research Leader on Gender and Social Inclusion. The draft recomendations from the CCAFS External Review also point to the need for increasing the focus on gender. It is in this light that the GSI strategy has been prepared. In Phase II, GSI research and results will be integrated through: Flagship research; gender-disaggregated data sets; indicators on technology uptake, gender-focused CapDev indicators (see Annex Table 3b) and indicators for six of the 12 CCAFS sub-IDOs; % of budget allocated to strategic and integrated gender research; and staff diversity indicators. As a result of ongoing reviews and syntheses in 2015-2016 of Phase I research, a series of gender gaps in research and assessment have been identified for integrating GSI more systematically into the CRP, along with promising areas for further analysis.

Flagship research. All FPs are using the results of gender research, analysis and tools to identify research priorities for Phase II. **FP1** will utilize and build on research that informs, catalyses and targets CSA for women and other vulnerable groups (Jost et al. 2015a,b). Recognizing that a lack of sex-disaggregated data has resulted in underestimation of women's contributions to livelihoods, health and nutrition (Huyer 2014), sex-disaggregated data collected during Phase I will be used for ex ante evaluation and priority setting to understand the implications of CSA interventions on men, women, youth, and marginalized groups. FP1 will explore and test the best methods for formulating policies and programs that encourage equitable access to and control of productive assets. This will involve examining how GSI research findings are taken up by decision-makers. The aim is to better integrate gender into climate change policy and investment decisions.

In Phase II **FP2** will identify trade-offs of food security, adaptation and mitigation of CSA and whether they differ for men and women, young and old. It will address intra-household dynamics and decision-making processes to identify incentives for women's adoption of and benefits from CSA (including finance instruments). Addressing questions related to CSA and gender will help identify those practices and technologies that have positive impacts on the control of productive assets and resources within communities. Work initiated in 2016 will continue to develop a conceptual framework and GSI metrics for designing context-specific and gender-sensitive interventions. These include gender in CSA indicators at national and project levels; and inclusion of gender in the CSA best practices compendium.

It also includes integrating gender into scaling up frameworks, for example in CSVs. A major challenge for CSA is to identify the context-specific technologies and supporting measures that may be needed; and the trade-offs and co-benefits that different combinations of options will deliver, for different stakeholders including women (Beuchelt and Badstue, 2013; Bryan et al. 2015; Locatelli et al. 2015; Thornton and Herrero 2015). CCAFS proposes to address fundamental questions via participatory research at climate-smart villages (CSVs) and district scale with farmers and development agencies, including the private sector. This research will be linked to higher-level analyses (e.g. models of scaling processes and trade-offs) to generate IPGs on alternatives for agricultural development.

Phase I work informs **FP3** priorities and plans for Phase II in several ways: those mitigation options with the highest potential impacts involve activities dominated by men, especially in decision-making, so targeting women for adoption in the short-run will cause trade-offs in meeting SLOs. As a result FP3 has focused on increasing women's technical expertise, for example in the CLIFF and LAMNET PhD programs, and engagement in policy. Other opportunities include targeting value chain niches where women are more active, such as dairy; and analysis of gender safeguards, a requirement for climate finance. Participatory analysis of incentives for alternate wetting and drying in rice will take place in Southeast Asia. Current research on gender priorities and training in livestock in Kenya is influenced by an understanding that overcoming barriers for women in the sector is important for achieving NAMA goals. Dairy-related research with a gender dimension will take place in several countries. Two postdoc positions on gender and livestock are in place.

FP4 research in Phase I demonstrated that climate services can be implemented in a way that either reinforces existing gender and social inequities, or fosters equity by effectively targeting women and other social groups. As a result, institutional services that target rural communities are a major part of the FP4 agenda. In Phase II, research will build on these findings to strengthen understanding of how climate services and agricultural insurance can meet the differing needs of women and men and integrate this understanding into scaling up. Current evidence will be synthesized and new evidence will be generated to inform investment, design and implementation of services that reach both women and men.

Current gaps and areas for future research. In Phase I, insufficient attention was paid to coordinating research and results across the program. Steps need to be taken to *collect, synthesize and assess research to date* and to establish a basis for priorities going forward. Plans are underway for synthetic

activities in 3 FPs in 2016 (FP1: climate and food systems policy; FP2: CSA measurement and scaling up frameworks; FP4: climate services). In 2017 a synthesis of FP3 research will refine a GSI agenda for LED.

Another gap is **gender impact assessment of CSA technologies**. An assessment in 2013 indicated that 29% of Flagship products produced were explicitly targeted to women farmers, while 0% Flagship products were assessed for likely gender-disaggregated impact. In 2014, these percentages increased to 38% and 25% respectively. CCAFS will continue to measure this through the Phase II FP2 indicator "Number of site-specific targeted CSA technologies/practices tested, with all options examined for their gender implications". A gender impact assessment framework and method for this is being developed.

While steps have been taken, the challenge for CCAFS is to move beyond **diagnostic research to gender-transformative research,** or transformation of gender roles and relations between women and men (Cole et al. 2014). Action research is needed to analyse the most promising options for promoting the inclusion of women and youth in CSA. Development of tools and methodologies for CSA policy and programming, integration of GSI into scaling up strategies, and methods for working with policy makers, finance institutions and local institutions are also needed.

Power relations and socio-cultural norms affect the ability of different social groups to access and control productive resources and to participate in decision making. Phase II research will help to better understand **intra-household dynamics and decision making**, as well as options, models and methods for promoting equitable decision making among household members. An FP3 gender and livestock post-doc position will contribute research on household methodologies.

Gender monitoring indicators. CCAFS has included gender components in six of its 12 sub-IDOs. Included in these are two gender and youth sub-IDOs (Section 1.0.4). Sex-disaggregated data on beneficiary populations and participants are collected in all projects, and are integrated into all monitoring and endline data. The capacity development strategy also includes four gender-focussed indicators that will be tracked (Annex Table 3b). Gender is integrated into the MELIA, MARLO and RBM frameworks. Independent evaluations (including one undertaken in 2015) also integrate sex-disaggregated data and assessment of gender analysis in their review. The percentage of program funds going to gender-focused activities is targeted at 20% for Phase II (up from 15% in 2015). Attention to serious gender research will be monitored through RBM, and poor performance will be penalized by budget adjustments. There will also be capacity development efforts to raise understanding about gender research. Gender research budgets will follow the guidance contained in Definitions of Gender Research for CRP Budgets (June 2015), prepared by the CGIAR Gender and Agriculture Research Network. Staff diversity indicators in the GSI Strategy will monitor % women on the Program Management Committee, as Research Leaders and as Regional Program Leaders. The ultimate goal is that all bodies achieve a target of 50% women.

Enabling environment for women scientists

CCAFS supports women's active participation in research, capacity building, policy engagement activities and events at local to international levels. It will increase access of women scientists to research and training opportunities. It has a policy of recruitment and leadership development of women scientists. Three of seven members of the PMC will be women in Phase II, while three of six FPLs/Global Research Leaders and two of five RPLs are women.