Responsible Gender Scaling Strategies for Mechanized Conservation Agriculture Innovation Packages in Zimbabwe

Highlights from the GenderUp Workshop, 8 August 2023, Harare, Zimbabwe

Ojongetakah Enokenwa Baa, Karen Nortje and Thato Mabele

2023

Affiliation of authors

Ojongetakah Enokenwa Baa[1] Karen Nortje[1] and Thato Mabele[1]
[1] International Water Management Institute, South Africa

Citation

Acknowledgments

CGIAR Initiative on Diversification in East and Southern Africa

The CGIAR Initiative on Diversification in East and Southern Africa aims to help smallholders transition to sustainably intensified, diversified, and de-risked agri-food systems based on maize in 12 ESA countries. Specifically, it seeks to enable 50,000 value chain actors, including farmers (at least 40% women, 40% youth), to adopt climate-smart maize-based intensification and diversification practices and one million to access digital agro-advisory services. Emphasizing the role of the private sector in driving such transformation, UU targets to support at least 30 start-ups and SMEs.

Disclaimer

This publication has been prepared as an output of the CGIAR Initiative on Diversification in East and Southern Africa and has not been independently peer-reviewed. Responsibility for editing, proofreading, and layout, opinions expressed, and any possible errors lies with the authors and not the institutions involved.

Contents

Introduction

The Ukama Ustawi Initiative WP5 (Empower & Engage) facilitated a GenderUp workshop in collaboration with Wageningen University in Harare, Zimbabwe at the Monomotapa Hotel on 8th August 2023. The workshop was a follow-up to the WP1 innovation scaling readiness workshop on Mechanized Conservation Agriculture that took place in June 2023. The workshop brought together the Ukama Ustawi WP1 team (on mechanized CA) and stakeholders engaged in Conservation Agriculture (CA) from the Ministry of Agriculture, FAO, USAID, Community Technology Development Trust, researchers, and Canadian Food Grains Bank/ Tearfund in Zimbabwe to scale the use of mechanized CA from a gender lens. Presentations covered mechanized CA under WP1 by Dr Blessing Mhlanga from CIMMYT and from WP5 on gender and social inclusion by Dr Everisto Mapedza (IWMI). Dr Ojong Enokenwa Baa from WP5 (IWMI) facilitated the GenderUp session.

Pic 1: Blessing Mhlanga (WP1)   Pic 2: Everisto Mapedza (WP5)   Pic 3: Ojong Enokenwa Baa (WP5)

Workshop Objectives

The GenderUp training had the following objectives:

1. To facilitate a GenderUp process to design responsible gender scaling strategies for mechanized CA innovation packages in Zimbabwe
2. To provide scaling partners and stakeholders with a conversational method for designing responsible scaling strategies in a particular context where they operate using the GenderUp strategy.
3. Support project/entrepreneur teams who want to scale the use of mechanized conservation agriculture (innovation) in a socially inclusive way and who want to prevent undesirable outcomes.
4. To facilitate a GenderUp process to design responsible gender scaling strategies for mechanized CA innovation packages in Zimbabwe, to support stakeholder scale innovation in a gender and socially inclusive way for diverse groups of people in agriculture and food systems.

Methodological Approach

With about 17 participants, through an interactive process, the sessions supported users in identifying gender and other relevant diversity among innovation users and improving the scaling strategy by optimizing the inclusion of relevant social groups and anticipating unintended negative consequences for different social groups. **Table 1** consists of pre-survey key highlights (responded to by 14 participants) stating their expectations from the workshop.

Table 1: Pre-survey key highlights

Questions	Responses
Which socially marginalized groups do you believe are restricted from accessing and/or utilizing your innovations in some way?	Women, low-income groups, single heads of households, youth/elderly, groups with disability, migratory groups, remote/hard-to-reach groups, and religious minority groups.
Please list any complementary innovations you believe are necessary for your innovation to have an impact at scale (i.e., mobile phone access, agricultural extension support, specific policies, etc.).	Digital innovations, extension and support services, training, capacity building & empowerment, seed networks, crop diversification, specific policies
What do you hope to gain from using the GenderUp Scaling Tool?	- A better understanding of gender issues in programming/research, and knowledge to scale and implement projects from a gender perspective. - How to integrate GenderUp tool in mechanization CA. - To understand how communities are empowered on what to use and how to use them efficiently. - To understand gender dynamics and apply gender tools in targeting interventions, deeper technical expertise on gender and social inclusion.
On which geographical scale do you want to have an impact when scaling your innovation?	The majority noted at the national level, while only one indicated at the regional level and none at the local level.
How familiar are you with the idea of "complementary innovations" (innovations that enable the core innovation to have an impact at scale)?	Some participants indicated they were aware of complimentary innovations but did not know how to scale them in a gender-responsible way.
How much of a priority do you place on scaling up your innovation?	More than half are familiar with scaling innovations and place some priority on scaling up innovations
Is your project team currently collecting gender-disaggregated data?	Indicated by more than 80% of those who responded.
Are gender and socially marginalized groups relevant considerations for your innovation?	Noted as relevant by at least 60% of the respondents.

Workshop Group Discussion Outcomes

Group discussions were based on 4 main stages as outlined in the GenderUp process and the participants split into three working groups. The discussions centered around the four stages which are: i) defining the innovation scaling innovation, ii) discussing relevant dimensions of diversity, talking through iii) implications for intersectionality, and iv) mitigating consequences and embracing opportunities.

      The following factors were considered for effective scaling:

1. **Anticipating Long-Term Negative Consequences**: Considering the potential negative outcomes, both immediate and long-term, resulting from its adoption.

2. **Identifying Relevant Diversity:** By understanding which aspects of the farmer's life are vital to their farming activity, we can design better solutions to benefit them.

3. **Considering Socially Differentiated Effects**: By considering the social diversity of communities and individuals, we can develop and distribute equitable innovations.

4. **Trade-offs Associated with Scaling**: Scaling any innovation involves trade-offs, which should be identified and anticipated in advance to reduce the risks to farmers and farming communities.

1.1 Stage 1 – Defining the Innovation and Scaling Innovation:

Innovation – novel practices, products, services, models, and institutional arrangements that have a social and/or economic use in society.
Scaling – reaching a larger number of beneficiaries; expanding and/or deepening impact and thereby contributing to development.

Stage 1 focused on considering gender and social diversity in scaling, because women and other marginalized farmers are unlikely to reap the benefits of agriculture innovation compared to men farmers due to their different social experiences (see Figure 1). Agricultural innovations were highlighted as a positive way to transform gender relations when gender is considered in the scaling process. Which, if ignored, gender and social diversity can exacerbate inequity.

STAGE 1 – DEFINING THE INNOVATION AND SCALING INNOVATION

1a) Your Innovation – Mechanized conservation agriculture (CA)

What is the core innovation you are aiming to scale?	Describe which problem the innovation is solving	Describe which development goals the innovation is contributing to	What is the purpose of scaling? What ends do you aim to achieve?

The Context			
Are there other innovations that you are promoting at the same time?	Describe the context where the innovation will be launched (social, geographical, agricultural…)	Describe what your innovation will replace	Describe on which scale you want to have an impact: in the community, regionally or nationally?

Figure 1: Showing group template used for discussion of Stage 1

1.1.1 Defining the innovation and scaling innovation – Key highlights from group discussions

Stage 1 required teams/groups[1] to discuss one to three technologies/innovations each that they could identify as important for scaling. For Group 1, their innovation technology focused on Peanut Butter making machine and Chopper Grinder/Hay Baler, Group 2 focused on Ripper and Basin Digger, and Group 3 focused on two-wheel tractor and Multi-crop thresher **(Table 2 and Table 3)**

Table 2 Your innovation (technology) – Mechanized Conservation Agriculture (CA)

Innovation Group Type	What is the core innovation you are aiming to scale?	Describe which problem the innovation is solving	Describe which development goals the innovation is contributing to	What is the purpose of scaling, what ends do you aim to achieve?
Group 1	1. Peanut butter 2. Chopper grinder/Hay baler	• Manualizing production separations and drudgery Post-harvest losses • Nutrition deficiencies throughout supplementary feeding during lean periods • Poor/low-income proceeds through value addition • Efficient utilization of maize stalks and crop residues	• Increased incomes • Increased/improved food security throughout the year. • improved nutritional status of food for livestock, and human beings. • Employment creation for women and youth	• Increased incomes for participating groups • Increased reach and depth (geographical coverage, • increased beneficiary numbers or target reach: social cohesion.
Group 2	1. Ripper 2. Basin digger	1. Ripper • Labour • Soil disturbance • Soil cover. • Uniform planting depth 2. Basin digger • Labour • Soil disturbance	• End poverty in all its forms • Zero hunger • Economic growth	• Make life easier for both males and females. • Technology is used to increase productivity. • Aim is to achieve food and nutrition security.
Group 3	1. 2-wheel tractor 2. Multi-crop thresher	• Labour shortage + reduce drudgery. • Access affordability of tools • Time taken & human energy	• Ending hunger • Zero poverty • Gender equality • Good health & well-being • Decent work & economic growth	• Reduces manual labour & increases productivity & income for smallholder farmers, leading

---

[1] Groups were asked to limit technological innovation to no more than 3 as it was easier for the remaining stages to focus on this for discussion.

				to increased quality of life (especially for women). • Alleviate demand for post-harvest processing capacity.
		taken (especially for women). • Product quality & value addition • Waste in processing		

The Context				
Innovation Group Type	**Are there other innovations that you are promoting at the same time?**	**Describe the context where the innovation will be launched (social, geographical, agricultural…)**	**Describe what your innovation will replace**	**Describe on which scale you want to have an impact in the community, regionally or nationally?**
Group 1	Yes, a 2-wheel tractor for transporting groundnuts and peanut butter, Agro inputs. Ripper planter for planting nuts, forage Groundnut thrasher Grass mower, and mowers for cutting maize stalks	Natural Regions 3,4, and 5 of Zimbabwe	• Manual grinder • Duri Nemutswi (pestle and thistle) • Free ranging Wastage of maize stalks and crop residue	Community > Regionally> National
Group 2	Yes, good agricultural practices, environment friendly, and diversification of crops.	**Agriculture**- Cereal crops, fodder, and legumes **Social**- All gender groups **Geographical**- In all economic regions	• Hand hoe basins • Conventional plough	Community> Regionally> National

Group 3	Yes, conservation agriculture and diversification, service provider model, and other machinery options as possible parts of the package (mechanism in general e.g. weeding). Feeding strategies for integrated crop-livestock alongside CA	Communities of smallholder farmers throughout Zimbabwe (in crop-producing areas)	• Manual labor and animal traction (agricultural + processing).	Nationally (also regionally and in communities) Set up service providers in communities across the country so that nationally many farmers can access mechanization services.

Table 3 Existing Scaling Strategy

Questions	Group 1: Responses	Group 2: Responses	Group 3: Responses
Restate the innovation for scaling	Peanut butter-making machinery	• Ripper • Basin digger	• 2-wheel tractor • Multi-crop thresher
What kind of training is planned and who is providing it?	• Operation, maintenance, and reports [Technical] • Financial literacy> groups, individuals. • Business Management • Entrepreneurship training [farmers, local suppliers' parts, and machinery] NGOs/CIMMYT/Agritex, private companies, and agents will provide this training.	• Training on use, repair and maintenance • Service provider, Department of Mechanization, and CIMMYT will provide this training.	• Technical training on how to operate a 2-wheel tractor and the multi-crop thresher. • How to service or maintain the tools. • How to manage a business Supplier, CIMMYT, Gwebi Agricultural College will provide this training.
Who is communicating the innovation and through what media?	• NGOs • Private Companies, • Agents The innovation is communicated through government media, print and electronic media, and community radios.	• Service provider • Dept of mechanization • Ukama Ustawi • Agritex The innovation is communicated through emails, flyers, social media, electronic media, TV, radios, and field days/show	CIMMYT. The innovation is communicated through awareness meetings, printed materials, field days and seed fairs, media, and social media, including YouTube in local languages.

What else are you doing so people can use your innovation?	Marketing through: • Awareness meetings • Local Agric shows. • Media coverage • Social media • Print and electronic media, • Demonstrations, and schools.	• Demonstrations • Awareness events	• Collaborating with different stakeholders, including the government. • Service provider model.
What partners are you working with?	• Private companies • NGOs • Traditional leadership. • Agritex • Government ministries and departments. • Donors, schools, clinics, hospitals. • District councils and authorities.	• CIMMYT • FAO • NGOs. • Government, and private sector (mealie brand, kurima)	• Government • Private manufactures • Banks • Farming communities • NGOs • Donors
How will end users benefit from this innovation?	• Income through value addition. • Well-being and standard of living. • Employment creation. • Nutrition food security, and dietary diversity. • Agricultural practices. • Production and productivity.	• Save on labor. • Improvement of livelihoods • Environmental conservation	• Their problems such as Labour shortage + reduced drudgery will be solved.
Do you have specific users or beneficiaries in mind?	• All (women, men, and youth) • Minorities> disabled, elderly, OVCs. • Farmers, shops, clinics, and hospitals	• Farmers (smallholder) • Entrepreneurs	• Smallholder framers, indirectly: manufactures

2.2 Stage 2 – Relevant Dimensions of Diversity:

Dimensions of diversity refer to gender, wealth status, literacy level, indigeneity, land ownership, marital status, family size, religion, and other aspects of social status or norms that have implications on who does not benefit from the scaling of innovation.

The session highlighted that each dimension of diversity corresponds with certain groups, for example:

- Wealth: being rich or poor
- Age: being young or old
- Gender: being a woman or a man
- Equipment: owning or renting

For stage 2, participants explored ways to make use of their relevant innovation and think of the individual consequences of using such technology(ies) as well as the community benefits or consequences that come with the use of the mechanized CA technology.

2.2.1 Relevant dimension of diversity: Key highlights from group discussions

During the session, stage 2 was used to explore relevant diversity and to also look at how different social dimensions can affect access to benefits from the use of technology., Groups were required to indicate why the social dimension is important and how gender impacts each identified diversity dimension through questions that covered a range of thematic areas broken down into individual and community considerations. **Table 4** indicates responses from three different innovation groups.

Table 4: Exploring relevant dimensions of diversity by groups

Innovation Group Type	What resources are required for use of the innovation? (Choose 3)	What is the important resource to use the innovation?	Is access to this resource likely to differ depending on a specific social dimension?	Is it possible that there may be gender differences within each of these dimensions?
Group 1	• Market linkages • Agricultural inputs • machinery	Market Linkages	Yes, they are likely to differ depending on the following social dimensions: • Wealth status • Education • Religion • Geography • Age • Gender • Marital status • People with disabilities	1 **Wealth status** • Male farmers can withstand market rigours than females. • Wealthy farmers can afford meeting costs. 1. **Education** – Uneducated/poor literacy likely to be exploited due to lack of info. 2. **Religion** – Indian, Muslim, and Christian religions affect marketing. 3. **Geography** • Location vs Competition • Infrastructure availability and provision may affect female farmers. 4. **Age** – Youth is more energetic on use but weaker on decision making and control. 5. **Gender** – Male tend to dominate marketing process and proceeds. 6. **Marital status** – single/widows have greater freedom than married (decision making)
		Agricultural inputs	yes, they are likely to differ depending on the following social dimensions: • Wealth status • Geography • Occupation • Land ownership	1. **Geography** – distance, availability (affect both men and women) 2. **Occupation** – one formally and informally employed has greater access to inputs. 3. **Land ownership** male tend to dominate in terms of ownership, access and control decision making

		Machinery	Yes, they are likely to differ depending on the following social dimensions: • Wealth status • Ethnicity • Geography • Gender • Occupation • People with disabilities • Household structure	1. **Ethnicity –** women likely to be disadvantaged due to stereotype and norms. 2. **Geography-**distance and location will determine access to machinery. 3. **People with disabilities** – types of disability will determine access to machinery. 4. **Household structure –** patriarchy tends to have final say in male headed than female headed
Group 2	• Land • Machinery • Agricultural inputs	Land	yes, they are likely to differ depending on the following social dimensions: • Wealth status • Ethnicity • Geography • Age • Gender • Marital status • Occupation • Migrant status • People with disabilities • Land ownership • Household structure	1. **Wealth status** – A rich person can easily get land than the poor. 2. **Ethnicity –** Familiarity ensures that you get land. 3. **Geography** – it's easy to get land in dry barren areas. 4. **Age** – it's difficult to get land for the young (below 18) 5. **Gender** – Men are more likely to get land than women. 6. **Marital status** – if single you are highly unlikely to get land. 7. **Occupation –** Occupation is associated with the ability to pay for service. 8. **Migrant status** – preference given to locals. 9. **People with disabilities** – If disabled, you are discriminated against. 10. **Land ownership** – if you already have land, you cannot be given. 11. **Household structure** – Child and female-headed are discriminated against
		Machinery	Yes, they are likely to differ depending on the following social dimensions:	1. **Wealth status** – Rich can easily afford.

				2. **Education** – Educated can easily understand usage. 3. **Age –** in terms of operation and maintenance 4. **Gender** – Tend to think that they will be unable to operate the machinery. 5. **Marital status –** In terms of operation and maintenance, headed lighter machinery. 6. **Occupation** – Choice of machinery 7. **People with disabilities** – prefer machinery that is easily operated. 8. **Land ownership** – Size of land affects choice of machinery 9. **Household structure** – Depends on who will be able to operate it
			• Wealth status • Education • Age • Gender • Marital status • Occupation • People with disabilities • Land ownership • Household structure	
		Agricultural Inputs	Yes, they are likely to differ depending on the following social dimensions: • Wealth status • Education • Gender • Marital status • Occupation • People with disabilities • Land ownership • Household structure	1. **Wealth status** – Ability to procure is easier for the rich 2. **Education** – Ability to make informed decision (educated) 3. **Age** – Input prioritised to the aged. 4. **Gender** – Difficult to access for youths/targeted. 5. **Marital status** – The single might find difficulty in getting inputs. 6. **Occupation** – Affects choice & quality purchased. 7. **People with disabilities** – They get inputs first. 8. **Land ownership** – Given according to land area. 9. **Household structure** – Aged and vulnerable are given
Group 3	• Financial resources • Machinery • Land	Financial resources	Yes, they are likely to differ depending on the following dimensions: • Wealth status • Education	1. **Wealth status** – Rich will have more money. 2. **Education** – More educated likely more money.

			• Ethnicity • Geography • Age • Gender • Occupation • Migrant status • People with disabilities • Land ownership	3. **Ethnicity** – Maybe tribalism (loans). 4. **Geography** –Remoteness especially for loans. 5. **Age** – younger, collateral for loans. 6. **Gender** – Decision making, for loans (assets, landownership) 7. **Migrant status** – Rental(paperwork) harder to get finance. 8. **People with disabilities** – Access to jobs, access to loan. 9. **Land ownership** – Income, collateral (unbankable)
		Machinery	Yes, they are likely to differ depending on the following social dimensions: • Wealth status • Geography • Age • Gender • Marital status • Migrant status • People with disabilities	1. **Wealth status** – More financial resources 1. **Geography** – remoteness 2. **Age** – young people have low credit worthiness. 3. **Gende**r – Assets ownership, decision making. 4. **Marital status** – Decision making. 5. **Migrant status** – Access to capital 6. **People with disabilities** – may not be tailor made for them.
		Land	Yes, they are likely to differ depending on the following social dimensions: • Wealth status • Age • Gender • Marital status • Migrant status • People with disabilities	1. **Wealth status** Richer people have no access and can even rent ahead. 2. **Age** – Young people may not own land or make decisions. 3. **Marital status** – once married a young man can have own land. 4. **Migrant status** – Mostly rented. 5. **People with disabilities** – less likely to get or own land

Based on the mentioned resources and diversity dimensions, groups were required to discuss the individual and community benefits and consequences of using the innovation (Table 5).

Table 5: Understanding individual benefits and consequences from resource availability

Individual Benefits and Consequences			
Use of the innovation will possibly:	**Innovation Group Type**	**Please indicate on which social dimensions this is likely to depend on:**	**It is possible that there may be gender differences within the social dimensions?**
Leads to an increased labor burden for specific segments of people	**Group 1**	• Age • Social cohesion	**Age** The elderly people are likely to experience challenges starting, operating, and running the machines. **Social cohesion** Individualism destroys collectivism and interaction
	Group 3	• Gender	**Gender** • The poor and married women do most of the planting and weeding. • The young may also participate in these operations.
Shift the balance of intra-household decision-making power for specific segments of people	**Group 1**	• Social cohesion	**Social cohesion** Move income for the women who operate machines or the ones doing peanut butter
	Group 2	Household Structure	**Any reason given by the group?**
	Group 3	Age	**Age** Most likely to target, males than the females
Influence access to resources for specific segments of people	**Group 1**	• Land ownership • Gender • Wealth status	**Gender** Male-headed households or male dominated houses.
	Group 2	• Wealth status	**Wealth status** Rich can access more resources
Influence access to local markets for specific segments of people	**Group 1**	• Gender/certain groups.	**Gender/certain groups**. Farmers around the area are defined by gender. Any points from groups 2 and 3?
Community Benefits and Consequences			
Influence a shift in power for specific segments of people?	**Group 1**	• Wealth status • Land ownership • Gender	
	Group 2	• Wealth status	**Wealth status** Yes, it uplifts the wealth status of the rich and the poor.

	Group 3	• Wealth status	**Wealth status** Those who have access and skills like mechanisms will become richer and those with cattle not so rich.
Increase unemployment for specific segments of people?	**Group 2**	• Gender	**Gender** Yes, women and youths will be affected
Lead to increased social risk for specific segment of people?	**Group 2**	• Gender	**Gender** Yes, women and youths will lose livelihood.
	Group 3	• Marital status	**Marital status** Yes, if you are single and you want to be a service provider working with men
Lead to increased economic risks for specific segments of people?	**Group 2**	• Gender	**Gender** Yes, women and youths because of loss of livelihoods will not be economically empowered
	Group 3	• Wealth status	**Wealth status** The poor if they have to take out money to hire out some services
Lead to decreased food security for specific segments of people?	**Group 2**	• Gender	**Gender** Yes, women and youths because of loss of livelihoods they are unable to buy food
	Group 3	• Occupation	**Occupation** Those providing casual labours

Pic: Showing participants in group discussions

3.3 Stage 3 – Implication for intersectionality:

Stage 3 was aimed at helping participants understand the concept of relevant diversity dimensions and also identify focus groups or segments of people within these dimensions and how they intersect with gender. Each innovation group had to consider three main dimensions when responding to questions.

This workshop highlighted the importance of intersectionality and the way it impacts users' access to innovations (Table 6). Women were classified as a non-homogeneous group that experiences things differently based on other dimensions of their identities such as class, age, race, religion, and region.

Table 6: Exploring the implication of Intersectionality

Questions	Responses: Group 1	Responses: Group 2	Responses Group 3
What groups of people within this dimension may not be able to use or benefit from the innovation or face negative consequences?	1. Elderly/Age 2. Disabilities 3. Geography	1. Disabled 2. Single/child-headed families. 3. Poor/resource-constrained household	1. Age 2. Wealth status
For which of these groups of people might other social dimensions (men or women) make a significant difference in whether one is able to benefit or not from the innovation?	**Elderly/Age** • Wealthy status finances • Land ownership • Opinion leaders **Disabilities** • Wealth status • Land ownership • Targeted group **Geography**	**Disabled** • Man: Decision-making influencing how things are done • Resource allocation **Single/child-headed families.** Man has more opportunities than women, opportunities to	**Age** • Elderly people- the operation of the machinery may be difficult. • Access to credit to purchase the machinery. **Wealth status** • The poor will not be able to buy or hire services.

		• Targeted beneficiary for a certain innovation	diversify into other things.	• Wealth status can mitigate the problem through purchasing the service
What are the negative (or positive) consequences for those belonging to the at -risk groups?	**Individual**	**Elderly/Age** To be forgotten because they must be active to join others. **Disabilities** They feel shunted.	**Disabled** • They may not get access to the innovation. • They may be unable to use them because of their disability. • If loan, they may not have resources to pay. **Single/child-headed families.** • Food security • They become vulnerable to the people allocating /in control of the resources or innovation. • Have no access and use to resources.	**Age** • Risk of losing more money from the investment • This can lead to GBV. • Risk of accidents (too young to operate). **Wealth status** • Risk of losing more money from the investment.
	Community	**Elderly/Age** • To be forgotten • Target policies from target advocate	**Disabled** They become more dependant if they lack access on the community. **Single/child-headed families.** They become more vulnerable to abuse.	**Age** Elderly people become less respected and more discriminated
What are the immediate causes of these consequences – norms?		**Elderly/Age** Loss of investment	Lack of access/ability to use the innovation for both disabled and single or child headed families.	Age and wealth status
Which groups are most at-risk given the likelihood and severity of the consequences that can emerge?		Disability	1. Disabled women and children, as well as elderly. 2. Single and child headed household	1. The poor 2. The elderly 3. The marginalizes

4.4 Stage 4– Mitigating Consequences and Embracing Opportunities – Key highlights from group discussions:

In this stage, the groups had to revisit their scaling strategy and look at the most important practicing strategies to mitigate unintended consequences (see Figure 2)

What are the groups to which we will pay attention when adapting the scaling strategy?	What risks or positive outcomes need to be mitigated for this group? What positive effects can be promoted?	What needs to be changed in the training plan?	How should communication strategies/media use be changed?	What arrangements (complementary innovations) need to be in place		What new partnerships do you need to establish in view of the changed scaling strategy?	Is it possible and realistic to expect that scaling has positive outcomes for this group of people?
				To foster access to relevant resources?	To mitigate risks		
Priority segment/group 1							
Priority segment/group 2							
Priority segment/group 3							

Figure 2: Showing group discussion template for discussion on Stage 4

Their mitigation strategies had to identify complementary innovation to create more enabling conditions for the use of the innovation. Table 7 indicates responses from the three groups on what needs to be changed, new partnerships to be created, and the communication strategies needed to avoid unintended consequences.

Table 7: Discussions on mitigating consequences and embracing opportunities.

Questions	Responses: Group 1	Responses: Group 2	Responses Group 3
What are the groups to which we will pay attention when adapting the scaling strategy?	1. Elderly/Age 2. Disabilities 3. Geography	1. Disabled 2. Single/child-headed.	1. Young and elderly
What risks or positive outcomes need to be mitigated for this group?	**Elderly/Age** Use of user-friendly machines **Disabilities** User-friendly machines to cater to people living with disabilities. **Geography** Access remote areas	**Disabled** Exclusion from access to the innovation **Single/child-headed.** Exclusion from access to the innovation	**Young and elderly** - GBV: bring youth on board. Incorporate protection and police. - Loss of investment due to underutilization - Occupational hazards due to poor usage.
What positive effects can be promoted?	**Elderly/Age** Sensitization and outreach, to include everyone in the community.	**Disabled** Include them in the planning for scaling up the innovation.	Training and certified machines

		Geography Carry out awareness	Have a policy that covers those social groups. **Single/child-headed.** Empowering them from not being excluded by allowing them to be part of the groups.	
What needs to be changed in the training plan?		**Elderly/Age** Ensure training programs cover intergeneration gaps for sustainability	**Disabled** Inclusion of them (special arrangements on the plan to accommodate them). Engage service provider to look at possibilities to modify innovation to suit disability. **Single/child headed.** Include them in the training plan.	**Young and elderly** - Protection should be part of program. - Training and certified machines. - Sustainability plan to be part of training
How should communication strategies /media use be changed?		**Elderly/Age** Audio and pictorial videos not only in local languages within the communities **Geography** Remote use of electronic media	**Disabled** Information is communicated through all channels that are accessible to them (sign language & braille). **Single/child-headed.** Use language that is accommodative of them.	**Young and elderly** - Communication on protection protocol should be clear. - Simple training
What arrangements (complementary innovation) need to be in place?	To foster access to relevant resources?	**Elderly/Age** Create a strong link with suppliers. **Geography** Opening or assembling local train artisans to manufacture equipment suitable for the local environment.	Work with resource providers to sensitize the team on these social groups.	**Young and elderly** - Protection should be part of the program. - Training and certified machines. - Sustainability plan to be part of training
	To mitigate risks	**Elderly/Age** - Adjust machines to meet the end users. - Operational manuals are in the local language.	Complimentary Group lending	Training and certified machines

	Geography Incorporate the traditional methods with new technology.		
What new partnerships do you need to establish in view of the changed scaling strategy?	**Elderly/Age** No new partnership but need to educate the partners to adapt to new strategies that are inclusive	Association, NGOs included. Involve the local leadership	- You need experts in protection. - Governance mechanisms e.g. local must be effective
Is it possible and realistic to expect that scaling has positive outcomes for this group of people?	**Elderly/Age** It's possible but the time frame differs	Yes, training reaches far thus can understand.	If the governance mechanisms work.

Post Survey key highlights

Participants at the end of the session responded to the post-survey that was presented to them to assess their expectations at the beginning of the workshop. The following responses were recorded as summarized below.

1. **Continuing to collect gender-disaggregated data** was seen as important by all except for one respondent.
2. **Familiar with scaling innovations** was indicated as now being very familiar by most of the participants.
3. **Gender and socially marginalized groups were** noted as quite relevant groups by over 80% of the respondents.
4. **Complementary innovations** mentioned as necessary to have an impact: innovations in banking, extension services, gender policy, policy on inclusivity, agricultural extension support, and communication.
5. **Scaling innovation for impact at the local, national, or regional level:** Many participants moved from regional to scaling and the national and local levels.
6. **Knowledge gained from the training:** wider understanding of the role of gender in programming, skills on gender inclusion, including all social groups in programs, now know that there are a lot of things that attention is not paid to which have a bearing on the intended outcome (need holistic approach), to look at gender taking into account all categories, the need to look at the beneficiaries' perspective more, skills on how to be more gender-sensitive, learned that innovation can have both positive and negative outcomes, ability to now revisit stakeholders and have awareness meeting with them.
7. **What they liked about the GenderUp training method:** it is inclusive and allows for wider consideration in programming, active participation by all, identifying innovations and how to overcome risks/advantages associated with the innovation, learning about the concept of intersectionality, group involvement, the step-by-step analysis of each stage for the tool, made use of participants knowledge, identifying categories and associated people to benefit from innovations,
8. **What they did not like:** The definition of gender is broad, it enables one to realign objectives to meet the needs of all people in the communities, it is a simple tool but very inclusive, and it has put a lot of pressure on the resources available now that we understand the GenderUp process, the workshop was a bit long for a day (maybe 2-3 days)

9. **What can be done to change the training:** More time to be able to absorb what is covered, should be done with more researchers and program implementers, the flow of learning and language.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The GenderUp workshop was the first in-person attempt with participants using only printed materials. The process is usually done online with participants using Miro boards to fill in their responses. However, WP5 adapted and redesigned the program for an all-in-person process which has allowed the GenderUp team to revise the online platform to a more user-friendly one. The reason for using only printed materials for such training is that several of the communities are rural and do not have stable internet connectivity. Moreover, access to laptops for all in other to use Miro Boards is difficult. Adapting this online program in a context where connectivity is a problem allows the team to use printed materials. Several points were noted to allow facilitators to become better in subsequent in-person sessions.

- Pre-survey was often not clear to those who were not sure of the innovation (technology).

- The program is not viable for a one-day workshop as was done to reduce cost and time. Ideally, 3 days as indicated by most of the participants will enable them to better immerse the contents of this program.

- In-person was great and having the 4 stages printed (in A3 format) worked well as participants could directly write in them based on their group discussions

- It is tricky getting plenary (group) feedback especially if time is not well-monitored.

- GenderUp was widely received positively, and participants would appreciate regular training for different innovations.

- In-person meetings might also account for more discussions, rich insights, and experiences from the participants than when done online.