

# Workshop on Integrating Gender Into The Sentinel Landscapes in the CRP FTA

Hotel Santika, Bogor

Monday & Tuesday, 1<sup>st</sup> & 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2013



Prepared by

Deborah Rubin (Cultural Practice LLC) with input from Bimbika Basnett (CIFOR), Marlène Elias (Bioversity), Purabi Bose (CIAT), Maria Fernandez (Independent Consultant), and Esther Mwangi (CIFOR).



[cifor.org/forests-trees-agroforestry](http://cifor.org/forests-trees-agroforestry)

# **Contents**

<b>Main Report Workshop on Integrating Gender into Sentinel Landscapes Research</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Annexes:</b>	
<b>Evaluation card comments, listed positive to negative</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Flipchart notes</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>List of participants</b>	<b>21</b>

# Workshop on Integrating Gender into Sentinel Landscapes Research<sup>1</sup>

July 1-2, 2013

Bogor, Indonesia

This two day workshop brought together CRP 6: Forest, Trees, and Agroforestry (FTA) researchers to address the concepts, methods, and practicalities around integrating gender issues into research conducted on Sentinel Landscapes.

## Review of Day One

The first day introduced the group to the key issues in Sentinel Landscapes research. It led off with presentations by Robert Nasi, the Research Director for FTA, and by Anja Gassner, the Team Leader, Research Methods, followed by a review of key gender concepts and issues presented by Bimbika Basnett, Gender Postdoctoral Fellow, and Marlène Elias, Gender Specialist. The remainder of Day One was dedicated to working group discussions on i) identifying gender research themes in the SLs, ii) considering appropriate methods for gender-related research activities, and the iii) opportunities and challenges surrounding such work and how CRP6: FTA can provide the needed support to accomplish the activities.

Nasi reviewed the CGIAR's System Level Outcomes towards which each of the CRPs are expected to contribute and the specific IDOs for CRP6: FTA. There are six IDOs, still in the process of revision and refinement, and one of them is on gender (in addition to policy, income, food security, resilience, and NRM). Nasi emphasized that each of the research themes will be expected to identify gender-related research activities and to put 10% of their budgets towards these efforts. He added that increased attention to gender was visible at a recent meeting in Bonn involving several CRPs, which concluded that achieving food security and adaptive capacity and resilience are dependent on changing gender norms to create more equitable control over limited natural resources.

Gassner noted that the goal of the research methods group was to ensure that scientists working across sentinel landscapes use common research methods to allow for comparative research. The specific focus on SLs emerged from the findings of the STRIPE report on social science in the CG Centers (2009) which acknowledged the potential for the Centers to "undertake truly international and long-term research" but that a barrier to achieving this goal was the lack of common research instruments, resulting in regionally focused rather than truly global research. In response, the SL approach is expected to develop a common methodological approach in set of regions to extract global relevance from regional comparisons. The research teams will do cross regional comparisons, integrate biophysical and social sciences, have a long-term research horizon of ten years, and co-locate research activities and share resources among components, with partners, and with other CRPs. A request for research proposals was launched and 19 proposals were considered. These included landscapes that were

---

<sup>1</sup> Prepared by Deborah Rubin (Cultural Practice LLC) with input from Bimbika Basnett (CIFOR), Marlène Elias (Bioversity), Purabi Bose (CIAT), Maria Fernandez (Independent Consultant), and Esther Mwangi (CIFOR).

ecologically or geographically bounded as well as those that were issue-oriented (e.g., palm oil) and not physically bounded. The research methods team develops methodological tools to provide hard evidence on key indicators. They are open to incorporating research on gender into their survey instruments.

In the discussion after Gassner's presentation, a distinction was made between research that takes gender issues into account in the process of investigating other topics and research that explicitly focuses on a gender-related question. This point is referenced in the recent guide to proposal development prepared for CIFOR in the following way:

Gender-responsive research investigates the different priorities and needs of men and women. It also analyses how gender relations influence men's and women's ability to manage and use forests and forests products, as well as how policies affect women and men differently. Research aims to identify the underlying causes of gender inequalities. This involves collecting sex-disaggregated data and analyzing gender inequalities to examine how these inequalities affect different groups of people. Gender-focused research is more likely to be conducted collaboratively with communities and other stakeholders to shape its scope and activities. Recommendations from this research will identify improvements for forest policies and practices that offer the best options for all parties and aim to address imbalances in assets or power.<sup>2</sup>

Bimbika Basnett, a Gender Postdoctoral Fellow at CIFOR, started her overview on gender issues with a recap of reasons for addressing gender:

- To understand if and how gender equity changing across the landscapes
- To determine if gender equity is changing over time?
- To find synergies between the CRP6 gender strategy and the SL strategy
- To capitalize on the benefits of women's expanded participation in forest management.

Basnett also identified five areas of data collection and analysis that have emerged from the literature in exploring the gender dimensions of forestry research and which could be useful for integrating gender into the Sentinel Landscapes research in the future. Several different methodologies cover similar areas of gender relevant data, including i) Production (input and autonomy in production/management decisions); ii) Access and control over resources; iii) Control over the use of income; iv) Voice and influence in community; and v) Time allocation. This particular set of data topics is drawn from the Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index, a tool recently developed for USAID by the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) and Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative (OPHI), and which is being considered for more widespread use across the CGIAR as a possible way of standardizing the monitoring of gender equity.<sup>3</sup> Basnett also reviewed the CRP 6 gender impact pathway.

Marlène Elias, Gender Specialist at Bioversity, presented an overview on methods used in gender-related data collection and analysis. She identified best practices at each state of research, from design to implementation in the field, to analysis and reporting. When initially designing the research, it is

---

<sup>2</sup> "Does your proposal demonstrate appropriate attention to gender issues?" CIFOR (2013).

<sup>3</sup> "Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index." USAID, IFPRI, and OPHI (2012).

important to look at available existing data, drawing on literature and other databases (e.g., DHS, WEAI, SIGI) that have compiled sex-disaggregated data and analysis of data. When conducting the research, a wide range of methods are available and appropriate, depending on the research question, including focus group discussions, key informant interview, participatory methods, household surveys, and more. The importance of using both qualitative and quantitative methods was emphasized, as was the need to recognize diversity among women and among household members, where relationships are structured and negotiated. In reporting findings, identify ways to communicate back to those who were engaged in the research, both women and men.

## Group Discussions

The next sessions engaged the participants in a series of three discussions, divided into four groups of SL-related research: Africa, Oil Palm, Asia, and Global.

### Discussion on gender concepts in each SL

In the first session, each group discussed key gender issues related to their SL research and identified priority research questions.

#### Africa group

The discussion started with each Sentinel Landscape team (Burkina Faso/Mali, Central Africa, and East Africa) identifying the main themes of their research. These themes were based on issues of particular importance to each regional context. Based on these key themes, cross-cutting gender-specific questions (1-4 below) deemed relevant to more than one Sentinel Landscape were formulated:

1. What are the gender differentiated impacts of climate change and climate variability on livelihood strategies and natural resource management?
2. How do policies and institutions affect adaptive capacity of vulnerable groups (analyzed using a gender lens) between households and at the level of the community?
3. How have land tenure reform and land use changes affected ownership and access to land and forest resources of women and men from different socio-political groups?
4. What are the gendered opportunities and constraints to benefit from and manage ecosystem services?

#### Oil Palm

1. Impact: What is the impact of palm oil-related income on the gender dynamics within households and villages?
2. Decision making at the community level: What is the role of gender in decision making at landscape/community level related to the adoption of oil palm agriculture (ICRAF research)?
3. Scaling up: Gender and political economy at policy level with oil palm → changing landscape. What are the implications of expanding oil palm production on men and women, including relationships among men and among women?

#### Asia Group

The Asia group started their discussion with an agreement that their questions needed to be specific to the areas in which they were operating (Kalimantan, Sumatra, Mekong, and Java) to be most useful in

determining the emerging gender-research priorities in different SL sites. The group identified the following site-specific questions:

Sumatra:

- Who is responsible for land use (rubber, oil palm, crops)?
- How are resources used and the different perception of men and women?
- How to improve the balance between man and women (gain gender equity) in customary system?

Mekong:

- Distribution and benefit sharing?
- What is the different (types of) participation of value chains and how to integrate and what are benefits of different actors?

Kalimantan:

- How protected area management affect man and women differently?
- How different roles and knowledge of men and women contribute to trade offs (between) livelihood and conservation?

Java:

- To what extent government interventions affect gender relations in mangrove areas?
- What is the role of women in forest products value chains and how to improve it?

The group next discussed specific concept from each questions. For example, the first question for Sumatra's SL site was "who is responsible for land use?" The concept of responsibility was picked up in order to create a common understanding among the team members as well as to develop emerging sub-questions and methods to address it. Similarly, other concepts that were elaborated for each question included resources, distribution (related to the customary system with introduction of new Adat law in Indonesia), participation, protected area, and governance.

For each of these questions, the group continued with their efforts to identify gender-specific questions. For example, they discussed how, if women have no certificate of ownership, they would be able to maintain the land; whether there were differences in how men and women managed the land and in their management skills; what the difference in land ownership was or access to communal land and if it was related to the matrilineal structure of Sumatra society.

Global group:

This discussion addressed a number of topics in identifying the key questions listed below. They discussed what are enabling factors, listing more knowledge, access within household/communities, access to market, and effect on daily livelihood. They noted that the terms of access to resources included seasonality, types of tenure, and value of germplasm. The group noted that the policies on deforestation/reforestation impact men and women differently, and that they were often intersectorial conflicts. They identified the following questions:

- 1) Is there a co-variation (relationship) between tree cover change and livelihood outcomes "unpacked by gender"?
- 2) What enables people to:
  - Value trees?
  - Manage trees?

- 3) What are the institutional arrangements to ensure equal benefits:
  - If it remains forest?
  - If it is converted (land use change)?

### Methods discussion

The second discussion section picked up from Marlène's presentation on methods. For the most part, the groups' responses were similar. During this session, the Asia group discussed methods that might be relevant for each of SL sites in Asia. It thought there is a need to establish regional level SL sites network among all collaborating centers and partners. The group further discussed the challenges and opportunities presented by each method.

Each group supported the use of a range of methods, both qualitative and quantitative, depending on the type of questions being researched. Literature reviews, household surveys, focus group discussions, key informant interviews, and participatory techniques, such as mapping and transect walks were listed. There was interest in comparing different methods to determine which might be better at collecting gender-relevant data. Several common themes on methods emerged, e.g.:

- The desire to develop a strategy or tools for understanding gender dynamics at the landscape level;
- The importance of developing an understanding of the relationship between gender and other types of social diversity (age, ethnicity); and,
- The need for tools (both data collection and analysis) to link the local with the larger systems.

In the final discussion session of the day, groups were asked to identify the types of support they would like to receive from the gender team and from CRP 6. Several participants wanted to have better access to existing materials (such as literature, manuals, tools) and guidance on how to best use them. Others noted a desire for new funding to develop joint proposals across themes and more time with the gender team. Some called for capacity building for their partners. Others noted a desire for support to create better synergies across the regional landscape sites and themes. Support for writing workshops was also mentioned. One group wanted to hire one or two post-docs to look more systematically at data from existing gender-related case studies.

### Review of Day Two

Peter Holmgren, CIFOR's Director General, opened Day Two with a talk positioning forestry research within the broader research agenda, not only of the CGIAR system, but also among other broad development initiatives. He argued against the current stovepiping found in most presentations and priorities, and instead supported a more holistic approach about forestry research, demonstrating how forestry research findings can speak to many dimensions of poverty reduction, food security, and climate change, among other goals.

His talk was followed by a presentation from Aaron Russell on current research on the Mekong Delta (originally scheduled for Monday).

The topic of gender and value chains was introduced by Deborah Rubin, Cultural Practice, LLC. She briefly reviewed key concepts on gender and value chains. She noted that while value chain analysis (VCA) has been popular for some time, it has only in the past few years become a common focus in development work, particularly with a gender focus, and even more recently has become a focus for forestry research. In development work, VCA offers a lens through which to understand the competitiveness of key sectors within a national economy and to enhance the operations of value chains for pro-poor growth. It is also used by individual firms to improve their competitiveness in national and international commodity chains. Participatory forms of VCA help communities or producer and trading groups to explore their roles in global market networks, with the goal of improving the benefits they gain from their participation in them. Gender analysis of value chains helps to identify ways to reduce gender disparities in participation, access to resources, and benefit sharing throughout the chain, not solely at the producer level. Thus when value chain programs are designed using gender equitable principles, they can foster both competitiveness and gender equity goals.

Three examples of forestry value chains research involving both men and women were then offered in rotation by Robert Nasi (bushmeat), Herry Purnomo (furniture), and Narasihna Hegde (fruit trees), after which the participants reformed in their groups to map the gender dimensions of a value chain of their choosing. The groups worked on answering the following questions for i) the palm oil chain (globally); ii) charcoal in Africa; and iii) furniture in Indonesia.

1. What information do you have about the activities (roles and responsibilities) in which men and women are involved at the different nodes of the chain? What are the gaps?
2. What information do you have about the determinants of men's and women's participation in the chain at each node? What are the gaps?
  - What assets do women and men need for participation at each node of the chain? (e.g., land; human capital – education, skills; finance)
  - What are the differences in men's and women's access to these assets?
  - How does this differential access shape men's and women's different types of participation in the different nodes of the chain?
3. What information do you have about men's and women's income and benefits derived from participation in the chain? What are the gaps?
  - What are the different pathways by which this income and/or the benefits flow to men and women? (e.g., from direct linkage to the market, from community or producer groups, through intrahousehold transfers including non-monetary)
4. What do you know about the resource sustainability implications of further commercialization of the chain? What the gaps?
5. What are the implications for different livelihood strategies of further development of the chain? Will these differ for men and for women and if so, how? What are the gaps?

Two of the groups (charcoal and furniture) developed extensive responses to these questions as well as new research questions to consider. The third group working on oil palm was not convinced that gender issues were relevant to all stages of the value chain and did not care to develop questions to investigate



1. What has been the impact – positive or negative - of technologies (including but not only ICTs) on women and men from their participation in different forest value chains, different landscapes, and different countries? It is leading to more efficient chains? Is it leading to more effective forest management?
2. What has been the effectiveness of grassroots organizations on empowering women?
3. What are best practices for communicating results of research to end users (including communities)?
4. How can impact pathways be more fully engendered?
5. How can research findings be used for greater impact on forest management? Especially for groups at different levels?
6. Where is the starting point for forestry value chains? How can VCA be linked back to ecosystem services?
7. How can the methodologies for collecting and analyzing gender-related data be refined to address research questions beyond the household (producer) level (raised as part of the value chain discussion)?

## Final comments

At the conclusion of the workshops, Robert Nasi, Anja Gassner, Bimbika Basnett, and Marlène Elias offered a few summary comments, thanking all for their active participation and useful suggestions for moving research on gender in the Sentinel Landscapes forward. Anja emphasized the value of the discussions for guiding the SL work and suggested that the findings of the workshop would/could be used to inform the selection of IFRI village level indicators as well as the household survey. She said she is also keen to support the development of a gender module, drawing on some of the recurrent themes highlighted by the participants. Robert reiterated the importance of taking gender seriously and how there is high level institutional support for this within the CG system. He also welcomed the gender team to provide input into the developing the next round of proposal for CRP FTA. Bimbika reminded the group that the gender team is still looking for input to develop appropriate indicators for integrating gender into the SL research. Both Bimbika and Marlène also noted that there are a range of resources available to the group for integrating gender into their work.

Note: Presentations as well as documentation of the evaluations and comments are provided in separate files.

## CRP 6: Forests, Trees, and Agroforestry Workshop on Integrating Gender into the Sentinel Landscapes

### Evaluation card comments, listed positive to negative

#### Key points:

- More positive than negative comments.
- Many of the positive comments emphasize the value of getting together and the opportunity for the focused discussions, whether on the Sentinel Landscapes, on gender analysis, methods, or value chain concepts.
- At the same time, some felt that there was too much discussion.
- Most negative comments addressed the value chain component. Several expressed a desire for more examples of gender integration into value chains, successful and not. It isn't clear why these commenters apparently did not consider the presentations of CIFOR research by Robert Nasi (bushmeat), Herry Purnomo (furniture), and Narasihna Hegde (fruit trees) to be such examples or to see that the mapping exercise and questions were intended to provide these examples in a more interactive format. Note: The reorganization of the schedule on Day 2 to add the Mekong presentation required shortening the gender and value chain presentation, which would otherwise have had time for questions and/or have provided more examples.

Positive comments – highlighted opportunities for interactions and time for discussions
Great experience and shared and learned a lot about the methodologies being used globally for generating household data and its analysis.
Very happy to learn gender issues across discipline and continents.
Help me to know how to explore the research question very well, especially about gender perspective in the landscape context – Thank you so much.
Great to hear different viewpoints and a varied approach at addressing the gender imbalance issue.
This is an interesting opportunity to share and exchange ideas about gender in (the) forestry research.
Helped us explore the scale of our research and evaluate what impact we want our research to have.
I liked the group discussion around the value chain analysis.
Great questions for guiding group work.
Great group of people, well facilitated, led to some exciting ideas – very worthwhile for me.
I liked the sharing of ideas.
Good discussions, rich in context, plenty of scope for participants to voice opinions (even the non-conformist ones!).
Good interaction within group work.
Good sharing of different expertise on gender aspect.
Better understanding on objectives, research questions, methods and practicalities on integrating gender into Sentinel Landscapes.
It was good to meet other people (outside of CIFOR, CIFOR colleagues far away [to] learn about social landscapes.
Positive: The detailed analysis of a value chain. It helped us to understand the roles of men and women in each

node and it enabled us to raise research questions.
Specific cases on gender analysis were helpful to explore potentials/limitations.
Moving forward with the gender issue within forestry research needs to consider contextual factors (culture, people, aspirations, ....) and use more research-action approach to test systematically assumptions. The work done by this gender group is contributing greatly to this.
To see ways forward for comparative gender research.
Opportunity to bring multi-disciplinary team.
Excellent idea in general and great facilitation.
Research methodologies discussion on first day was very helpful. Group exercises on Sentinel Landscapes were good.
I learned how to get data in focus groups because my experience in same place in Indonesia, women and men cannot talk/meet in the same places because man is dominant talker. I got more WHO should get benefit on the gender perspective and how to do it.
Fantastic facilitation.
I liked the facilitation and participation.
Good scientific exercise.
Good workshop venue and facilities.
<b>Suggestions for improving organization or content</b>
I'm still not exactly sure what gender encompasses. I now understand that it is a bit broader/larger than I first thought, but it wasn't clearly defined.
Need more ... days for this nice workshop.
It would have been good to see/hear about experiences and discuss about integrating these analyses /data into practical/action research and look how exactly we can (get) more closer to achieving the SLOs.
It would have been more interesting to adopt/look at several approaches for moving forward gender research.
I think that cards and other aids could have been used a bit more to help clarify the topic.
Points for discussions are too wide and needs to be developed considering multi-disciplines.
Shorten group discussions and mobilize a fixed facilitator in each group.
To be improved: time management (and) effective participation in group discussion.
What could be improved in the program agenda is to avoid overlapping questions/practicalities.
Change: value chain exercise – one group didn't see relevance of value chains!
If forced, I would say there was not enough attempt on the part of the facilitator to summarize things and highlight where there is consensus and where there are differences in views.
I hope the outcome/outputs of the workshop are shared at least to all the participants. More importantly there should be a concrete follow up!
<b>Critique</b>
Group exercise questions were too many and in some cases not specific, mainly on value chain (2 <sup>nd</sup> day).
Add-on module – lack of good example on gender integration in value chain improvement/interventions.
Could have had more practical examples of how different programs/interventions have tried to address gender issues, both positively and negatively.
The discussion and the process are very slowly becoming boring.
Presentations on the agenda not so informative – maybe also needed more guidance (in terms of gender), examples, concepts, etc.
The two presentations on Day 2 (morning) were not linked enough to gender analysis/integration (rather a presentation of concepts and SL regions).
The presentations on Day 2 were out of step – not really focused on gender – presenters did not seem to have given serious thought to contributing to the goals of this workshop.

Quite long days (8:30 – 17:30) with a lot of discussions.

**Beyond the control of the organizers or facilitators**

Not enough sleep.

Time difference effects.

Food on Day 1 was not good.

Participants is not full like on the list – some missing

## Flipchart notes

### Day 1: Concepts discussion

General point:

Gender responsive:

- Gender informed
- Gender focused

Group 1 (Africa): Types of Sentinel Landscapes:

Each Sentinel Landscape team (Burkina Faso/Mali, Central Africa, and East Africa) identified the main themes of their research. These themes, listed in A-D below, were based on issues of particular importance to each regional context. Based on these key themes, cross-cutting gender-specific questions (1-4 below) deemed relevant to more than one Sentinel Landscape were formulated.

A. West Africa: 5 priorities:

- Climate change
- Energy
- Water
- Biodiversity
- Governance
- Crosscutting migration issues

B. Central Africa: Reconciling ecosystem services and development → land use conflict; vulnerability to climate change, AF systems (intensification and diversification); logging

C. East Africa: High populations; vulnerability to climate change; land tenure and access; ecosystem services (water)

D. Southern Africa: Land tenure and land access; migration; logging

Research questions:

1. What are the gender differentiated impacts of CC and climate variability on livelihood strategies and natural resource management?
2. How do policies and institutions affect adaptive capacity of vulnerable groups (analysed using a gender lens) between hhs and at the level of the community?
3. How have land tenure reform and land use changes affected ownership and access to land and forest resources of women and men from different socio-political groups?
4. What are the gendered opportunities and constraints to benefit from and manage ecosystem services?

Group One:

1. What are the dynamics of landscape change in terms of diverse effects and impacts on the households and ecosystems as well as the implications for achieving the four SLO with the landscape
2. How do change processes impact capacity of ecosystem to provide services to rural households?

Group 2 (Oil palm): Oil palm industry is seen as a solution to forest issues

- Key questions of OPSL
  - 1° Trajectories and what is influencing them (Is it driving deforestation?)
  - 2° Political economy
  - 3° Business models and distribution of benefits

Overarching – i) foreign investors ii) local smallholders (who are either independent or plasma)

- Gender issues in these three areas:
  - Trajectories – gender in decision making; role of tenure (securing rights before investment; gender and tenure)
  - Political economy
  - Business models -- food productions (from subsistence to cash crop); shifting from one market to another (rubber or rice to oil palm – what influence does gender have?); gender in the plantation model
- Three gender-specific questions:
  1. Impact: When income comes in from palm oil what effect does it have on the gender dynamics within households and villages?
  2. Decision making at the community level: ICRAF research on the role of gender in decision making at landscape/community level – adoption of oil palm agriculture
  3. Scaling up: Gender and political economy at policy level with oil palm → changing landscape. What are the implications of expanding oil palm production on men and women, including relationship among men and among women?

N.B.

Gender in FPIC: is it inclusive and gender representative?

Gender along the whole value chain

Group 3 (Asia): Questions are slightly different for the three landscapes

The Asia group started their discussion with an agreement that their questions needed to be specific to the areas in which they were operating (Kalimantan, Sumatra, Mekong, and Java) to be most useful in determining the emerging gender-research priorities in different SL sites. The group identified the following site-specific questions:

Sumatra:

- Who is responsible for land use (rubber, oil palm, crops)?
- How are resources used and the different perception of men and women?
- How to improve the balance between man and women (gain gender equity) in customary system?

Mekong:

- Distribution and benefit sharing?
- What is the different (types of) participation of value chains and how to integrate and what are benefits of different actors?

Kalimantan:

- How protected area management affect man and women differently?

- How different roles and knowledge of men and women contribute to trade offs (between) livelihood and conservation?

Java:

- To what extent government interventions affect gender relations in mangrove areas?
- What is the role of women in forest products value chains and how to improve it?

The group next discussed specific concept from each questions. For example, the first question for Sumatra's SL site was "who is responsible for land use?" The concept of responsibility was picked up in order to create a common understanding among the team members as well as to develop emerging sub-questions and methods to address it. Similarly, other concepts that were elaborated for each question included resources, distribution (related to the customary system with introduction of new Adat law in Indonesia), participation, protected area, and governance. For each of these questions, the group continued with their efforts to identify gender-specific questions. For example, they discussed how, if women have no certificate of ownership, they would be able to maintain the land; whether there were differences in how men and women managed the land and in their management skills; what the difference in land ownership was or access to communal land and if it was related to the matrilineal structure of Sumatra society.

1. Responsibilities – Resources use/Concept
  - Maintenance (if women has no certificate then no loan)
  - Management
  - Land tenure (who owns land/private land)
  - Decision making
  - What are different role of men and women related to areas in #1?
2. How are resources from all land users different between men and women and in perceptions of men and women, regarding types of capital?
  - Work patterns
  - Capital/Financial resources
  - Social
  - Human
  - Environment
  - Political
3. Customary system – example, access to community land and forest
  - Land system/institutions
  - Leadership/policy
  - Incentive/disincentive for men and women
4. Participation:
  - Different actors (producers, retailers, wholesalers, men and women traders)
5. Protected areas:
  - Wildlife and plants
  - Human settled inside Pas
  - Management authority (to whom does community report? What are implications for men and women?)
  - Conflict management and resolution
6. Is it trade off or balance between conservation and development?
  - Peoples' local practice and knowledge (women and men)

7. How establishment (male) government interventions /farmers groups affect women?

Group 4 (Global):

What are seen as benefits by different genders/classes?

Terms of access to resources: e.g., seasonal, types of tenure, to parts of resources, 'value' of germplasm

How do deforestation/reforestation policies impact men and women differently?

Policy coherence/incoherence – intersectoral conflicts

Covariation between tree cover change and livelihoods

What causes people to value trees?

Themes:

- Enabling factors
- Benefits
- Access to resources
- Deforestation and reforestation policies – impact on men and women
- Policies improve the situation

Research questions:

- How to do action research?
- How can we best get different viewpoints from same household?
- If you have production unit managers in household, they will have different priorities
- Resource management
- Resource use

**Day 1: Methods discussion:**

Group 1 (Africa):

Proposed Methodology:

1. Literature review of both social and biophysical components including policy analysis
2. Identifying and seeking and analyzing relevant data available with a gender lens (identifying gaps); review existing data sets
3. Identification of gaps – what data is missing or of inadequate quality to be used such that it must be re-sought?
4. Adapt and/or develop appropriate tools and instruments; use a range of methods; Apply mixed tools:
  - a. FGD using participatory tools
  - b. Key informant interviews
  - c. Gap analysis workshops with all stakeholders
  - d. Social network analysis
  - e. Institutional analysis
5. Collect current data and institute long-term data collection systems (do we need new data?)

Support discussion:

Group 1 (Africa):

1. Formalization of commitment to gender in terms of time allocation and budget allocation; attention to gender should officially be part of the responsibility of researchers (i.e. should be recognized when doing performance appraisals); support for this must be institutionalized
2. Focal point in each region
3. Improve access to gender resources (Internet/network)
4. Capacity building for partners

#### Group 2 (Palm oil):

##### Proposed methodologies:

1. How to reconcile methods for larger scale of research?
  2. Incorporation in research sites the time to include new questions related to gender in these surveys
- Incorporating gender into the three fieldwork sites
    - Impacts of oil palm
    - Corporate strategies
  - Issues that could include gender
    1. Income, resource access, control, credit
    2. Labor (in plantations), time allocation, job allocation
    3. Tenure and inheritance
    4. Decision making processes and land use
  - Role of gender in decision making n FPIC
  - Transitioning between crops
  - Labor

#### Group 3:

During this session, the Asia group discussed methods that might be relevant for each of SL sites in Asia. It thought there is a need to establish regional level SL sites network among all collaborating centers and partners. The group further discussed the challenges and opportunities presented by each method.

##### Methods:

- Use range of 'generic' methods; have flexibility in methods
  - Secondary information; literature review
  - FGDs (e.g., documentation of best practices and case studies)
  - Surveys – households
  - In-depth interviews on certain specific topics
  - Role-play, e.g., on land use, with mixed groups
  - PRA tools, e.g., participatory village mapping or sketch, seasonal calendar, pebble distribution
  - Direct and participant observations
  - Sampling methodology should be considered at the beginning of the research design
  - Timeframe
- Data collection team with gender expertise
- Build partnerships

- Time frame
- Resources

What do we need?

- Development of training manual
  - Existing training manuals, gap analysis, and recommendations – e.g., gender in SL considered
- New funding (Development of CNs/joint proposals)
- Additional hr (for gender team)
- Capacity building – partnerships (local government and other partners)
- Establishing regional sentinel sites networks (AP region)
  - Maximize potential for synergy – for learning and leveraging
- Writing workshop and other publications support (locally specific)

Challenges and Opportunities:

- Data collection team (composition)
- Capacity building for local partners as they have different skills and knowledge
- Clear ideas on proposed methodology
- All SL methods should consider timeframe and resources
- Researchers should consider local context
- Flexibility, allow evolving framework, e.g., value chain analysis
  - gender-sensitive VCA (methods, data, resources, time for allowing women's participation)

Group 4 (Global):

Household survey with more than one hh member

1. Implement a comparative (study) of BF HH survey using PR methods such as:

- Transect and resource description walk
- Resource man (NR)
- "Farm" /forest resource flow
- Triangulate with GIS mapping and HR imaging

2. Literature review and case studies

- Well intended interventions resulted in unbalancing of household power relations with implications
- Participation tools and methods – most useful for questions

Practicalities:

- Comparison of PR methods with hh survey and other types of tools (e.g., mapping, past/present/future; seasonal calendars; resource flows; 4 cell analysis; field observation with group feedback)
- [Goal is to really measure the effectiveness of different methods to get the gendered information needed to address research questions]
- \$150,000
- 2. Case study harvesting: Hire 1 or 2 post grads at \$10,000 for 3 months to look at the impact of introduced technologies on gender relations in (and) NRM

What are the key questions of your SL?

Is there a covariation between tree cover change and livelihood outcomes, unpacked by gender?

What enables people to value trees and to manage trees?

What are the institutional arrangements to ensure equal benefits if the area remains forest or if it is converted?

What are enabling factors?

Knowledge

Access within hhs/communities to markets

Effect on daily livelihoods

Day One summary comments:

General agreement on need for greater indepth documentation on:

- Land use and land use change
- Access to/ownership of/ and control over resources
- What are the gender differentiated impacts of policies (and their relationship on ability of men and women to enhance ecosystem)?
- Decision making patterns
- Need to use both qual and quant data collection and analysis tools
- Need to use data collection team including gender expertise
- Need to develop strategy for understanding gender dynamics at the landscape level
- Need to understand relationship between gender and other types of social diversity (age, ethnicity)
- Need to link the local with the larger systems

## Day Two:

### Discussion: Furniture value chain

1. What information is already available?

Complete info on processing sphere. More partial info on raw material producers and marketing. Good information on consumers in capital city (national) [but not on international]

2. Information on: skills for processing; networks for marketing; finance requirements and flows
3. Men have higher skill levels and higher paid jobs. Men are the owners; women are the workers.
4. Shift to high market demand has encouraged tree production (more than in the past) and [this] is sustainable if illegal logging [is] controlled. Compete with solid wood and carving.
5. Four scenarios for upgrading:
  - a. Moving up – closer to the buyer (women)
  - b. Form and/or join associations for small scale producers (men and women)
  - c. Green products (men and women)
  - d. Collaborating down (men and women)

## Day Two: Final session: Research Questions

Palm oil group:

1. Who controls income from palm oil sales within smallholder households and how is this income spent? Who within the household decides how to spend this income?

Group 3:

1. Can IT technologies positively impact the possibilities of women moving up (Scenario 1)
2. What kind of skills and processing techniques are required to enable more participation of women in the value chain?
3. How do associations of small scale producers affect gender equity?
4. How to improve women's role in "Collaborating Down" scenario?
5. What kind of institutional structure exists and what would enhance [better] participation in the value chain?

General group:

1. What has been the impact – positive or negative - of technologies (including but not only ICTs) on women and men on participation in different forest value chains, different landscapes, and different countries? It is leading to more efficient chains? Is it leading to more effective forest management?
2. What has been the effectiveness of grassroots organizations on empowering women?
3. What are best practices for communicating results of research to end users (including communities)?
4. How can impact pathways be more fully engendered?
5. How can research findings be used for greater impact on forest management? Especially for groups at different levels?

6. Where is the starting point for forestry value chains? How can VCA be linked back to ecosystem services?

7. Can we compare the efficacy of different gender research methods to achieve change in gender relations?

8. What are the gender-related implications of moving across the forest transition curve? Who are the winners/losers, both inside the hh and across the community?

9. Build the evidence base on gender.

10. Test gender hypothesis, e.g., the research on rights to access that has found that when women have rights to access the resource, better management results – how true is this?

Examples cited from Mexico

Address issue of how to measure these results over the short term

11. Within value chain, do research on how women's rights are affected by expansion or initiation of value chains? Are there positive or negative impacts, e.g., on labor allocation and time allocation or on gender based violence? How does it affect gender dynamics at the household/community/national levels?

12. Is there always a benefit to increasing women's participation in value chains? What are men's perspectives on women's increasing involvement in value chains? What if men's involvement is able to support many women – should we still be pushing for more women to participate?  
Need to study the trade offs between income generation and employment.

General comments to remember:

Use qual and quant research and analysis

Empowerment needs to be considered in the cultural context and appropriate to it.

Recognize women's current levels of engagement – things have changed since the 1950s!

Context is critical

Check your assumptions.

Next steps:

- Consolidate the discussion and review at the upcoming theme meetings to develop proposals for new research activities
- Look into ways to link research results to the local communities where research is taking place
- Remember that the 2<sup>nd</sup> phase of CRP6 will need to include gender in explicitly and concrete ways and a commitment of 10% of each theme's budget
- Look at the intersection of the questions on gender and the research questions on the themes
- Do some demonstration of gender integrated work emerging from non-gender integrated work (e.g., the furniture value chain)

## PARTICIPANT LISTS GENDER SENTINEL LANDSCAPES WORKSHOP

### Keynote Speaker

No	Name	Position	Organisation	E-mail
1	Peter Holmgren	Director General	CIFOR	<a href="mailto:p.holmgren@cgiar.org">p.holmgren@cgiar.org</a>
2	Robert Nasi	CRP FTA Director	CIFOR	<a href="mailto:r.nasi@cgiar.org">r.nasi@cgiar.org</a>
<b>Organizers of workshop</b>				
3	Anja Gassner	Team leader, Sentinel landscapes	ICRAF	<a href="mailto:a.gassner@cgiar.org">a.gassner@cgiar.org</a>
4	Marlène Elias	Gender specialist	Bioversity	<a href="mailto:Marlene.elias@cgiar.org">Marlene.elias@cgiar.org</a>
5	Purabi Bose	Social Scientist	CIAT	<a href="mailto:p.bose@cgiar.org">p.bose@cgiar.org</a>
6	Bimbika Sijapati Basnett	Gender Post-Doctoral Fellow	CIFOR	<a href="mailto:b.basnett@cgiar.org">b.basnett@cgiar.org</a>
7	Deborah Rubin	Workshop facilitator	Cultural Practice	<a href="mailto:drubin@culturalpractice.com">drubin@culturalpractice.com</a>
8	Fitri Heryani	Secretary	CIFOR	<a href="mailto:f.heryani@cgiar.org">f.heryani@cgiar.org</a>
<b>Coordinators/Scientists for Sentiel Landscapes</b>				
9	Michael Balinga	Burkina Faso/Mali	CIFOR	<a href="mailto:m.balinga@cgiar.org">m.balinga@cgiar.org</a>
10	Richard Atyi Eba'a	Cameroun/DRC	CIFOR	<a href="mailto:r.atyi@cgiar.org">r.atyi@cgiar.org</a>
11	Judy Loo	Central Asia	Bioversity	<a href="mailto:j.loo@cgiar.org">j.loo@cgiar.org</a>
12	Sophia Gynch	Oil Palm	CIFOR	<a href="mailto:s.gynch@cgiar.org">s.gynch@cgiar.org</a>
13	Pablo Pacheco	Oil Palm	CIFOR	<a href="mailto:p.pacheco@cgiar.org">p.pacheco@cgiar.org</a>
14	Ahmad Dermawan	Oil Palm	CIFOR	<a href="mailto:a.dermawan@cgiar.org">a.dermawan@cgiar.org</a>
15	Aaron Russell	Mekong	CIFOR	<a href="mailto:a.russell@cgiar.org">a.russell@cgiar.org</a>
16	Devashree Nayak	Western Ghats/Gender focal point for South Asia	ICRAF	<a href="mailto:d.nayak@cgiar.org">d.nayak@cgiar.org</a>
17	Marina Skandarski	Western Ghants	Bioversity	<a href="mailto:skandarski.marina@gmail.com">skandarski.marina@gmail.com</a>
18	Denis Jean Sonwa	Central Africa	CIFOR	<a href="mailto:d.sonwa@cgiar.org">d.sonwa@cgiar.org</a>
19	Mrigesh Kshatriya	Mekong	CIFOR	<a href="mailto:m.kshatriya@cgiar.org">m.kshatriya@cgiar.org</a>
20	Kristof Obidzinski	Indonesia/palm oil	CIFOR	<a href="mailto:k.obidzinski@cgiar.org">k.obidzinski@cgiar.org</a>
21	Maria Ojanen	Land tenure	CIFOR	<a href="mailto:m.ojanen@cgiar.org">m.ojanen@cgiar.org</a>
22	Meine van Noordwijk	Component 3	ICRAF	<a href="mailto:m.vanmoordwijk@cgiar.org">m.vanmoordwijk@cgiar.org</a>
23	Linda Yuliani	C3	CIFOR	<a href="mailto:lyuliani@cgiar.org">lyuliani@cgiar.org</a>
24	Siddhartha Mohan		ICRAF	<a href="mailto:s.mohan@cgiar.org">s.mohan@cgiar.org</a>
25	Ratna Akiefnawati	Sumatra SL	ICRAF	<a href="mailto:r.akiefnawati@cgiar.org">r.akiefnawati@cgiar.org</a>
26	Rolando H. Cerda	Nicaragua/Honduras	CATIE	<a href="mailto:rcerda@catie.ac.cr">rcerda@catie.ac.cr</a>
27	Ujjwal Pradhan	Regional Coordinator, ICRAF Southeast Asia	ICRAF	<a href="mailto:upradhan@cgiar.org">upradhan@cgiar.org</a>
<b>Value chain Scientists</b>				
28	Mathurin Zida	C1 and C4	CIFOR	<a href="mailto:m.zida@cgiar.org">m.zida@cgiar.org</a>
29	Herry Purnomo	C1	CIFOR	<a href="mailto:h.purnomo@cgiar.org">h.purnomo@cgiar.org</a>
30	Sola Phosiso	Regional	CIFOR	<a href="mailto:s.phosiso@cgiar.org">s.phosiso@cgiar.org</a>
31	Houria Djoudi	C4	CIFOR	<a href="mailto:h.djoudi@cgiar.org">h.djoudi@cgiar.org</a>
32	Yvonne Kiki Nchanji	Gender fellow	CIFOR	<a href="mailto:ynchanji@gmail.com">ynchanji@gmail.com</a>
33	Nguyen Thi Hoa	(value chain research in Mekong)	ICRAF	<a href="mailto:T.Nguyen@cgiar.org">T.Nguyen@cgiar.org</a>
34	Abdon Awono	C5 (value chain NTFPs)	CIFOR	<a href="mailto:a.awono@cgiar.org">a.awono@cgiar.org</a>
35	Maria Fernandez	Honorary research fellow for Bioversity working on gender and participatory research	Bioversity	<a href="mailto:m.fernandez@cgiar.org">m.fernandez@cgiar.org</a>
36	Narasinha Hegde	Value chain	Life Trust, India	<a href="mailto:lifetrusts@gmail.com">lifetrusts@gmail.com</a>
37	Bayuni Shantiko	value chain	CIFOR	<a href="mailto:b.shantiko@cgiar.org">b.shantiko@cgiar.org</a>
38	Elok Mulyoutami	Gender and value chain	ICRAF	<a href="mailto:E.MULYOUTAMI@CGIAR.ORG">E.MULYOUTAMI@CGIAR.ORG</a>
39	Bhawana Upadhaya	Program Officer, Gender and Rights;	RECOTFC	<a href="mailto:Bhawana.upadhya@recoftc.org">Bhawana.upadhya@recoftc.org</a>
40	Libor Stloukal	Policy officer	FAO	<a href="mailto:libor.stloukal@fao.org">libor.stloukal@fao.org</a>
41	DR. Tuti Herawati		FORDA	<a href="mailto:tuti.hera.wati@yahoo.com">tuti.hera.wati@yahoo.com</a>
42	Dr. Lukas Rumboko		FORDA	<a href="mailto:lukas_19672000@yahoo.com">lukas_19672000@yahoo.com</a>
43	Mr. Yanto Rochmayanto		FORDA	
44	Mr. Handoyo		FORDA	
45	Magdalena Gultom		FORDA	<a href="mailto:magda.gultom@gmail.com">magda.gultom@gmail.com</a>