

Annual Report 2008

CGIAR Systemwide Program on Participatory Research and Gender Analysis



PRGA

Supported by the CGIAR



Annual Report 2008

PRGA Program

**Program on Participatory Research and
Gender Analysis for
Technology Development and
Institutional Innovation**

A CGIAR Systemwide Program

Cali, Colombi

Co-Sponsors:

CIAT

International Center for Tropical Agriculture
(Convening Center)

CIMMYT

International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center

ICARDA

International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry
Areas

IRRI

International Rice Research Institute

© 2009 CGIAR Systemwide Program on Participatory Research and Gender Analysis (PRGA Program)

The PRGA Program encourages fair use of this material. Proper citation is requested:

PRGA Program, 2009. *Annual Report 2008*. CGIAR Systemwide Program on Participatory Research and Gender Analysis (PRGA Program), Cali, Colombia, vii+32p.

The PRGA Program is convened by CIAT, and is co-sponsored by CIMMYT, ICARDA and IRRI.

PRGA Program
Coordination Office
C/o International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT)
A.A. 6713
Cali
Colombia

Phone: (52-2) 445-0000 (direct)
(1-650) 833-6625 (via USA)
Fax: (52-2) 445-0073 (direct)
(1-650) 833-6626 (via USA)
E-mail: prga@cgiar.org
Website: www.prgaprogram.org



Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Preface	vii
Research and Development Activities	1
Auditing gender at the International Center for Tropical Agriculture	1
Institutionalizing gender-responsive research and development in agriculture and natural-resource management through women's networks	6
Gender mainstreaming framework	8
Book on gender mainstreaming experiences in East and Central Africa	8
Gender Project Support Person, ASARECA	8
Workshop on Rethinking Impact: Understanding the complexity of poverty and change	9
International journals focus on impact assessment of participatory research and gender analysis	14
Combining gender analysis into a CGIAR participatory plant breeding program	14
Appendices	17
1. Output Targets 2007	17
2. Most Significant Outcomes in 2008	19
3. Publications	23
4. Staff List	27
5. Program Advisory Committee	28
6. Budget for 2008	29
7. Abbreviations	31

Preface

The PRGA Program remained in a state of transition throughout 2008. It was not until November, that we welcomed a new Program Coordinator (Patricia Biermayr-Jenzano) on board. Moreover, our only other fulltime staff member (Nina Lilja, impact assessment scientist) left the Program in June, and the Acquisition Consultant hired in 2007 had to leave suddenly for family reasons. Consequently, a number of activities planned for the year simply didn't happen, as we were short on staff, and the Program structure remains in draft form for want of those who will guide it forward.

Despite all this, 2008 was by no means wasted. Nina's 'swan song' was to co-organize (with ILAC Initiative and ILRI's Innovation Works) an international workshop on Rethinking Impact: Understanding the Complexity of Poverty and Change, held at CIAT Headquarters in March. This workshop produced a mass of useful material and excellent networking opportunities for the participants. Even as we go to press, discussions are underway to produce a special issue of an international peer-reviewed journal with some of the workshop papers.

The year also saw the completion of the first comprehensive gender audit conducted by the Program—of CIAT. This is the first step along the road to having gender mainstreamed in research and the workplace. Meanwhile, the former Program Coordinator continued to provide support to the final months of the IDRC-supported gender-mainstreaming project in South Asia and Lao PDR. Moreover, he also put the Gender Mainstreaming Framework into publishable form.

The year also saw the end of the Program's support to ASARECA in the form of the Gender Project Support Person, who continued to help guide the Association and its constituent NARS along a gender-mainstreaming path. And last, but not least, the Program-supported PhD student at ICARDA was instrumental in the successful engendering of one of the Center's participatory plant breeding programs.

We look forward to 2009 with renewed hope. Our new Coordinator has an uphill task to consolidate the lessons of the last 12 years, while fundraising to fulfill the promise of the future.

Research and Development Activities

Auditing gender at the International Center for Tropical Agriculture¹

Among the 15 CGIAR Centers, CIAT offered one of the best opportunities to carry out a comprehensive gender audit as a first step to mainstream gender into its research activities and into the workplace. CIAT has built priceless experience and knowledge on gender analysis in agricultural research through 'learning by doing' for decades, its successive senior and management staff have been supportive of gender-analysis and participatory approaches. In parallel, CIAT has seen many actions aimed at promoting gender equity in the workplace expressed in internal norms, regulations and oversight committees. However, CIAT has not yet gone through an institutional gender-mainstreaming process, which seemed to be the next step to consolidate CIAT's visionary to approach collaborative research in the tropics. The PRGA Program commissioned a gender audit at CIAT with the overall objective to contribute to the establishment of an institutional strategy for gender mainstreaming in research and in the workplace through a process that involves and builds on the experience of all staff. The gender audit resulted in an in-depth diagnosis, conclusions and recommendations.

Background

The PRGA Program acknowledged the importance of gender issues and the need to mainstream them in agricultural research and development during its first phase (1997–2002). During its second phase (2003–2007), the Program supported gender-mainstreaming processes in eight national programs in Eastern and Central Africa (all part of ASARECA), Urban Harvest and CIP, and women's networks in Asia (mostly in the eastern Himalayas). The First External Review of the Program (Walker *et al.*, 2007) commended the work on gender mainstreaming and recommended that the Program "should accelerate its efforts to introduce gender analysis into the wider CGIAR System." The PRGA Program Medium-Term Plan 2008–2010 builds on both its past experiences and on the External Review, and specifically contemplates five supporting actions for gender mainstreaming in the CG Centers—one of them aims at building advanced capacity within the Program's host Center, CIAT.

In parallel, in 2006, the CIAT Gender and Diversity (G&D) Committee proposed a gender audit to understand the perception and current knowledge of CIAT staff on gender and diversity issues, and to provide a baseline for future action. In May 2007, a meeting between representatives of the CIAT Board of Trustees, PRGA Program Advisory Committee and CIAT G&D Committee resulted in an agreement to carry out a gender audit in order to contribute toward a strategy for incorporating best-practice gender analysis into the development of projects and programs, and further the aims of the

¹ Executive Summary from Aviles Irahola (2008).

G&D Committee. A Gender Consultant was recruited in September 2007 to conduct the audit, which took place between October 2007 and June 2008.

Objectives

The audit's overall objective was to contribute to the establishment of an institutional strategy for gender mainstreaming in research and in the workplace through a process that involves and builds on the experience of all staff.

Specific objectives divided into two components. Auditing *gender in research* sought to assess the current situation of gender mainstreaming in CIAT research activities, and to provide guidelines for designing and implementing a CIAT strategy for mainstreaming gender in research projects and programs. Auditing *gender in the workplace* sought to assess the extent to which the CIAT G&D Committee has achieved its goals of gender equity in the workplace and the factors its performance, to show the current perceptions and knowledge of CIAT staff on gender issues, and to provide a baseline for future action.

Methodology

The audit sought to answer four questions:

- To what extent is gender analysis incorporated into CIAT project and program development, research and research-for-development activities, and performance assessment?
- Where are the best opportunities for gender mainstreaming in CIAT's research activities?
- To what extent have the CIAT G&D Committee and Associates achieved their goals?
- What actions offer the best opportunities for CIAT G&D Committee and Associates to further their aims?

A wide consultation process involved CIAT personnel, research and development partners, former CIAT personnel and end-users. Main methodological tools were interviews, questionnaires, focus-group discussions and a documentation review. Consultations were held at CIAT Headquarters (Cali, Colombia) and at CIAT's most heavily staffed regional offices (Kampala, Nairobi and Vientiane); the audit also covered the Bangkok office, as it was en route to Vientiane.

Some 16% of CIAT personnel were interviewed, 20% completed the questionnaire, and 8% were involved in focus-group discussions. Of 200 questionnaires sent out to partners, about 15% were returned.

In assessing the status of gender in the workplace, gender-disaggregated data were also collected on staffing levels, recruitment, turnover and other staffing issues.

Main findings and recommendations

Gender in research

Across the regions, CIAT offices integrate gender analysis to different extents, with projects in Africa and Asia being designed, implemented and evaluated with more regard for women's and men's differentiated roles and priorities. In general, gender analysis is poorly integrated into CIAT research projects, mainly because it is done in an unstructured way.

For the most part, the inclusion of gender analysis involves one of the following: use of disaggregated data in diagnosis and identification of the vulnerable population; active inclusion of women in diagnosis or evaluation meetings; or evaluation of differentiated impact of finished projects.

The implementation stage is the most critical for targeting the inclusion of gender analysis, mainly because: (i) project design may include gender analysis in diagnosis, but does not specifically include gendered objectives or indicators; (ii) the implementation phase typically involves partnerships and participation of stakeholders, many of whom will not have participated in the design phase; and (iii) during the implementation phase, interdisciplinary teams tend to integrate tasks without a clear follow-through strategy that ensures gendered priorities are taken to the projects' end. Lack of communication, confusing and mixed definitions of what gender analysis is and what it entails, low profile of gender issues in research, time pressures and the need to show fast results appear to be associated with a lack of gender-analysis inclusion.

There is generally a positive attitude within CIAT towards gender mainstreaming, which is perceived as fitting with the Centers' image and mission. However, scientists express that CIAT still needs to institutionalize gender analysis in its policies and procedures and that many of them still do not see clearly how gender analysis could add value to their particular projects. Cultural resistance still plays a role difficult to evaluate, although the last ten years have seen a more open attitude as a reflection of advances on the status of women worldwide.

CIAT has built valuable knowledge and experience on gender issues during more than 20 years, primarily linked to participatory approaches in research. However, this knowledge and experience need to enrich all research activities and to develop into human skills and methodological tools to tackle specific research challenges across all regions.

Main recommendations:

- Adopting a double path for gender mainstreaming in research. Path 1 needs to address CIAT institutional policy on gender mainstreaming in all research activities, and Path 2 requires that CIAT and the PRGA Program focus on projects identified as strategic or as offering the best opportunities for gender analysis.
- Writing explicit policy statements that relate CIAT's mission and values to gender equality in research and research-for-development actions. Policy

statements should acknowledge the role of gender inequalities in hindering the reduction of hunger and poverty in the tropics and CIAT's commitment to show impact on women's lives.

- Including clear definitions as part of the written policies.
- Providing incentives for gender mainstreaming in projects and programs as part of the gender-mainstreaming policies. Strategies may include visibility and acknowledgment in professional records (including annual performance appraisals of staff). Visibility might include also highlighting the relation of projects to global policy and actions instruments such as the Millennium Development Goals, the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) and guidelines on gender mainstreaming provided by FAO, the World Bank or other relevant actors. Dissemination of best practices on gender mainstreaming through ArcoNet and on weekly research seminars may be endorsed specifically by management.
- Establishing specific procedures to oversee gender mainstreaming in CIAT's research activities. The Research Committee, under the Deputy Director General for Research, would be in charge of reviewing projects in the pipeline and those in progress once per year, and providing suggestions to make sure that women's interests are integrated into the CIAT research process. To this end, the Research Committee would receive support from the PRGA Program, management grants office and the consultant on gender issues in research. Its comments and recommendations should be presented in written form to project leaders.
- Recruiting a consultant on gender issues until a critical mass of gender-analysis expertise is built and gender mainstreaming is institutionalized.
- Other actions include: (i) establishing assessment forms at the Grants Management Office, assigning values to specific indicators on gender analysis, among other cross-cutting themes; (ii) elaborating and disseminating a manual on gender mainstreaming in CIAT's R&D activities; (iii) recovering and communicating good practices on gender mainstreaming; (iv) elaborating general guidelines to influence R&D partners to be consistent with CIAT gender-mainstreaming strategy; (v) supporting disaggregated data by gender; and (vi) including gender-analysis capacity as part of job descriptions.

Gender in the workplace

CIAT's activities toward gender equity in the workplace are based on the goals set by its own G&D Committee and Human Resources Department and on strategies established by the CGIAR Gender and Diversity Program.

Achievements of the CIAT G&D Committee and Associates have been modest when considering the activities carried out thus far. Reasons for this include: (1) lack of economic and human resources devoted to undertaking research, advocacy and innovative actions; (2) there are conflicting views among CIAT management who, on the one hand, support (or do not oppose)

goals set by the CGIAR G&D Program and CIAT G&D Committee and, on the other hand, are not all personally convinced of their priority among many other challenges.

Human Resources' records from 2002 to 2007 show that the proportion of female to male staff has been lower than 25% among senior staff, administration management and technical staff. Moreover, three worrying signals show the need to tackle the issue more directly: (1) CIAT has not had female representation at senior management level since 2006; (2) at the senior scientist level, male representation has increased while female representation has remained constant; and (3) in spite of female candidates, among ten open postdoctoral positions during the period 2003–2006, only one was filled by a woman.

Male personnel see CIAT's environment as more conducive to gender equity than female personnel do. CIAT contractors at Headquarters, men and women, have the most negative views on women's position at CIAT. However, they attribute discrimination as coming primarily from the low regard of the kind of work they perform.

The allegedly small number of actions taken following the Ethics Committee's recommendations to the Director, in some cases of work abuse and harassment, comprise a major setback, not only to the Ethics Committee but also to the G&D Committee. This is because both Committees, together with Human Resources, have built a strong synergy to elaborate and implement an Ethics Code.

There is a generalized perception that gender issues may not be as relevant as diversity issues. From the interviews, it was clear that this responds to two main issues: (1) discrimination is perceived as coming from other variables (such as inequalities between internationally and nationally recruited staff); and (2) lack of awareness on gender equity issues covered by cultural norms and tradition.

Main recommendations:

- Institutional policies derived from CIAT's acknowledgment of the relationship between its goals and values and gender equality should be stated in written form in English, Spanish and regional languages, and disseminated as a first step to promote gender equity at CIAT. This has implications for gender mainstreaming in research, involves specific policies for gender-sensitive human-resources management and a work environment free of harassment and discrimination. A monitoring mechanism should rest on both internal human-resources self-monitoring mechanisms and established institutional bodies (G&D and Ethics Committees).
- Re-organizing CIAT G&D Committee and Associates would re-invigorate their work. First, re-elaborating the list of members through a process of personal dialogue—fewer but more convinced and active members would be an asset rather than a disadvantage. Second, establishing strategic and practical objectives rather than carrying on with dispersed actions. Third,

building internal capacity to reach a common understanding on gender equity in the workplace and what it implies.

- G&D focal points in the regions need to play an active role as part of the Committee in headquarters. It is relevant to clearly set up roles of Committee Members in the regional offices and arrive at common understandings. Committee Members are not only an extension of the Committee at headquarters, but may be active actors in promoting the G&D goals locally and in providing feedback to both human resources and the G&D Committee at headquarters.
- The G&D Committee and Associates need to expand their information and awareness campaigns to reach a wider public and avoid limiting them to only those immediately interested in G&D. Besides their current themes, others such as the diffusion of compelling evidence on the impact of gender equity in improving people's lives and institutional performance seem to be relevant.
- Alliances with the CGIAR G&D Program can provide room for wide and cost-effective actions. Nevertheless, attention must be paid to replication mechanisms, so not only women and not only women in the higher positions get the benefits.
- In addition to searching for alternative paths to bring women on board, other topics remain relevant. For example, many complaints and reasons for high staff turnover related either to what is perceived as lack of transparency on what a contract entails or to low career opportunities. Both examples mirror what was also said in Cali. These topics need to be included in the G&D agenda and their discussions with human resources and management.

In addition, the gender audit report includes an action plan toward gender-mainstreaming for both research and the workplace, which could begin as early as January 2009, with the dissemination of the audit's results.

Institutionalizing gender-responsive research and development in agriculture and natural-resource management through women's networks²

There is an increasing demand on agricultural and natural-resources management (NRM) research and development (R&D) institutions to address the needs of those constituents who are highly vulnerable to the effects of poverty, land degradation and climate change. Perhaps nowhere is this more significant and urgent as in mountain areas, where the vulnerability of marginalized groups such as poor women and indigenous minorities requires that R&D systems focus attention on the underlying causes of their marginalization.

One significant causal factor contributing to marginalization of such groups is the ineffectiveness of R&D systems to address the demands and needs of their constituency groups, particularly of female small-holders. Often,

² Synthesis edited from WOCAN (2008).

such systems are constrained by a limited capacity to conduct gender-sensitive research and the predominance of a 'supply-driven' agenda of innovation that cannot effectively respond to the complex social and environmental realities of such vulnerable groups.

Thus, a major aim of this project was to strengthen the capacities of women agricultural and NRM professionals and rural women's groups to themselves control the process of research, while simultaneously building their capacities and power to demand agricultural and NRM development on their own terms—an approach that meets both the practical and strategic needs of poor rural women for empowerment and poverty-alleviating technologies. A key component of this approach is the transformation of the institutions and organizations that address food security and their involvement of end-users in the process of innovation. Strengthening the capacities of both rural and professional women's networks to do this is an investment in social capital that complements other forms of capital—natural, physical, human and financial.

The project aimed to undertake action research through change agents—selected from partner organizations—who diagnosed and designed specific action-research approaches using a framework that enabled one to view an organization as being composed of three systems: technical, political and cultural. Used as an analytical tool, this framework enabled the assessment of opportunities and constraints to mainstreaming social analysis/gender analysis (SA/GA) approaches in the organization.

The principal findings of the action research can be characterized as follows. There was a general absence of technical expertise to conduct gender-sensitive approaches, no specific policies and no internal fund allocation for gender. On the other hand, the managers of most of the organizations agreed that gender was a critical and important component that needed to be integrated into organizational practice; the majority of the partner organizations did indeed have gender components within certain projects. However, they did not possess the technical capacity to integrate 'best practices' from these projects into the organizational context.

As a result of the project, there has been a significant increase in the capacities of partner organizations to integrate gender-sensitive approaches within the various stages of the project cycle, as well as in the structures of the organization. There has also been an increase in the individual capacity of the change agents—where they have moved on to other organizations, they have continued to be part of the network, while continually seeking to affect transformations in their new organizational settings.

Considerable achievements have been made in terms of the individual capacities of the change agents. Several of them (Sikkim, Meghalaya, Nepal and Laos) have already been functioning as 'trainers' for organizations other than their own. These participants will function as trainers in an upcoming project supported by CARE/Nepal, to build capacity for gender and organizational change among forestry organizations in Nepal.

It is important, however, to continue building on existing capacity of change agents. As members of WOCAN, these change agents will be continually

exposed to future opportunities to train others as well as to enhance their own learning processes.

Several lessons have also been generated from the implementation of the project. These 'best practices' have been summarized in a video production of the approach adopted by WOCAN and refined during this project. This video was shown at the United Nations Commission for Sustainable Development meetings in May 2008 and is accessible via the WOCAN website. In addition, this approach is being replicated in new initiatives in the Himalayan region, as well as in Africa through partnerships with CARE/Nepal, Heifer International and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) in several countries of Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia.

Gender mainstreaming framework

Using experiences primarily from the second phase of the Program, but also drawing on the recent gender audit of CIAT (*see below*), the former Program Coordinator devised the Gender Mainstreaming Framework, which was published (online) as a *PRGA Program Working Document* in September (Gurung, 2008). The framework brings together two important concepts that address organizational change (Gender Integration Framework) and the subsequent outcome at the community level (Gender Equality Wheel).

Book on gender mainstreaming experiences in East and Central Africa

Experiences from the PRGA Program–ASARECA project *Building Capacity in Gender Analysis and Gender Mainstreaming in the National Agricultural Research Systems (NARS) of ASARECA* are being written up in the form of a book. Each of the eight NARS involved—Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Ethiopia, Kenya, Madagascar, Rwanda, Sudan, Tanzania and Uganda—are contributing a chapter on the experience and future prospects from their perspective; there will be a chapter based on the project evaluation, and a conceptual introduction and overview. Progress in 2008 has been slow, and we are now looking toward publication in 2009.

Gender Project Support Person, ASARECA³

The gender position that was supported by the PRGA Program at ASARECA was an outcome of the initiative *Building Capacity in Gender Analysis and Gender Mainstreaming in the NARS of ASARECA*. By the end of the project, it was apparent that a lot needed to be done to continue the gender-mainstreaming efforts at ASARECA—gender mainstreaming is a process. Since ASARECA had no established position for a gender advisor, the PRGA Program offered to support this position for 2 years. Having a gender specialist (or gender unit) is an important step toward gender-mainstreaming efforts. Although gender is a cross-cutting issue which all staff in programs and projects should address, it is important to have a gender specialist in order to ensure accountability, guide the gender-mainstreaming efforts and ensure that

³ Executive Summary from Ssendiwala (2008).

attention to gender does not ‘evaporate.’ The position referred to as Gender Project Support Person (GPSP) was located at the Policy Analysis and Advocacy Programme (PAAP), formally Eastern and Central Africa Programme for Agricultural Policy Analysis (ECAPAPA), a program of ASARECA.

Experiences as well as lessons learned through the PRGA–ASARECA project have been synthesized into chapters for a book publication under the theme ‘Influencing Change.’ The editor has approved the chapters (except the Madagascar one which is still under review). The GPSP has co-authored the evaluation chapter based on the project evaluation that she carried out.

The GPSP visited gender teams in three NARS to offer technical support, as well as to discuss issues of gender mainstreaming in specific NARS and in the region. The teams visited were DRT (Tanzania), KARI (Kenya) and EIAR (Ethiopia).

During the reporting period, significant steps were made toward gender mainstreaming at ASARECA. In recognition of the need to contribute more widely to gender mainstreaming through its work, ASARECA engendered its logframe. In consultation with senior management, gender-sensitive indicators were developed to track the integration of a gender perspective in the five result areas of ASARECA. A gender-specific logframe has also been developed to ensure a gender perspective in those result areas.

Although previous efforts to integrate gender in PAAP’s current strategic plan were not successful, ASARECA is now in the process of developing a strategic plan for gender. This will provide guidelines and procedures for implementing gender in programs and projects, and shed light on how to support ASARECA partners in gender mainstreaming. The GPSP has already started consulting some gender practitioners among ASARECA partners regarding the development of a gender policy. She is in the process of writing a background paper to support the strategy. The gender-mainstreaming framework—which is a combination of two frameworks (Gender Integration Framework and Gender Equality Wheel)—will inform the strategy. The next step in the process is a stakeholders’ workshop (scheduled for first quarter of 2009) to consult ASARECA’s staff and partners on the development of the gender strategic plan.

Workshop on Rethinking Impact: Understanding the complexity of poverty and change⁴

The Challenge Dialogue System (CDS) process followed for this workshop

Within 3 weeks of the call for papers being released, the workshop organizers decided to engage the Challenge Dialogue System (CDS) of Innovation Expedition Inc. (www.innovationexpedition.com). The CDS is an eight-step process for “improving the organizational and innovative performance of diverse groups,” and had been used successfully at ILRI in several complex virtual

⁴ From ILAC Initiative *et al.* (2008h).

team challenges. The pre-workshop Challenge Dialogue was sponsored by Emile Frison, Chair of the Executive Alliance of the CGIAR.

The organizers formed a workshop planning team that worked with Keith Jones of Innovation Expedition to develop a 22-page ‘Challenge Paper’ (Kristjanson *et al.*, 2008a), which was sent to 60 participants in January 2008. The common challenge to be addressed by the group was articulated in the Challenge Paper:

To learn from the experiences and empirical findings of a diverse group of colleagues from across the agriculture and natural-resources research and development community about how research approaches and institutions have contributed to sustainable poverty reduction, social inclusion and equity. We are particularly interested in approaches that attempt to address issues of how change comes about and who benefits.

The purpose of the Challenge Dialogue, background issues and events leading to the Challenge, assumptions driving it, expected outcomes at the end of the dialogue, along with suggested potential action options to be enhanced by Dialogue participants, are all included in the Challenge Paper.

Thirty-eight responses were received to the Challenge Paper covering a wide diversity of views. These responses were made available both in a ‘raw’ format (Kristjanson *et al.*, 2008b) and as an ‘initial synthesis’ (Kristjanson *et al.*, 2008c) via the workshop website (www.prgaprogram.org/riw). The responses were used by Keith and the organizing committee to prepare a ‘Workshop Workbook’ (Kristjanson *et al.*, 2008d) to guide a proactive workshop. Based on the feedback received, the objective (or Challenge) for the Workshop became

To find common ground among a diverse scientific group, working in the broad field of poverty and environmental research, so that a future direction for research for impact approaches can be identified and expressed clearly; a future that would see an improved capability and capacity to support and inform the efforts of those working to reduce poverty in a sustainable and equitable manner.

Expected outcomes

The 3-day workshop was quite intense, as 58 participants strove toward six major outcomes:

1. Alignment on key elements of a vision and set of principles that encompass a new way of thinking about impact that better reflects the

complexity of poverty, social inclusion and equity, and of how change occurs—possibly leading toward some kind of ‘Statement of Purpose,’ in addition to some ‘policy briefs.’

2. Alignment on important strategies-for-development guidelines that will help researchers, research managers, practitioners and partners reach poor communities more effectively with new knowledge—including guidelines addressing needed institutional change.
3. (A) Alignment on strategies and plans that will make the portfolio of existing impact assessment and evaluation methods more accessible and understandable for their most appropriate use by researchers, research managers, practitioners and partners—including identification of ‘gaps’ where new methods are needed;
(B) Strategies for institutionalizing methods, principles, guidelines—to work with organizational change and institutions—toward international public goods.
4. Alignment on the nature and form of a network aimed at increasing the exchange and sharing of knowledge and experience for co-learning, facilitating mentoring, increasing collaborative opportunities (joint projects), enabling more collective action, and nurturing communities of practice.
5. Situation analysis—why we want to do something different.
6. Publications and other communication activities.

Profile of the participants

Gender

The Workshop was attended by 59 professionals (including 3 workshop reporters and a facilitator), 42% (25) of whom were women.

Organizational affiliation

Thirty-two (54%) of participants were affiliated with the CGIAR, representing 11 Centers and 3 inter-Center/Systemwide entities. Twenty-seven (46%) were non-CGIAR (e.g. NGOs, universities, advisors, and donor organizations).

Disciplinary affiliation

- *Natural Science*: agriculture, natural-resources management, animal health, ecology, and livestock
- *Evaluation & Institutional Management*: evaluation, impact assessment, management, and institutional change
- *Economics*: agricultural economics and economics
- *Humanities & Social Science*: development studies, gender, training, participatory research, and sociology.

Key messages

Four key messages seemed to arise from the workshop:

1. 'Rethinking impact' refers to rethinking how we do research to have sustainable poverty impacts and link knowledge with action, along with how best to evaluate that
How we do the research is key to achieving pro-poor, gender-sensitive and socially inclusive results. Working more thoughtfully with, and helping to bridge boundaries between, strategically chosen partners can help increase the probability of linking the knowledge generated by the research to actions that lead to sustainable poverty reductions.
2. Bring other (existing) evaluation methods and approaches into more regular practice
A wide array of evaluation methods and approaches already exists that is not fully utilized by the agricultural and natural-resource management (NRM) R&D community. The participants should review the available options and try out some of the methodologies that they are currently not using.
3. There seems to be a legitimacy gap in terms of approaches and methods
There is still a high degree of skepticism among (especially CGIAR) agricultural and NRM researchers about non-economic and non-statistical data being used in evaluations. More empirical evidence of the validity and value of approaches other than economic (e.g. *ex-post* assessments) is an area where we could all add value and help reach a wider audience regarding sustainable poverty-related impacts of research.
4. Methodology gaps still exist
Some believe that the CGIAR does not have adequate evaluation methods and approaches for the 75% of its research that is not related to germplasm improvement (e.g. policies, institutions, natural-resource management, gender and social inclusion). The evaluators in the System need to access or devise new methods to fill this important gap.

The key issues discussed at the Workshop are further elaborated in a 2-page Brief (ILAC Initiative *et al.*, 2008e) and discussed in detail in Kristjanson *et al.* (2008e).

There was also a considerable amount of alignment around the following ideas:

- The need for this group to develop a conceptual or organizational framework to capture the complex challenge we all face.
- The experience and knowledge of the workshop participants brings together a wealth of lessons as to ways in which we can increase the probability of linking knowledge with action to help sustainably reduce poverty.

- Starting with this group to build some kind of a coalition or community of practice would be a good idea, as it would give us a stronger collective voice with which to share our knowledge.
- This group can contribute (and this workshop has already contributed) toward capacity-building with respect to a broad range of skills, tools and institutional-change-supporting efforts to have an impact in terms of sustainable poverty reduction.
- The importance of strategic communication is often not recognized, both in terms of having greater impact with our research-for-development efforts, and in evaluating those impacts.

Action plans

Action-planning was an integral part of the CDS process originally proposed for this workshop. Even when the agendas were reworked for days 2 and 3, action-planning was still considered a valuable element for moving participants toward concrete action. In the end, two sessions on the final afternoon were set aside for participants to join groups to discuss specific action points of interest. Thus, the action-planning ‘teams’ were self-selected, and each participant had the opportunity to contribute to two such groups.

The nine groups were: Principles and standards; Networking and community of practice; Methodologies guidelines (including ‘soft’); Institutionalization; Ex-ante impact assessment, priority-setting and planning; Organizing framework; Capacity-building; Communications; and, Histories and political economy of agricultural and natural resources science and technology. For the most part, the text of this section is presented as it was written on the charts at the workshop. Some of the actions to which participants committed themselves are included in a Brief (ILAC Initiative et al., 2008g), and again as part of the discussion of the key issues (Kristjanson et al., 2008e).

Workshop evaluation

In-workshop evaluation

At the end of the workshop, outcome 6 (publications and communications) was considered to have been fully met (in terms of planning) by all participants; outcomes 3 (strategies) and 5 (situation analysis) were considered to have been met by about half of the participants (the remaining participants considered both ‘partially met’). The remaining outcomes were considered ‘partially met.’ It was pointed out that several of these outcomes were added at the outset of the workshop to what some already considered quite ambitious outcomes coming out of the Challenge Dialogue process.

Post-workshop evaluation survey

An evaluation questionnaire was sent (by e-mail) to all participants shortly after the workshop. The questionnaire addressed six areas of interest to the organizing committee:

1. The Challenge Paper

2. Strengths and weaknesses of the CDS process
3. Strengths and weaknesses of the workshop
4. Issues and take-home messages
5. Follow-up activities
6. Final comments

Thirty-five participants responded to the questionnaire out of the 60 to whom it was sent (see ILAC Initiative *et al.*, 2008h, for details).

International journals focus on impact assessment of participatory research and gender analysis

A number of papers originally presented at the PRGA Program–CIMMYT Impact Assessment Workshop (Texcoco, Mexico, October 19–21, 2005) were used as the bases for special issues of the international journals *Experimental Agriculture* and *Development in Practice*, both published in 2008. Full details of the background and contents were given in the *PRGA Program Annual Report 2007*.

Combining gender analysis into a CGIAR participatory plant breeding program⁵

The PhD work, funded by a small grant to the participatory plant breeding (PPB) program of the International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas (ICARDA), aims to: (1) transform a PPB program into a gender-sensitive program; (2) empower the most marginalized people and women in particular; and (3) recognize and preserve indigenous knowledge at the household level.

A conceptual framework for a social impact assessment of the empowering effects of PPB has been developed. Fieldwork methods have also been selected, tested and refined in collaboration with the women farmers.

Three Syrian villages were identified for the fieldwork—Lahethah (Sweida region), Souran (Hama region) and Ajaz (Aleppo region). A network of women farmer-collaborators has been established and continues to be expanded.

An MA student from Aleppo University has been identified to collaborate on translation and fieldwork support.

A baseline participatory rural appraisal was conducted with the women farmers to assess their involvement in their households' farming activities, with particular attention to gender dynamics that influence those activities. This comprised: daily calendars; seasonal calendars; crop preferences; land ownership and use analysis; and focus discussions on seed exchange, management and preferences, gender division of labor in irrigation, knowledge-sharing, marketing, and control of revenues.

An 'epistemic exploration' was conducted to determine the women's current views on their family structure; the matrix of intra-household relations in agricultural activities; perceived changes in rural areas; and future

⁵ Text based on 'Report to the PRGA Program on the small grant "Combining Gender Analysis into a CGIAR PPB Program".'

expectations. Meanwhile, a baseline estimation was made of the women's access to, use of and control over resources; and the women's expectations of their participation in the PPB elucidated.

Interim results

The initial work has led to the participation of six women farmers (5 from Sweida and 1 from Souran) in the PPB project. Though this is far from the target of a gender balance, it is a major step forward for a project that has been male-only for the first 10 years of its existence.

The experience has identified practical ways of involving women in a PPB program, including: use of a woman facilitator for PPB activities; separate women-only meetings (but open to interested male participants); collaboration with existing networks (e.g. women's union, farmers' union); and providing support for someone to accompany younger farmers to workshops and conferences.

The women were encouraged to be proactive, and those from Sweida asked to plant a PPB field of their own.

The women participated in an international meeting in Jordan—their first ever trip outside Syria—where they expanded their networks by meeting farmers from other countries. The trip help increase their knowledge of agriculture and travel.

Through their involvement in focus groups and in creating daily and seasonal calendars, the women increased their awareness of their own role as farmers, increased their self-confidence, and arguably raised their visibility in the community.

It has become evident that women have a wealth of tacit knowledge related to non-mechanized agricultural management in terms of crop-handling, seed selection and preservation, and use of crops for food preparation. A gender-sensitive approach to knowledge-sharing has proved important in tapping this gender-specific local knowledge that is rarely the focus of research and is often overlooked and marginalized. Informal knowledge-sharing methods (e.g. storytelling) facilitate the women's access to, sharing and distribution of information, where they are uncomfortable with formal presentations, and may experience difficulty with the official language. The informal methods allow space for 'marginal' topics of interest to farmers.

Although women appreciate the novelty of information technologies (e.g. mobile phones), they can often only access them through male relatives. It is therefore important that they be supported in the use of such technology, but also be supplied with alternative means for accessing and sharing knowledge, such as printed material, field visits and visual mnemonics (e.g. seeds, dried herbs, bread that they associate with an experience or story).

Fourteen women farmers from three countries (including the 6 from this project) were among 53 farmers from six countries who shared their experiences and knowledge at a farmers' conference in Aleppo in May.

By the end of 2008, the ICARDA PPB program had become gender-sensitive, and was becoming gender-balanced. It is providing useful insights for potential out-scaling.

Dissemination

The conceptual framework, methodology and early challenges were presented at the Workshop on Rethinking Impact: Understanding the complexity of poverty and change (Galie', 2008) and at an in-house seminar of the Social, Economic and Policy Research program of ICARDA (April 22, 2008).

The work was also used as a contribution to an expert consultation on Strengthening Regional Approached to Gender and Social Analysis in ENRM Research for Development in the Middle East and North Africa (Aleppo, April 9–10, 2008).

Appendix 1. Output Targets 2008⁶

The year 2008 was one of transition for the PRGA Program. The remaining senior staff member (Impact Assessment) left in the middle of the year, and the new Program Coordinator did not come on board until November.

2.1. Output 1: New Developments in Participatory Plant Breeding

- Researchable topics identified by stakeholders (through 4th PRGA International Seminar) — *Over 50% Achieved*
 - The 4th PRGA International Seminar did not take place because the Program was in transition and the new Coordinator only came on board in late 2008.
 - However, e-mail consultations were conducted, which identified a number of researchable topics.

2.2. Output 2: Institutional Innovations in Africa's Seed and Seedling Revolution

- Researchable topics identified by stakeholders (through 4th PRGA International Seminar) — *Over 50% Achieved*
 - The 4th PRGA International Seminar did not take place because the Program was in transition and the new Coordinator only came on board in late 2008.
 - However, e-mail consultations were conducted, which identified a number of researchable topics.

2.3. Output 3: Re-framing Effective Action for R&D

- Researchable topics identified by stakeholders — *Cancelled*
 - The 4th PRGA International Seminar did not take place; moreover, this Output was reformulated in the 2009–2011 MTP exercise.

2.4. Output 4: Supporting Actions for Gender Mainstreaming

- Annual Gender Research Prize is established (to help stimulate gender research within the CG Centers) — *75% Achieved*
 - Terms of reference developed, and discussed with the Gender and Diversity Program and the Alliance.
 - The Prize is to be advertised early in 2009.
- Main lessons in PR & GA summarized in Policy Briefs and disseminated — *Fully Achieved*
 - Gender Mainstreaming Framework published as *Working Document* (Gurung, 2008).
 - *Thematic Briefs* on gender mainstreaming and PPB (incorporating lessons learned) published February 2009.

⁶ World Bank–CGIAR Performance Indicators (part).

- Methods for PR & GA in key CG research areas compiled into Manuals and disseminated — *Deferred to 2010*
 - Gender Mainstreaming Framework published as *Working Document* (Gurung, 2008).
 - PPB manual deferred to 2010.
- CIAT has appropriate gender indicators in project review procedures and evaluations — *Deferred to 2009*
 - First stage of the process was completed with the gender audit for CIAT conducted in 2007–2008 and published in late 2008 (Aviles Irahola, 2008).
 - The Gender Audit was accepted by the CIAT Management Team, and subsequently endorsed by the CIAT Board of Trustees in December 2008.
 - The audit’s strong recommendation for a CIAT action-plan to move in this direction has been reflected in the Center’s new Strategic Directions document.
 - The new PRGA Program Coordinator is supporting the Strategic Plan’s future implementation through development of indicators in project review, and monitoring and evaluation procedures.
 - While adoption by CIAT Management of specific indicators is not within the PRGA Program’s control, we expect this deferred conclusion to become reality during 2009.

Appendix 2. Most Significant Outcomes in 2008

Follow-up to the 2007–08 gender audit of CIAT⁷

CIAT is following up on the gender audit conducted by the PRGA Program in 2007–08. Specifically, the Center is implementing the recommendations made by the Program in the Gender Audit Report, including capacity-building strategies which are the first step in moving on from the audit toward mainstreaming gender issues in research and development. To implement these strategies, the Center held a seminar on Gender and Participatory Work for the staff of one of its projects (February 2009). This was followed up by a Center-wide seminar (early March 2009). CIAT is also disseminating pertinent information in the form of *Briefs* addressing gender mainstreaming and gender auditing in the CGIAR context, which will be used in the capacity-building process.

Moreover, the gender audit report has generated interest among other Centers, which have contacted the PRGA Program with a view to developing tailored strategies (beginning with assessments) for gender mainstreaming in their specific contexts.

The gender audit of CIAT arose from the convergence of the PRGA Program's renewed focus on gender mainstreaming in CG Centers and CIAT's Gender and Diversity Committee recommending that the Center undergo a thorough gender audit. The meeting that actually resulted in the gender audit going ahead occurred as recently as May 2007, which was too late for inclusion in the Medium-Term Plan (MTP) 2008–2010. However, the Output that is giving rise to the reported Outcome was identified in a generic sense in the Program's MTP 2006–2008: *Capacity developed for mainstreaming gender analysis and equitable participatory research—improved competencies of the CG System and collaborating institutions to mainstream the use of gender-sensitive participatory approaches in plant breeding, and natural-resource management research.*

The Output—i.e. the gender audit—has been reported in detail in a report to CIAT (Aviles Irahola, 2008). Moreover, the Executive Summary of that report has been widely distributed to donors, and other Centers and stakeholders. The work is also reported in the PRGA Program's Annual Report 2008 and in a brief-cum-flier entitled *Auditing Gender in Agricultural R&D Organizations: Mainstreaming Gender in the CGIAR* (both documents expected to be published in March 2009).

The results of the gender audit are being used by CIAT Outcome Line Leaders (OLs) at headquarters and in the regional offices, and initiatives to work toward gender mainstreaming are being explored in various parts of the Center.

⁷ CIAT's follow-up to the PRGA Program-led gender audit of the Center was proposed as the Program's most significant Outcome in 2008 for the World Bank–CGIAR Performance Indicators report; however, the fact that the Program reports *through* CIAT meant that the proposal was not viable in the wider context.

Some of the PRGA Program’s recommendations—namely, capacity-building and sensitizing of staff—are being implemented or otherwise acted upon.

The Outcome is being pursued as intended. Over the course of the coming years, implementation should result in full integration of gender issues in CIAT’s entire R&D landscape. Moreover, the interest shown by other Centers is a good sign that gender could be mainstreamed throughout the CG System. Ultimately, the mainstreaming of gender concerns will result in better-targeted R&D.

Data was collected via thorough interviews and informal observations, etc. The data collected was primarily qualitative. Main evidence was recorded through an *ex-post* assessment, which included the interviewing of CIAT OLLs.

Evidence of the outcome has been reported by CIAT’s OLLs and scientists during a follow-up consultation to redefine their perceptions related to ‘gender work’ in their own programs and/or projects. Leaders of *Cambio Andino* mentioned that using a gender perspective, along with the participatory work they carry out, will help them to assess women’s power issues at the farm-household level, besides direct and indirect benefits for men and women at the community level. The Director of CIAT’s *Project on Tropical Forages and Grasses* recognized the advantages of including a gender perspective in the Project’s work and that there is a need to maintain an ongoing strategy and backstopping activities beyond the theoretical perspective of gender. Another important component was highlighted by the head of *Sharing the Benefits of Agrobiodiversity* in relation to nutritional values and health-related issues, which are enhanced through sensitive gender work at all levels.

Overall, the importance of the audit (the PRGA Program Output) is that CIAT has been ‘permeated,’ and researchers are more aware of the advantages of including gender issues in their work-plans, activities, budgeting, etc.

4.2. Progress in gender mainstreaming in ASARECA⁸

The Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa (ASARECA)—the sub-regional agricultural research organization for Eastern and Central Africa—has taken major steps forward in its process of gender mainstreaming. It has developed 13 gender-sensitive indicators in five ‘result areas,’ drafted its first engendered logical framework (2008/09–2012/13), and is in the process of adopting its first engendered strategic plan.

This Outcome builds on several Measurable Indicators (now known as Output Targets) identified for the Second Phase of the PRGA Program (2003–2007), and most clearly articulated in the Program Medium-Term Plan 2005–2007:

- ... Robust partnerships are formed with regional networks, prominent national partners ... that have (or have the potential to have) considerable impact on the rural poor...;

⁸ World Bank–CGIAR Performance Indicators (part).

- The nature of collaboration takes the form of (1) exploiting synergies in objectives, (2) taking opportunities to considerably expand the integration, or improve the quality of, the gender analysis and participatory research practiced, or (3) incorporating gender analysis and participatory research approaches where they would otherwise be absent or weakly applied;
- ... Methods workshops held for gender analysis, participatory research, impact assessment of institutional learning and change, and organizational development, training ... participants in a variety of 'best practice' approaches; and follow-up support extended to participants to enable them to continue change processes in their respective institutions...;
- One training-of-trainers workshop held for gender analysis, participatory research, impact assessment of institutional learning and change, and organizational development, training ... trainers in a variety of 'best practice' approaches; and follow-up support extended to trainers to enable them to provide training and technical support to scientists in their institutes...;
- ... Collaborative action-research activities undertaken through strategic partnerships...;
- Institutional analysis conducted with ... partner institutions, and 'best practices' analyzed and disseminated...;
- Mentoring and capacity building provided to partner institutions to guide and lend support to the mainstreaming process....

Achievement of the Output Targets has been variously documented in Workshop, Progress and Technical Reports emanating from the Project 'Building Capacity in Gender Analysis and Gender Mainstreaming in the National Agricultural Research Systems (NARS) of ASARECA,⁹ *PRGA Program*

⁹ ECAPAPA, 2004. Proceedings of Gender Workshop Training at Nairobi, Kenya.
 ECAPAPA, 2005. Proceedings of Gender Workshop Training at Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
 ECAPAPA, 2006. Proceedings of Leadership Workshop Training at Entebbe, Uganda.
 ECAPAPA, 2006. Proceedings of Training of Trainers Workshop at Nairobi, Kenya.
 ECAPAPA (Eastern and Central Africa Programme for Agricultural Policy Analysis), 2006. Capacity Building in Participatory Research and Gender Mainstreaming in the NARS of ASARECA, Workshop Report, Leadership Training Workshop, Imperial Resort Beach Hotel, Entebbe, Uganda, 30th November to 4th December 2006. ECAPAPA, Entebbe, Uganda, 30p.
 Ssendiwala EN, 2007. Building Capacity for Gender Analysis and Gender Mainstreaming in Eastern and Central Africa: Progress Report September 2007. ASARECA, [Entebbe, Uganda], 23p.
 Eastern and Central Africa Programme for Agricultural Policy Analysis (ECAPAPA), 2007. Building Capacity in Gender Analysis and Gender Mainstreaming in the National Agricultural Research Systems (NARS) of the Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa (ASARECA) Final Technical Report. PRGA Program, Cali, Colombia, 32p.

Annual Reports for 2004–2005, 2006, 2007 and 2008, and the Report of the Evaluation of the Project.¹⁰

The Outputs were used by the representatives of the NARS of eight countries¹¹ of ASARECA who participated in the Project, and by those staff of ASARECA itself who were involved in developing the new (draft) logical framework and are involved in the strategic-planning process. The NARS personnel became their NARS' gender experts by default.

The Outputs provided the Project participants with information and insights for them to develop concrete recommendations and work-plans for mainstreaming gender in the work of ASARECA, its programs and projects, and its constituent NARS.

Gender mainstreaming is a *process*, it takes time. The development of an engendered logical framework and strategic plan at the regional level are relatively early steps along the way. In due course (assuming that the process continues), gender issues will be embedded in agricultural research and development throughout Eastern and Central Africa (including in Burundi and Eritrea, which did not participate in the Project). This in turn will enable the better targeting of agricultural R&D for all end-users—men, women, youth and children. The lessons learned by the more progressive (gender-wise) NARS will help the other NARS in the region, and wide exposure is obtained also through the participation of the NARI directors general and national university leaders on ASARECA's Committee of Directors. Moreover, the lessons learned in the Project as a whole will be used by the PRGA Program in shaping gender-mainstreaming work elsewhere.

ASARECA's engendered Logical Framework is a concrete document, and the fact that both ASARECA and the NARS are continuing with the gender-mainstreaming process are documented in the final report of the PRGA Program—supported Gender Project Resource Person based at ASARECA (Ssendiwala, 2008).

¹⁰ Ssendiwala E, 2007. Building Capacity in Gender Analysis and Gender Mainstreaming in the NARS of ASARECA. Evaluation Report. ECAPAPA, Entebbe, Uganda, and PRGA Program, Cali, Colombia, 22p.

¹¹ Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Ethiopia, Kenya, Madagascar, Rwanda, Sudan, Tanzania and Uganda.

Appendix 3. Publications

Articles in refereed journals

- Biggs SD, 2007. Reflections on the social embeddedness of S&T in rural and agricultural transformations: learning from positive experiences of poverty reduction and social inclusion in Nepal. *Studies in Nepali History and Society* 12(2): 251–282.
- Biggs S, 2008a. Learning from the positive to reduce rural poverty and increase social justice: Institutional innovations in agricultural and natural resources research and development. *Experimental Agriculture* 44(1): 37–60.
- Biggs S, 2008b. The lost 1990s? Personal reflections on a history of participatory technology development. *Development in Practice* 18(4&5): 489–505.
- Gurung Goodrich C; Justice S; Biggs S; Sah G, 2008. Participatory technology development in agricultural mechanization in Nepal: How it happened and lessons learned. *Development in Practice* 18(4&5): 643–649.
- Lilja N; Bellon M, 2008a. Some common questions about participatory research: A review of the literature. *Development in Practice* 18(4&5): 479–488.
- Lilja N; Bellon M, 2008b. Participatory research practice at the International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center (CIMMYT). (Practical Note) *Development in Practice* 18(4&5): 590–598.
- Lilja N; Dixon J, 2008a. Impact assessment: Foreword to a special issue of *Experimental Agriculture*. *Experimental Agriculture* 44(1): 1.
- Lilja N; Dixon J, 2008b. Responding to the challenges of impact assessment of participatory research and gender analysis. *Experimental Agriculture* 44(1): 3–19.
- Lilja N; Dixon J, 2008c. Operationalising participatory research and gender analysis: New research and assessment approaches. (Guest editors' introduction) *Development in Practice* 18(4&5): 467–478.
- Manners G, 2008. Further resources for participatory research and gender analysis. *Development in Practice* 18(4&5): 658–669.

Books and monographs

- Lilja N; Dixon J (Ed.), 2008d. Special Issue on Impact Assessment of Participatory Research and Gender Analysis. *Experimental Agriculture* 44(1).
- Lilja N; Dixon J (Ed.), 2008e. *Development in Practice* 18(4&5).

Papers presented at formal conferences and workshops

- Biggs S; Gurung B, 2008. Institutional change: The unanticipated consequences of action. Implications for development and research in NRM context. Paper presented at the Workshop on Rethinking Impact: Understanding the Complexity of Poverty and Change, Cali, Colombia, March 26–28.

- Dixon J, 2008. Update on selected activities for the IAFP–SPIA Meeting, November 2008: Systemwide Program on Participatory Research and Gender Analysis for Technology Development and Institutional Innovation (PRGA Program). Presentation at the CGIAR Impact Assessment Focal Point (IAFP) Group and Standing Panel for Impact Assessment (SPIA) Meeting ‘Defining and Refining Good Practice in *Ex-post* Impact Assessment,’ Alvorada Brasilia Hotel, Brasilia, Brazil, November 10–11.
- Galie’ A, 2008. Assessing women’s empowerment through participatory agricultural technology in Syria. Paper presented at the Workshop on Rethinking Impact: Understanding the Complexity of Poverty and Change, Cali, Colombia, March 26–28.
- Lilja N, 2008. Welcome remarks. Presented at the Workshop on Rethinking Impact: Understanding the Complexity of Poverty and Change, Cali, Colombia, March 26–28.

Working documents

- Gurung B, 2008. Gender mainstreaming framework. *PRGA Program Working Document no. 27*. PRGA Program, Cali, Colombia, 27p.
- ILAC Initiative; PRGA Program; ILRI, 2008h. Rethinking Impact: Understanding the complexity of poverty and change. Summary. *PRGA Program Working Document no. 26*. Rome; Cali, Colombia; Nairobi, 32p.
- Kristjanson P; Lilja N; Watts J, 2008e. Rethinking impact: Understanding the complexity of poverty and change. Key issues discussed at the Workshop. *PRGA Program Working Document no. 25*. Rome; Cali, Colombia; Nairobi, 16p.

Reports

- Alianzas del Aprendizaje para el Desarrollo Empresarial Rural; Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical, 2008. Evaluación de la Experiencia del CIAT con la Alianza de Aprendizaje en Centro América. Feb. 2006 – Feb. 2008.
- Aviles Irahola DL, 2008. Report of the Gender Audit at the International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT). Final Report. PRGA Program, Cali, Colombia, 93p.
- Ceccarelli S, 2008. Village-Based Participatory Breeding in the Mountain Slopes of Yemen. Impact Monitoring. August 28 – September 3, 2008.
- PRGA Program, 2008. *Annual Report 2007*. CGIAR Systemwide Program on Participatory Research and Gender Analysis for Technology Development and Institutional Innovation (PRGA Program), Cali, Colombia, ix+42p.
- PRGA Program, 2008. *Annual Report Summary 2007*. CGIAR Systemwide Program on Participatory Research and Gender Analysis for Technology Development and Institutional Innovation (PRGA Program), Cali, Colombia, vii+17p.

- PRGA Program, 2008. Narrative Report on Funding Received for the Year 2007. Submitted to Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA). PRGA Program, Cali, Colombia, 31p.
- PRGA Program, 2008. Systemwide Program on Participatory Research and Gender Analysis for Technology Development and Institutional Innovation (PRGA Program): Update on selected activities for the IAFP–SPIA Meeting, November 2008. PRGA Program, Cali, Colombia, 5p.
- Ssendiwala E, 2008. Gender Expert Position in ECAPAPA 2007–2008. Final Report. Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa (ASARECA), Entebbe, Uganda.
- WOCAN (Woman Organizing for Change in Agriculture and Natural Resource Management), 2008. Institutionalizing Gender-responsive Research & Development in Agriculture and Natural Resource Management through Women’s Networks. Final Technical Report 2005-2008. WOCAN, Ithaca, NY, 30p.

Other publications

- Aviles D; Aristizabal J, 2008. CIAT scientists mainstreaming gender in research. Poster presented at CIAT’s Sharing Knowledge Week Poster Exhibition, May.
- ILAC Initiative; PRGA Program; ILRI, 2008a. *Rethinking Impact Workshop Newsletter* No. 1, March 26, 2008. ILAC Initiative, Rome; PRGA Program, Cali, Colombia; ILRI, Nairobi, 2p.
- ILAC Initiative; PRGA Program; ILRI, 2008b. *Rethinking Impact Workshop Newsletter* No. 2, March 27, 2008. ILAC Initiative, Rome; PRGA Program, Cali, Colombia; ILRI, Nairobi, 2p.
- ILAC Initiative; PRGA Program; ILRI, 2008c. *Rethinking Impact Workshop Newsletter* No. 3, March 28, 2008. ILAC Initiative, Rome; PRGA Program, Cali, Colombia; ILRI, Nairobi, 2p.
- ILAC Initiative; PRGA Program; ILRI, 2008d. *Rethinking Impact Workshop Newsletter* No. 4, March 29, 2008. ILAC Initiative, Rome; PRGA Program, Cali, Colombia; ILRI, Nairobi, 2p.
- ILAC Initiative; PRGA Program; ILRI, 2008e. Rethinking Impact Workshop Key Issues. *Rethinking Impact Workshop Brief* No. 1. ILAC Initiative, Rome; PRGA Program, Cali, Colombia; ILRI, Nairobi, 2p.
- ILAC Initiative; PRGA Program; ILRI, 2008f. Suggested Actions for CGIAR Leaders. *Rethinking Impact Workshop Brief* No. 2. ILAC Initiative, Rome; PRGA Program, Cali, Colombia; ILRI, Nairobi, 2p.
- ILAC Initiative; PRGA Program; ILRI, 2008g. Commitment to Action by the Rethinking Impact Workshop Participants and Organizers. *Rethinking Impact Workshop Brief* No. 3. ILAC Initiative, Rome; PRGA Program, Cali, Colombia; ILRI, Nairobi, 2p.

- ILAC Initiative; PRGA Program; ILRI, 2008i. *Rethinking Impact Workshop Newsletter* No. 5, October 29, 2008. ILAC Initiative, Rome; PRGA Program, Cali, Colombia; ILRI, Nairobi, 2p.
- Kristjanson P; Lilja N; Watts J; *et al.*, 2008a. *Rethinking Impact: Understanding the Complexity of Poverty and Change – A Pre-Workshop Dialogue. Challenge Paper*. International Livestock Research Institute, Nairobi; PRGA Program, Cali, Colombia; Institutional Learning and Change Initiative, Rome, 22p.
- Kristjanson P; Lilja N; Watts J; *et al.*, 2008b. *Rethinking Impact: Understanding the Complexity of Poverty and Change – A Pre-Workshop Dialogue. Consolidated Feedback*. International Livestock Research Institute, Nairobi; PRGA Program, Cali, Colombia; Institutional Learning and Change Initiative, Rome, 61p.
- Kristjanson P; Lilja N; Watts J; *et al.*, 2008c. *Rethinking Impact: Understanding the Complexity of Poverty and Change – A Pre-Workshop Dialogue. Initial Synthesis of Feedback*. International Livestock Research Institute, Nairobi; PRGA Program, Cali, Colombia; Institutional Learning and Change Initiative, Rome, 44p.
- Kristjanson P; Lilja N; Watts J; *et al.*, 2008d. *Rethinking Impact: Understanding the Complexity of Poverty and Change – A Pre-Workshop Dialogue. Workshop Workbook*. International Livestock Research Institute, Nairobi; PRGA Program, Cali, Colombia; Institutional Learning and Change Initiative, Rome, x+84p.
- PRGA Program, 2008. *Medium-Term Plan 2009–2011*. PRGA Program, Cali, Colombia, 25p.
- PRGA Program, 2008. *Newsletter* Nos 29–40 (January–December 2008). PRGA Program, Cali, Colombia.
- PRGA Program, 2008. *CGIAR Systemwide Program on Participatory Research and Gender Analysis for Technology Development and Institutional Innovation (PRGA Program)*. [Handout for CGIAR AGM 2008]. PRGA Program, [Cali, Colombia], 2p.

Appendix 4. Staff List

Senior staff

Patricia Biermayr-Jenzano, PhD Agricultural Extension and Social Anthropology, Senior Researcher*
Coordinator, PRGA Program (100% PRGA)

Nina Lilja, PhD Agricultural Economics, Senior Scientist†
Impact Assessment (100% PRGA)

Denis Aviles, PhD Development Studies†
Gender Consultant

Stephen D. Biggs, PhD Agricultural Economics†
Social Inclusion Consultant

Ann Braun, PhD Ecology†
Acquisition Consultant

Guy Manners, BSc Zoology
Communications Consultant

Administrative staff

Juliana Aristizabal, Bachelor's in Social Communication and Journalism
PRGA Communications Assistant (100% PRGA)

Claudia Garcia, BA Production Engineering
Assistant Program Coordinator (100% PRGA)

Note: * Staff joined PRGA in 2008; † staff left PRGA in 2008.

Appendix 5. Program Advisory Committee

PAC members in 2008:

Roger Kirkby
Convening Center representative
Leader, Research for Development
Challenge: People and
Agroecosystems, CIAT, Kampala,
Uganda

Louise Fortmann†
Convening Center Board of Trustees
representative
Professor of Natural Resource
Sociology, University of
California, Berkeley, USA

Fina Opio‡
Convening Center Board of Trustees
representative
ASARECA

Bhuwon Sthapit†
PPB representative
Bioversity International, Nepal

Stefania Grando‡
PPB representative
ICARDA, Aleppo, Syria

John Dixon‡
NRM representative
Director, Impacts Targeting and
Assessment Unit, CIMMYT,
Mexico

Janice Jiggins†
Gender representative (*currently
vacant*)
Department of Rural Development
Studies, The Netherlands

Mauricio Bellon‡
CGIAR representative
Director, Diversity for Livelihoods
Programme, Bioversity
International, Rome, Italy

Andres Laignelet Sierra†
NARS representative (*currently
vacant*)
CORPOICA, Bogotá, Colombia

Monica Kapiriri†
NGO representative (*currently
vacant*)
Kampala, Uganda

Annina Lubbock†
Donor representative (*currently
vacant*)
Technical Advisory Division, IFAD,
Rome, Italy

Position vacant
Farmer representative

† Term ended in 2008; ‡ New member, 2008–2009.

Appendix 6. Budget for 2008

Contributions	US\$
CIDA	153,294.7
IDRC	13,909
Switzerland	97,002
Italy	233,370
The Netherlands (CIAT core contribution)	42,966
New Zealand (CIAT core contribution)	41,966
Bioversity International	78,573
Program Reserve	359,743.3
TOTAL	1,020,824

Budget Allocation 2008

Allocation of funds	US\$
Mainstreaming Gender at CIAT Headquarters, Consultant	23,592.2
Institutionalization SA/GA Eastern Himalayas	12,500
Workshop on Rethinking Impact	165,075.5
Salaries	156,001
Research Technical Support fee – CIAT	21,322
Supplies, operations and services	15,078.4
Strategic meetings and Publications (AGM, CIAT Review, ACM, etc.)	43,013.3
Consultants	24,974.6
CIAT Overhead	54,008
Total	515,565

* Carryover committed for 2009 activities

Appendix 7. Abbreviations

ACM	Advisory Committee Meeting (<i>of</i> PAC)
AGM	Annual General Meeting (<i>of the</i> CGIAR)
ArcoNet	on-line news service (CIAT, internal)
ASARECA	Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa
BA	Bachelor of Arts
BSc	Bachelor of Science
CDS	Challenge Dialogue System
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women
CG	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
CIAT	International Center for Tropical Agriculture (<i>Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical</i>), based in Colombia
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CIMMYT	International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center (<i>Centro Internacional para Mejoramiento de Maíz y Trigo</i>)
CIP	International Potato Center (<i>Centro Internacional de la Papa</i>)
CORPOICA	<i>Corporación Colombiana de Investigación Agropecuaria</i>
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
ECAPAPA	Eastern and Central Africa Programme for Agricultural Policy Analysis (<i>now</i> PAAP)
Ed.	editors
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
Feb.	February
G&D	Gender and Diversity
GA	gender analysis
GPSP	Gender Project Support Person (ASARECA)
IAFP	Impact Assessment Focal Point
ICARDA	International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas
IDRC	International Development Research Centre (Canada)
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
ILAC	Institutional Learning and Change Initiative (CGIAR)
ILRI	International Livestock Research Institute
IRRI	International Rice Research Institute
MA	Master of Arts (postgraduate degree)
MTP	Medium-Term Plan
NARI	national agricultural research institute
NARS	national agricultural research system(s)
NGO	non-governmental organization
No.	Number
Nos	Numbers
NRM	natural-resources management
NY	New York State (USA)
OLL	Outcome Line Leader (CIAT)

p.	page(s)
PAAP	Policy Analysis and Advocacy Programme (<i>formerly</i> ECAPAPA)
PAC	Program Advisory Committee
PDR	People's Democratic Republic (of Lao)
PhD	Doctor of Philosophy (doctorate degree)
PPB	participatory plant breeding
PRGA Program	CGIAR Systemwide Program on Participatory Research and Gender Analysis (<i>formerly</i> CGIAR Systemwide Program on Participatory Research and Gender Analysis for Technology Development and Institutional Innovation)
R&D	research and development
S&T	science and technology
SA	social analysis
SPIA	Standing Panel on Impact Assessment (CGIAR)
US\$	United States dollars
USA	United States of America
WOCAN	Women Organizing for Change in Agriculture and Natural Resource Management

PRGA Program Coordination Office
A.A 6713, Cali-Colombia

Phone: +57-2445-0131, +1-650-833-6625 x3131 (via USA)

Fax: +57-2-445-0073, +1-650-833-6626 (Via USA)

e-mail: prga@cgiar.org

web-site: www.prgaprogram.org