

Demand Analysis Report

Gender-Responsive Participatory Research

Facilitating Impact Team – CIAT

**Simone Staiger-Rivas
Sophie Alvarez
Katherine Tehelen**

Program on Participatory Research and Gender Analysis
International Center for Tropical Agriculture

August 2010

Cali, Colombia

Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical
International Center for Tropical Agriculture
Apartado Aéreo 6713
Cali, Colombia
Tel.: +57 2 4450000
Fax: +57 2 4450073
E-mail: prga@cgiar.org
Internet: www.ciat.cgiar.org

CIAT Working Document No. 215
Press run: 0 (PDF only)
August 2010

Staiger Rivas, Simone

Demand analysis report: Gender-responsive participatory research /
Simone Staiger-Rivas, Sophie Alvarez, Katherine Tehelen. -- Cali, CO :
Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical (CIAT), 2010.
36 p. -- (Working document no. 215)

AGROVOC descriptors in English:

1. Gender analysis. 2. Farmer participation. 4. Women's participation. 4. Research institutions.
5. CGIAR. 6. Developing countries. 7. Surveys.

Local descriptors in English:

1. Participatory research. 2. Research impact.

AGROVOC descriptors in Spanish:

1. Análisis de género. 2. Participación de agricultores. 3. Participación de la mujer.
4. Instituciones de investigación. 5. GCIAT. 6. Países en desarrollo. 7. Encuestas.

Local descriptors in Spanish:

1. Investigación participativa. 2. Impacto de la investigación.

I. Alvarez, Sophie. II. Tehelen, Katherine. III. Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical.

AGRIS subject category: E50 Rural sociology / Sociología rural

Copyright © CIAT 2010. All rights reserved.

CIAT encourages wide dissemination of its printed and electronic publications for maximum public benefit. Thus, in most cases colleagues working in research and development should feel free to use CIAT materials for noncommercial purposes. However, the Center prohibits modification of these materials, and we expect to receive due credit. Though CIAT prepares its publications with considerable care, the Center does not guarantee their accuracy and completeness.

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Abbreviations	iv
Acknowledgements.....	iv
Executive Summary.....	1
1. Introduction	4
2. Methodology.....	5
3. Main findings.....	7
Summary.....	7
Follow-up interviews	8
Respondents' experience with gender-sensitive participatory research	9
Respondents' experience with the Systemwide Participatory Research and Gender Analysis (SW-PRGA) Program	13
Future of the PRGA Program	14
4. Recommendations	15
Recommendations for the use of gender-sensitive participatory research:.....	15
Recommendations for the CIAT-PRGA Program:	15
Recommendations for the workshop (Repositioning Gender-Responsive Participatory Research in Times of Change, June 16–18, 2010):	16
5. Discussions and recommendations from the Workshop on Repositioning Gender-Responsive Participatory Research in Times of Change (June 16–18, 2010)	16
Comments on the study	16
Comments on the question: How can positive actions and new opportunities be reinforced and generated?.....	17
6. Conclusions	18
References	18
Text boxes	
Why respondents find gender-sensitive participatory research useful	10
Figures	
Figure 1. Geographical area of work of survey respondents.....	7

Annexes

Annex 1: List of respondents	20
Annex 2: Participants' thematic areas of work.....	22
Annex 3: Survey questionnaire	23
Annex 4: Survey results.....	25
Annex 5: Summary results of follow-up interviews (7)	31
Annex 6: List of organizations mentioned working with gender-sensitive participatory research.....	34

Abbreviations

CBO	community-based organization
CG, CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
CIAT	International Center for Tropical Agriculture (Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical)
COP	community of practice
FIT	Facilitating Impact Team of CIAT
G&D	Gender and Diversity program (CGIAR)
GFAR	Global Forum on Agricultural Research
GO	governmental organization
GRPR	gender-responsive participatory research (gender-sensitive participatory research)
ICT	information and communications technology
M&E	monitoring and evaluation
MP	Mega-Program (CGIAR)
NARS	national agricultural research system
NGO	non-governmental organization
PE	private enterprise
PPB	participatory plant breeding
PRGA Program	Program on Participatory Research and Gender Analysis
RO	research organization
SHG	stakeholder group
SW	Systemwide (CGIAR)

Acknowledgements

The authors gratefully acknowledge the respondents who contributed their insights and experience to this assessment. Special thanks to our follow-up interview respondents: Rupert Best, Miguel Gomez, Mark Lundy, Ruth Meinzen-Dick, Ana Lucía Moreno, Aruna Rao and Graham Thiele.

Executive Summary

This document reports the application and results of the Demand Analysis Survey and Study commissioned by the Program on Participatory Research and Gender Analysis (PRGA Program) and carried out by the CIAT Facilitating Impact Team ([FIT](#)). The study was completed in preparation for the Workshop on Repositioning Gender-Responsive Participatory Research in Times of Change (Cali, June 16–18, 2010), where the study was submitted for the consideration and feedback of over 40 professionals with recognized expertise in gender-responsive participatory research (GRPR). The inputs of this study contributed to the strategy and action plan for the use of GRPR in international agricultural research developed during the workshop.

The PRGA Program, established in 1997 as a CGIAR Systemwide (SW) program, promoted the institutionalization (mainstreaming) of gender-sensitive participatory research approaches (within the CG and its partners). Throughout its life, the SW-PRGA Program provided leadership to the CG and its partners in impact assessment (particularly of participatory and gender research) and gender-mainstreaming. This role is important in the light of the current re-modeling of the CGIAR to better address the needs of international agricultural research. This ‘demand analysis’ is one step in the process of redefining the Program’s role in the new CGIAR.

This study began with a qualitative survey, designed to establish respondents’ (a group of experts in the field of gender and participatory research, mostly in agricultural science: researchers of CGIAR centers and representatives of NARS and NGOs) experiences and perception regarding the following areas:

1. Perceived importance of, relevance of, and training received in, the area of gender-sensitive participatory research; and respondents’ use of gender-sensitive participatory research in their work;
2. Partners’ contributions to process, outcomes and impacts, obstacles and needs in the use of GRPR;
3. Knowledge and use of SW-PRGA Program products;
4. Contributions to process, outcomes and impacts, and obstacles in the use of SW-PRGA Program products;
5. CGIAR change process, Gender Platform and Mega-Programs; and the possible future roles for the CIAT-PRGA Program;
6. Request for references to success and non-success stories in the use of GRPR and SW-PRGA Program products.

Survey design was carried out by the authors, with support and input from Patricia Biermayr-Jenzano (PRGA Program Coordinator), Claudia Ximena García (PRGA Program Assistant Coordinator) and María Fernández (PRGA Program consultant), and was applied using the web-based tool Survey Monkey during April and May 2010. A total of 76 e-mail invitations to participate in the web-based survey were sent. Thirty-eight (38) people responded: 26 were female and 12 male, the majority of who were based in the Sub-Saharan Africa, ‘global,’ and Latin America and Caribbean regions. In addition to the survey, follow-up telephone interviews were conducted with seven key informants (4 males and 3 females).

The main findings of the survey were that most participants had used GRPR at some point in their work, and found GRPR relevant. All women respondents, and most male respondents, thought the use of GRPR enhanced their work in terms of processes, results and impacts. The main obstacles to the continued use of GRPR were perceived to be lack of funding and lack of training and/or training materials. There were 25 'success stories' of the use of gender-sensitive participatory research, and the stories were considered a good point for further action by workshop participants.

Regarding the PRGA Program, almost half of the respondents had a high level of knowledge of the Program, and said that the use of SW-PRGA Program resources and research outputs improved their work in terms of the process. Most male respondents also thought that using SW-PRGA Program resources and outputs also improved their work in terms of results and impact, while most female respondents thought that these improved only a little. Almost all respondents related PRGA equally to GRPR, participatory plant breeding (PPB) and participatory methodologies.

A CGIAR gender mechanism (such as the proposed Gender Platform) should cover gender research (highlighted especially by female respondents), gender training and gender analysis, and provide funding mechanisms. Respondents perceived a distinctive role for the PRGA Program in this CGIAR gender mechanism, principally in participatory research with gender-sensitive orientation and PPB. In terms of a role for the PRGA Program in the Mega-Programs, respondents gave equal importance to knowledge-sharing, providing methods and tools, and providing training. Other roles mentioned were monitoring and evaluation (M&E), and documentation of GRPR initiatives and experiences.

The demand analysis produced important recommendations in three fields. First, several recommendations in the use of GSPR: the need for more support, tools and funding; the systematization of GRPR success stories, which are underpinned by the perception of the majority that the use of GSPR had truly enhanced their work in terms of processes, results and impacts; and the need to engage with the private sector, mentioned the least among (past and present) partner categories. Second, the participants provided ideas for future application for the PRGA Program: to make more of the good-quality materials already produced by the Program, deviding them also into sub-products for different needs and audiences; to tackle the criticism of being too far from end-users, including overcoming language barriers; and some functions for the program for the Mega-Programs, such as providing a network with focal points for the discussion of GRPR issues, having a role as a knowledge broker and helping centers in monitoring, evaluation and documentation of GRPR. Finally, the participants also volunteered some ideas of possible focus and activities for the (then upcoming) Workshop on Repositioning Gender-Responsive Participatory Research in Times of Change.

The initial findings of the demand analysis were presented and discussed during the workshop and the valuable feedback and comments from the exercise are recorded in this document, as well as in the final report of the meeting. Some of the most salient points were that community-based organizations (CBOs) did not participate in this study, and that the response rate was low. The importance of networks, partnerships and establishing a strong community of practice for GRPR were flagged, as well as the need for the improvement of rigor and quality of research, evidence-based and impact-driven research, and the need for more innovative M&E of GRPR.

The recommendation for sex disaggregation of results was duly taken on board and is reflected in the results reported in this document.

1. Introduction

This is the final report of the Demand Analysis Study commissioned by the Program on Participatory Research and Gender Analysis ([PRGA Program](#)) and carried out by the CIAT Facilitating Impact Team ([FIT](#)) in preparation for the [Workshop](#) on Repositioning Gender-Responsive Participatory Research in Times of Change (June 16–18, 2010, Cali, Colombia). This exercise aimed at gathering firsthand information about workshop participants' and stakeholders' expert experiences and thoughts on the use and knowledge of gender-sensitive participatory research in their field(s) of expertise, across the CGIAR centers, national agricultural research systems (NARS), NGOs and other partner organizations.

This information served as input to the workshop, which aimed at developing a strategy and action plan for the use of GRPR in international agricultural research, which included helping the 'new' CIAT-PRGA Program to develop a strategy to enable it to support its stakeholders as its work becomes more relevant in this new phase of the CGIAR.

The PRGA Program was established in 1997, as a CGIAR Systemwide (SW) program, to: identify, adopt, adapt and develop suitable participatory and gender-analysis methodologies for agricultural research; build capacity in the use and understanding of these methods in the CGIAR and its partners; develop appropriate research partnerships and networks; and promote the institutionalization (mainstreaming) of gender-sensitive participatory research approaches (within the CG and its partners).

The Program and its partners helped build strong momentum for the implementation of participatory approaches in agricultural research both within the CGIAR and on a wider scale. In particular, it demonstrated that participatory research and gender analysis embody rigorous methods that are scientifically grounded, confirming that the results produced are valid; produce broad impacts through technologies and resource-management options that are well suited to end-users' needs, thereby significantly reducing the likelihood of farmers rejecting the technologies developed; produce process impacts in the form of human and social capital, which help sustain rural development and innovation; are especially beneficial to women, the poorest and marginalized groups (all of whom were frequently overlooked by conventional research); and are cost-efficient, primarily because of the increased impact and shortened time for technology development (Saad, 2003).

Many of the lessons learned by the early 2000s are still applicable today—for example (Saad, 2003; CIAT, 2010b):

- While there is increasing interest in the use of participatory approaches, it seems that gender issues still constitute a largely ignored area in agricultural R&D;
- Many CG centers have not achieved a critical mass in the use of equitable participatory research and gender analysis methods;
- There is a great and unmet need for capacity-development in the use of these methods;
- In cases where participatory approaches have been applied, there has been enhanced learning as a result of experimentation with methods; however, much of this learning

and change remains isolated from the project cycle and does not extend to the organization level.

These factors severely restrict the extent to which equitable participatory research and gender-analysis approaches are integrated into the research process, thereby limiting the extent to which their positive impacts can be scaled up.

Over the years, the SW-PRGA Program amassed a [large amount of information](#) on participatory and gender research, providing state-of-the-art reviews and revealing the diversity of methods available in the pursuit of gender-sensitive and participatory research. For several years, the Program facilitated electronic communities of practice for participatory plant breeding (PPB), participatory natural-resources management (NRM) and gender. Having identified, adapted and developed various methodologies for participatory and gender research, the Program also provided capacity-building in their use to partners. Partnerships themselves became a key characteristic of the Program's work and research was often at the 'cutting edge' of the two subject areas.

Throughout the Program's life as a Systemwide entity, it provided leadership to the CG and its partners in impact assessment (particularly of participatory and gender research) and gender-mainstreaming. Meanwhile, its strong partnerships with leaders in the field helped to ensure the evolution of PPB as a flagship of participatory research world-wide. Much of the Program's work was conducted with partners through a small-grant mechanism, in which the Program provided technical back-stopping and capacity-building (CIAT, 2010a).

As the CG is being re-modeled to better address the needs of international agricultural research, the Systemwide program structure is being discontinued in favor of Mega-Programs and other mechanisms of operation. The future of the CIAT-PRGA Program's activities and the legacy of the SW-PRGA Program are under the microscope, and this 'demand analysis' is one step in the process of redefining the Program's role in the new CGIAR.

2. Methodology

This assessment sought detailed input regarding respondents' experiences, while remaining brief, simple and relevant to those who seek the enhancement of GRPR across the CGIAR and its networks. Therefore, a qualitative survey was designed with scale and open-ended short-answer questions. The survey was web-based, with e-mail invitations sent to all participants. This approach was complemented with the possibility of follow up where participants agreed by providing their contact information.

The questions were divided into the following areas:

1. Survey participant's information;
2. Perceived importance of, relevance of, and training received in, the area of gender-sensitive participatory research;
3. Use of gender-sensitive participatory research in respondent's work;
4. Partners, contributions to process, outcomes and impacts, and obstacles in the use of GRPR;

5. Needs and capacity-building in the use of gender-sensitive participatory research;
6. Knowledge and use of SW-PRGA Program products;
7. Contributions to process, outcomes and impacts, and obstacles in the use of SW-PRGA Program products;
8. CGIAR change process, Gender Platform and Mega-Programs;
9. Possible future role(s) for the CIAT-PRGA Program;
10. Request for references to success and non-success stories in the use of GRPR and SW-PRGA Program products.

Following basic demographic information pertaining to gender and institutional affiliation, a number of questions were posed for each of the thematic areas, most of which also left room for additional comments and explanations. Respondents could reply to as many or as few of the questions as they wished, and partial survey results were recorded.

The survey respondents were a group of experts in the fields of gender and participatory research, mostly in agricultural science, as known to the PRGA Program Coordinator and staff. Researchers of CGIAR centers and representatives of NARS and NGOs were invited because of their expertise in conducting participatory research with a gender-responsive/sensitive perspective. All survey participants were either specialists in gender and participation or practitioners of participatory approaches, thus the survey's results—as well as the conclusions of the corresponding workshop—may be considered akin to those of an expert consultation. The follow-up, more in-depth interviews were conducted with a selection of respondents who had more information to offer and were (with one exception) unable to attend the workshop in person; thus their input would not be available in the group context. Only seven of these interviews were carried out in the hope of achieving more in-depth conversation, difficult to do with great numbers. The names and contact details of all survey participants and the follow-up interviewees were made available to FIT by the PRGA Program Coordinator.

Survey design was carried out by the authors, with support and input from Patricia Biermayr-Jenzano (PRGA Program Coordinator), Claudia Ximena García (PRGA Program Assistant Coordinator) and María Fernández (PRGA Program consultant).

The survey was applied using the web-based tool Survey Monkey, where the questions were recorded and the list of potential recipients was introduced. Survey Monkey returns partially analyzed data in the form of tabular frequencies to scale questions. Further explanations and comments recorded by each respondent are returned in text boxes. These narrative responses were then analyzed by the authors using key words, phrases and thoughts.

The demand analysis survey, titled 'Repositioning PRGA in Times of Change,' was applied during April and May 2010. A total of 76 e-mail invitations to participate in the web-based survey were sent. Thirty-eight (38) people responded, 30 of who completed the whole survey.

Of the 38 respondents, 26 were female and 12 male. The geographical areas of work were distributed as per Figure 1.




Figure 1. Geographical area of work of survey respondents

Respondents worked in many different areas, which may be grouped into the following broad categories: gender and participatory research, agriculture and gender, food production/improvement, agro-enterprise and ‘others.’ A complete list of thematic areas of work of respondents is presented in Annex 2.

Throughout this document, the terms ‘gender-sensitive participatory research’ and ‘gender-responsive participatory research’ (GRPR) are used interchangeably. While the authors record the difference, and the questions were asked in terms of ‘gender-sensitive participatory research,’ workshop participants seemed comfortable using either one for the same purpose. We also wish to clarify that CIAT-PRGA Program adopts the term ‘gender-responsive participatory research’ when describing its thematic area of research.

3. Main findings

Summary

The survey respondents were, not surprisingly, well versed in the topics related to gender-sensitive research, although some of them clarified that they were not directly involved with participatory forms of research. Approximately half of the respondents had received some formal training in GRPR, and some cited receiving ‘learning-by-doing’ training in the field. Two-thirds of respondents said they had always thought that GRPR was relevant, and the other third indicated an increasing appreciation of the importance of gender research. Most participants had used GRPR at some point in their work and *all* women respondents, and most male respondents, thought the *use of GRPR enhanced their work in terms of processes, results and impacts.*

Interestingly, *lack of funding* (by female respondents) and *lack of training and/or training materials* (by male respondents) were cited as the main obstacles to use of gender-sensitive participatory research. Other frequently cited obstacles were the lack of capacity of staff in the use of gender tools and methods, and facilitation of processes, and lack of support from senior

staff toward gender issues. Further reasons cited: lack of time, of gendered statistics, and of good collaborators.

There were many ‘success stories’ of the use of gender-sensitive participatory research by respondents—25 respondents mentioned that there were stories of this kind. A table with the stories cited was prepared in a separate document to process during the workshop, and was considered a good point for further action by workshop participants. This list with examples of successful use of gender-sensitive participatory research will continue to be enriched and may form the basis for a future compilation.

Almost half of female and male respondents had a high level of knowledge of the SW-PRGA Program. Respondents related the Program almost equally to GRPR, PPB and participatory methodologies.

More than half of the respondents said that the use of SW-PRGA Program resources and research outputs improved their work in terms of the process. Most male respondents also thought that using SW-PRGA Program resources and outputs also improved their work in terms of results and impact; while for female respondents, the use of these outputs had only helped them improve the results and impacts of their work in a small measure. The resources most referred to were publications, reports and papers. *Most male respondents noted that the main obstacle to using PRGA resources / research outputs had been funding, while female respondents recorded funding as an equal obstacle to lack of information.* Other obstacles mentioned were lack of research opportunities and lack of interaction.

A CGIAR gender mechanism (such as the proposed Gender Platform) should cover gender research (highlighted especially by female respondents), gender training and gender analysis, and provide funding mechanisms. Among additional suggestions for the role of a gender platform were gender monitoring and evaluation (M&E), further development of methodologies, working directly with women’s producer groups and in the field, articulation of the demand, and decision and policy analysis.

Respondents perceived a distinctive role for the PRGA Program in the gender platform, principally in participatory research with gender-sensitive orientation and PPB. Other roles could relate to gender awareness and education. In addition, respondents suggested a role in the coordination of a network of gender and participatory research focal points within the CGIAR system and its partners.

Respondents gave equal importance to the following support functions of PRGA Program to the CGIAR Mega-Programs: knowledge-sharing; providing methods and tools; and providing training. Less emphasis, but nevertheless mentioned, were M&E, and documentation of GRPR initiatives and experiences.

Follow-up interviews

In addition to the survey, follow-up telephone interviews were conducted with seven key informants (4 males and 3 females). When asked about the possible role of the PRGA Program in

the future CGIAR and the current uncertainty around the 'gender platform,' several options were mentioned:

1. Making the PRGA Program fit into one Mega-Program;
2. Working through a community of practice (COP) approach;
3. Distinguishing between participatory research and gender analysis;
4. Making participatory research fit in a Mega-Program and gender analysis in the Gender Platform;
5. Actively involving the Global Forum on Agricultural Research (GFAR);
6. Start regional gender networks.

A main finding from these interviews was the perception of the interviewees that the *PRGA Program needs to come closer to its end-users to support stakeholders inside and outside the CGIAR*. For Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC), this would necessarily include an effort to overcome the language issue, as most of the work is done in English only, as well as a more open-minded attitude toward work done by others in the region.

Follow-up interviews revealed a need for: (1) easier access to all available resources; and (2) tools and methods that reach a broader range of users than academic publications alone. Concerning methods and tools, interviewees referred to the need to provide resources for different audiences and to connect to existing programs and networks to foster learning by doing, understand what has worked and what hasn't, and monitor and evaluate the tools and resources. *Users wish to have easier access to information on gender and agriculture, and in different languages*. It was also mentioned that in order to put tools to work there is a need to go through a process of collective construction of the proposed tools together with partners. Concerning training on gender issues, it was suggested that the offer exists, but that experience shows that it is better to focus on specific issues and incorporate gender aspects rather than train in gender separately.

A question was asked of the interviewees regarding their suggestions for and expectations of the (then) upcoming workshop. Interviewees mentioned that they thought it would be useful to: undertake a needs assessment of the Mega-Programs and the research-to-development spectrum; recap participatory research and gender analysis to understand the needs and possible delivery mechanisms; create a map of their collective knowledge as an entry point to a COP that also facilitates linkages with the outside; organize the workshop in different working groups on participatory research and on gender analysis, because many of the participants work only on one of the two aspects; analyze how to structure the new (CIAT) PRGA Program and rebuild its visibility. Where possible, their suggestions were incorporated in the workshop strategy.

Respondents' experience with gender-sensitive participatory research

Importance of gender-sensitive participatory research in respondents' work

For all male survey respondents, and the great majority of female respondents, gender-sensitive participatory research plays an important role in their work. This was to be expected as most of the people surveyed were gender experts or at least people who had worked closely with the

gender topic, and it was the main emphasis of the survey. Some of the respondents clarified that although they did not do participatory research, the gender topic was still important to them (they cited working on quantitative and more traditional research). The main reasons cited for the importance of gender research were: the need for gender-differentiated strategies; the call to support what women prioritize and to empower women (focus on women); and that good research with good participation requires both men and women (focus on inclusiveness and men–women equity); that gender-sensitive research is a strategy to create an enabling environment; that it is the best way to obtain outcomes and impact; and that it helps in getting buy-in from natural-resources management (NRM) institutions.

“[GRPR addresses] the needs, challenges, constraints, aspirations and opportunities of women and men including the young and old, improves women participation in technology development to suit their potential and needs—hence increased adoption.”

Why respondents find gender-sensitive participatory research useful

Attend the need for differentiated strategies
Support what women prioritize, such as the incorporation of stakeholder needs
Empower women and communities
Promote inclusiveness and equity
Help to get buy-in from NRM institutions
Promote a sense of ownership of results
Aid in the redefinition of targets and strategies
Contribute to improved processes of decision-making
Representativeness of results
Build on sustainable partnerships
Promote more teamwork
Increasing meaning and coherence of processes
Including diverse perspectives
Create an enabling environment
Obtain better outcomes and impact, and faster adoption

Experience of formal training in gender-sensitive participatory research

Most female respondents had received formal training in gender-sensitive research, while most male respondents had not. Even those people who said they had not received what they would call ‘formal’ training, had received gender-sensitive research training in other ways, e.g. workshops, working within a multidisciplinary team of specialists in the field, short course and long-term field experience, or learning by doing.

“While I was a researcher I was fortunate to work in a multidisciplinary team with persons who are specialists in the field. What I know I have picked up from them.”

Perception of the importance of gender-sensitive participatory research

Most female respondents said they had always thought GRPR was relevant, while some of them, and most male respondents, said they had developed an increasing appreciation of the importance of gender research, mostly due to: learning the importance of gender differentiation (e.g. poverty and ethnicity) through experience; through work with a majority of women farmers; and the fact that presently gender-sensitive research is more ‘mainstream’ and has greater credibility thanks to evidence of its contribution to effectiveness. Others said that although they did know the relevance of GRPR, they did not previously integrate it in their work.

Use of gender-sensitive participatory research in respondents’ work, and partners involved

Most of the survey respondents had used gender-sensitive participatory research at some time, and a great majority of female respondents had used it systematically. Respondents had used various aspects and tools of gender-sensitive research: inclusive business design work; action-research; participatory varietal selection (PVS); focus groups; participatory evaluations; seed quality improvement; PPB; poverty assessments; micro-enterprise assessments; pilots and exploratory design work; domestic water development; and policy development.

This gender-sensitive participatory research was carried out with a large number of partners of many different types, but especially with community-based organizations (CBOs), NGOs and governmental organizations. Other CG Centers were mentioned in much lower proportion, and the private sector was cited least, which indicates a gap and a possible opportunity for future engagement. (See Annex 6 for a detailed list of organizations mentioned.)

Use of gender-sensitive participatory research to enhance processes, results and impacts, and value added by this use

A great majority of male respondents, and all female respondents, thought the use of GRPR enhanced their work in terms of processes, results and impacts. No participants thought that it hadn’t done this at all. The added value of using gender-sensitive participatory research was evenly distributed among the categories suggested—female respondents highlighting the top ones as empowerment of women and communities, and the inclusion of diverse perspectives. Better outcomes, faster adoption, more effective genetic improvement processes, redefinition of targets and strategies, improved processes of decision-making, the representativeness of results, the incorporation of stakeholder needs, building of sustainable partnerships, a sense of ownership of results, more teamwork, and increased meaning and coherence of processes—are some of the other beneficial effects of gender-sensitive participatory research cited by respondents. Two female respondents said they did not see any added value in doing gender-sensitive participatory research.

“Conducting gendered participatory research ensures that insights, inputs and needs of stakeholders are incorporated from the beginning of the process.”

Success stories of gender-sensitive participatory research to achieve impacts

Respondents cited the existence of many stories on how conducting GRPR enhanced the impact in their work. A few respondents (6) mentioned having been involved in, or had knowledge of, stories where the use of gender in research had not been successful. Only three of them mentioned the cases specifically.

“The success story I would like to offer is from the ILO [International Labor Organization] Enterprise for Pro-Poor Growth in Sri Lanka. There, we used a mixed methodology of workshops, focus groups and interviews to assess cultural norms and values in relation to enterprise and how to enhance benefits to rural people from micro/small enterprises. Gender and age were used as systematic categories for data collection and analysis. The findings indicated both women and youth were disadvantaged; thus, these two groups were considered as primary target groups for a social marketing campaign based on forum theatre to highlight the special obstacles they faced in pursuing enterprise as a livelihood. The impact assessment indicated a positive change in attitudes towards gender issues in micro/small enterprise in the four districts where the project was implemented.”

Main obstacles and needs for the use of gender-sensitive participatory research

Most female respondents cited lack of funding as the main obstacle to the use of GRPR, while the majority of male respondents cited lack of training and/or training materials. Almost half the female respondents also cited lack of training and tools. There were, however, several other reasons cited: lack of time, of gendered statistics, and of good collaborators. Other obstacles cited were the lack of capacity of staff in the use of gender tools and methods and in the facilitation of processes; and the lack of support from senior staff toward gender issues. There is a perception of a frequent discriminatory or ‘patriarchal’ attitude toward gender themes and women in projects, and (in general) cultural, policy and institutional constraints. The perceived needs of respondents to enable them to carry out gender-sensitive research in their work corresponded soundly with the perceived obstacles: females cited the need for funding first, and the majority of male respondents mentioned equally the need for funding and training and training materials. Tools were mentioned by almost half of the female respondents, and a third of all males. Finally, partners and institutional constraints were mentioned again.

“Many of my colleagues feel that paying attention to gender takes away time and other scarce resources from them and their work.”

Additional training needs

Most male respondents would like to strengthen their capacity in key concepts, methodologies and tools of gender analysis, and gender M&E. Training in these same topics, in contrast, was what female respondents felt the least need for: female respondent’s capacity-building topic choices were almost equally distributed over gender analysis, gender inclusion in proposal design and planning, and gender advocacy and organizational change. These were followed by ‘others,’ including gender-responsive PVS; statistical analysis of participatory designs; and gender

participatory impact assessment. Some respondents added that all training is helpful, and that they may have the capacity already, and would rather have a forum, other ways to learn from newer initiatives and strengthening of these areas.

“I am interested in having a regular forum to exchange knowledge on gendered and participatory research within the CGIAR system that is more discursive than a website.”

Respondents’ experience with the Systemwide Participatory Research and Gender Analysis (SW-PRGA) Program

Knowledge of SW-PRGA Program

Almost half of the respondents had a high level of knowledge of the SW-PRGA Program, while the rest had medium to low level, with three female respondents saying they didn’t know the Program at all. Those respondents that knew the Program related the SW-PRGA Program almost equally to GRPR, PPB and participatory methodologies.¹ Three respondents also highlighted the link to the SW-PRGA Program’s earlier NRM work.

Use of SW-PRGA Program resources / outputs

Of those who were familiar with the Program, almost half of female and male respondents had used SW-PRGA Program resources or outputs sometimes, and about a third had never used them. Most respondents used academic publications. Two-thirds of male and exactly half of the female respondents found that the use of SW-PRGA Program resources and research outputs improved their work in terms of the process; however, while two-thirds of males found an improvement in terms of outcomes, half of the female respondents stated that this improvement in terms of results and impact only happened some of the time.

The most used resources (as found before in answer to question relating to use of SW-PRGA Program products/outputs) were publications, reports and papers. Funding was cited by the majority of male respondents as an obstacle to the use of SW-PRGA Program resources and research outputs, followed by lack of information.

“I have not been able to find funding for the kind of research I would like to do. Instead, I use opportunities I get with ongoing projects to incorporate my concerns and approaches.”

¹ Note that those three were given as specific answer options to the question (see Annex 4). It is noteworthy that none of the respondents mentioned the Program’s work on impact assessment (not one of the answer options), perhaps because this was not their area of specialization?—Ed.

Future of the PRGA Program

Perception of the future of gender-sensitive participatory research and the PRGA Program in the new CGIAR

A great majority of the respondents were familiar with the CGIAR and its ongoing change process. As part of this process, there is a strong perception, by both male and female respondents, of the **need** for strengthening gender-sensitive participatory research in the new CGIAR in the areas of participatory research with gender-sensitive perspective, PPB, policy work, gender-awareness, and education (in order of importance). We went into more detailed descriptions of the role the PRGA Program could play in the follow-up interviews (see Annex 5).

“There should be MUCH more attention for gender in the CGIAR, in all respects. Similarly, participatory methodologies should also receive MUCH more attention.”

CGIAR Gender Platform[†]

Equally distributed numbers of respondents said that a CGIAR Gender Platform should cover gender research, gender training and gender analysis, and provide funding mechanisms. Female respondents emphasized *gender research* as the most important aspect that a gender platform should cover. Among the additional suggestions were gender M&E, further development of methodologies, working directly with women’s producer groups and in the field, articulation of the demand for all four areas mentioned with subsequent delivery of gender-related products whether produced by the PRGA Program or others, and decision and policy analysis.

Respondents (both male and female) perceived a distinctive role for the PRGA Program in the platform, the majority mentioning contribution of participatory research with gender-sensitive orientation. About half of the respondents also mentioned PPB. Other roles could relate to gender-awareness and education. In addition, respondents suggested roles in areas such as the promotion of a gender-mainstreaming strategy and gender action plans, or the coordination of a network of gender and participatory research focal points within the CGIAR system and partners.

“The combination of gender and participatory approaches is meaningful, and should definitely not only apply to plant breeding.”

Support to the Mega-Programs

The suggested action items to support the Mega-Programs received almost equal approval from all respondents, male and female: share knowledge; provide methods and tools; provide training; designing a framework and M&E. Less emphasis was given to documentation.

“An opportunity to challenge the weak status of participatory research/action-research across the CGIAR; drastically uplift the status of participatory

[†] At the time of the survey, a global platform on gender in agriculture was proposed and seemed most likely to be created; however, by the time of the workshop, the proposal had been put on hold—Ed.

approaches and action-research, through all means possible, including a stronger theoretical basis for this methodology; collaborate with centers for 'winner' projects that can serve as example to other centers, both on substance and method."

During the workshop, participants developed a complete list activities for possible inclusion of GRPR into the Mega-Programs. This list and related information will be part of the workshop proceedings and also made available on the workshop website.

4. Recommendations

In this section, we present basic recommendations from the demand analysis exercise. Pre-workshop recommendations are presented for three broad thematic areas: for the use of gender-sensitive participatory research; for the CIAT-PRGA Program; and as strategic input for the workshop.

Recommendations for the use of gender-sensitive participatory research:

1. The main obstacles respondents found to the use of gender-sensitive participatory research and/or SW-PRGA Program resources were a lack of funding, of training and/or training materials in the use of gender tools and methods and facilitation of processes, and lack of information. In addition, more institutional and senior support for gender issues is needed. In order to engage more intensively in GRPR, respondents therefore perceive the need for more funding, time, training and tools, as well as a forum to learn from newer initiatives and strengthen GRPR.
2. A great majority (93.5%) of respondents said that the use of gender-sensitive participatory research enhanced their work in terms of processes, results and impacts. There are many 'success stories' of the use of gender-sensitive participatory research: the 25 provided by respondents can and should be systematized.
3. GRPR was carried out with: government organizations, NGOs and CBOs. Other CG centers played a minor role, and the private sector was the least cited (31.1%), indicating a gap and a possible opportunity for future engagement.

Recommendations for the CIAT-PRGA Program:

1. Make more out of the resources and tools that the SW-PRGA Program produced and divide them into sub-products for different types of users and audiences.
2. Tackle the criticism of being too academic and too far away from the end-users. PRGA Program needs to come closer to its end-users to support stakeholders inside and outside the CGIAR. This would necessarily include an effort to overcome the language issue, as most of the work is done in English only, as well as a more open-minded attitude toward the work done by others.
3. Suggested support functions
4. of PRGA Program to the CGIAR Mega-Programs, 'gender platform,' CGIAR system and partners:

- a. The CGIAR needs a space to discuss issues related to participatory research and GRPR. In the absence of a gender platform, a COP or network with focal points within the CGIAR system and partners would be an alternative. The role of the PRGA Program in this community or network could be discussed.
- b. PRGA Program as a knowledge broker: providing knowledge-sharing, existing methods and tools, and training (focused on specific issues incorporating gender aspects rather than training in gender separately).
- c. PRGA Program can play an important role in providing help to centers and other networks in relation to M&E and documentation of GRPR initiatives and experiences.

Recommendations for the workshop (Repositioning Gender-Responsive Participatory Research in Times of Change, June 16–18, 2010):

1. Undertake a needs assessment of the Mega-Programs and the research-to-development spectrum.
2. Recap participatory research and gender analysis to understand the needs and possible delivery mechanisms.
3. Create a map of participants' collective knowledge as an entry point to a COP that also facilitates the linkages with initiatives outside the CGIAR.
4. Organize the workshop in different working groups on participatory research and on gender analysis, because many of the participants work on only one of the two aspects.
5. Analyze how to structure the new [CIAT] PRGA Program and rebuild its visibility.
6. Follow a process centered on appreciative inquiry—what has been done well? What has worked?

5. Discussions and recommendations from the Workshop on Repositioning Gender-Responsive Participatory Research in Times of Change (June 16–18, 2010)

The initial findings of this study (Staiger *et al.*, 2010) were presented and discussed during the Workshop on Repositioning Gender-Responsive Participatory Research in Times of Change that took place at CIAT on June 16–18, 2010, and further refined by the participants (see Alvarez *et al.*, 2010). This exposure and the reflection of the experts make this piece of research a sound study that aims to offer guidance for the inclusion and enhancement of GRPR within the CGIAR and its partner organizations.

Workshop participants were divided into groups for this discussion, and then reported back in plenary. The comments below have been grouped into themes by the authors of this study.

Comments on the study

- No CBO participation in the study
- Low response rate
- Low uptake of the PRGA [Program] outputs
- Silence on the links between PRGA [Program] and G&D [Program]
- Not much on their respective institutions (no. of gender researchers, resource allocation)

- Lack of consistency in the document: ‘gender’ versus ‘women’; ‘gender responsive’ versus ‘-sensitive’
- Need sex disaggregation in report.

Comments on the question: How can positive actions and new opportunities be reinforced and generated?

Networks and partnerships

- We need a network that gives strength to ‘believers’ in GRPR
- Importance of partnerships
- Need to establish a strong community of practice
- To increase the linkages of the Program there is a need to identify other stakeholders and donors.

Support

- The respondents of the Demand Analysis are those who benefited and practice GRPR, but feel marginalized and without enough space to do more GRPR.

Impact at scale

- In broader context PRGA [Program] not successful in ‘mainstreaming.’

Knowledge-sharing and capacity-strengthening

- Need to share success stories about issues like (1) model organizations which succeed in mainstreaming; (2) success in terms of outcomes; (3) success in terms of impact
- Need to work on the misconceptions about participatory research and gender analysis
- Enhance access of learning resources for different users
- To overcome lack of capacity-building, need to pool expertise in all parts of the world to develop capacity-building programs consisting of: training material, manuals, and tools developed on the basis of situational analysis
- New website platform with success stories
- More proactive, innovative public-awareness work.

GRPR in the research cycle

- Develop research designs which can be used by both farmers and researchers
- Behavioral changes are needed among scientists and service-providers. This requires new tools and approaches, sensitization, training, accountability mechanisms, and incentives at different levels for GRPR
- The rigor and quality of research has to improve towards evidence-based impact-driven research
- Research has to become demand-driven and accountable. This requires organizational change, a rigorous process documentation (success stories and experiences) to be used by donors, policy-makers and practitioners, as well as impact assessment

- Better and more innovative M&E of GRPR required
- Academic outputs dominate. Not equal to development outputs.

6. Conclusions

“PRGA Program needs to come closer to its end-users to support stakeholders inside and outside the CGIAR.”

The Demand Analysis Study highlights the existence of a strong body of research on GRPR by the PRGA Program over the past 12 years. The Program is particularly recognized in the areas of PPB and participatory methodologies. These are thus the areas that were considered as those in which the Program could deliver its main contributions in the future, within CIAT, the new CGIAR and its Mega-Programs. The perceived need to include aspects of gender research into the Mega-Program (or Consortium program) proposals is a recognition of the importance of gender as a key issue for agricultural research to achieve its intended developmental impacts. This inclusion could lead to increased research opportunities, the availability of funding and better high-level support—all issues highlighted as missing in the study.

The Program’s research outputs are considered relevant by a significant number in the CGIAR and partner professionals who are convinced about the importance of GRPR. Although these outputs have enhanced the impact of their work, there is still a need for more training in GRPR, and easier access to training materials. SW-PRGA Program research has perhaps been academic and has yet to be further developed into some easy-to-use products and tools. On a similar note, it seems that the work with producer groups in the field has not been visible enough and that this increases the perception of PRGA Program as a solely academic-focused research program. Hence, the Program should in the future connect with partners, existing programs, networks and researchers to foster learning by doing. Equally, the Program could expand its research outputs to issues related to decision and policy analysis to increase its outreach to end-users. A focus on success stories, shared in multiple formats to fit different audiences, from scientific articles to policy briefs, could again enhance the impact of the Program. For a more prominent presence in the LAC region, it seems that it is necessary to make information resources available in Spanish, and other language versions should be considered as well, depending on the strategy developed.

References

- Alvarez, S.; Staiger, S.; Tehelen, K. 2010. Workshop on Repositioning Gender-Responsive Participatory Research in Times of Change – Final Report. International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT), Cali, Colombia. 48 p. (CIAT Working Document No. 214)
- CIAT (International Center for Tropical Agriculture). 2010a. New directions in participatory plant breeding for eco-efficient agriculture. Cali, Colombia. 4 p. (CIAT Brief No. 3)
- CIAT (International Center for Tropical Agriculture). 2010b. Participatory research and gender analysis, 1997–2009: The work and impact of a Systemwide Program. Cali, Colombia. 6 p. (CIAT Brief No. 4)
- Saad, N. 2003. 5-Year Synthesis Report. PRGA Program: Synthesis of Phase I (1997-2002). CGIAR Systemwide Program on Participatory Research and Gender Analysis, Cali, Colombia. 56 p.

Staiger, S.; Alvarez, S.; Tehelen, K. 2010. Demand analysis report: Gender-responsive participatory research. (Draft, June 2010). PRGA Program, International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT), Cali, Colombia. 33 p.

Annex 1: List of respondents

First name	Last name	Organization	Current position	E-mail	Gender
Rupert	Best	Independent consultant	Agroenterprise development specialist	rupertbest@gmail.com	M
Paula	Bramel	IITA	Deputy Director General – Research for Development	p.bramel@cgiar.org	F
Dindo	Campilan	CIP	Regional Leader for South, West and Central Asia	d.campilan@cgiar.org	M
Salvatore	Ceccarelli	ICARDA	Consultant	s.ceccarelli@cgiar.org	M
Anja	Christinck	Independent consultant	Consultant	mail@seed4change.de	F
Kristin	Davis	GFRAS	Director	kristin.davis@g-fras.org	F
John	Dixon	ACIAR	Senior Adviser / Principal Regional Coordinator, South Asia and Africa	dixon@aciar.gov.au	M
María	Fernández	PRGA Program	Consultant	mefernandezme@gmail.com	F
Alonso	Gonzalez	CIAT	Leader, Tropical Fruits	a.gonzalez@cgiar.org	M
Jeannette	Gurung	WOCAN	Director	jeannettegurung@wocan.org	F
Maria	Hartl	IFAD	Technical Adviser	m.hartl@ifad.org	F
Haven	Ley	Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation	Program Officer	Haven.ley@gatesfoundation.org	M
Mark	Lundy	CIAT	Researcher	m.lundy@cgiar.org	M
Ruth	Meinzen-Dick	IFPRI	Senior Research Fellow	r.meinzen-dick@cgiar.org	F
Ana Lucía	Moreno	RUTA	Coordinadora Área de Desarrollo Social	amoreno@ruta.org	F
Esther	Muchiri	Andest Bites Limited	CEO	emuchiri@andestbites.com	F
Esther	Mwangi	CIFOR	Scientist	e.mwangi@cgiar.org	F
Mary	Njenga	University of Nairobi	PhD student	m.njenga@cgiar.org	F

Jemimah Forough Pedro	Njuki Olinga Oyarzún	ILRI ASARECA EkoRural	Scientist Gender Expert Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Livelihoods Specialist	j.njuki@cgiar.org f.olinga@asareca.org poyarzun@ekorural.org	F F M
Thelma	Paris	IRRI	Senior Scientist (Socio-economist – Gender Specialist)	tparis@cgiar.org; t.paris@irri.org	F
Amber	Peterman	IFPRI	Postdoctoral Research Fellow	a.peterman@cgiar.org	F
Agnes Maya Aruna	Quisumbing Rajasekharan Rao	IFPRI CIAT Gender at Work	Senior Research Fellow Program Officer Co-Founder and Senior Associate	a.quisumbing@cgiar.org m.rajasekharan@cgiar.org arao@genderatwork.org	F F F
Paolo Maria	Sarfatti Scurrah	IAO Grupo Yanapai	Technical Director Project coordinator (ex-president for 11 years)	paolo.sarfatti@iao.florence.it scurrah@gmial.com	M F
Moussa	Sié	AfricaRice	Senior Rice Breeder & Task Force Coordinator	m.sie@cgiar.org	M
Grando Graham	Stefania Thiele	ICARDA CIP	Barley Breeder Leader, Impact Enhancement Division	s.grando@cgiar.org g.thiele@cgiar.org	F M
Barbara Nireka	Van Koppen Weeratunge	IWMI WorldFish Center	Principal Researcher Senior Scientist, Gender and Social Development	b.vankoppen@cgiar.org n.weeratunge@cgiar.org	F F
Vicki Luz	Wilde Zúñiga	G&D Program INIA	Director Agrarian Researcher	v.wilde@cgiar.org zunigaluz@yahoo.com	F F

Annex 2: Participants' thematic areas of work

Gender and participatory research

Gender, poverty and economic mobility
Gender and agricultural development
Gender and institutional change
Gender and participatory research
Gender, social equity, project design and implementation, policy analysis
Gender and agriculture, forestry, organizational change
Gender and diversity
Gender, M&E, participatory approaches
Gender in agriculture
Institutional change for gender, women's leadership in agriculture and NRM
Participatory research
Participatory varietal selection; gender studies; socio-economic studies

Agriculture

Agricultural extension
Agricultural research for development
Agriculture and rural development

Agro-enterprise

Agro-enterprise development
ICTs [information and communications technologies] in agri-business
Markets, policy, partnerships, innovation

Food production/improvement

Biodiversity and food production
Crop improvement
Fisheries and aquaculture
Genetic improvement of plants/participatory research
Tropical fruits
Breeding
Participatory plant breeding

Others

Sustainable rural development
Property rights, tenure
R&D; farming systems; food security
Research management and genetics
Social sciences

Annex 3: Survey questionnaire

1. About you
2. Gender
3. Your thematic area of work
4. Geographical area of work
5. Is gender-sensitive participatory research important in your work?
6. Have you received training on gender-sensitive participatory research?
7. Have your perceptions about the relevance of gender-sensitive participatory research changed over time?
8. Have you used gender-sensitive participatory research in your research/development work?
9. If so, what kinds of partners did it involve?
10. Do you find the use of gender-sensitive participatory research enhances your work in terms of processes, results and impacts?
11. Do you have a successful story to share, on how conducting gender-sensitive participatory research enhanced impact? Is it documented? How? Please provide details
12. Do you have knowledge (whether you have been directly involved or not) of a less successful experience? Please provide detail
13. What were the main obstacles, in your experience, to the use of gender-sensitive participatory research?
14. What is the added value of doing gender-sensitive participatory research?
15. What are your main needs to be able to carry out gender-sensitive participatory research in your work?
16. Would you be interested in strengthening your capacity in any of the following areas?
 - a. Gender analysis: key concepts / methodologies / tools
 - b. Gender inclusion in proposal design and planning
 - c. Gender monitoring and evaluation
 - d. Gender mainstreaming
 - e. Gender organizational change
 - f. Gender advocacy and change
 - g. Gender and the program cycle
17. What is your level of knowledge of the Participatory Research and Gender Analysis (PRGA) Program (its resources, research outputs, visibility)? (If you choose the 'I don't know the PRGA Program' option, you will be skipped to section 4)
18. Do you relate PRGA to:
 - a. Gender-sensitive participatory research
 - b. Participatory plant breeding research (PPB)
 - c. Participatory methodologies
 - d. Other related topics
19. Have you used PRGA resources / research outputs in your work?
20. Do you find that the use of PRGA resources and research outputs improved your work in terms of the process?
21. Do you find that the use of PRGA resources and research outputs improved your work in terms of results and impacts ?
22. What have been the main obstacles for you to use PRGA resources/research outputs? Lack of:

- a. Information
 - b. Interaction
 - c. Research opportunities
 - d. Funding
23. Do you have a success story to share, on how using PRGA resources/research outputs enhanced your impact? Is it documented? How? Please provide details
 24. Are you familiar with the CGIAR and the ongoing change process?
 25. Do you perceive a need for strengthening gender-sensitive participatory research in the new CGIAR?
 26. If so, please specify priority areas:
 - a. Participatory plant breeding research (PPB)
 - b. Policy work
 - c. Participatory research with a gender-sensitive perspective
 - d. Gender awareness
 - e. Education (non-formal / extension, etc.)
 27. What do you perceive to be the most useful research opportunities for PRGA?
 28. What are the main areas that the CGIAR Gender Platform should cover?
 29. What would be a possible distinctive role of PRGA in the gender platform? How do you see that PRGA can best contribute to the Gender Platform?
 30. What do you think would be the best approach for PRGA to support the Mega-Programs?
 31. Would you be available for a follow-up interview?

Annex 4: Survey results

Gender		
<i>Answer options</i>	<i>Response percentage</i>	<i>Response count</i>
Male	29.7%	12
Female	70.3%	26
<i>answered question</i>		38
<i>skipped question</i>		0
Geographical area of work		
<i>Answer options</i>	<i>Response percentage</i>	<i>Response count</i>
Asia or Pacific	21.6%	8
West Asia and North Africa	13.2%	5
Central Asia and Caucasus	5.3%	2
Europe	5.3%	2
Sub-Saharan Africa	42.1%	16
Latin America and Caribbean	31.6%	11
North America	0.0%	0
Global	44.7%	16
<i>answered question</i>		38
<i>skipped question</i>		0
Is gender-sensitive participatory research important in your work?		
<i>Answer options</i>	<i>Response percentage</i>	<i>Response count</i>
Yes	90.9%	30
More or Less	9.1%	3
No	0.0%	0
Why? Please specify		28
<i>answered question</i>		33
<i>skipped question</i>		5
Have you received formal training in gender-sensitive research?		
<i>Answer options</i>	<i>Response percentage</i>	<i>Response count</i>
Yes	54.5%	18
No	45.5%	15
Please specify		22
<i>answered question</i>		33
<i>skipped question</i>		5

Have your perceptions about the relevance of gender-sensitive participatory research changed over time?		
<i>Answer options</i>	<i>Response percentage</i>	<i>Response count</i>
I always thought it was relevant	66.7%	22
I have learned to appreciate the relevance of gender participatory research over time and with experience	33.3%	11
I am still not convinced of its relevance	0.0%	0
Please specify		13
<i>answered question</i>		33
<i>skipped question</i>		5
Have you used gender-sensitive participatory research in your research / development work?		
<i>Answer options</i>	<i>Response percentage</i>	<i>Response count</i>
Yes	78.8%	26
Not systematically	18.2%	6
No	3.0%	1
Please specify		19
<i>answered question</i>		33
<i>skipped question</i>		5
If so, what kinds of partners did it involve?		
<i>Answer options</i>	<i>Response percentage</i>	<i>Response count</i>
NGOs	84.4%	27
Governmental organizations	78.1%	25
Private sector	31.3%	10
Community-based organizations	90.6%	29
CGIAR centers	59.4%	19
Can you please list some of these organizations you have worked with?		25
<i>answered question</i>		32
<i>skipped question</i>		6
Do you find that the use of gender-sensitive participatory research enhanced your work in terms of processes, results and impacts?		
<i>Answer options</i>	<i>Response percentage</i>	<i>Response count</i>
Yes	93.5%	29
More or less	6.5%	2
No	0.0%	0
Please specify		16
<i>answered question</i>		31
<i>skipped question</i>		7

What were the main obstacles, in your experience, to the use of gender-sensitive participatory research?		
<i>Answer options</i>	<i>Response percentage</i>	<i>Response count</i>
Lack of information	24.0%	6
Lack of tools (statistics, analytical software, etc.)	40.0%	10
Lack of training / training materials	60.0%	15
Lack of / not enough funding	64.0%	16
Other (please specify)		17
<i>answered question</i>		25
<i>skipped question</i>		13
What is the added value of doing gender-sensitive participatory research?		
<i>Answer options</i>	<i>Response percentage</i>	<i>Response count</i>
It increases levels of adoption	41.9%	13
It empowers communities, specifically women	64.5%	20
It improves the quality of partnerships	45.2%	14
It includes diverse perspectives	58.1%	18
All of the above	58.1%	18
I perceive no added value	6.5%	2
Other (please specify)		7
<i>answered question</i>		31
<i>skipped question</i>		7
What are your main needs to be able to carry out gender-sensitive research in your work?		
<i>Answer options</i>	<i>Response percentage</i>	<i>Response count</i>
Information	34.5%	10
Tools (statistics, analytical software, etc.)	44.8%	13
Training / training materials	55.2%	16
Funding	82.8%	24
Other (please specify)		13
<i>answered question</i>		29
<i>skipped question</i>		9
Would you be interested in strengthening your capacity in any of the following areas?		
<i>Answer options</i>	<i>Response percentage</i>	<i>Response count</i>
Gender analysis: key concepts / methodologies / tools	52.2%	12
Gender inclusion in proposal design and planning	56.5%	13
Gender M&E	56.5%	13
Gender mainstreaming	30.4%	7
Gender organizational change	39.1%	9
Gender advocacy and change	30.4%	7
Gender and program cycle	30.4%	7

Other (please specify)		10
<i>answered question</i>		23
<i>skipped question</i>		15
What is your level of knowledge of the Participatory Research and Gender Analysis (PRGA) Program? (its resources, research outputs, visibility)		
<i>Answer options</i>	<i>Response percentage</i>	<i>Response count</i>
High	43.8%	14
Medium	28.1%	9
Low	18.8%	6
I don't know the PRGA Program	9.4%	3
<i>answered question</i>		32
<i>skipped question</i>		6
Do you relate PRGA Program to:		
<i>Answer options</i>	<i>Response percentage</i>	<i>Response count</i>
Gender-sensitive participatory research?	75.0%	21
Participatory plant breeding (PPB) research?	71.4%	20
Participatory methodologies?	71.4%	20
Other related research topics?	7.1%	2
Other (please specify)		6
<i>answered question</i>		28
<i>skipped question</i>		10
Have you used PRGA Program resources / research outputs in your work?		
<i>Answer options</i>	<i>Response percentage</i>	<i>Response count</i>
Yes, many times	28.6%	8
Sometimes	42.9%	12
Never	28.6%	8
If so, please specify		11
<i>answered question</i>		28
<i>skipped question</i>		10
Do you find that the use of PRGA Program resources and research outputs improved your work in terms of the process?		
<i>Answer options</i>	<i>Response percentage</i>	<i>Response count</i>
Yes	56.0%	14
More or less	24.0%	6
No	20.0%	5
If so, please specify		11
<i>answered question</i>		25
<i>skipped question</i>		13

Do you find that the use of PRGA Program resources and research outputs improved your work in terms of results and impacts?		
<i>Answer options</i>	<i>Response percentage</i>	<i>Response count</i>
Yes	41.7%	10
More or less	37.5%	9
No	20.8%	5
<i>answered question</i>		24
<i>skipped question</i>		14
What have been the main obstacles for you to use PRGA Program resources / research outputs? Lack of:		
<i>Answer options</i>	<i>Response percentage</i>	<i>Response count</i>
Information	40.9%	9
Interaction	22.7%	5
Research opportunities	27.3%	6
Funding	50.0%	11
Other (please specify)		10
<i>answered question</i>		22
<i>skipped question</i>		16
Are you familiar with the CGIAR and the ongoing change process?		
<i>Answer options</i>	<i>Response percentage</i>	<i>Response count</i>
Yes	89.7%	26
No	10.3%	3
<i>answered question</i>		29
<i>skipped question</i>		9
Do you perceive a need for strengthening gender-sensitive participatory research in the new CGIAR?		
<i>Answer options</i>	<i>Response percentage</i>	<i>Response count</i>
Yes	93.1%	27
Maybe	3.4%	1
Don't know	3.4%	1
No	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		29
<i>skipped question</i>		9
If so, please specify priority areas:		
<i>Answer options</i>	<i>Response percentage</i>	<i>Response count</i>
PPB	62.1%	18
Policy work	58.6%	17
Participatory research with a gender-sensitive perspective	79.3%	23
Gender awareness	51.7%	15

Education (non-formal/extension, etc.)	37.9%	11
Other (please specify)		9
<i>answered question</i>		29
<i>skipped question</i>		9
What do you perceive to be the most useful research opportunities for PRGA Program?		
<i>Answer options</i>	<i>Response percentage</i>	<i>Response count</i>
PPB	58.6%	17
Policy work	48.3%	14
Participatory research with a gender-sensitive orientation	82.8%	24
Gender awareness	24.1%	7
Education (non-formal/extension, etc.)	34.5%	10
Other (please specify)		8
<i>answered question</i>		29
<i>skipped question</i>		9
What are the main areas that the CGIAR Gender Platform should cover?		
<i>Answer options</i>	<i>Response percentage</i>	<i>Response count</i>
Funding mechanism	60.7%	17
Gender analysis	75.0%	21
Gender training	75.0%	21
Gender research	78.6%	22
Other (please specify)		10
<i>answered question</i>		28
<i>skipped question</i>		10
What would be a possible distinctive role of PRGA Program in the gender platform? How do you see that PRGA Program can best contribute to the gender platform?		
<i>Answer options</i>	<i>Response percentage</i>	<i>Response count</i>
PPB	52.0%	13
Participatory research with a gender-sensitive orientation	88.0%	22
Gender awareness	28.0%	7
Education (non-formal/extension, etc.)	24.0%	6
Other (please specify)		6
<i>answered question</i>		25
<i>skipped question</i>		13
What do you think would be the best approach for PRGA Program to support the Mega-Programs?		
<i>Answer options</i>	<i>Response percentage</i>	<i>Response count</i>
Design a gender-sensitive participatory research framework	69.0%	20

Provide training	75.9%	22
Share knowledge	82.8%	24
Provide tools and methods	79.3%	23
Monitor and evaluate	48.3%	14
Document	37.9%	11
Other (please explain)		7
	<i>answered question</i>	<i>29</i>
	<i>skipped question</i>	<i>9</i>

Annex 5: Summary results of follow-up interviews (7)

How do you perceive the role of PRGA Program in the future CGIAR?

- It is unclear where the Program could fit now that the Gender Platform has not been confirmed. One option is to make it fit in one of the Mega-Programs (MP2). Another option would be to work through a Community of Practice approach. In any case there is a need for a space where we can debate and act from and be a service provider and knowledge broker to the different Mega-Programs—but now we have no clarity where such space would fit.
- There is a need to distinguish between participatory research and gender analysis. PRGA Program got recognition for its work on participatory research, but was less successful in gender analysis where there is a need for lots of different types of gender analysis, i.e. econometrics. The participatory research work could fit within MP1 and MP3.
- We could start regional gender networks. GFAR could be a good entry point and PRGA Program could have a key role specifically in LAC. We may want to wait for the CG to move on, and find the excellent people in the regions and link up with them. A good example is how PRGA Program strengthened the ASARECA capacity in Africa.

How can the Program support stakeholders inside and outside the CGIAR?

- A big limitation is the language issue. Major part of the work is done in English which limits its influence in LAC.
- In order to really serve the farmers, PRGA Program needs to improve, adapt and create new methodologies. PRGA Program was rather inward looking. It also needs to be more open-minded and take into account the good work, and the lessons learned worldwide around women's participation and gender analysis.
- PRGA Program needs to come closer to its end-users and focus on where agricultural research is connected with demand from women farmers, through extension. The Program should gather good examples of innovations in extension and where research has shown results.

Do you know about resources / courses in gender-sensitive participatory research? What tools and methods around gender-sensitive participatory research would be useful to produce? What format could those products take?

- Lack of good tools is not the reason for participatory research not being used. We may have the info and tools, but we need to get those out and make sub-products depending on target groups so it reaches different audiences or perhaps only do more promotion. People keep talking about needing tools and toolkits, but there are lots out there like the World Bank sourcebook. We don't need to create new tools but to connect to existing programs and networks to foster horizontal learning, understand what has worked and what didn't, do some M&E of the tools and resources.
- PRGA Program could review what gender materials they have, put those on web, so they are easy to find, a sort of clearinghouse: one single site where people could go for information on gender and agriculture.

- Translation into Spanish would be niche for PRGA Program to reduce language divide. That could lead to more connection between academics, and also NGOs, and the regions.
- There are many courses on gender and development (IDS [Institute for Development Studies], Wageningen, ISS [International Institute of Social Studies] Hague, Netherlands Royal Tropical Institute, Oxfam). In Central and Latin America there are many postgraduate studies related to gender. Training courses are available through UNIFEM. GTZ and CATIE are incorporating issues related to gender equity strongly in value-chain work. Experience shows that it is better to focus on specific issues and incorporate gender aspects rather than train in gender separately.
- PRGA Program could produce resources on project formulation, implementation and evaluation. There is a need to go through a process of collective construction of the tools together with partners.

Workshop expectations

- It would be useful to do a needs assessment of the Mega-Programs and the research-to-development spectrum.
- Do a recap of participatory research and gender analysis: what are the needs and how do we deliver on those?
- The workshop should be organized in different working groups on (1) participatory research and on (2) gender analysis, because many work only on one of the two aspects. The two cannot be put together if we want to avoid that the CGIAR relates gender work only to women involvement in research.
- Create a map of our collective knowledge; identify entry points within the new CG and how to build a shared space for practical reflection and debate. Create a community of practice that also facilitates the linkages with the outside.
- Analyze how to structure the new PRGA Program and rebuild its visibility.
- Share each other's work and identify useful interventions. Learn more about the Program methodologies, share opportunities for training and regional experiences.
- It would be useful to do an appreciative process—identify collectively what has been done really well in women farmers' agricultural research, and how that can be expanded or developed. And derive from there real priority areas for further development and then frame it strategically within the present CG context.

Annex 6: List of organizations mentioned working with gender-sensitive participatory research

Organization	Location	Type of organization ²
International Potato Center, CIP	Peru	CGIAR
Food and Agriculture Organization, FAO	Italy	Donor
International Food Policy Research Institute, IFPRI	USA	CGIAR
Participatory Research and Gender Analysis (PRGA) Program	Colombia	CGIAR
Christian Action Research and Education, CARE	USA	NGO
Christian Action Research and Education, CARE, Laos	Lao PDR	NGO
Christian Action Research and Education, CARE, Nepal	Nepal	NGO
International Center for Maize and Wheat Research, CIMMYT	Mexico	CGIAR
Catholic Relief Services, CRS	Africa	NGO
Department of Agriculture (Nepal)	Nepal	GO
Grupo Yanapai	Peru	NGO
Indian Council of Agricultural Research, ICAR	India	NGO
International Institute of Tropical Agriculture, IITA	Nigeria	CGIAR
International Union for Conservation of Nature, IUCN	USA	UN
International Water Management Institute, IWMI	Sri Lanka	CGIAR
Kenya Agricultural Research Institute	Kenya	GO
National Agricultural Research Organization, NARO	Uganda	GO
Oxfam	GB	Donor
Plan Internacional	Malawi	NGO
United Nations, UN, and specialized agencies (FAO, ILO)	Italy	UN
World Bank	USA	Donor
Yanapai	Peru	NGO
Africare	Uganda	NGO
Agro-Management	Uganda	PE
Centro Agonómico Tropical de Investigación y Enseñanza, CATIE	Costa Rica	RO
Center for Sustainable Development & Environment, CENESTA	Iran	NGO
Central Salinity Rice Research Institute, CSSRI, Lucknow	India	RO
Centre for Poverty Analysis	Sri Lanka	RO
Challenge Program on Water and Food	Sri Lanka	CGIAR
Chambers of Commerce (Ampara, Anuradhapura, Batticaloa, Galle, Hambantota, Kurunegala, Matara, Puttalam, Polonnaruwa, Trncolmalee)	Sri Lanka	PE
Center for International Forestry Research, CIFOR	Indonesia	CGIAR
Centro de Información para la Mujer y la Familia, CIMUF	Ecuador	GO

² Types of organizations: NGO: non-governmental organization; UN: United Nations organization; PE: private enterprise; SHG: stakeholder group; GO: governmental organization; CGIAR: organization part of the Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research; RO: research organization; NARS: national agricultural research organization.

Organization	Location	Type of organization²
Instituto de Investigacion y Desarrollo en Abastecimiento de Agua, Saneamiento Ambiental y Conservacion del Recurso Hidrico, CINARA	Colombia	RO
Communities of Huancavelica	Peru	SHG
Communities of Junin	Peru	SHG
Cuttack Rice Research Institute, CRRI, Orissa	India	RO
Department of Agricultural Research Services, DARS	Malawi	GO
Department of Agricultural Research and Technical Services, DARTS	Malawi	GO
Data Analysis and Technical Assistance, Ltd	Bangladesh	PE
Department of Agriculture and Forests	Lao PDR	GO
Department of Forest	Nepal	GO
Department of Agriculture	India	GO
Department of Agriculture	Lao PDR	GO
Desert Research Center	Egypt	GO
Directorate of Women in Agricultural Research, Bhubaneswar	India	GO
Dar Jana International School, DJIS	Saudi Arabia	PE?
ECO Himal	India	NGO
Farmers in select villages of Eastern Bhutan	Bhutan	SHG
Forest Commission	Ghana	GO
Future in Your Hands, Badulla	Sri Lanka	NGO
Global Multiple Use Services, MUS, Group	South Africa	RO
Government of El Salvador	El Salvador	GO
Governments of South Africa, Malawi, Swaziland, Zambia, Mozambique, Namibia	Africa	
GTZ	Germany	GO
GWP	Sweden	RO
Heifer International in Zimbabwe, Ghana, Zambia, Mozambique, Madagascar, Kenya	Africa	NGO
International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas, ICARDA	Syria	CGIAR
World Agroforestry Centre, ICRAF	Kenya	CGIAR
International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics, ICRISAT	Kenya	CGIAR
International Development Research Centre, IDRC	Canada	GO
International Fund for Agricultural Development, IFAD	Italy	UN
Instituto Nacional Autónomo de Investigaciones Agropecuarias, INIAP	Ecuador	NARS
Algerian National Agronomic Research Institute, INRAA	Algeria	NARS
InterAmerican Development Bank	USA	Donor
International Rice Research Institute, IRRI	Philippines	CGIAR
Isuru Sanwardana Kendraya, Chilaw	Sri Lanka	NGO
ITCG	Algeria	?
Kinniya Vision	Sri Lanka	NGO
Land O Lakes	USA	PE

Organization	Location	Type of organization²
Local NGOs in Rajasthan	India	NGO
Local organizations of peach palm sellers	Colombia	SHG
Ministry of Agriculture, Namibia	Namibia	GO
Ministry of Agriculture, Algeria	Algeria	GO
Ministry of Agriculture, Eritrea	Eritrea	GO
Ministry of Agriculture, Iran	Iran	GO
Ministry of Agriculture, Jordan	Jordan	GO
Ministry of Agriculture of Pazon (Huancavelica), Perú	Peru	GO
Ministry of Livestock, Kenya	Kenya	GO
Uganda National Agricultural Advisory Services, NAADS	Uganda	NARS
Nandos	Uganda	PE
Narendra Dev University of Agricultural Technology	India	University
National Agricultural Research and Extension Services (NARES) of Jordan	Jordan	NARS
National Agricultural Research Institute, NARI	Papua NG	NGO
NGO Consortia (Ampara, Batticaloa, Trincomalee)	Sri Lanka	NGO
Northeast Women's Network, Shillong	India	SHG
Palm Foundation, Nuwara Eliya	Sri Lanka	SHG
National Program of Participatory Development, PNDP	Cameroon	GO
Population Council	India	GO
Private constructors and pump sellers	Africa	SHG
Ramakrishna Mission in Kolkatta	India	NGO
Unidad Regional de Asistencia Técnica, RUTA	Central America	NGO
Sarvodaya SEEDS	Sri Lanka	NGO
Save the Children (UK)	Bangladesh	NGO
Stockholm Environmental Institute, SEI	Sweden	RO
Sewalanka Foundation	Sri Lanka	NGO
Sinhala Tamil Rural Women's Network, Nuwara Eliya	Sri Lanka	SHG
Small Ruminants Collaborative Research Program (SR-CRSP)	Kenya	RO
Netherlands Development Organization, SNV	Netherlands	NGO
Social Mobilizers Foundation, Hambantota	Sri Lanka	NGO
Social Welfare Organization, Ampara	Sri Lanka	NGO
Stellenbosch	South Africa	University
Swaziland Water and Agricultural Development Enterprise, SWADE	Swaziland	GO
Swiss Foundation for Technical Cooperation, Swisscontact	Switzerland	GO
Sysco	USA	PE
Tanzania Information Project, TIP	Tanzania	NGO
Traders' Associations (Puttalam, Medirigiriya)	Sri Lanka	SHG
United Nations Development Programme, UNDP	USA	UN
Unilever	UK	PE
University of Eritrea	Eritrea	University
University of Hohenheim	Germany	University
University of Wageningen	Netherlands	University
Urban Harvest Program	Uganda	CGIAR

Organization	Location	Type of organization²
Various government ministries/departments	Sri Lanka	GO
Vehilini Development Centre, Moneragala	Sri Lanka	NGO
Vinivida NGO Coalition	Sri Lanka	NGO
WAVE Foundation	Bangladesh	NGO
Wilpotha Women's Savings Effort	Sri Lanka	SHG
Women's Chamber of Commerce and Industry (Central Province)	Sri Lanka	PE
Women's Development Federation, Hambantota	Sri Lanka	NGO
Women's Development Foundation, Ampara	Sri Lanka	NGO
World Food Program projects	Ethiopia	UN
World Food Program projects	Sudan	UN
World Neighbors – Andes Area	Ecuador	NGO
WWF	USA	NGO