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The Integrated Agricultural Research for Development (IAR4D) concept represents a paradigm change in the way agricultural research and development activities are carried out in Africa. The concepts build on other models for conducting agricultural research and development. The concept has its main root in the innovation system approach; which is a multi-institutional, multi-stakeholder framework that has been successfully used in the industrial development era of the West. The IAR4D concept is implemented on an Innovation Platform (IP). An IP is a partnership framework that engages partners along and outside the commodity value chain or system of operation to jointly identify the problems of sustainable production, they jointly source solution, implement the solution options and learn lessons until an innovation is generated. The IP works in a commercial mode and thus ensure an effective partnership between the public and the private sector actors. The use of the IP in implementing the IAR4D concept has facilitated additional benefits from social networking intertwined with social, economic and cultural issues. The success of the IP model is hinged on the capacity of the facilitator to manage relationships especially the different stakeholder’s expectation.

The proof of the efficacy of the IAR4D concept and the IP was carried within the SSA CP program between years 2007 –2015 using an unprecedented but rigorous research methodology. The proof was carried out in eight countries of the sub Saharan Africa. The proof of concept project involved many agricultural research and non-research organizations, with the core implementation in three pilot learning sites. These include; (a) Western Africa (Kano-katsina-Maradi); (b). Southern Africa (Zimbabwe, Malawi and Mozambique) and (c). Eastern Africa (Uganda, Rwanda and Democratic Republic of Congo) around the Lake kivu regions. The debut knowledge on the practice of the IAR4D concept has been documented in various volumes with contribution of many stakeholders. This volume that projected the best systems to entrench gender consideration on an innovation platforms. This is vital to the sustainability of Africa agriculture and continued relevance of the IAR4D concept. The knowledge documented were drawn from the rich experience and contributions from broad stakeholders across the different innovation platforms in Africa.

As such the authors wish to acknowledge the contribution of the following institutions to the development and implementation of the IAR4D concept. The contribution of the sub-regional organization viz., Conseil Ouest et Centre Africain pour la Recherche et le Développement Agricole / West and Central African Council for Agricultural Research (Senegal) (CORAF/WECARD) and Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa (ASARECA), the Centre for Coordination of Agricultural Research and Development for Southern Africa (CCARDESA) is recognized in coordination of the pilot learning sites. The relentless contributions of the task force institutions viz., International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (Nigeria) (IITA); International Fertilizer Development Center (IFDC); Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique du Niger (INRAN), Bioversity International; Makerere University Uganda, Rwanda agricultural Board (RAB), International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT) and The International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center (CIMMYT).

The authors also wish to acknowledge the huge contribution of the program donors viz., the European Commission (EC), International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), Italy Government, Government of Netherlands, Department For International Development (DFID), UK and the CGIAR.

Lastly the contribution of over 200 researchers and development practitioners that contributed to the SSA CP project is highly recognised. You will agree with me that the number is too high to be listed in this one pager.
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Innovation Platforms are operational instruments for Integrated Agricultural Research for Development (IAR4D). IAR4D strategy was developed and tested by FARA as a new strategy to overcome the shortcomings of the traditional linear approaches for implementing agricultural innovations, research and development in Africa and beyond. The IAR4D strategy views agriculture as a multifaceted system with many sub-systems that must work together to improve African agriculture especially for small scale farmers. This approach engages all actors, organizations and institutions that are involved in the agricultural/livestock/fish sector to interact and plan together with the farmer being the core business in such interactions. IAR4D uses both the farming systems and value chain commodity approach. Its ultimate goal is to engage all actors along the commodity value chain, including external actors like policy makers, financial institutions, meteorologist, insurances and others who may have interest in a given chain (FARA, 2016).

According to FARA, IAR4D concept delivers socio-economic benefits by adherence to the following principles:

1. IAR4D simultaneously addresses research and development as a fused continuum for generation of innovation.

2. All stakeholders on an IP have a contribution and benefits which sustain their interest and continued participation.

3. Innovation generated using IAR4D will benefit all stakeholders on the platform.

4. IAR4D engages the policy makers at different levels all along the process of R&D till innovation is generated.

5. IAR4D demands investment by partners, which is followed by returns on the investment.

6. IAR4D ensures a smooth public-private partnership in ARD.

7. All-inclusive partnership arrangement to address technological and non technological issues.

8. IAR4D links all kinds of research endeavours (blue sky, strategic, basic and adaptive research) for the benefit of the farmers.

9. IAR4D ensures an effective engagement and capacity strengthening of the NARS FARA, 2016).

An IAR4D strategy uses an Innovation Platform (IP) as its operating mechanism. The IP is a forum of important stakeholders selected, consultatively by the IP facilitator, along the value chain of specific commodity or system of production. They include farmers, researchers, extension agents, traders, processors, financial institutions, policy makers, regulators, output market operators, consumers and others. They come together in an IP to identify challenges, needs, opportunities which they jointly find solutions which help them innovate responses which lead to socio-economic benefits to all the members.

Sub-Saharan economies are based on agriculture and related activities. To improve African food security and wealth creation, agricultural growth is essential. Thus, experiences that support (participatory) innovations in agriculture provide essential contributions towards improving the sector for development of the continent and its people. Innovation Platforms (IPs) are providing a new method of making agriculture work for all in Africa. IPs give room for more actors to be involved in agricultural development programmes. In so doing, IPs provide a conducive environment to mainstream gender in IPs, thus ensuring better results than the previous linear models could provide. Mainstreaming gender in IPs contributes to gender equality within African small scale agriculture which is known to leave women, youth and marginalized groups out. According to the World Food Program, “Gender equality and women’s empowerment are preconditions for effective and sustainable development and the enjoyment of universal human rights. It is essential that every decision be designed to allow women, men, girls and boys to reach their full potential” (WFP, 2015). While Canadian development agency sees gender mainstreaming is an essential strategy not only for attaining gender equality, but also for the sustainable development of societies as a whole (CIDA, 2000).
Why this toolkit?

The Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa (FARA) has a mandate to strengthen gender mainstreaming in agricultural, innovations research and development. FARA seeks to provide appropriate leadership for mainstreaming gender in Innovation Platforms which are the flagship institutions to deliver IAR4D in Sub-Saharan Africa. Mainstreaming gender in IPs ensures gender equality and women empowerment in IAR4D which is one of the key strategies of wealth creation among small scale farmers, pastoralists and fishermen and women in SSA. (http://farafrica.org/programs/cross-cutting-issues/gender/).

The toolkit will:

- enhance stakeholders’ understanding of the need to integrate gender in an Innovation Platform, the rationale for doing so and how to do so.

- Mainstreaming gender in IPs is a major step in addressing gender inequalities, exclusions and unjustified/unnecessary additions which are created by the contexts in which African small scale agriculture is practiced.

- Most of African agriculture is conducted within “… a complexity of norms, beliefs and practices that determine individual household members’ roles, rights, expectations, obligations, responsibilities and entitlements within and beyond households” (Manyire, H. and A. Dela Apekey, 2013).

- These cultural attributes are gendered and therefore gender determines the political, economic, social roles that women, youth and men play in each agricultural setting and within diverse commodity value chains. That is why it is important to mainstream gender in IPs so that these cultural complexities can be questioned, discussed and addressed.

The users of the toolkit

- FARA, FARA partners, anyone interested in establishing an IP, Innovation Market place, Incubation Models, hubs, clusters
- Sub-regional Research Organizations (SROs),
- Universities and research institutions,
- the Private Sector
- Innovation Platforms Facilitators and Stakeholders
FARA (2007), defines an IP as "a set of stakeholders that are brought together by their interest in shared issues. It provides a physical or virtual forum for exploring opportunities to address those common issues, investigates and implements joint solutions. IPs deliver IAR4D, often on an agreed agricultural commodity or commodities. As such, they provide a forum for negotiating on what needs to be done, by who, when, with what resources and how benefits are to be shared. IP uses agricultural value chains processes to ascertain required interventions and the actors to be involved. It avails stakeholders/actors opportunities to identify and fill critical gaps in commodity research, innovation and development. IPs ensure fair distribution of benefits among the stakeholders as each play their role within a chain.

Innovation platforms have gained popularity and are now widely used in agricultural research to connect different stakeholders to achieve common goals.

IPs are necessary in that they provide a conducive institution to take up a systems approach to innovation (Gates Innovation Platform Report 2013). They provide the fora for real time information and exposure to grassroots community members. The fact that all the players are on the same table, at the same time, means the time to inform back and forth among actors is significantly reduced. The threat of distorted information is eliminated, to a very high degree, since everyone is present during the discussions.

Ips provide the enabling environment of human and institutional capacity to enable small scale farmers access information, skills and knowledge needed for adoption of new innovations including new technologies and new ways of doing things. The IP environment also demystifies actors among themselves. Previously a farmer would hardly meet a policy maker or a researcher as an equal on the same table, they would be receivers of information, innovations and research results with no opportunities to respond or ask questions. IPs provide this conducive environment of information exchange, of working together as equals. It helps high level scientists and policy makers come down to the level of small scale farmers and engage with them directly.

IP also provides the much needed "...institutional culture change shifting mind-sets towards more farmer-centric innovation; a need for partnerships and collaboration across a range of institutions to incorporate broader perspectives into the R&D design phase and downstream to help deliver innovation to farmers; and the need for incentives to bring about this change; the ability to adjust to changing conditions, interact with diverse stakeholders, seize new opportunities, and develop new skills. (IPs ensure farmers are included in the innovation processes and discourage them from being merely the recipients of information and innovations). IPs help the other practitioners to be "farmer-centric" and focus on the farming system. (An IP is able)...to connect and incentivize a complex system to innovate across the entire value chain with the end user in mind" (BMG, 2013). IPs provide the coordination of actors and users.
An Innovation Platform

An IP can have more or less stakeholders depending on what the facilitators and the actors agree. Sometimes, a facilitator can start with a few critical members and then keep increasing them as need be. Below is an example of a Cavy Innovation Platform in DR Congo.

**Facilitators:** BeCa/ILRI, CIAT, Uni of Dschang, L’Université Evangélique en Afrique (UEA)

**Producers:** Cavy Farmers (Women and Youth)

**Researchers:** BeCa/ILRI, CIAT, IRAD, INERA

**Private Sector:** HORECA

**Policy Makers:** Minagri-Livestock Dept.

**Cavy Traders**

**Credit And Finance:** Macrebu, Coopec and Mecre

**Communication:** Radio Maendeleo and Radio Okapi

**Figure 1** Cavy IP in DR Congo
Gender mainstreaming is the process of assessing the implications for women, youth and men of any planned action, whether legislation, policies, projects or programs in all areas and at all levels. It is an approach that makes women’s and men’s concerns and experiences an integral part of the design/plan, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of projects and programs in all political, economic and societal spheres so that women and men participate and benefit equally. Involvement of both women and men at the beginning (design/planning stage) ensures that inequality is not perpetuated at all. The ultimate goal is to achieve gender equality in all these endeavours (ECOSOC, 2004).

Gender mainstreaming in an IP means having an institution which will actively promote gender equality. As such IP facilitator and other stakeholders adjust their individual attitudes and collectively the IP position towards gender. In many cases a gender mainstreaming capacity building is necessary for all the actors in an IP. Gender mainstreaming in IPs is a transformative process in that it involves rethinking and redefining socio-economic values and development goals that IP envisages. Gender mainstreaming process helps the IP institution to achieve fairness, justice and develop an intelligent use of resources that permeates all aspects of a community. Gendered IPs help communities to realize their full potentials. Gender mainstreaming must therefore be understood as a complex, multi-dimensional and long-term process that focuses on the needs of both women and men in order to achieve the optimal development of their society. It is important for all IP actors to know that gender mainstreaming is a process to work towards gender equality and sustainable development goal. It is not an end in itself. It is a strategy for IP governance that makes men’s and women’s concerns, needs, challenges, experiences and opportunities an integral part of the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of IP activities (CIDA, 2000).
Rationale for mainstreaming gender in IPs

There are two main reasons which justify mainstreaming gender in IPs which include, social and wealth creation. Mainstreaming gender in IPs is a major step in addressing gender inequalities, exclusions and unjustified/unnecessary additions which are created by the contexts in which African small scale agriculture is practiced. Most of African agriculture is conducted within “…a complexity of norms, beliefs and practices that determine individual household members’ roles, rights, expectations, obligations, responsibilities and entitlements within and beyond households” (Manyire, H. and A. Dela Apekey, 2013). These cultural attributes are gendered and therefore gender determines the political, economic, social roles that women, youth and men play in each agricultural setting and within diverse commodity value chains. That is why it is important to mainstream gender in IPs so that these cultural complexities can be questioned, discussed and addressed.

Social justice rationale

Most poverty studies in Africa show that, unfair distribution of means of production between men and women, is responsible for some aspects of poverty, food and nutrition challenges the continent is facing (FAO, 2011). A 1999 World Bank study on poverty in Africa concluded that gender inequality is the root cause of persistent poverty in the continent (Blackden and Bhanu, 1999). Therefore, to ensure IPs deliver on their mandates to put money in farmers’ pockets, balanced food on the table and improved livelihoods, it is imperative that gender is mainstreamed in the IP formation and management processes. Innovation Platforms, like many other institution serving the agricultural, pastoral and fishing communities in Africa can unconsciously encourage power imbalances that women face in their daily lives (Cullen et al. 2013). It is often a challenge for women and youth to be equal participants in such institutions. For example, in East Africa, agricultural cooperatives as institutions for production and marketing of cash crops such as coffee, sugarcane, tea and milk, structurally left women and youth out because membership was based on land ownership.

Culturally women and youth are not expected to speak out during public meetings. Whatever the elders decide should not be questioned by women or the youth in both public forum or even at home in the privacy of a household. This cultural norm if carried over into the IPs, will not allow women and the youth to be considered as partners on the platform. Furthermore, with their triple roles (Moser, 1993), women may not have the time to participate in innovation platforms activities and especially meetings, if their multiple responsibilities are not considered when calling for such meetings. In many other situations, they are not culturally allowed to attend meetings outside their homes. This means they cannot attend the much needed trainings for IAR4D and IPs which may be outside their respective villages and which may require a number of days out of the home.

Therefore, inclusion of women and youth in an IP has to be done differently for them to have time, space and voice in IP processes, decision making and benefit from IP goods and services (Mulema et al 2015).

Wealth creation rationale

Gender responsiveness of IPs for any economic activities result in improved incomes for both men and women. It is not usual for IP proponents, those who establish them or those who operationalise them to ignore gender mainstreaming in the IP formation and operationalization processes. In most of agricultural research and development approaches and strategies, there is an assumption that gender issues take care of themselves somehow along the way. It is rare to find efforts being made to understand the role of women, men and youth in an IP establishment, in spite of the fact that each group faces different constraints, needs and opportunities. There is a wrong assumption that women, and youth can be engaged at the same level, contribute equitably and derive similar benefits accruing from an IP and its flagship commodity value chains, as the men. However, this can be achieved if gender is mainstreamed in setting up an IP and in its processes.
Research has shown that vulnerable groups are usually found in the nodes where there are minimal benefits within a commodity value chain. For instance, globally, many women are involved in agricultural business enterprises, but often dominate in the low-income informal sector sections often characterized by production and retailing in small quantities. Men on the other hand tend to dominate bulk trading, processing and long distance marketing of agricultural products (Chiuri and Birachi, 2009). The youth have minimal access to finances, productive assets such as land, machinery and equipment, and these hinder their participation in lucrative agricultural value chains. However, a gender mainstreamed IP will ensure that youth constraints, needs and opportunities are identified and addressed.

Women and youth are important actors in wealth creation (KIT et al, 2012). They are involved in productive, community service and reproductive activities (triple roles). Therefore, any efforts for putting money in farmers’ pockets including innovation platforms cannot afford to be gender ‘blind’. Gender issues need to be mainstreamed in order to avoid detrimental negative consequences while increasing the chances of maximum benefits to most if not all actors in an IP. Stotsky (2006) reckons that, "societies that increase women's access to social and business services narrow differences between men and women in economic opportunities" and therefore increases the rate of economic development and wealth creation. IPs are institutions for interventions whose goal is equitable economic empowerment among different groups. If properly constituted and guided, an ideal IP is an excellent means to improved livelihoods and well-being of all people in a community where it is established. Inequalities among IP actors can be attributed to inadequate knowledge of gender differences and the challenges that women and youth face in Africa’s agricultural settings such as poor access to production resources and services (finances, infrastructure, knowledge and skills). These challenges are compounded by family and community responsibilities (GEM, 2010, cited in Vossenberg 2013: 4). It can also be due to low skill capacity in gender mainstreaming IPs. Building capacity in gender mainstreaming skills of IPs can be a good response to some of these challenges.
Why Innovation Platforms are not gender responsive?

i Many proponents of Innovation Platforms assume that IPs can be gender neutral. They ignore the fact that men and women have different starting points, and are presented with different opportunities and constraints in relation to their gender roles.

ii IPS proponents may not regard promoting gender equality and women's empowerment as their role, and, if involving women means extra efforts, more time and additional resources, they may view gender mainstreaming as a bother, or an exercise that will slow down the IP establishment and its operations; increase cost and/or destabilize the cultural environment.

iii IPs may also subscribe to stereotypes associated with women's involvement in decision making processes. Local cultural realities may compound this, leaving women with limited chances to participate in an IP.

iv Lack of skills to mainstream gender in IP processes may also be a challenge. Gender mainstreaming is not an easy job. It requires political will and attitudinal change among the decision makers and implementors, deliberate efforts to spend time and resources to include women and youth.
The facilitators are expected to carry out scooping studies or diagnostic studies that will inform the discussions of the initial stakeholders meetings that will deliberate on challenges/needs/opportunities that an IP can address within the community. This information must be collected with gender lenses in place so that women, men and youth issues are captured during this exercise.

Step 1: Scooping/Diagnostic surveys or studies
To the team that wants to start an IP- ensure the following:

i) Understand and document the gender dynamics within the community where the IP will be hosted.

ii) Profile gender roles and responsibilities; rights and privileges around a commodity or commodities the IP will zero in (a combination of gender analysis tools can be used). If the IP has chosen a commodity, map gender roles and relations along the value chain.

iii) Understand, document and discuss the cultural norms that shape women's and men's and youth farm work, domestic duties, social status and access to and control over resources and services.

iv) Understand the decision making processes for women, youth and men and how well these will be integrated as active participants in an IP.

v) Identify gender and mainstreaming gaps that might need to be addressed before the IP is set up or in the IP performance process.

Information gathered during the scooping/diagnostic surveys is subjected to gender and stakeholders' analysis and any other relevant review that will help tease out the gender issues in the community where the IP is going to be established.

Gender Analysis

Gender analysis is a process to assess and understand the differences in the lives of women and men; their participation in social, cultural, political and economic life, and the differential impacts policies, programs, projects and services have on each socio-economic category of a population. The aim of gender analysis is to identify inequalities in order to address them in the most effective and efficient manner. Social, cultural, political and economic context in which IAR4D strategy is to be applied, and IP is to be established has gender dimensions that must be understood well by practitioners and other stakeholders. Gender analysis provides a tool to analyze the wider social, cultural and economic context in which IP interventions will take place. “Gender analysis helps gain an understanding of the different patterns of participation, involvement, behaviour and activities that women and men in their diversity have in economic, social and legal structures and the implications of these differences” (http://eige.europa.eu/gender-mainstreaming/tools-and-methods/gender-analysis) downloaded on 14th November, 2015.

Gender analysis will help the facilitators of the IP to do the following:

• Understand how men, women and youth participate as economic actors along the value chain and use this information in the design and operationalization of an IP;

• Ensure that all data used in the analysis is broken down by sex and age (disaggregated data);

• Draw on existing qualitative and quantitative research results to establish gender differences;

• Ensure that where differences between women, youth and men exist, they are analysed for cause and effects information usable in the design, implementation and monitoring of the IP activities;

• Ensure that relevant gender issues, gaps and inequalities are clearly defined, discussed and sorted out by IP members comprehensively;

Stakeholder analysis

Stakeholders are those who are interested and concerned in a project/programme – for better or for worse. Stakeholders will either help or hinder the project/programme, depending on their vested interests. Any successful project depends on the support of its stakeholders. Therefore, it is important to understand the stakeholders to be involved/affected in the Innovation Platform activity/ies. As the IP Facilitator, stakeholders’ analysis is important in order to decipher who to invite to the IP as a member.
After analysing stakeholders, it is important for the facilitators to carry out a stakeholder mapping exercise. By this time the facilitators are well versed with the local politics and they are aware of stakeholders’ interests in the chosen service or value chain.

### Table 1 Stakeholder Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Category</th>
<th>Relevant stakeholder</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Influence</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Social, geographical and organizational</td>
<td>Power to facilitate or impede the establishment of an IP</td>
<td>Degree of priority needs and interests</td>
<td>From commitment to status quo to openness to change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Facilitators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy makers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from World Bank 2003

### Table 2 Stakeholder Mapping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Importance/low Influence</th>
<th>High Importance/ High Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Importance/Low Influence</td>
<td>Low importance/High Influence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from World Bank 2003
Stakeholders

IP facilitators will be interested most in those stakeholders who have high importance and high influence as the core members of the IP for it to achieve its mandate. The capacity of the low importance but high influence is also important to help in propelling the IP and unlocking potentials within interlinked IP members.

Step 2: Capture women’s and young peoples’ voices
In many cultural set ups women do not speak in front of men; young people are expected not to contract their elders especially in public or forum like the proposed IP meetings. To overcome this, the practitioners can do the following:

i. Separate older women and have a women’s group only discuss the issues at hand
ii. Separate young men and young women in a group of their own and have each group discuss their issues separately
iii. Bring women and youth views to the main group for incorporation

Step 3: Employ good facilitation skills

i. Ensure there is a culturally knowledgeable facilitator for the various stakeholders in an innovation platform who is able to ensure that all the participants share their ideas in an equitable manner.
ii. Ensure that women and youth are represented and have a strong voice by taking into account cultural settings, power structures and the ways men and women relate (Mulema et al, 2015).

Step 4: Sensitize men

It is important to sensitize men on gender mainstreaming at the beginning of setting up an IP. This is to help them understand why this institution will be different from other local institutions handling agricultural issues in their locality. This exercise should target societal structures that may work against IP efforts in gender mainstreaming. Provide a forum where men can question/challenge some of their current social norms and behaviors at household, community and national levels that perpetuate gender inequality. This will provide the needed supportive environment for women and youth which will enable them to take up new roles, responsibilities and leadership positions without men feeling threatened in the IP (Apekey A et al 2015).

Step 5: Ensure at least 30% representation of men, women and youth in all IP committees
It is important to make sure women, men and youth are well represented in the overall IP management committee. This may be followed up by a gender analysis and mainstreaming workshop for all the members. The IP will have sub-committees depending on the value chain of choice, 30% representation of men, women and youth is also mandatory here to ensure that gender issues are taken care of at all levels of an IP. This representation provides the numbers each group needs to achieve the required gendered participation in the IP operations.

Step 6: Identify key gender constraints

After identifying the value chain to address, IP facilitators and actors need to identify gender constraints in the following areas of concern:

i. Access to and control over production resources
ii. Gender and Age distribution of roles and responsibilities
iii. Access to technologies, training and extension services
iv. Gender division of labour
v. Access to and control over financial services
vi. Access to and sharing of benefits
vii. Access to and integration into markets
viii. Participation and representation decision-making powers within the IP
ix. Social cultural barriers inhibiting release of full potential of any gender.

Step 7: Gender budgeting

IP facilitators must introduce the theory and practice of gender budgeting in order to ensure that the IP actors are comfortable with gender mainstreaming activities which many need extra finances to include women, men and youth and their needs. As IP activities are planned...
with gender lenses in place, the budgetary allocations to enable the plans to be inclusive is critical. This ensures that gender mainstreaming does not fall through the cracks or falters due to lack of finances.

**Step 8:** Formulate a Theory of change or Impact Pathway for an IP

To establish an IP, one may need to have a goal for it with a clear theory of change or impact pathway (Table 4).

**Table 3 An Example of an IP’s Theory of Change**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Improved lives of women, men, girls and boys through the value chain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ultimate Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>Gender differences addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immediate outcomes</strong></td>
<td>Women and men participate equally in the design and implementation of gender-transformative IPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outputs</strong></td>
<td>Documented gender differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities</strong></td>
<td>Gender analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Setting up an Innovation Platform
Step 9: Develop a gender monitoring and evaluation strategy
Monitoring indicators can be developed from the Impact pathway developed earlier. A gendered monitoring and evaluation strategy will help the IP facilitators and actors to measure the extent to which the IP as an institution have been able to address the different needs of women, men and the youth. It will also assist in finding out if the IP activities are making any impact on the lives of those concerned. Monitoring will help an IP to improve on its implementation processes in good time and for future engagements. An established IP has several sub-committees which include market, technology and M&E. It is important to identify key gender-sensitive indicators for inputs, outputs, outcomes and impacts (Example of table 4 below).

### Table 4 Sensitive Indicators to Measure Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Based constraints and causes</th>
<th>Actions to address constraints to achieve equitable outcomes</th>
<th>Gender sensitive indicators to measure success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women and youth are not members of any local agricultural related institution</td>
<td>Ensure at least 30% gender representation is embedded in the IP management policy or constitution</td>
<td>Gender representation in the IP management structures (men, women and youth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women, young men and young women cannot access credit because they do not own collateral assets.</td>
<td>Work with lending institutions to provide women pro-poor credits facilities</td>
<td>Number of pro-women and pro-poor credit facilities developed by financial institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women are not able to participate in away from home trainings and exchange visits due to cultural believes</td>
<td>Sensitize men in the community on the need for improved capacity of all; Discuss the validity of this practice with both men and women</td>
<td>Improved participation of women in activities away from home e.g. trainings, and exchange visits.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from (USAID, 2009)
Gender analysis Tools

As mentioned earlier, when mainstreaming gender in IPs, one may start with simple check list (an example is provided in Table 5 below) which will give some highlights on areas to focus for detailed gender analysis.

### Table 5 Checklist for Mainstreaming Gender in IPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>1= Yes</th>
<th>2= No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Are organizations to be incorporated in the IP working specifically on gender, and/or with women? Explain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Is data (qualitative and quantitative) sex-disaggregated? Make observations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Are gender stakes relevant to the programme/project/sector clearly highlighted? Get evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Are women/men’s constraints, needs/opportunities and views reflected in the objectives, risk analysis and impact projections of the IP intervention? Review the documents and develop analysis table siting evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Is the allocation of financial and human resources appropriate to address equality issues? Get evidence from documentation or key informants input</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Is there room for gender budgets? Get evidence from documentation or key informants input</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Are key processes (e.g. dialogue between key stakeholders), procedures (e.g. Terms of Reference) and planning tools (e.g. log frame/Theory of Change/Impact Pathway/ Result Based Frameworks) explicit on gender goals and objectives? Analyze the documentation for evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Is the IP planning and management participatory? Analysis for evidence and also key informants input</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the check list above, it is imperative to use other gender analysis tools. These tools have been developed over the years by different institutions and individual over the years. These include gender daily activity profile, the resource access and control profile and gender based constraint tool among others. As the IP facilitator, one has the liberty to choose from a variety of tools depending on what the IP will focus on and the socio-economic and cultural environment the IP will operate from. Example of some of the gender analysis tools to use in an IP establishment and management are given below.
1. **Harvard Analytical Framework**: Daily Activity Profile— who does what, when and with what resources?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>Women/Girls</th>
<th>Men/boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Productive activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income generating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproductive activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning and repair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **The access and control profile**: What resources do different social categories access and control and what benefits are they entitled to?

### Table 7
Access and Control Profile Tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outside incomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset ownership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic needs (food, clothing and shelter)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political power/prestige</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Gender based constraints identification tool**: What are the potential gender based constraints that will hinder an IP from being a success?

### Table 8 Gender Based Constraints Identification Tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender based constraint</th>
<th>Factors contributing to the constraint</th>
<th>Actions to address the constraint and achieve more equitable outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women fail to improve on their farm production due to time-poverty</td>
<td>Women’s triple roles (production, reproduction and community roles)</td>
<td>Identify labor saving technologies to reduce women’s time on reproductive roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women do not get top positions in institutions’ leadership</td>
<td>This is due to social and cultural attitudes/stereotypes towards women in leadership</td>
<td>Sensitization of men on gender issues; Dialogue to discuss discriminatory social and cultural attitudes/stereotypes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adopted from USAID (2009).*
PROBLEM ANALYSIS (PA)

The first step in program planning, management, monitoring and evaluation starts with a detailed problem/opportunity analysis. As such integrating gender into this process must also start with a problem/opportunity analysis. Problem Tree Analysis tool has been selected because it feeds directly into the planning and the monitoring and evaluation frameworks, and serve as basis for Impact assessment for the IPs.

The Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation cycle is based on the assumption that the hierarchy of objectives is already determined. The problem tree analysis tool facilitates faster the formulation of the hierarchy of objectives, and helps to uncover the underlying causes as well as overarching effects of the observed problems. A good plan, or M&E system that does not address real problems is not only useless, but it wastes resources, chasing results that do not exist.

The process begins with a core or priority problem, explores the root causes and the effects/impacts. In the case of gender, it specifies the core gender challenge.

The process
- It begins with the core problem
- Explores the underlying causes
- Explore resultant effects
- From the problems to objectives

Fig. 2: The structure of a Problem Tree

Fig. 3: Example of a problem tree
Fig. 3: Example of a problem tree

**HOW TO PROCEED**

a. **Root causes**
   In this case the core problem is: "The role of females in the value chain is not supported". The facilitator explores root causes by asking "why". For instance, "Why are the roles of females in the value chain not supported?"

   *Two responses emerged:*

   ➔ The roles are done as part of the females household chores and household chores do not require external inputs.

   ➔ It is assumed that men do all the tasks associated with the product, so support in terms of training, credit etc, is given to men. But the men do not use the support for the tasks done by women.

   The facilitator probes for the causes of the responses above.

   "Why are these roles played by women assumed to be male roles?"

   ➔ The men are the ones that are seen in public with the products. Development agents and government officers assume the men do all the tasks related to the products.

   "Why are the men the only one seen in public with the goods?"

   ➔ They use the bicycles to take the products to the mill and markets.

   **Why do only men do the marketing?**

   ➔ So they can claim cash ownership.
   ➔ Women do not have good bargaining skills.

   The facilitator probes on all causes until the responses become repetitive.
b The effects
The facilitator then turns to the “Effects”. The probing question is “What is the result of …….” For instance,

“What is the result of women’s work not being supported?”

- Women end up spending unnecessarily long time on these activities
- Levels of production are limited

Again the facilitator probes until responses become repetitive. The second step is to formulate the hierarchy of objectives

FROM PROBLEMS TO OBJECTIVES

When the problem tree is complete as in Fig 3 above, each of the cards is discussed to arrive at the best and realistic desired condition. For instance at the upmost is the effect of “cycle of poverty”. Options could be: Poverty eradication, or poverty alleviation. From the discussion, the groups realised that poverty was difficult to eradicate so they opt for alleviation or mitigation. The goal of the project therefore becomes “poverty alleviation” as indicated in Table 1 below

Table 1 Example of translating problems into objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ultimate effects</strong></td>
<td><strong>Goal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle of poverty</td>
<td>Poverty alleviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor livelihoods (Poor feeding, poor health, Poor dressing, assets, etc)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women economic disempowered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long term effects</strong></td>
<td><strong>Outcome</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low re-investments</td>
<td>Enhance agricultural value chain investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persisting rudimentary approaches</td>
<td>Modern approaches adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low income</td>
<td>Increased income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immediate effects</strong></td>
<td><strong>Outputs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited learning</td>
<td>Enhanced knowledge and skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low exposure of females Limited outputs</td>
<td>Enhanced women economic empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities consume a lot of time</td>
<td>Increased production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outputs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core problem</strong></td>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females role in the value chain was not supported</td>
<td>Women empowered for active value chain engagement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Underlying causes
- Roles done as home chores
- Roles assumed to be male
- Men do the public marketing and milling
- Can use children to help
- No support networks

### Root causes
- Men claim ownership of money
- Men claim the financial power
- Men make the financial decisions
- No money to hire
- No time to network
- Too much time consuming work
- Money kept by men

### Objectives
- Learning and support networks
- Marketing engagement
- Invest in time saving approaches
- Female saving and credit

### Activities
- Joint ownership of cash
- Women involvement in financial decision making
- Saving and credit groups
- Training in marketing
- Support market surveys
  - Improved labour
- Investing in labour saving technologies
- Train in labour-saving approaches
- Access to hired labour
  - Network
- Training in group learning
- Support to group formation
- Support learning and Exposure visits

### 2. Time related - Daily calendar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>When is it used</th>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily calendar is an interactive tool used to provide an overview of how a normal day of a particular individual or group looks like.</td>
<td>When planning a project that will involve specific gender groups’ availability over a period of time. When the program intends to affect the way time is used by gender groups</td>
<td>It involves all parties in understanding the time limitations. It facilitates all parties to agree on the appropriate time for meetings. It is a good basis for determining the duration of events. It optimized the time resource</td>
<td>It does not take into account the “not – normal” days. The definition of a normal day may change with seasons, week days. This requires specific reference to working days (Not Sunday of Friday for religious purposes)???</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. Seasonal Calendar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>When is it used</th>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A seasonal calendar is a tool that provides an over-view of seasonal changes of a specific theme in a normal year. The themes could be rainfall, farm activities, community activities, incomes, plant and animal diseases, etc</td>
<td>Program planning at village level where views of different groups on seasonal issues is important. Map out constraints and diagnosis. Resources allocation and labor availability. Effective extension. M&amp;E. Impact analysis on drought, food security and employment.</td>
<td>Draws on peoples experiences throughout the year. Provides an over-view of annual occurrences of issues being discussed. Everyone can participate because seasons affect all.</td>
<td>Does not cater for un-usual years. With recent erratic changes, special attentions needs to be focused on the norm and actual happenings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Seasonal calendar by women of Namanganga village in Mukono district Uganda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rainfall</strong></td>
<td>♠♠♠</td>
<td>♠♠♠</td>
<td>♠♠♠</td>
<td>♠♠♠</td>
<td>♠♠</td>
<td>♠♠</td>
<td>♠♠</td>
<td>♠♠♠</td>
<td>♠♠♠</td>
<td>♠♠</td>
<td>♠♠ ♠</td>
<td>♠♠♠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TseTese fly</strong></td>
<td>♠</td>
<td>♠</td>
<td>♠</td>
<td>♠</td>
<td>♠</td>
<td>♠</td>
<td>♠</td>
<td>♠</td>
<td>♠</td>
<td>♠</td>
<td>♠</td>
<td>♠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crop raiding by monkeys</strong></td>
<td>♠</td>
<td>♠</td>
<td>♠</td>
<td>♠</td>
<td>♠</td>
<td>♠</td>
<td>♠</td>
<td>♠</td>
<td>♠</td>
<td>♠</td>
<td>♠</td>
<td>♠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crop raiding by birds</strong></td>
<td>♠♠</td>
<td>♠♠</td>
<td>♠♠</td>
<td>♠♠</td>
<td>♠♠</td>
<td>♠♠</td>
<td>♠♠</td>
<td>♠♠</td>
<td>♠♠</td>
<td>♠♠</td>
<td>♠♠</td>
<td>♠♠</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**When is it used** | **Strength** | **Weaknesses**
--- | --- | ---

---

*Adapted from the FARA Gender toolkits*
Gender
This refers to socially constructed roles, behaviours and expectations; sex is based on anatomical and biological characteristics defining males and females. Awareness of gender is important for IPs because gender roles can vary among cultures and change over time. An IP has to be aware of these attributes in order to support positive changes.

Gender equality
Gender equality is the state in which women and men enjoy equal rights, opportunities and entitlements. For an IP, promoting gender equality means laying out processes and procedures that assign equal value to women and men, according to their differences, and that do not discriminate against either gender. The treatment of women and men should be impartial and relevant to their respective needs.

Gender Blind
Gender blindness is the failure to recognise that gender is an essential determinant of social outcomes impacting on projects and policies. A gender blind approach assumes gender is not an influencing factor in an IP, a value chain, a projects, a program or policy (UNDP, 2003).

Gender transformation
Gender transformation is an approach that engages women, youth and men to examine, question and change cultural norms, beliefs and value systems as well as institutions that reinforce gender inequalities (USAID, 2009). If gender is mainstreamed in an IP, that IP becomes a gender transformative institution where attitude change is experienced among the IP actors.

Empowerment
Empowerment of means the process of gaining power over one’s life especially for women and youth who are purported to have less power compared to men. However, in an IP, it also means empowering men not to feel threatened when women and young people are empowered as equal participants in IP activities. Empowerment involves awareness-raising, building self-confidence, expansion of choices, increased access to and control over resources and capacity and willingness to transform cultural and political structures and institutions which reinforce and perpetuate gender discrimination and inequality. This implies that to be empowered they must not only have equal capabilities (such as education and health) and equal access to resources and opportunities (such as land and employment), but they must also have the voice and agency to use these rights, capabilities, resources and opportunities to make strategic choices and decisions (EIGE, 2016).

Voice is being able to speak up and be heard, and to shape and share in discussions, discourse and decisions (WB, 2014).

Agency is being able to make decisions about one’s own life and act upon them, to achieve desired outcomes free of violence, retribution or fear (WB, 2014).

Equal Opportunities for women and men
This concept indicates the absence of barriers to economic, political and social participation on ground of sex and gender and other characteristics. Such barriers are often indirect, difficult to discern and caused and maintained by structural phenomena and social representations that have proved particularly resistant to change. Equal opportunities as one of the gender equality objectives is founded on the rationale that a whole range of strategies, actions and measures are necessary to redress deep-rooted and persistent inequalities (EIGE, 2016).

Gender Audit
A participatory gender audit is a tool and a process based on a participatory methodology to promote organizational learning at the individual, work unit and organizational levels on how to practically and effectively mainstream gender (EIGE, 2016). A gender audit is essentially a “social audit”, and belongs to the category of “quality audits”, which distinguishes it from traditional “financial audits”. It considers whether internal practices and related support systems for gender mainstreaming are effective and reinforce each other and whether they are being followed. It establishes a baseline; identifies critical gaps and challenges; and recommends ways of addressing them, suggesting possible improvements and innovations. It also documents good practices.
towards the achievement of gender equality (EIGE, 2016).

A gender audit enhances the collective capacity of the IP to examine its activities from a gender perspective and identify strengths and weaknesses in promoting gender equality issues. It monitors and assesses the relative progress made in gender mainstreaming and helps to build organizational ownership for gender equality initiatives and sharpens organizational learning on gender (EIGE, 2016).

Gender balance
Gender balance is commonly used in reference to human resources and equal participation of women and men in all areas of work, projects or programmes. In a scenario of gender equality, women and men are expected to participate proportionally to their shares in the population. In many areas, however, women participate less than what was expected based on the sex distribution in the population (under-representation of women) while men participate more than expected (over-representation of men) (EIGE, 2016).

Gender blind
This term refers to the failure to recognize that the roles and responsibilities of men/boys and women/girls are assigned to them in specific social, cultural, economic, and political contexts and backgrounds. IPs which are gender blind do not take into account these different roles and diverse needs. They maintain the status quo and will not help transform the unequal structure of gender relations (EIGE, 2016).

Gender equality
This refers to the equal rights, responsibilities and opportunities of women and men and girls and boys. Equality does not mean that women and men will become the same but that women’s and men’s rights, responsibilities and opportunities will not depend on whether they are born male or female. Gender equality implies that the interests, needs and priorities of both women and men are taken into consideration, recognizing the diversity of different groups of women and men. Gender equality is not a women’s issue but should concern and fully engage men as well as women. Equality between women and men is seen both as a human rights issue and as a precondition for, and indicator of, sustainable people-centred development (EIGE, 2016).

Practical gender needs
Practical Gender Needs (PGNs) are identified by women/men within their socially defined roles, as a response to an immediate perceived necessity. PGNs usually relate to inadequacies in living conditions such as water provision, health care and employment, and they do not challenge gender divisions of labour and women’s subordinate position in society (EIGE, 2016).

Strategic Gender needs
Strategic gender needs interests then are derived from the analysis of women’s and youth subordination in society where men in most cases are privileged. Strategic gender needs address the question of empowerment to participate in IP governance where women, men and the youth have the voice and the agency to participate in IP activities and benefit from the same. Strategic gender needs are structural needs which are often embedded in cultural practices, legal systems, institutions and policies which discriminate on women, youth and even some men.
Apekey A., H. Manyire and M Olupot (2015). Roadmap for Mainstreaming Gender into Rural Agricultural Services for Poverty Reduction in Africa: A Policy Brief. FARA-
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About FARA

The Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa (FARA) is the apex continental organization responsible for coordinating agricultural research for development (AR4D) in Africa so as to increase its efficiency and effectiveness. It serves as the entry point for agricultural research initiatives designed to have a continental reach or a sub-continental reach spanning more than one sub-region.

FARA serves as the technical arm of the African Union Commission (AUC) on matters concerning agricultural science, technology and innovation. It provides a continental forum for stakeholders in AR4D to shape the vision and agenda for the sector and to mobilize them to respond to key continent-wide development frameworks, notably the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Program (CAADP) of the African Union (AU) and the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD).

FARA’s vision
Reduced poverty in Africa as a result of sustainable broad-based agricultural growth and improved livelihoods, particularly of smallholder and pastoral enterprises

FARA’s mission
Creation of broad-based improvements in agricultural productivity, competitiveness and markets through strengthening of the capacity for agricultural innovation across the continent FARA’s value proposition: Strengthening Africa’s capacity for innovation and transformation by visioning its strategic direction, integrating its capacities for change and creating an enabling policy environment. FARA’s strategic direction is derived from and aligned with the Science Agenda for Agriculture in Africa (S3A), which is, in turn, designed to support the realization of the CAADP vision of shared prosperity and improved livelihoods.

FARA’s programme is organized around three strategic priorities (SPs), namely:

• Visioning Africa's agricultural transformation through foresight, strategic analysis and partnerships to enable Africa to determine the future of its agriculture, using proactive approaches to exploit opportunities in agribusiness, trade and markets, taking the best advantage of emerging sciences, technologies and risk mitigation practices and approaches, and harnessing the combined strengths of public and private stakeholders.

• Integrating capacities for change by making different actors aware of each other’s capacities and contributions, connecting institutions and matching capacity supply to demand, so as to create consolidated, high-capacity and effective African agricultural innovation systems that can use institutional comparative advantages to mutual benefit while strengthening individual and institutional capacities.

• Enabling environment for implementation, initially through evidence-based advocacy, communication and widespread stakeholder awareness and engagement to generate enabling policies and institutions, then by ensuring the stakeholder support required for the sustainable implementation of program for African agricultural innovation. Key to these outcomes is the delivery of three important results, which respond to the strategic priorities expressed by FARA’s clients.

These are:

Key Result 1: Stakeholders empowered to determine how the sector should be transformed and to undertake collective actions in a gender-sensitive manner.

Key Result 2: Strengthened and integrated continental capacity that responds to stakeholder demands in a gender-sensitive manner.

Key Result 3: Enabling environment for increased AR4D investment and implementation of agricultural innovation systems in a gender-sensitive manner.

FARA’s development partners are the African Development Bank (AfDB), the Canadian Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and
Development (DFATD), CGIAR, the Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA), the UK’s Department for International Development (DFID), the European Commission (EC), the governments of the Netherlands and Italy, the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD), the Australian Agency for International Development
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