

## Context Paper Five

# Mainstreaming Gender in Participatory Watershed Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation

### Background

The moment the issue of participation in watershed management is mentioned, a question arises: who are the participants? Krosschell (1997) discusses this in detail and attributes achievement of sub-optimal results to gender-blind project formulations. She lists five myths about gender in watershed management which are responsible for the invisible position of women in the ecosystem.

- Women only do domestic work
- Each member of the family shares benefits equally
- Technology will automatically benefit both men and women equally
- Women's voices will be heard through their male counterparts
- Women are incompetent at carrying out certain activities

### Disproving this hypothesis are some bare facts about women

- Women constitute half the world's population
- Women perform two-third of the world's work hours
- Women receive one-tenth of the world's income
- Women own less than 1/100th of the world's property

The debate on women in development started in the 1970s when development projects failed to yield desired results. At this time the complete absence and invisibility of half of the world's population on the development project design forum was recognised and accepted by planners and policy-makers. Gradually, women in development (WID) programmes were replaced by the 'gender and development' concept in which gender-related activities and impacts are examined from a broader perspective and not restricted to women only.

All over the world, commonalities amongst gender roles and responsibilities are affected by the circumstances of women's lives (Thomas-Slayter, 1993). These include the following.

- environment
- economic conditions
- occupation

- class
- culture
- national history
- household circumstances
- legal structures
- religion

As resource productivity declines across the globe, the cash economy pushes people towards wage earning, in both rural and urban areas. This global phenomenon affects rural communities through:

- extensive out-migration,
- more time-intensive work for those left behind,
- growing number of women-led households,
- newly-acquired responsibilities of women without access to resources,
- new norms and expectations in fragmented families,
- changes in gender and generational perspectives, and
- shifts from exchange work groups to wage labour.

The transformations are driven by a number of localised variables and watershed inhabitants have a very special role in ecological balance:

- transforms gender roles,
- leads to out-migration,
- increases the hours women work,
- pushes rural men and women to find new methods for protecting and stretching their livelihoods, and
- precipitates further decline of the resource base.

### Examples Where Needs Are Generated

The following case studies outline increases in women's drudgery due to ecosystem degradation.

- Karnataka, India - Social forestry was designed to reduce the pressure for biomass on the forest. The forest department afforested degraded lands with exotic cash species after consulting 'people'. Women subsequently had to travel further to collect fuelwood for daily use.



- Garhwal, India - Biogas plants were commissioned to save women's time. The slurry had to be moistened with water. Carrying this extra water to the biogas plants takes more hours of women's time than was required to collect fuelwood for household use.
- Machakos, Kenya: Women previously got water from sand. Nairobi builders removed sand for construction purposes and women had to travel five hours further to collect water.

## Why Design Gender-sensitive Plans?

Identifying the problem is the first step in the process of evolving gender-sensitive strategies to address development concerns in watershed ecosystems. A set of tools has been developed to carry out exercises leading to facts about 'what is' and 'what could have been' in a logical way, respecting the existence and giving weightage to women's opinions. Some questions arising out of women's invisibility are discussed below.

- Where are the women in upland watersheds?

It is important to identify the lacunae and gaps in knowledge about the presence of women in watershed management plans. Women are the most important vectors of watershed ecosystems as resource users and resource losers. Any planning intervention affects them directly (and not indirectly, as many authors state). Often the managers unconsciously leave out women during participatory planning sessions. At the same time, women, due to set norms and traditions, do not notice being left out. Their direct concerns with the watershed may be: replenishing the supply of water from streams and visiting the forest for fuelwood, fodder, medicinal plants, and non-timber forest produce for subsistence.

- What are the basic or practical needs and strategic interests?

Starting with the planning process, women's linkages with natural resources must be identified. Supplying and collecting household water, fuelwood, and fodder are basically women's jobs. Any intervention that alters the supply, consumption, or management patterns of these resources directly impacts the time women spend. Basic needs may be fulfilled by short-term plans while fulfilling strategic needs requires bringing about structural changes over a long period of time. Where long-term structural changes are intended, identifying and analysing all possible linkages of development interventions are crucial.

### Caselet – from Garhwal, India

The introduction of a hybrid variety of cow yields more milk. This leads to economic upliftment, but supplying hybrid bulls is far from helpful in subsistence

agriculture. This is because the small cropping terraces in the hills need bullocks with humps which can jump up and down easily. The bulls from hybrid cows without humps cannot jump, and so a parallel army of native bulls has to be maintained. They are also fed fodder, thereby multiplying the burden of fodder collection on women. This is why women's participation in planning is required before introducing such interventions. Forest areas have also been put under pressure for more fodder.

This intervention was clearly designed to address a strategic interest. It has increased economic outputs for men from selling the extra milk; at the same time, however, it has increased the time consumption of women. This caselet answers the first question: What is getting better and what is getting worse as a result of a development intervention? The assumption that people do not respond enthusiastically to this disproportionate distribution of resources may also be answered by this example.

- Division of labour between genders - The division of labour between men and women is very peculiar in the developing world. Women's work includes most of the economically unproductive household activities which go unnoticed because no price is paid for this work. Tradition assumes them to be women's duty. During planning meetings, one of the following situations may arise regarding women's active participation.

- Women do not come at all because the scheduling is such they are busy elsewhere and do not prioritise the meetings over and above their other occupations.
- Women come and participate in neutral or passive ways, neutral when no one bothers to communicate with them and passive when certain gender-specific programmes are thrust upon them.
- Women follow what is happening and can express themselves when people are willing to listen to them. This is an ideal situation out of which the most productive results are obtained.

- Barriers to Women's Participation:

The barriers to participation in expression and communication apparent in the first two situations above result from three causes.

- Situational - Women are busy with household chores and find participation inconvenient because ultimately this will add extra working hours for them. They want to finish their work quickly.
- Dispositional - Traditions restrict women from talking before their elders, unknown and outside persons, and even in the presence of their adult sons. They live with the notion that they remain

under the protective cover and natural advice of father, father-in-law, brother, husband, and son. They feel no need to overcome these social boundaries.

**Institutional** - Managers and facilitators of the programme planning process often use slogans loaded with words like 'people', 'below the poverty line', 'beneficiaries', or 'children' without internalising these words to always refer to men and women, boys and girls. This is a major reason why women remain invisible during the planning or monitoring stages of watershed development programmes. In addition, these managers see women as resource-depleting agents and over time have developed a certain aversion to their presence. This hinders them from taking the initiative to include women in the processes. These factors hamper successful implementation of watershed development projects aimed at equitable delivery of social goods and services. Thus, women's drudgery is not reduced and female literacy rates, food quality, or health status are not improved. Legal provisions favouring women generally turn to be neutral or passive. In most Indian states, equitable distribution of land between male and female offspring is provided for by law, but the practice of sisters waiving rights to their shares in favour of their brothers is based on deeply-ingrained traditional understandings. Contrary to this, the provisions in Nepal are heavily male-biased, leaving no room for claims on family land by women (Anonymous 1994).

### Tools of Gender Analysis

Various usable tools have been developed to identify and measure the participation of women in development interventions. Kabeer (1994) developed the Gender Analytical Framework (GAF) to work out causes and effects in terms of institutional sites against vectors as rules, resources, practices, and people involved. The concept of socioeconomic gender analysis floated by Thomas-Slayter (1995) also holds good for explaining the impact of several vectors working in tandem with the social status. Kabeer's explanation, however, is simple and the objectivity is greater for testing the strength of any intervention at various institutional sites.

Different strategies planned to address structural changes desired in the current system may be analysed through the GAF to test their success and identify lacunae which need further probing and redress. One instance of a development intervention providing a biogas plant to a village is worked out below to highlight the issues of what went wrong and who lost from this long-term solution which was envisaged in plans to alleviate women's drudgery.

The instance quoted above reveals the gap between goals envisaged in the plans and the results achieved in reality.

Kabeer's concept of GAF has provided an acid test designed to authenticate the practical value of development interventions while other authors have offered a number of profile analytical tools which directly test their dispositions. The presence of various factors, contexts, resources, and gender roles at these institutional sites results in a musical chair-like game. This is especially evident in the context of developing nations where interventions aimed at rural support and empowerment from within are important vectors of much sought-after sustainable means of development. Wilde and Vainio-Mattila (1995) and Thomas-Slayter et al. (1995) have hypothesised the objectives of using these tools. In the context of participatory watershed management, the objectives of gender analysis may be as follow.

- To multiply the effectiveness of integrated development by using gender-disaggregated information on the separate linkages of men and women with different components of a watershed.
- To lead to positive social impacts of watershed management in terms of the access of men and women to resources derived or used from watersheds.
- To increase the possibility of success as targets are singled out, complex webs of interactive institutional sites identified, and then specific strategies designed to address development needs.
- To SEE the three principles of Sustainability, Equity and Effectiveness.
- To help make efficient use of scarce, limited resources by the community - the most significant reason.

The Gender Analytical Framework refers to answers developed to key questions related to the process of investigating the roles played by men and women in any

**Table 1: Gender Analytical Framework**

Institutional Site	Rules	Practice	Resources	People	Power
1. State	To install a biogas plant in homes which can't afford fuelwood				
2. Community	To install it in less affluent households				
3. Household	Women will maintain it				
4. Market					



given place at a given time. One framework may not be suitable for different places at the same time or for the same place at different times. Four major steps are identified in this exercise.

### **First Step - Context Profile or Force-Field Analysis or SWOL Analysis**

In a watershed ecosystem, the major patterns affecting development are as follow.

- Environmental: topography, biomass, water resources, soil erosion, recharge
- Social: education, health, population
- Institutional: what development agencies are visiting the area and with which schemes and programmes? to whom do they talk? with men or/and women?
- Political: Community dynamics amongst people, class, caste, power, leadership and usufructuary sharing
- Economic: income, tools and technology and access to work types by men and women

This analysis answers who gets what and who needs what.

Before querying gender roles, looking at the context in which the probe is carried out gives an overview of vectors working in the physical and biological environment along with their enabling and hindering intensities. A number of further findings are correlated with these vectors.

**Second Step - The Gender Analysis Activity Profile (GAAP)** describes the context of the watershed where one is trying to analyse who does what? where? and when? GAAP is designed to probe the linkages of each gender with the time and location of the activities they carry out. Knowing the sites where the two genders work makes planning programmes easier. The site of these activities may be one of the following.

- State holdings like government-owned lands, forests, uplands, and lowlands where common property resources of fodder fuelwood, and water are distributed. These are the seats of productive as well as reproductive activities.
- Community common lands with rights and reservations of the community, yet whose uses are decided by community activities.
- Markets where economic forces are working to decide barter returns and returns for other productive activities.
- Households where mostly reproductive activities related to maintenance are carried out and significant time is consumed.

GAPP answers the questions who does what in terms of gender. This profile can also draw out the amount of time invested by each sex on a daily basis.

### **Third Step - Resource Access and Control Profile**

This defines which resources of a watershed are available to women and men separately and who uses them, who derives benefit from them, and who controls them. The resources may be the means of agricultural and animal production, land, capital, labour, knowledge or skill, opportunities for income and employment, health services, etc. It is also necessary to differentiate between access and control as women's access to small wood from an agroforestry plantation may not imply that they control the plot for its economic returns over a rotation period.

The locations in terms of institutional sites of these resources may also restrict their use or control by women. For instance, most of the resources and services of the state and market are apparently inaccessible to women unless designed for a woman-specific use (like sewing machine and stitching training schemes). This indicates who needs what and who gets what.

### **Fourth Step - Programme Action Profile**

For strategic planning, information generated through steps I, II, and III is used as raw material and projected in the framework to address the desired activities with special reference to participation from men or women. This step also defines the course of action desirable to make their specific participation possible at intended work sites. Individual opinions on future action plans from men and women may yield useful recommendations referring to changes in the primary project structure in order to make it viable and beneficial, especially to women (Anonymous 1994).

## **Means of Analytical Framework**

RRA tools help in collecting gender-disaggregated information. These tools may help identify the perspectives in which participatory watershed management has to be carried out and the vital linkages to focus on, e.g., livestock, forestry, and agriculture. RRA also identifies five gender-specific aspects:

- Co-operation
- Complementarity
- Co-existence
- Competition
- Conflict

With these strengths, the gender analysis provides a strong base for planning, implementing, monitoring, and evaluating interventions addressing upland watershed ecosystem needs.

Various tools of PRA can be tested in this framework for the four aforementioned profiles.

**Table 2: PRA Tools for Gender Analysis**

S. No	Profile Tool	Framework of PRA as a tool for GA			
		Context	Activity	Resource	Action
1.	Mapping/modelling	✓		✓	
2.	Transect	✓		✓	
3.	Seasonal Analysis		✓	✓	
4.	Trend diagramming	✓			
5.	Matrix Ranking		✓	✓	✓
6.	Wealth Ranking			✓	
7.	Chapatti/Venn Diagram	✓		✓	
8.	SWOL				✓

These tools may simultaneously elicit information required for more than one analytical framework. Since it is an almost foolproof method of appraising resources, conditions and services, it is used widely in GAF.

**Bangladesh: Chandpur Irrigation Project (CIP)** - The CIP was designed to (i) increase agricultural production, (ii) increase agricultural employment, and (iii) improve the living standards of the people in the area. It finally resulted in (i) increase in paddy output -> increased poultry raising by women -> marketing by husbands and sons. (ii) People had to buy home food ten times more than their neighbours as winter crops were not grown for subsistence in CIP villages. (iii) Women in non-CIP villages derived 20% of their income from vegetable sales compared to 5% in CIP villages. (iv) Investments on male child education went up while dowry rates increased for girl children. (v) Continuous electricity supply failures hampered farmers' plans, causing deduction in expected outputs (Overholt 1991).

This case study strongly suggests what happens to development interventions and can be tested on gender analysis profiles for:

- what is getting better?
- what is getting worse?
- who does what?
- who has what?
- who needs what? and
- how to bridge gaps between the needs of men and women and what development delivers?

**India: Adgaon and Kamalpur** - The Participatory and Integrated Development of Watersheds (PIDW) showed a few striking patterns emerging in both locations. In both, different castes and communities have had different starting points of advantage and lack of privilege. The absence of women in core areas of watershed management has resulted in a skewed capacity base between men and women. Organising Sanghas by MYRADA in Kamalpur offered opportunities for women to be introspective about their issues and created platforms for sharing. This enabled them to achieve representation in district-level committees. It also enlarged the work universe of men with stronger empowerment. In Adgaon, women were not included in plans and the amount of work carried out by them increased, while economic gains

to men increased. The striking fact is that there was no assumed change in their identity (Ramaswamy and Vasudevan).

## Selected References

- Anonymous, 1994. *Gender Assessment Study: A Guide for Policy Staff*. The Netherlands: Special Programme Women and Development, DGIC.
- Thomas - Slayter, B., Esser, A.L. and Shields, M.D. 1993. *Tools of Gender Analysis*. Worcester: ECOGEN Research Project, I.D.P., Clark University.
- Thomas - Slayter, B., Polestico, R., LeeEsser, A., Taylor, O., and E. Mutua, 1995. *A Manual for Socio-economic and Gender Analysis: Responding to the Development Challenge*. Worcester: ECOGEN Research Project, Clark University.
- Kabeer, N., 1994. *Reversed Realities; Gender Hierarchies in Development Thought*. London/New York: Versoi.
- Kröschell, C., 1997 'The Integration of Gender into Participatory Watershed Management Programme: A review and Some Suggestions'. In Sharma, P.N. (ed) *Participatory Processes for Integrated Watershed Management*. Kathmandu: FAO.
- Moser, C.O.N. and Levy, K., 1986. *A Theory and Methodology of Gender Planning, Meeting Women's Practical and Strategic Gender Needs*. London: University College.
- Overholt, C.A., Cloud, K., Anderson, M.B., and Austin, J.E., 1991. 'Gender Analysis Framework, 9-22'. In Rao, A., Anderson, M.B., and Overholt, C.A. (eds) *Gender Analysis in Dev. Planning: A Case Book*. Connecticut, USA: Kumarian Press.
- Ramaswamy, U. and Vasudevan, B. 19. *Watershed: Gender Process, Parts I & II*. Swiss Development Co-operation.
- Wilde, V. L. and Vainio - Mattila, A., 1995. *Gender Analysis and Forestry: Int. Training Package*. Rome: FAO - Forest Trees and People Programme.