



M4P AND WOMEN'S ECONOMIC EMPOWERMENT

PHASE 2: GUIDELINES FOR INCORPORATING WEE INTO M4P PROGRAMMES ©

CONSULTATION DOCUMENT

DFID

M4P Hub

May 2012

ACRONYMS

Alliances KK	Market Alliances Against Poverty in Kvemo Kartli
Alliance SJ	Market Alliances Against Poverty in Samtskhe-Javakheti
DFID	Department for International Development
GEMS	Growth and Employment in States
GEMS1	Support to Meat and Leather
GEMS2	Construction and Real Estate Sector
GEMS3	Support Improved Business Environment
ICCN	International Center on Conflict and Negotiation
M4P	Making Markets Work for the Poor
M&E	Monitoring and evaluation
NGO	Non-governmental organization
ProPCom	Promoting Pro-Poor Opportunities in Commodity and Service Markets
RAMP	Rural Access and Mobility Project
SDC	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
Sida	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
Springfield	The Springfield Centre for Business in Development
TOR	Terms of reference
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
VCA	Value chain analysis
WEAI	Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index
WEE	Women's Economic Empowerment

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Our sincere appreciation and thanks to Helen Bradbury and Davidson Highfill and their staff in Georgia and to Paul Weijers and other GEMS project staff in Nigeria, for their exceptional support to our project visits and the information and thoughts they have so freely shared with us. We also acknowledge Roger Oakeley the M4P Hub Manager for his able technical guidance and Adam Brain of Coffey International for his ongoing administrative and logistical support. Our meetings with busy representatives from DFID, SDC and project implementing partners were extremely valuable—thank you.

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PART A – WORK DONE, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS

1	BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES	3
2	DRAFT FRAMEWORK AND APPROACH TO THE FIELDWORK	4
3	MAIN FINDINGS	5
3.1	Nigeria – Comparison of the GEMS’ WEE/gender approach and the WEE/M4P framework	5
3.2	Georgia – Comparison of the Alliances’ WEE/gender approach and WEE/M4P framework	8
3.3	Main challenges and opportunities	10
4	CONCLUSIONS AND NEXT STEPS	15

PART B – MAINSTREAMING WOMEN’S ECONOMIC EMPOWERMENT – A GOOD PRACTICE NOTE

1	WHAT AND WHY	16
2	HOW DOES IT WORK?	17
3	KEY FACTORS FOR SUCCESS	26
4	FURTHER READING	32

ANNEX 1 – PRIMARY RESOURCES

ANNEX 2 – MAIN DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

ANNEX 3 – NOTE ON PROJECT SITE VISITS

ANNEX 4 – COMPARISON OF PROJECT WEE APPROACHES TO THE DRAFT FRAMEWORK

ANNEX 5 – FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT WEE/M4P FRAMEWORK

ENDNOTES

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Study context and objectives: Making Markets Work for the Poor (M4P) is an approach to making market systems work more effectively, sustainably and beneficially for the poor and so reduce poverty for large numbers of women and men. As experience with the approach is gained and investment made in a growing portfolio of projects, there is an increasing recognition of the need, potential and challenges in terms of scale and sustainability. There is also the recognition that the market development agenda, practice and outcomes as defined by donors is changing and still evolving. The private sector development approaches of aid agencies (e.g., DFID, USAID, SDC and Sida) have moved substantially in the last decade towards market-based economic engagement with the poor, and more recently, towards Women's Economic Empowerment (WEE) and gender equality. A shared agenda has emerged for donors and practitioners in the WEE and M4P fields, that recognises it cannot be assumed that equal access of women and men to economic, social and political opportunities exists, and that aims to contribute to redressing this. This requires a better understanding and response from development agencies generally, including those working with M4P and WEE approaches.

A discussion paper for an M4P WEE framework was therefore commissioned by the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) on behalf of the M4P Hub, written by Dr. Linda Jones for the Springfield (UK) Centre for Business in Development¹. The paper aimed to initiate and support a process for developing recommendations and guidance for better addressing WEE in M4P projects. It included a concept of an analytical framework for doing so. The present assignment, commissioned by the Department for International Development (DFID), also for the M4P Hub, focused on the further development of a WEE/M4P framework and guidelines for use by M4P practitioners based on experience on the ground. It draws on lessons and experience of development practitioners as well as donors, and particularly those dedicated to the M4P approach, in efforts to better understand and address the systemic constraints that face poor women and poor men.

The common elements of definitions of women's economic empowerment used by major donors are:²

- Economic advancement – increased income and return on labour
- Access to opportunities and life chances such as skills development or job openings
- Access to assets, services and needed supports to advance economically
- Decision-making authority in different spheres including household finances

It is in this sense that WEE will be used in this report. WEE may entail changes in relation to practical gender needs (arising in the context of existing gender roles) as well as strategic gender needs (requiring changes in existing gender roles). Given projects' limited duration and the need to deliver the results stipulated by donors, in practice M4P projects often focus on practical gender needs and women's economic roles, though there is by no means a consensus that this should be so.

Overview of the work: The assignment began with a review of gender mainstreaming and analysis frameworks and research, including the discussion paper prepared by Linda Jones.

The consultants, Roel Hakemulder and Emily Miller developed a set of questions from these materials which formed the basis of a draft analytical WEE/M4P framework structured along the M4P five phase project cycle. The draft framework was discussed with M4P and WEE project practitioners in Nigeria and Georgia for validation and revision. The consultants also reviewed and discussed the project WEE strategies and compared them to the draft WEE/M4P framework. These reviews, comments and suggestions, from the project practitioners' experiences in integrating WEE into an M4P project, are reported on in Part A of the report. They form the basis of a Good Practice Note on mainstreaming WEE presented in part B of the report, which includes a set of questions and lessons learned on key factors for success. This is intended to become part of the M4P Operational Guide (2008).

Key factors for success: The main lessons on key factors for success in mainstreaming WEE in M4P included in the Good Practice Note are outlined below. Some of the lessons are, at this stage, challenges with which projects are still grappling.

- It is important to integrate WEE into the project cycle from the very start. Gender should be integrated into the M&E and impact assessment system from the start as well.
- WEE should therefore be included in the strategic framework and logframe for a project. This should make explicit what the WEE objectives are within the broader context of how the project defines poverty and what the poverty reduction objectives are, and whether gender specific constraints will be addressed.
- If WEE is a high priority, a market system should be selected with scope for WEE when tradeoffs are understood with regard to growth potential of a sector and a market system that includes many women.
- Good research forms the basis for mainstreaming WEE. Integrating gender analysis into the market system analysis is an effective way to ensure this happens. This benefits from taking into account context factors such as class or ethnicity.
- The analysis should consider rules and their implementation such as legislation or informal rules about what is culturally acceptable. This enhances the potential for impact on large(r) numbers.
- Women's ability to make use of economic opportunities can be improved by considering interventions for constraints rooted in women's reproductive, productive and community roles beyond the selected market system. This includes their disproportionate role within the care economy of paid and unpaid work, inside and outside the household, which constitutes a special burden to women and a challenge to private sector development projects.
- As for all M4P interventions, it is important to be able to make a "business case" for those that contribute to WEE. Women are a large potential market is the underlying argument of many of these business cases.
- Interventions that contribute to WEE include those that target men and women, as well as those that specifically target women. The goal is equal opportunities in the market system, not equal treatment by a project.
- Intervention planning should consider and predict the potential impact on WEE. Gender analysis makes this possible, but research does not stop once initial studies for the analysis of the market system are done.
- Research and interventions gain from including and considering the public sector, NGOs and civil society.
- Reaching scale is a challenge for most projects at this stage of development in WEE/M4P because market players that respond to the case for WEE are often small and not perceived as market leaders. Projects are still experimenting with ways to achieve this.
- Capacity in a project is a prerequisite for success in WEE and there are successful precedents in M4P of integrating multiple skills sets in intervention teams. This can be a model in integrating and embedding gender specialists needed for M4P WEE.

The authors and the M4P Hub invite practitioners, donors and other partners to provide their own reality based experiences (to the M4P Hub) as they arise in the mainstreaming of WEE into M4P projects as well as views and experiences that are in contrast to those provided in this initial guide.

1 BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

The M4P Hub tasked the design and implementation of a short term consultancy for developing recommendations and guidance for mainstreaming sustainable women's economic empowerment (WEE) into M4P projects and programmes³. This was accomplished by:

1. A review of the document: Discussion Paper for an M4P WEE Framework: How can the Making Markets Work for the Poor Framework work for poor women and for poor men?⁴⁵ and development of questions/review methodology to 'ground truth' the findings and recommendations of the discussion paper;
2. Review and consideration of other leading guides and analyses of women's economic empowerment and gender integration into development programmes; and
3. Project site visits to M4P projects in Nigeria (the three GEMS – Growth and Employment Markets in States – projects) and Georgia (the two Market Alliances Against Poverty projects) with women's economic empowerment (WEE) strategies and experience.

Two international consultants were contracted for this assignment and facilitated through Coffey International. The Lead Consultant Mr. Roel Hakemulder, is a specialist in the development, conduct and review of M4P projects across Africa, Asia, and Eastern Europe. Ms. Emily Miller, the Women's Economic Empowerment Specialist, is a business development specialist who works in the design and evaluation of market development programmes and gender strategies for USAID and EU throughout Africa and in southern and Eastern Europe.

The assignment was launched in February 2012 with a detailed review of Dr. Jones's discussion paper and other internationally recognized gender mainstreaming frameworks and research.⁶ From this, a set of questions were developed that M4P programmes may need to address along the M4P five phase project cycle in order to be most effective in addressing WEE priorities. The main output, an analytical WEE framework reviewed and validated by M4P project practitioners in Nigeria and Georgia, ultimately becomes the basis of key questions and issues for M4P project practitioners to consider on how their M4P projects can better address and integrate WEE needs and priorities.

Part A of this final report details the draft framework and approach to the fieldwork, main findings from the comparison between the strategies of projects visited in Nigeria and Georgia and the M4P/WEE framework (referred to as the framework), challenges and opportunities foreseen in the implementation of the strategies. Conclusions and next steps are offered based on the analysis and project visits and direct feedback on the framework. Part B of the report is oriented to M4P and WEE project practitioners and provides a Good Practice Note modelled after those in the "Operational Guide for the M4P Approach"⁷, including a WEE/M4P Framework that provides key questions and issues to consider by M4P WEE project practitioners.

2 THE DRAFT FRAMEWORK AND APPROACH TO THE FIELDWORK

The draft analytical WEE/M4P framework developed for this assignment built on the framework included in Dr. Jones's paper. It draws on the M4P operational guide in terms of the questions the guide includes as well as structure (it follows the 5-phase project cycle). The draft framework also takes into account gender analysis approaches, including those of SDC and DFID, various Nigeria GEMS project documents and SDC Georgia papers⁸. Key underlying issues that are reflected in four guiding lines of enquiry are:

1. What are the gender roles relevant to the selected market systems, including division of labour and women's unpaid work?
2. What access to and control over do women and men have to resources and support functions and how are they different?
3. How do the "rules" (legislation, regulations, informal norms) in the selected market systems affect women and men, and how is this different?
4. What gender needs (practical – in relation to existing gender roles; strategic – in relation to possible change in gender roles) do women and men have and how best to mainstream efforts to facilitate and meet gender needs?

This approach is in principle compatible with the M4P market system framework as well as with gender analysis. Considering the questions project staff need to ask themselves according to the different steps in the project cycle is also compatible with other approaches, such as USAID's and the ILO's gender mainstreaming efforts in agricultural and other value chain projects⁹.

Our approach to validation of the framework and development of guidelines was as follows:

Step 1: Find out as much as possible from project teams and other stakeholders in Nigeria and Georgia, through interviews of key project staff and project documentation, what staff have actually done during each of the M4P project cycle stages, in terms of analytical framework (questions asked) as well as guidelines (how to do it), and what worked and did not. An important line of questioning was how findings from one phase affected the next, e.g. how did findings on male and female division of labour affect the design of interventions?

Step 2: Compare the findings from above with the draft analytical framework – this could result in some questions in the framework being validated, while others could be added or dropped.

Step 3: Ask project team members and other relevant stakeholders for each of the project cycle phases 1) Would the questions we have in our analytical framework (in addition to those they have asked themselves) have been useful to consider? 2) Why or why not? 3) Make an effort to obtain a rough ranking or other prioritization. This could again validate some of the questions in the framework, while others could prove less important or not useful at all.

Step 4: Ask direct feedback from project team members on how to make a WEE framework relevant to their work and practical to employ.

A note on the Nigeria and Georgia project visits including interview sources, methodology and approach can be found in Annex 3. In addition to the projects in Nigeria and Georgia, our conclusions and the framework also draw on the review of documents of the Katalyst (Bangladesh) and Promoting Pro-Poor Opportunities in Commodity and Service Markets (PrOpCom, Nigeria) projects, and on the SDC "e-discussion on M4P and WEE", held in the second half of March and the beginning of April. The authors of this guide contributed to this discussion.

3 MAIN FINDINGS

3.1 Nigeria – Comparison of the GEMS' WEE/gender approach and the WEE/M4P framework¹⁰

GEMS 2 – Construction and real estate sector

The goal of the DFID-funded Growth and Employment in States (GEMS) programme is to reduce poverty in selected states in Nigeria by increasing growth, incomes and jobs in selected industrial sectors that have been identified as having strong potential to contribute to this goal. GEMS applies the M4P approach. For GEMS 2, implemented by Coffey International, the construction and real estate sector was selected.

The GEMS 2 inception phase in 2010 resulted in the project being reformulated from a sector development to an M4P project. At DFID's request WEE was added on to the project in early 2011. The project therefore did not finalize its gender mainstreaming strategy until the end of September 2011. Because the project is in its early stages—initial implementation as well as ongoing programme design and testing—no mainstreamed gender interventions have started. There is therefore no empirical evidence to validate either the gender strategy or the framework against. In hindsight, GEMS 2 did not serve as the optimal M4P project for validating the WEE/M4P analytical framework.

As WEE was not part of the original project design agreed with DFID, sector selection did not take the potential for WEE into account. The project estimates that only 0.4% of those employed in the Nigerian construction sector are women. The scope for WEE is therefore limited. While GEMS 2 background reports identify systemic constraints in the construction industry, since they were written before WEE was added constraints on women's participation were also not analysed. The project logframe so far included no indicators or targets for outreach to women, but these are now being agreed on. Disaggregation by sex is foreseen for relevant indicators. There are no indicators for WEE that go beyond increases in income and work (e.g. decision making authority). While project team members expressed doubts about the usefulness of targets for outreach to women (they would be "unrealistic"), DFID regarded them as critical to keeping WEE at the core of the project strategy. It is clear that without a well-defined logframe that included WEE, and as a consequence without analytical work that addressed WEE, setting targets was so far neither possible nor useful. On the other hand, WEE has been incorporated now, and once a baseline study and further analytical work has been completed, there is no reason why WEE should have no targets while other goals and outcomes do. Setting and revising targets while implementation is ongoing is also in line with M4P practice.¹¹

The project has a part-time international and a part-time national gender adviser, whose main roles are the development of a gender strategy and supporting its implementation, screening proposed interventions, and building staff capacity. In part because they are not full-time, their work is not yet optimally integrated in the project team's. They function as "gate keepers" rather than as equal members of the planning and implementation team, which limits the contribution they can make.

The goal of the project's gender strategy is to:

"Increase opportunities for women to participate in and receive benefits equal to men across a wider range of employment and help them move from low-paid casual work to longer term sustainable positions"¹².

This covers addressing women's needs in existing roles (practical needs) as well as the need for their taking on new roles (strategic needs). It does not cover women's decision making authority, which is a key element of most definitions of WEE¹³.

The key characteristics of the project's approach to achieving this are:

- Acceptance of the M4P principles (facilitation of systemic, sustainable change that reaches scale).
- Addition of a gender lens, which includes consideration of women's work outside the selected sector, values and norms, and power differences.

- Integrating gender into the programme management cycle through:
 1. A basic gender analysis for each intervention when women and men are expected to be affected differently.
 2. Integrating gender into intervention plans rather than adding new interventions for women; intervention plans should include a statement on gender sensitivity.
 3. Screening of intervention plans by a gender specialist.
 4. Results chains that foresee disaggregation by sex of targets and data.
 5. Disaggregation by sex of indicators in logframe, M&E framework.
- Implementation strategies include:
 1. Promoting inclusion of gender equality as good practice in the industry.
 2. Attracting more women to work in semi-skilled and skilled levels (i.e. non-traditional occupations), for instance through use of role models.
 3. Advocacy for gender equality.
- Broadening the scope to “social” interventions is not foreseen.
 1. Use of a Challenge Fund to support work where changes in attitudes or aspirations are needed to remove barriers to opportunities, focus on taking up non-traditional careers.
- Developing a capacity and systems in the project that can deliver this and that reflect gender equality.

While this strategy has been documented, it largely still has to be operationalised. Gender analyses had not yet been conducted at the time of the project visit, and while intervention plans do include a statements on gender these are therefore still superficial and largely based on anecdotal knowledge and untested conceptions. Results chains and M&E frameworks do foresee disaggregation by sex. The Challenge Fund is only just considering first proposals.

On the whole, the strategy confirms the draft WEE/M4P framework. This includes the need for integrating WEE into the programme management cycle, the need for gender analysis, and the possibility to address practical and strategic gender needs. However, there are also some key differences:

- The framework foresees integration of WEE from the very start. This was not possible in the case of GEMS 2 because WEE was initially not prioritised by the donor.
- The framework more explicitly requires analysis of gender roles beyond the selected market system because these affect roles in the market system and the potential for positive change.
- The framework explicitly includes consideration of who has decision making authority, in accordance with the definition of WEE.
- The framework places more emphasis on building on the incentives of market actors: in the GEMS 2 gender strategy it is not always clear *why* partners or market actors should change their behaviour (for instance why they should market their products or provide information to women and men, rather than men only), or how such incentives can be identified. Without these incentives systemic, durable change and scale are unlikely and only few women will benefit.
- The framework foresees the possibility of separate interventions that address constraints that are specific to women.
- The framework does not cover the need for developing a WEE capacity and systems in projects. Interviewees agreed this is critical to the success of mainstreaming gender into interventions.

GEMS 1 and 3 – Meat and Leather; Policy and Legislation

The focus of our work was GEMS 2 and we have not analysed GEMS 1 and 3 in the same depth. GEMS 1 deals with the meat and leather sector, while GEMS 3 works on policy and legislation. Both projects are in an early stage of implementation, and there is still no empirical evidence to validate either their gender strategy or the WEE/M4P framework against.

GEMS 1 has the same limited scope to affect WEE as GEM 3. The sector was selected before WEE became part of the project's strategic framework, and some 97% of those working in this sector are men. The project does not have its own gender strategy. It plans to use the overall GEMS WEE strategy (see below).

Because the logframe has a gender-related output (combined with CSR and the environment) considerable work has been done to understand gender roles in the market system. Disaggregation by sex of data was done from the start.

As part of its strategy to reach gender targets, the project proposed to work in the poultry sector, dominated by women in small-scale production. This was rejected by DFID and overall GEMS management as the future for the poultry sector was thought to be in industrial scale production. In other words, potential for WEE was overruled by perceived market system development priorities. We are not aware of whether other options for WEE were considered, for instance with regard to women moving into larger scale production, or being outgrowers for larger producers. This experience also indicates the need for explicitly considering trade-offs between interventions for WEE and economic growth priorities. The transformation to industrial scale poultry production is likely to take a considerable period of time. Supporting small-scale producers could have had benefits in the medium-term, meanwhile.

GEMS 3 addresses land administration and tax reform as well as investment promotion. Like the other two projects it was transformed into an M4P project in early 2011, while its gender strategy dates from April 2011. Around 40% of people who will be affected by the project are expected to be women. There is therefore much more scope for WEE than in GEMS 1 and 2.

The project's gender strategy and the WEE/M4P framework agree with each other in some important respects. They both see gender analysis as an integral part of the full project cycle. Interventions that include women as well as those that target women specifically are considered legitimate. On the other hand, the strategy does not explicitly take M4P as a starting point, and takes gender equality as its goal, not just more economic empowerment for women. While the strategy does refer to the importance of making a business case for WEE, how market actors' incentives would be identified and addressed is not worked out. The WEE/M4P framework places greater emphasis on this key element of M4P's approach to sustainability.

The many proposals for activities in the strategy often depend on advocacy and awareness rising. Some could run the risk to become "hands-on" if market actors have no incentives to take on the suggested functions. This includes for instance the major efforts in government capacity building that are proposed, and support to land and tax agencies to become "model gender equality institutions". How this can be done in ways that are systemic (e.g. develop capacity in public administration training institutes, at universities?) remains to be worked out.

Overall GEMS WEE strategy

A WEE strategy that cuts across the GEMS programme was finalised in January 2012, following a workshop with the three project teams in December. Like the other strategies, implementation has only just commenced.

On the whole the framework and the WEE strategy confirm one another in terms of the process of WEE mainstreaming. The strategy does not, however, fully commit to M4P principles, as it states that gender related interventions should address market failures "as far as practical", and without "ideological application of the M4P approach"¹⁴. That is, it foresees that in some circumstances it may not be practical to apply M4P principles when mainstreaming WEE and the strategy's authors believe that application of M4P principles would be "ideological" in such cases. This creates the risk that

projects develop parallel WEE activities in which they revert to the traditional project role of providing direct support in order to achieve WEE objectives, to the detriment of sustainability and outreach. There do not seem to be either theoretical or experience-based reasons to believe that mainstreaming WEE into M4P requires direct support interventions. It is also contrary to the projects and DFID having agreed on M4P as the framework on which the projects are based. Moving from sector development projects to M4P and then partly away from M4P again as a result of including WEE is confusing and unlikely to produce the expected results in terms of outreach, sustainability and WEE.

It is useful to note that while GEMS 2 has a gender strategy that does not explicitly include increasing decision making authority of women, and GEMS 3 aims at gender equality, the overall strategy settles on women's economic empowerment, "in line with DFID's overarching concern with reducing poverty in Nigeria"¹⁵. Though WEE is not defined explicitly, the content of the strategy indicates women's decision making authority is included. In other words, after WEE had been added to the projects it took another nine months or so for DFID and the projects to reach a common understanding of what this meant. This should normally have happened at the time that the project's strategic framework was agreed on, and valuable time was lost.

3.2 Georgia – Comparison of the Alliances' WEE/gender approach and the WEE/M4P framework

The two projects Market Alliances against Poverty in Samtskhe-Javakheti (SJ) and in Kvemo Kartili (KK) are located in the South of Georgia. The first started in October 2008 and is now in its next three-year phase. The inception phase of the second started in February 2011 and was completed in September that year. Both projects use the M4P approach and have done so from the start (SJ following its first phase inception period). Both address systemic constraints in the dairy and beef markets, while KK also works in the sheep market. The projects are funded by SDC, and implemented by Mercy Corps in partnership with two Georgian NGOs.

Gender was mainstreamed as a "transversal (cross cutting) theme" in both projects from the start, though phase 1 of SJ did not aim to design interventions that were gender specific¹⁶. The projects do not have separately documented gender strategies and did not indicate there is a need for them. They consider their gender strategies as work in progress. The project strategies make reference to gender in several places and have a gender section. Mercy Corps' "Gender procedures" also govern the projects' work in this area, while SDC's gender toolkit is a further point of reference and has been used for gender analysis¹⁷. Both projects have in-house, full-time gender specialists.

Both projects aim at women's "equal access to services, inputs and markets".¹⁸ The projects' goal and purpose refer to poverty reduction and income increases, not to decision making authority, which is a key aspect of WEE as defined by the majority of donors¹⁹. However, governance is also a transversal theme, and a greater involvement of women in decision making at the community level is explicitly part of that.

The key characteristics of the projects' evolving gender mainstreaming strategies so far are:

- Acceptance of the M4P principles.
- Application of a gender lens, which includes consideration of women's work outside the selected sector, values and norms, and power differences.
- Integrating gender into the programme management cycle through:
 1. A market analysis that presents sex-disaggregated information, complemented by gender analysis. This also considered ethnicity.
 2. Design and implementation of interventions in a way that ensures the inclusion, where appropriate, of women. This can include interventions that target women in particular, if constraints are identified that are specific to them.

3. Envisaging how interventions could affect women and men differently. Additional research is done if necessary. Intervention plans have a “gender sensitivity” statement.
 4. Developing results chains that foresee disaggregation by sex of targets and data. Indicators specific to WEE could be included if appropriate to the intervention.
 5. Disaggregation by sex of indicators in logframe, M&E framework.
- Implementation strategies include:
 1. Addressing constraints on access women experience.
 2. Building on a “business case” for inclusion or targeting of women, i.e. addressing the incentives of market actors, whether in the private sector or Government.
 3. Using women who have (informal) leadership positions, as role models, champions, catalysts.
 4. Synergies with governance as a transversal theme, where women’s decision making authority in the community is tackled directly.
 - The possibility of interventions that address constraints rooted in gender roles outside the selected market systems (e.g. women’s reproductive roles) is not excluded.
 - Developing a capacity that can deliver this.

In terms of implementation, the projects have both done market system analyses, for which, among other things, focus group discussions were held for women and men separately. The reports present and analyse the disaggregated results. In addition, the projects have conducted gender analysis studies, in 2011, so too late to affect SJ’s first phase. The goal of the gender analyses was to contribute to the understanding of men’s and women’s roles in the selected value chains as well as in other economic and non-economic roles. The studies also assessed household, community and local government level decision-making processes. The intention was that this would inform the market analysis and intervention design, sensitise the projects to gender differences and serve as a baseline so that the impact on “women’s position” could be gauged²⁰.

KK’s interventions are largely still being developed or tested. Since it started earlier, SJ has done more implementation. This includes interventions that were designed specifically with women in mind, such as development of a newspaper supplement that provides agricultural information. The market research for this covered women and men separately.

Much of the projects’ current planning and practice is around the finding that while women have an important role in dairy in particular (and the other two value chains too), the implications of this are not well-understood by market actors. Input suppliers, service providers and the next levels in the value chain (milk collection centres, processors) promote and provide largely to men, while in fact much of the work is done by women. The projects aim to adjust this. For instance, the effectiveness of promoting better nutrition for livestock or providing information to improve milk hygiene can be much enhanced by feed providers and milk collection centres targeting women who are the primary caretakers of livestock. While artificial insemination is still largely men’s business, it is women’s role to recognise when cows are in heat. Having AI service providers offer them training on this will enhance AI’s success rate. Having agents of a manufacturer of veterinary drugs market to women and provide them with information and training on how to use the drugs will also improve their effectiveness. The “business case” is relatively easy to make in these cases: better information and skills for women will increase productivity and quality, and eventually markets, sales, profits. The projects’ experience demonstrates, though, that it may require intensive facilitation before men accept this. It should also be noted that it is too early to demonstrate the impact of such interventions on incomes.

While no interventions that target women mostly or only are operational yet, development of a credit product for women is under discussion.

As also pointed out in a gender mainstreaming review of SDC projects in the Caucasus²¹, no interventions are yet foreseen that address constraints on women's participation in the selected market systems that are rooted in roles *outside* these systems. For instance, the projects' analysis shows that women have very little time available to expand their work in e.g. the dairy value chain. This is partly due to child care responsibilities, and women have expressed the need for child care facilities. In fact, work under the projects' governance theme has contributed to women advocating for this with local government, and one municipality has agreed to budget for a child care centre. This success indicates that there may be opportunities for a more systemic approach to child care, i.e. developing the market system for this service in the project areas. Limitations on women's mobility, which are partly due to lack of transportation, and access to piped water are other constraints around which interventions leading to systemic change might be built²².

We are not in a position to here recommend or do the analysis and additional research to explore such opportunities. The projects are in too early a stage of implementation to have systematically considered them as well. Given that they have not excluded interventions such as these and they take an opportunistic approach to developing their programmes, they are well placed to do this at a later stage. Fully integrating the gender analysis findings into the market analysis would, in our opinion, be helpful for doing so. The relevance of constraints originating in women's roles outside the selected markets could then be made explicit and intervention points identified.

The projects' WEE mainstreaming strategy and practice, though not yet much advanced in implementation of interventions, confirm the draft WEE/M4P framework. Both include integration of WEE into the programme management cycle and project instruments (e.g. M&E), sex-disaggregated market analysis, gender analysis, and the possibility of interventions that target women. The strategy is not specific on whether strategic gender needs will be addressed, but in practice the projects do so under their governance theme. Making a business case for WEE is also central to the projects' work and what is proposed in the framework.

The projects also demonstrate the advantages of a clear agreement with the donor that WEE is a priority, and including it in the strategic framework. This has enabled the projects to mainstream WEE from the start. This is not to say that the projects' and SDC's understanding of gender mainstreaming is always the same, or static. While the projects' focus is on the selected market systems and impact on incomes, SDC's vision is evolving towards a broader concept of poverty, gender equality and making a contribution to human development. The gender mainstreaming review mission mentioned above was undertaken in this context and guiding notes for projects are under formulation. While in principle such support to projects could be useful, the experience from Nigeria indicates it would be counter-productive if this leads to revising strategic frameworks when projects are already underway. Moving the goal posts during the game does finally not benefit either the players or the audience.

3.3 Main challenges and opportunities

From the project visits to Nigeria and Georgia we identified the following *main challenges and needs* for the implementation of WEE mainstreaming strategies, most of them indicated by project staff themselves. This also draws on our review of documentation from Katalyst, PrOpCom, and the SDC e-discussion on mainstreaming WEE.

1. **Integrating WEE after start-up:** The GEMS projects in Nigeria had WEE mainstreaming imposed on them well after their inception phase. That meant that sectors had been selected without considering the scope for WEE, the project's strategic framework had already been drafted, and a market analysis had been done without adequate consideration of gender. The subsequent mainstreaming of WEE requires a significant adjustment with regard to capacity, analytical work done, the process of developing interventions, and M&E, which takes time, effort and extra resources. The potential for success is also limited by decisions already taken (e.g. sector selection).
2. **A clear and common understanding of WEE:** Even once WEE has been mainstreamed, ambiguity about what that means can lead to considerable confusion. In Nigeria it took more than half a year to move from "gender equality" in one project and "equal opportunities" in another to

WEE as the goal of mainstreaming. Discussions with project staff showed that it was still far from clear what this meant. In Georgia the Alliances projects and SDC are still in the process of working out what mainstreaming gender implies, with the projects tending to focus on economic roles in selected market systems and SDC thinking in much broader terms. This generates significant uncertainty about goals as well as means.

3. **Selecting market systems with limited scope for WEE:** Projects such as GEMS 2 and 1 are working in value chains in which the potential outreach to and impact on women is clearly limited. Improving incomes of women already in these value chains will not affect many, and involving more women will require major shifts in attitudes and behaviour. If WEE is a priority this should be agreed with the donor from the start and taken into account when the market system is selected. The approach to this taken in the “setting the strategic framework” phase of the project cycle should depend on the extent to which WEE actually is a main objective.
4. **Lack of gender specific research:** GEMS2 in Nigeria illustrates the challenges due to having insufficient gender specific information and analysis. Since WEE was not mainstreamed from the start, market research and analysis did not consider it. Interventions are being designed without the benefit of a gender analysis or reliable facts on the involvement of women in the sector. While this will be addressed over the coming months through a baseline study, the project meanwhile depends on the common sense knowledge of project staff and on its gender specialists. Disagreements on strategy or specific interventions can therefore not be resolved by reference to research. The projects in Georgia on the other hand have done such research. The gender analyses are an important resource for the projects to understand the context in which women work, and may still be the basis for interventions that go beyond the selected market systems or their transversal governance theme.
5. **Translating gender analysis into interventions:** This brings us to the next challenge, translating constraints identified through gender analysis that are rooted in women’s roles outside the selected market system (e.g. their unpaid care work in the household or community) into interventions that address them directly. While M4P projects have come to follow constraints through to market systems that are not those they address directly (e.g. going from an identified lack in skills to considering the market system for training in its own right), this has not yet happened with regard to women’s non-economic roles. The specific reasons are unclear to us and are likely varied, but may be linked to projects not considering this their core mandate and this being unfamiliar territory.
6. **WEE/M4P framework:** With regard to an analytical framework for mainstreaming WEE on the project cycle, the need is for a framework that:
 - Is easy to understand and use, written in non-technical language.
 - Is flexible – the questions a project should consider depend on context and the priority of WEE in its strategic framework. This underlines once again the need to have a clear agreement on a strategic framework at the start of a project.
 - Covers the issues included in the framework we drafted based on the Linda Jones’s Discussion Paper, with priority given to going beyond women’s roles in the selected market system (i.e. other productive roles, reproductive roles, community roles), covering access to and control over resources and services separately, covering contextual factors (e.g. ethnicity, age, class), and including risk analysis (which considers the possible negative impact on women’s and men’s roles and gender equality).

A detailed account of the feedback – content and format – provided by project and donor staff on the draft WEE/M4P framework is given in Annex 5.

7. **Identifying incentives to take up innovations that contribute to WEE:** The M4P approach calls for building on market actors’ incentives for changing behaviour rather than advocacy or appealing to their good will. The rationale is that if there are good reasons for market actors to change behaviour they will do so and continue to do so. There has to be a “business case”, even

if the incentive is not just a financial bottom line but, for instance, political. Projects have found it difficult to make a business case for targeting women. This does seem to depend, though, on the extent to which women are involved already. In GEMS 2, generally a business case has to be made to involve women in new roles, since they are hardly engaged in construction. Since men are doing well in these roles, market actors find it hard to see why that is in their interest. The Alliances projects, on the other hand, largely focus on systemic change that will make women more effective and productive in *existing* roles (i.e. practical gender needs). This is also in the interest of market actors. While more is required to demonstrate this, the experience of a project like Katalyst confirms this point (see the box below). Katalyst's experience in the maize sector also indicates that new sectors, in which gender roles are not yet set, are a possible exception (see the example in the good practice note, part B of this report). Market actors then appear to be more open to consider working with women and men.

Box 1 – Incentives to address “practical gender needs”

In Bangladesh seed companies contract households to grow the seeds. Katalyst used maintaining quality as the business case for seed companies to provide information and training to the female members of such households. While women already played a major role in seed production, they were not targeted by the companies. Now a company organizes courtyard meetings for the wives of the male seed growers to educate them on post-harvest activities that ensure acceptable seed quality. The intervention was successful. For the contract growers' the rejection rate has become nil, non-seed is reduced and they receive a higher price per kilogram of seed. This has resulted in a 25% income increase. For the women the training allowed them to gain essential skills, and assist in improving the household income without breaking social barriers.

Source: Shahnewaz Karim, 22.3.12, SDC e-discussion

- 8. Deciding what is a “given”:** The M4P operational guide suggests that, when sustainable outcomes are being defined (phase 3 of the project cycle) some factors should be considered a “given”: the nature of the market, its historical context and the “innovation landscape” beyond the market in question. In practice what is given is ambiguous, and projects and their donors find it difficult to agree on what they should and should not attempt to change. Attitudes and values in relation to women are the most important case in point. Opinions in the same project can range from “we cannot change attitudes and this is not our task” to “we are here long enough to contribute to change attitudes that pose a constraint on women, and should play that role”. This can result in a confused approach to an issue of prime importance to WEE. What should be considered a given is, of course, to a large extent context specific, and will therefore have to be considered on a case by case basis. For instance, projects with a lot of resources, a wide range of influential stakeholders, and a long expected life span are more likely to be able to contribute to attitude change, directly or indirectly, especially if change is already taking place²³. The box below gives an example from PrOpCom in Nigeria.

Box 2 – From Incomes to Attitudes

PrOpCom found a positive correlation between increases in economic benefits and increases in social benefits. Women reported being elevated to higher status and gaining more respect within their families and communities due to their income increases in rice parboiling. Women reported that their opinions were listened to more attentively than before, because, as some stated, husbands perceived them as contributing to the household rather than as a liability. The biggest social gains of the women were their influence on other women in the community. Other women looked up to the PrOpCom beneficiaries as a source of inspiration, knowledge about business, access to business services or a source of loan money or gifts. Although the husbands were still the final decision makers in the household, women reported that due to their stronger economic positions they were able to assert greater influence over purchase decisions.

Source: Nigeria PrOpCom Project Completion Report, Chemonics International for DFID, October 2011, Annex C-2.

9. **Scaling up WEE activities:** Scale is one of M4P's defining characteristics, and scaling up initial interventions is of critical concern for creating systemic market change and sustainability. With regard to innovations that aim at WEE, projects have found it a challenge to achieve this. Market actors that respond to the business case for reaching more women are often fairly exceptional and limited in scale, depending on how significant the required change in behaviour is (the bigger the change, the more difficult to find first adopters). This is even more so if gender equality advocacy is part of the argument for change. The success of such market actors does not often lead to automatic or immediate "crowding in", perhaps because they are not seen as market leaders or as typical. PrOpCom for instance developed innovative WEE activities in credit but the MFI it found willing to work on this was too small to reach significant scale. Crowding in was not automatic, and the project ended too soon to enable it to further facilitate (see box in Part B, the Good Practice Note's key factors for success). The Katalyst project in Bangladesh has reported similar constraints²⁴. For instance, it did not pursue a promising intervention in homestead gardening that reached nearly 4,000 women partly because of concerns about the scalability of the intervention, which depended on NGOs.
10. **Maintaining the M4P facilitative approach:** Should a WEE partner not hold up its end on an agreed upon programme or activity, projects may revert to a traditional role in direct intervention and diminish outreach and sustainability accordingly. This may happen when market actors initially collaborate but discontinue when more effort is required or the returns are not as immediate as they had expected. Projects may then be tempted to step in to "make things happen". In GEMS 1 for instance, an intervention to increase women's involvement in and control over goat rearing required a degree of "hands-on" involvement of staff that bordered on direct support²⁵. If projects rely on more than a convincing business case, engaging effective and committed partners is challenging and finding the small pockets of women's advocates in the private sector may be even more problematic. This is related to the problem of reaching scale.
11. **Setting WEE targets:** Setting targets for outreach to women, or for impact on their productivity and incomes, is difficult and uncertain. This is especially but not only so in a new M4P market such as construction and real estate. Projects resist the usual pressure of donors to have high(er) numbers. On the other hand, targets can help to get projects to focus and stay on track on mainstreaming WEE. It is likely that the practice that many M4P projects with regard to target in general, i.e. to set them when a good understanding of the market system and its potential for change has been obtained and realistic estimates of outreach and impact can be set, also applies to setting WEE targets. Flexibility and resetting of targets, within reason, is also acceptable once additional experience is gained.
12. **Gender specific indicators:** Having targets and indicators disaggregated by gender is a relatively simple matter. Some projects, however, are also asked to design "gender specific indicators" or indicators for WEE, and to provide data against them. It is not always clear what

such indicators could be and how they could be realistically assessed. The most promising approach may be the one the Alliances projects plan to take, to use their first gender analysis, using largely qualitative descriptions, as a baseline and do a second study, also with focus groups, as an impact assessment. This is still to be demonstrated, though²⁶.

13. **Capacity development needs:** While projects' capacity to mainstream WEE is only a means to an end, it is a major challenge for most. The combination of M4P and gender expertise is rare. Projects usually have to build it up themselves, but find that conducting workshops or other training does not suffice. Real expertise comes with practice. Focussing on M4P training and practice and buying in gender expertise is the most common approach taken. However, when gender specialists have little private sector development expertise, they risk being marginalised or being given the responsibility for doing the gender "part". Part-time specialists run this risk even more. When gender specialists are full-fledged part of the teams that design and implement research and interventions and have more than a review function they are likely to be the most effective. The projects in Georgia demonstrate this to a large extent.
14. **Lack of financial resources:** Discussions with some of the projects indicated that if donors want to contribute to WEE they have to be prepared to pay for it, also in M4P projects. Mainstreaming WEE requires additional investments in expertise and systems, developing proactive partners and longer-term and perhaps more costly interventions.

With regard to opportunities for WEE, in principle each of the above challenges can be turned around into an opportunity. For instance, mainstreaming WEE from the start provides projects with a good opportunity to address WEE systematically, good gender research is an opportunity for good intervention design, etc. Instead of going through the process of doing this, we will indicate a few additional opportunities.

1. **Availability of good gender analysis frameworks and tools:** Especially the Alliances projects have demonstrated that good gender analysis tools do not have to be reinvented specifically for M4P. They used the SDC gender toolkit, as it stands and with some modifications, which has resulted in studies with information that is of a high quality and relevant to the projects. The SDC's is not the only such "toolkit". The DFID manual, which we reviewed for this assignment, seems excellent as well, Mercy Corps has a good gender procedures manual, and there are of course many more²⁷.
2. **Systemic change already taking place:** Societies are not static, and gender roles are therefore not fixed either. This is one reason why it may not be useful to define what is and what is not "given" for a market system too narrowly. When gender roles are changing towards greater women's empowerment or gender equality, clearly there is an opportunity for projects to make use of that and possibly contribute to it. Changes in legislation are one factor in this process. The Alliances projects demonstrate that gender equality legislation at the national level can be an opportunity to promote women's empowerment at the local level and so contribute to changing what might have had to be taken as a "given" otherwise. Change can, however, also be in the other direction. The situation in northern Nigeria is now such that, as one of our respondents stated, "if you don't want to risk your life you don't talk about changing gender roles".
3. **Champions and role models:** One sign of change taking place may be the emergence of champions for greater gender equality (e.g. in the local government, or the manager of a lead firm), role models (the female welder in Nigeria, the female vet in Georgia), or other forms of catalyst. Projects are experimenting with the use of such catalysts, success stories, and using mass media. The effectiveness of such approaches is still untested in the area of mainstreaming WEE in M4P, but they are well employed in traditional projects, known as success stories.

4 CONCLUSIONS AND NEXT STEPS

Overall, the substance of the analytical framework we drafted on the basis of the Discussion Paper for an M4P/WEE Framework was confirmed. That is, the questions were found relevant and projects that had already made progress with mainstreaming WEE in practice had asked the same or similar questions. However, the format and language of the framework were found to be cumbersome and over-technical. The questions were found to be too numerous, though it was difficult to say which were not needed. Practitioners want guides that are succinct and intuitive to grasp.

Part of the problem lies in the framework (as worked out by us) trying to combine M4P analysis and gender analysis in a comprehensive way. That is, the questions asked are those asked by both. This is not necessary, as excellent gender analysis frameworks are available already, which are relevant to mainstreaming WEE into M4P. The M4P operational guide, on the other hand, presents the M4P analytical framework, and there is no reason to duplicate it.

The best way to avoid duplication and complicating matters by yet another framework, would be to mainstream WEE in the M4P operational guide itself. This was also recommended by most of our respondents. Revising the guide is also proposed in the discussion paper. However, since this is not an option at present, we recommended to the M4P Hub that the framework and guidelines for mainstreaming WEE into M4P projects should take the form of a “good practice note” such as those that are part of the guide already. This would make it easy to combine with the guide, and the structure of the notes is also appropriate.

This recommendation was accepted and Part B of this report therefore comprises a draft good practice note. The analytical framework it includes takes the M4P framework as a starting point, since the intention is to mainstream WEE into M4P, not the other way around. We have not duplicated gender analysis frameworks, since these are available. We have attempted to use non-technical language, as strongly requested by our respondents.

The challenges and opportunities presented in Section 3.3 above are reflected in the note’s section on key factors for success. There is therefore no need to summarise them here. It suffices to say that our work did identify such factors, though good practice is still emerging. Some of the factors we have identified are still issues to be considered rather than clear cut lessons learned.

This leads to our final conclusion. It is clear that testing and validating a WEE/M4P framework would require using it in several projects and evaluating the results after a year or so. The way our assignment foresaw validation through field experience is second best, especially since field experience is very limited as yet. The M4P donors and practitioners should consider the outcome of this assignment as “work in progress”, to be reviewed after a period of use by projects. The authors and the M4P Hub invite practitioners, donors and other partners to provide their own reality based experiences (to the M4P Hub) as they arise in the mainstreaming of WEE into M4P projects as well as views and experiences that are in contrast to those provided in this initial guide.

PART B – MAINSTREAMING WOMEN’S ECONOMIC EMPOWERMENT – A GOOD PRACTICE NOTE

1 WHAT AND WHY

How to mainstream Women’s Economic Empowerment (WEE) in M4P programmes. This is more straightforward than mainstreaming gender, since it focuses specifically on women and on *economic* empowerment.

Definitions of WEE generally include the following:

- Economic advancement – increased income and return on labour
- Access to opportunities and life chances such as skills training and job openings
- Access to assets, services and support needed to advance economically
- Decision making authority in different spheres, including household finances²⁸

The first three elements are part of the M4P framework: systemic change results in greater access which result in more jobs and higher incomes. The last element refers to women’s level of control over her and family resources, and also over community-level economic decision making. The degree to which projects take it into account varies greatly, but the M4P approach does not exclude considering it. Who has control over savings and land, who takes the business decisions, and how benefits are shared and used are, in fact, issues of prime importance to M4P.

WEE is an aspect of greater *gender equality*. This is a broader concept, which means that:

- Women and men have equal rights, freedoms, conditions, and opportunities for realizing their full potential and for contributing to and benefiting from economic, social, cultural, and political development. It means society values men and women equally for their similarities and differences and the diverse roles they play²⁹.

Reducing income poverty, M4P’s primary goal, is considered by many to be a step towards WEE and eventually greater gender equality. Although still debated in some quarters, there is considerable evidence that this is indeed the case³⁰. Systemic thinking would suggest that reducing income poverty may contribute to WEE and gender equality, but is not sufficient by itself. A more useful question than “does more income contribute to gender equality” may be “under which conditions does it do so, and what else is required?”

Mainstreaming gender means, in short:

- The process of assessing the implications for women and men of any planned action, including legislation, policies or programmes, in any area and at all levels. The ultimate goal is to achieve gender equality³¹.

This note therefore takes mainstreaming WEE into M4P projects to mean:

- The process of assessing the implications for women in particular of M4P projects, with the ultimate goal of women’s greater economic empowerment.

Men are not the primary concern of mainstreaming WEE, though of course the impact on them has to be considered. While men should not be “harmed”, it has to be understood that women gaining decision making authority will often mean that men lose it.

M4P projects can benefit from mainstreaming Women’s Economic Empowerment (WEE), because:

- Women are among the poor, and usually poorer than men. They make up a large part of the target group in any country: a poor person is more likely to be a girl or woman³².
- Women are part of market systems, and removing barriers to their full participation will contribute to growth and reduce poverty for women as well as men, girls and boys. This is M4P projects’ main goal.
- WEE is an important goal in itself, and increasingly recognised as such by donors, Governments civil society and M4P practitioners.

A different way of looking at this is of course that non-discrimination on the basis of gender is a human right and market systems that are biased against women should therefore be changed. While this is an argument that may not convince many private sector market actors to change their behaviour, it does convince many poor women, donors, governments, NGOs and civil society organisations.

2 HOW DOES IT WORK?

Mainstreaming WEE means doing so throughout the project cycle, so that:

- WEE is part of the strategic framework
- The market analysis identifies constraints on women participating and benefitting from market systems, those they have in common with men, and those specific to them.
- Interventions are planned and implemented that address such constraints in a way that leads to systemic, sustainable change that affects many.
- Results are monitored and measured in such a way that the effect on WEE can be demonstrated.

As will be clear from this, mainstreaming WEE does not mean that *projects* treat men and women in the same way. Market systems may not offer women the same opportunities and benefits as men. It is to facilitate the removal of such inequalities that projects may have to address constraints specific to women and facilitate systemic change that benefits them in the first instance. Mainstreaming WEE will result in interventions that target women, those that target women and men together, and those that target men if it contributes to WEE. Targeted interventions are in no way at odds with the concept of mainstreaming³³.


Nothing in the above, including targeting, is at odds with M4P principles either. As will be seen in the next section, mainstreaming WEE does not require abandoning key M4P principles relating to facilitation, sustainability and scale. Neither does it require abandoning the M4P analytical framework. M4P projects have demonstrated that this framework is relevant to WEE. They have also demonstrated that:

- Mainstreaming WEE requires using the gender lens in addition to the market systems lens. In practice, this means that all the questions suggested in the M4P operational guide for different stages of the project cycle need to be asked for women and men separately, and differences have to be analysed and reflected in interventions. This is the most important step to be taken.
- In addition, gender analysis is vital to mainstreaming WEE. Gender analysis examines women’s as well as men’s experiences, roles, needs and priorities. Needs may be “practical” (arising in the context of existing gender roles) or “strategic” (requiring changes in existing gender roles). Gender analysis considers attitudes, values and norms with respect to gender, and differences in power, or decision making authority. M4P analysis does not exclude investigation of the broader social and cultural context of market systems. The M4P Operational Guide argues that programmes often “need to understand political, legal and social and cultural factors” (page 25). This includes gender. In practice many M4P projects do not, however, take analysis of such factors to any depth, a risk also pointed out in the Guide (page 22). Mainstreaming WEE does require this, since many of the underlying causes of constraints on women, or the constraints themselves, originate in this wider context. For instance, if women have no time to spare due to their reproductive role (unpaid care and other work mainly at the household level), creating new economic opportunities is not going to help, by itself. Women’s opportunities may also be limited by their community management role (voluntary work for the benefit of the community as a whole) or their weak community political role (representation and decision making for the community). Gender analysis helps identify such constraints.

Both the M4P and practical gender analytical frameworks are available (see the end of this note for some references), and there is no need for this note to duplicate them. The following framework draws on gender analysis and project experience to facilitate WEE mainstreaming in the normal M4P practice. It suggests a set of questions to be considered in each of the five stages of the M4P programming cycle. This is neither an exhaustive list, nor will all questions be relevant to all projects. While there is a significant overlap between questions asked for “Setting the strategic framework” and “Analysing the market system”, the depth in which they should be considered is much greater in the latter. The framework assumes that projects will carry out a gender analysis that will help them answer the questions here suggested. It also assumes projects are aware of the M4P analytical framework, and does not explain the concepts M4P uses. Like the M4P framework, it is not a research tool but can provide the basis for selecting or developing such tools.

Figure 1: The M4P Project Cycle

M4P process within a typical project cycle



1. Setting the strategic framework—vision and rationale, selection of market system(s)

Key question	Consider this:
What are the poverty reduction objectives?	
How are poor women part of the group whose poverty should be reduced?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the project’s definition of poverty? • What is the target group? • What share are women (if WEE is a priority, women mainly?) • What main economic and non-economic activities are they involved in?
What do we want to achieve for them?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More income? • Higher return on labour? • More time?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less unpaid work? • Better quality of work? • More decision making authority?
What changes in growth and access are needed to achieve the poverty reduction objectives?	
What are the opportunities for women?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More work and income in existing roles in a market system? Which market system? • Entering new roles in a market system? Which market system? • Entering new market systems? Which?
What change in access to resources and services do women need?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What resources and services do women have and not have access to? • How does this need to change so they can make use of opportunities?
What systemic changes are needed to achieve the changes in growth and access?	
Why are markets not working for women?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relations in the core of the market system (exchanges between providers and consumers)? • With service providers? • With setters and enforcers of rules (e.g. legislation, regulations, informal rules)?
How does the market system have to change for women?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relations in the core of the market system? • With service providers? • Setters and appliers of rules?
What is the main thrust of the intervention strategy?	
Which market system(s) will be targeted? (drawing on answers to preceding questions)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In which market system(s) do or could many poor women participate? • Which market system(s) have good potential for improved growth and access from which poor women could benefit? • In which market system(s) is the feasibility high of achieving systemic change that will benefit poor women?
Which areas that may play a role in limiting women’s benefits from the selected market system(s) will be addressed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support and resistance that may be expected to interventions? • Time and resources available for interventions? • Potential partners and their capacity?

2. Understanding market systems

Key questions	Consider this:
<p>What constraints do women face in the core (exchanges between providers and consumers) of the market system?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What do women do in this market system? • Paid, unpaid? • What relationships do they have, e.g. to <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Input supply? 2. Next level in the system (e.g. for producers – processors, collectors, wholesalers)? 3. Other market players at the same level (e.g. in associations, competitors)? • Are these relations with women or men? • Who has control in these relationships? • Who decides about these relationships? • How do women’s other roles (paid, unpaid work, reproductive, productive and community roles) affect this? • How do attitudes, values and norms affect this? • Ethnicity? Age? Class? Marital status? • What changes are taking place in any of the above? • What needs have women expressed, practical and strategic?
<p>What constraints do women face in access to household and community resources (e.g. land, own savings, labour)?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are resources available that women could benefit from? • Do women use them? • If not, why? Consider: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Who owns the resources? 2. Who decides about their use? 3. How do women’s other roles affect this? 4. How do attitudes, values and norms affect this? 5. Ethnicity? Age? Class? Marital status? • What changes are taking place in any of the above? • What needs have women expressed, practical and strategic?
<p>What constraints do women face to access support functions (e.g. services, community,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are services/infrastructure available that women could benefit from? Do women use them?

<p>market and other infrastructure)?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If not, why? Consider: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What relationships do women have with providers? 2. Are services promoted to women? 3. Are women seen as a market opportunity by service providers? 4. Are services provided in a way appropriate to women? 5. Are providers men or women? 6. Can and will women pay? 7. Who controls access to services? 8. How do women’s other roles affect this? 9. How do attitudes, values and norms affect this? 10. Ethnicity? Age? Class? Marital status? • What changes are taking place in any of the above? • What needs have women expressed, practical and strategic?
<p>What constraints do women face due to rules and the way they are implemented?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whose rules are they? • Do rules discriminate against women? • If so, how and why? • Does the way institutions apply the rules discriminate against women? • If so how and why? • Do women have a voice that could affect rules? • If not, why? • Do women participate in local governance, community decision making? • If not, why? • How do women’s other roles affect this? • How do attitudes, values and norms affect this? • Ethnicity? Age? Class? Marital status? • What changes are taking place in any of the above? • What needs have women expressed, practical and strategic?
<p>What opportunities can/do women partake of to overcome constraints?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there relationships in the community, family with other women and/or advocacy groups? • Are there public or private institutions that with WEE philosophy and goals?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In education and training? • Incentives in place for women to take up the opportunity (e.g. more income, recognition)? • Public policies and programmes promoting gender equality/WEE?
What are women’s expressed needs in other areas that affect their roles within the market system?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At home? • In the community? • Related to lack of time, tools, etc., or other constraints?
What are the primary incentives women are motivated by in making market changes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monetary? • More time? • Reducing physical labour? • Reallocating or reducing unpaid work? • More control over benefits (e.g. income)? • Social? (e.g. respect)

3. Defining sustainable outcomes – planning and design

Key questions	Consider this:
What is the goal for women of the specific intervention?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More income? • Higher return on labour? • More time? • Less unpaid work? • Better quality of work? • More decision making authority? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In market relations? 2. In the community? 3. In the household?
What is the business case for women in this intervention?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Women as consumers of services and products? • Suppliers of inputs? • Labour force? • Improving quality and productivity? • As industry advocates? • As entrepreneurs and innovators? • Women as political constituents? • Benefits for the family?
What other opportunities for women may sustain the intervention’s results?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group advocacy by BMOs or women’s organisations?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Ministry of Women’s Affairs or similar institutions? • Legislation? • Policies? • Education?
What resistance can be expected due to attitudes, values sand norms?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are changes in women’s roles required for the intervention? • If so: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Are women’s roles changing already? 2. How? 3. Why? 4. What market players influence this? 5. Will market players support further change? 6. What capacity do market players have?
Is there a need to target women specifically?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If yes, why? <p>Consider, for the market system and beyond it:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Constraints that affect women only or mostly? 2. Opportunities for women only or mostly?
What are the risks women, or men, will be harmed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Displaced or marginalised in the market system? • Or in related market systems? • Impact on other roles? • Backlash reaction? • Loss of decision making authority (e.g. going from household to commercial crop)?

4. Facilitating systemic change

Key questions	Consider this:
What is the impact of the (initial) intervention on women?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More income? • Higher return on labour? • More time? • Less unpaid work? • Better quality of work? • More decision making authority? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In market relations? 2. In the community? 3. In the household?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A change in women’s roles? • Greater equality? • Any harmful effects, on women or men? • Can it be sustained? Is it consistent with • Incentives? • Capacities?
Should the intervention be modified?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To enhance positive impact? • To avoid harmful effects? • To shift towards addressing strategic (transformational) or conversely practical needs? • Realign with different market players? • Address different incentives?
What is the scale potential?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For women in the core of the market? • For services that reach women? • For rules that affect women? • For women beyond a localised market? • In other market systems?
How can this potential be realised?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incentives that can be demonstrated? • Market actors with scale and capacity? • Further investment with such market actors? • Women role models as a catalyst? • Social marketing to promote awareness of changes and benefits? • Advocacy and gender sensitization? • Supporting policies, legislation? • Effect of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Attitudes, values, norms? 2. Women’s other roles? 3. Lack of control/power?
With greater scale, what are the new risks women, or men, will be harmed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Displaced or marginalised in the market system? • Or in related market systems? • Impact on women’s other roles? • Backlash reaction? • Loss of decision making authority?

5. Assessing change – monitoring and evaluation

This final part of the framework provides a few key questions to be considered, but also applies good practice in results measurement and research to WEE. It provides guidelines for mainstreaming WEE for each of the steps for developing measurement systems proposed in the M4P operational guide.

Key steps:	Do:
Develop impact logics for the interventions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicate expected impact on women explicitly • Include impact other than on income that is relevant to WEE (e.g. on decision making) • If activities in an intervention target women in particular, show this • If an intervention addresses a constraint specific to women, show this
Develop indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include indicators for the objectives for women at each of the levels of the results chain, i.e. the goal, access and growth, and systemic change. • Specify which indicators will be sex disaggregated – all that are quantitative • Ensure inclusion of indicators specific to WEE: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. More decision making authority? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. In the economic activity? ii. Over productive resources? iii. Over use of income? iv. Over time use? v. In relations with suppliers, buyers, service providers, setters and appliers of rules? vi. In the community?³⁴ • Consider including other qualitative and/or quantitative indicators relevant to gender equality, e.g.: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Women and men taking on new productive roles 2. Women and men sharing reproductive roles more equally 3. More equal access to social services (e.g. education, health)
Establish a baseline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include women among respondents in a way that reflects their roles in the market system • Recruit women researchers • Include gender expertise • Conduct research in ways, times, places, conducive to participation of women

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider separate discussions with women and men
Predict the amount of change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider the factors that may reduce or delay impact on women, including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prevalence of women? 2. Attitudes, values, norms? 3. Women’s other roles? 4. Lack of control/power? 5. Lack of awareness of women as a market?
Design and implement a measurement plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include women among respondents in a way that reflects their roles in the market system • Recruit women researchers • Include gender expertise • Conduct research in ways, times, places, conducive to participation of women • Consider separate discussions with women and men
Analyse information and feed into decision making and reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider the following questions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do the results meet what was intended, predicted? 2. If not, why? 3. What measures can be taken to improve results? 4. Any unintended negative effects? 5. Measures to avoid or mitigate these? • Mainstream gender in analysis and reporting – a separate “gender” section does not suffice. • Include gender expertise in the analysis

3 KEY FACTORS FOR SUCCESS

The above framework has been developed on the basis of a conceptual consideration of mainstreaming WEE in M4P and the practice of the relatively small number of projects that have made progress in this area. It therefore needs to be validated by applying it in practice, when the key factors for its successful use can be established. More generally, good practice in mainstreaming WEE is only just emerging. Some lessons have already been learned, though, while some others are being discussed. This note presents both lessons and issues.

Mainstream WEE from the start

It is essential to integrate WEE into the project cycle from the very start. If the strategic vision for a project does not include WEE, market analysis, intervention plans, etc. will not do so either. Foisting WEE onto a project once it has been running for a while is confusing and results in a loss of effectiveness. Since main strategies will already have been decided on, WEE runs the risk of remain

an add-on. In addition, an already operational project is unlikely to have the required expertise, and staff react with frustration and defensiveness.

Include WEE in the strategic framework and logframe

The strategic framework and logframe provide the basis for project planning and implementation. If a project’s backers (donors and other stakeholders) want to ensure WEE is addressed adequately, WEE should be included in them. The prominence with which this is done will depend on those backers, but referring to “poor women and men” rather than just the poor, defining the WEE objectives within the broader context of how the project defines poverty and what the poverty reduction objectives are, making explicit whether gender-specific constraints will be addressed, including indicators that can be sex-disaggregated and indicators that are specific to WEE (including women’s decision making authority) are minimum requirements. The need for setting targets for outreach to women is still being debated among practitioners. Without them, though, projects have little guidance on what to aim at and it will be difficult to hold them accountable. While targets are, on the whole, likely to be a good thing, they should be set once projects have a good understanding of their selected market system and are in a position to estimate outreach and impact of interventions on WEE. This is not different for other indicators in M4P projects.

Select a market system with scope for WEE

Projects that aim at WEE have a better chance to affect many poor women if they select market systems in which many are involved and which are vibrant, not stagnant or contracting. Markets with strong business associations of mixed gender, advocacy groups, vibrant women’s cooperatives, private-public partnerships, a positive business enabling environment and government regulations that support equality opportunity are also more likely to create more benefits to women. Although, in other words, the usual M4P principles should be applied in selecting a market system, there may be situations where trade-offs have to be made between affecting many poor women and absolute growth levels achievable. Market systems that include many women and have moderate potential for growth may have to be given priority over those with small WEE potential and high growth.

The Market Alliances against Poverty projects in Georgia selected market development in the livestock sector in Georgia because it is vital for alleviating poverty and promoting a sustainable market economy and relies on the high involvement (80%) of small farmers in dairy and beef production. The sector has significantly changed over the last two decades as a result of the rapid transition to a market economy. Finally, the sector was selected for its high potential for a positive impact on rural women who make up over 50% of the agricultural workforce yet have disproportional labour burdens, are grossly underrepresented in decision making arenas as well as land ownership.

Source: SJ Alliances Phase 2 proposal, page 4

An explicit gender strategy

Some projects formulate a separate strategy for achieving their WEE goals, objectives and targets. This may be useful when projects are at a very early stage of mainstreaming WEE and there is still little understanding on how to go about this. It may guide action and function as a touchstone. However, making WEE an integral though explicit part of the overall project strategy is likely to decrease the risk that gender is considered a separate “component”, dealt with, often, by gender specialists. It is also likely to better clarify the relevance of WEE to overall project goals and increase ownership over interventions among non-gender staff. Although there are some indications of this in projects’ practice, it still needs to be demonstrated that there is a difference in effectiveness. In any case, if WEE is part of a project’s strategic framework it needs to be addressed explicitly in the project strategy.

Good research forms the basis for mainstreaming WEE

The successful mainstreaming of WEE is based on integrating gender into the assessments done for developing the strategic framework and into the market system analysis. Including women in the research and disaggregating data by sex results in identification of gender specific constraints in the market system that a project can address. A gender analysis provides essential additional information that helps identify constraints rooted in roles outside the market system, including paid and unpaid work in the care economy, both inside and outside the household, or productive roles in other market systems. A gender analysis is also important for anticipating possible impact on women and for, eventually, doing an impact assessment that goes beyond establishing the effects on income. A gender analysis can be a separate exercise, but it should be done as part of the market analysis. Including its findings in the market analysis rather than (only) in a separate report will enhance its relevance to the design of interventions.

The Market Alliances against Poverty projects in Georgia did a market systems analysis that provided sex disaggregated information. It showed what women do in the dairy value chains, what access constraints they face, how this is different from men, and how, given women’s role, market actors could make them more effective participants in the market system. Simultaneously, the projects conducted several gender analysis studies, using the SDC gender toolkit. The studies provided insight into gender roles beyond the market system, including issues of control (decision making). So far, the design of interventions draws on the disaggregated information on the market system analysis rather than the gender analysis. The latter provides “context”, “background”. It will also be used to assess impact on WEE. Nino Lomidze, the Gender Specialist in one of the two projects: “I have learned so much from these studies and we will continue to identify sector related gender issues and entry points to ensure the ongoing inclusion of women.” The findings of the gender analysis were, however, not fully integrated with the market analysis and the link between women’s participation in the market system and constraints rooted in women’s roles outside the market system (e.g. child care, mobility, access to water) is not always explicit.

Source: Interviews with project staff, Georgia, 19-22 March, 2012

Consider context factors

So-called “context factors”, e.g. class, ethnicity, age, marital status, are important for understanding women’s and men’s roles, including economic ones. Gender roles, including constraints on women in market systems, may vary greatly with such factors, which therefore need to be taken into account in the analysis.

The Market Alliances against Poverty Samtskhe-Javakheti project in Georgia found that women in minority Armenian villages were especially disadvantaged in their access to information because they did not speak Georgian. The project therefore ensured that a Farmers’ Supplement in the regional newspaper was published in Georgian as well as Armenian.

Source: Gender Analysis of the ‘Market Alliances against Poverty’ Programme Area, Akhaltisikhe, 2011

Consider rules and their implementation

Many project focus on the core and the support functions parts of the market systems. This may in part be due to a bias in favour of working with the private sector and the belief that transactions and services are easier to improve. However, legislation and its implementation, as well as informal rules, such as what is culturally acceptable for women and men to do, can have an enormous impact on large numbers of women and are an important field for M4P facilitation.

Changes in legislation can offer an opportunity to work with the public sector in ways that affect WEE in and beyond a market system. The Market Alliances against Poverty projects in Georgia raise awareness at the level of local government on national level gender equality legislation that includes provisions for participation of women in local decision making. While this is in an early stage, women’s greater influence on local level planning and spending could result in for instance child care facilities (one municipality agreed already) or better water supply (a key factor in increasing hygiene in milk production).

Source: Interviews with project staff, Georgia, 19-22 March, 2012

Be clear about what will be considered a “given”

The M4P framework suggests that some characteristics of market systems are a given, they cannot be changed: the nature of the market, its historical context and the innovation landscape beyond the market in question³⁵. Projects that mainstream WEE are often undecided about whether they can affect gender attitudes, values and norms. Although some things had best be considered a given, in many ways what a project can affect depends on its resources and duration. It also depends on trends taking place already. When attitudes are changing, there may be opportunities for projects to contribute to this. Where women are taking up new roles already, projects may further facilitate this. Be that as it may, it is important for projects to get clarity on what change they will and will not attempt to facilitate, to avoid confusion in strategies and interventions.

Intervention planning should consider and predict the potential impact on WEE

This is one area in which the findings of a gender analysis are useful. Research does not, however, stop once initial studies have been done. The planning of specific interventions may benefit from additional research, including on relevant gender roles. Intervention planning should not only consider the effect on gender roles in the selected market system but on women’s other roles, and on relations within the household too. This is where women (and men) will experience the impact of changes in household income and decision making. Projects should not assume that impact on income will benefit all household members equally. To whom the benefits will go and who has control over them are important questions in the context of mainstreaming WEE in M4P. Focusing interventions on activities over whose benefit women have control already is one way of enhancing the impact on WEE.

Consider interventions for constraints rooted in women’s other roles

There is very little M4P experience with addressing constraints rooted in women’s reproductive and community roles. Women’s ability to make use of economic opportunities is affected by their unpaid care work both inside and outside the household. Constraints may also originate in productive work outside a selected market system. Gender analyses identify such constraints, but generally no interventions are developed to address them. At a time that M4P is being applied to social services such as health care and education, there could be increasing scope for donors and practitioners to apply M4P thinking in these areas. For instance, child care facilities are a service like any other, that can be provided commercially or with public funding, and that is as amenable to systemic, M4P analysis and facilitation as any other service. It increases the chances that women can make use of their economic opportunities, and therefore contributes to WEE. Where women for instance spend many hours per day searching for water or fuel, or where there are limits on their mobility, considering such constraints in a systemic manner and facilitating sustainable solutions could contribute significantly to women’s participation in markets, though this is still to be demonstrated.

Making a “business case”

It is important to make a “business case” for interventions that contribute to WEE, like for other M4P interventions. Market players (and project partners) will need to be given good reasons why, for instance, they should employ or provide services to women, buy from women producers, or provide inputs to them. That women are a large potential market is the underlying argument of many of these

business cases. Women are often already viewed as possessing desirable labour qualities (e.g. attention to detail, good follow through) and work ethic. If their skills or resources improve, women contribute to better product quality and productivity, is another. A business case does not necessarily mean appealing to the bottom line of profits. In the public sector, references to organisations’ mandates, national policies and legislation (e.g. on gender equality), recognition by superiors, and women as part of the electorate can be part of the business case. Often, however, this is still an area in which projects struggle, especially when making a case for changes in gender roles. E.g., why should women become artisans if men are already trained and doing well at it?

The business case Katalyst in Bangladesh made for contracting women to grow maize for a feed mill rested on their reliability. The mill responded by leasing land and providing inputs and guidance to women who had been labourers before, to start cultivation themselves. That season the women experienced a 100% increase in income. They planned expansions and increased expenditure on food, shelter, clothing and children’s education. While the numbers are still small (160 women in 2011), making a “business case” has in this instance led to a strategic change in gender roles (from labourers to contractors) and empowerment. Two more contractors are forming women’s contract farmers groups, indicating emerging systemic change.

Source: Bidowra Tahmin Khan, Katalyst Bangladesh, 12.4.12

Include the public sector, NGOs, civil society

The M4P framework recognizes the public sector, NGOs and civil society as important market players.

The public sector provides opportunities to affect many women especially in its regulatory function. One could think, for example, of legislation on land ownership, which also often affects women’s access to finance. Legislation may also play a role in reducing the exploitative nature of some value chain relations (e.g. through labour legislation). But the projects may also affect women’s say in public spending on infrastructure, utilities or social services that may affect WEE. NGOs and civil society organizations can play an important role as service providers and advocates. Importantly, as indicated above, the incentives for these market players to bring change are not necessarily those of the bottom line. For some, WEE, or gender equality, may well be a meaningful goal itself.

The project enhancing incomes of rural women in the Pamirs / Tajikistan is supporting a women’s association to set up value chains mainly involving women in the dairy and dry herbs / fruit sector. Its market analysis included consideration of rules and regulations, and identified a number of constraints, confirmed by subsequent experience, that affect large numbers of women. Most importantly, licenses and permissions from local authorities are designed for larger businesses. They take away some 30% of income from the small businesses women operate. Women therefore choose to remain informal, which excludes them from social protection and other benefits and limits their access to markets. The women’s association has taken this up in policy dialogue facilitated by the project, lobbying for a change in licensing regulations or allowing registration as groups. Its relationships with local authorities have also helped to get access to land and reduce demands for informal payments.

Source: Nicole Stolz, Caritas Switzerland, SDC e-discussion on WEE, 26.3.12

Consider scaling up strategies early on

Scale is one of M4P’s defining characteristics, and scaling up initial interventions is of critical concern for creating systematic market change and sustainability. Projects are facilitators in this process and rely on market actors to achieve this. In WEE, projects have found this challenging. Market actors that respond to the business case for reaching more women are often fairly exceptional and limited in scale, depending on how significant the required change in behaviour is. This is even more so if

advocacy is part of the argument for change. The success of such market actors does not often lead to automatic or immediate “crowding in”, perhaps because they are not seen as market leaders or as typical. PrOpCom for instance developed innovative WEE activities but found no “scale agents” to increase outreach or pathways to crowding in. The Katalyst project in Bangladesh has reported similar constraints³⁶. For instance, it did not pursue a promising intervention in homestead gardening that reached nearly 4,000 women partly because of concerns about the scalability of the intervention, which depended on NGOs. The earlier strategies for reaching scale are considered, the better the chances that “pilots” do not remain just that. Preferably, scaling up strategies should be part of the intervention design.

Although an intervention of Promoting Pro-Poor Opportunities in Commodity and Service Markets (PrOpCom) in parboiling in northern Nigeria did increase women’s incomes and empowered them to make reinvestment decisions, it was not successfully brought to scale due to limitations with two financial institutions. In Kano the partner was a public sector rural development bank that had no commercial incentive for following up on repayment of credit extended to the women and did not. In the second phase PrOpCom partnered with a commercial micro finance institute which was proactive in marketing to women and embedded trainings and mentoring in its business model. However the MFI was too small to scale up and PrOpCom was ending.

Source: Interview with Ms. Tiffany Urrechaga, GEMS 3, Abuja, Nigeria, March 7, 2012

Integrate WEE into the M&E and impact assessment system from the start

This enables projects to react appropriately if interventions do not reach women or affect women in ways not foreseen. The flexibility that is one of M4P’s defining characteristics can be made use of to ensure that interventions are adjusted as needed and when new opportunities are uncovered. Disaggregation by sex of relevant indicators in the logframe and those related to results chains is essential. It is also important, though, to include indicators specifically for WEE. Even if M4P projects may not explicitly aim at WEE, it will benefit them if they can demonstrate a positive impact, and they need to be able to avoid reducing WEE (“do no harm”).

While PrOpCom did not aim specifically at WEE, its parboiling intervention in northern Nigeria changed gender roles and responsibilities by linking women to a local microfinance provider, allowing them to buy rice from farmers directly, when prices were low, store it, parboil it, and sell to millers when prices were higher. In Kano, the women had previously not owned the rice, and served as contract parboilers for a fee whenever the rice was brought to them. They were not taught the “store-and-sell-later” business model. They increased their income simply by virtue of changing their role from contract parboiler to trader-parboiler. The Adamawa parboilers were already acting as trader-parboilers (different culture), and their increase in income and empowerment came from learning the “store-and-sell-later” business model. According to project staff Tiffany Urrechaga, impact studies showed that incomes went up and also a sense of being in control as women now owned the rice and were not dependent on the millers. It was the women who now made the business reinvestment decisions; however, the men had the final say on household spending. Additional information on traditional household decision making and resource control may have flagged this imbalance at the outset and suggested the need for possible interventions to further empower women’s control of resources.

Source: Interview with Ms. Tiffany Urrechaga, GEMS 3, Abuja, Nigeria, March 7, 2012

Maintain a facilitative role

Given that the business case for WEE is not always obvious to market actors, and that projects often rely on advocacy to make a case for WEE as well, there is a risk that projects revert to traditional implementation just “to make things happen” or to “show that it works”. Experience indicates that this does not result in systemic, sustainable change for many, be they women or men. Projects that

maintain their facilitation role have a better chance to achieve this. What is often required is more *intensive*, and *longer* facilitation: more frequent and intensive relations with market actors, a higher financial contribution, more research, more investment in developing a business model, more networking and consensus building. The key to success in the long run remains, however, for projects not to take on the role of market actors.

Include or develop gender capacity and systems

Capacity in a project is a prerequisite for success in WEE. The combination of M4P and WEE expertise is rare, and successful projects give priority to developing such expertise. They use different approaches: gender workshops and other training for staff within the M4P context, in-house gender expertise who work alongside implementation staff with M4P experience, and external gender consultants, national and international. It is not obvious what the most effective approach is. It may depend on circumstances. Projects need to beware, though, of the tendency to “delegate” gender or WEE to a specialist, who may then come to have a marginal not fully integrated role in the project. They need to devise ways in which WEE remains at the core of a project. M4P experience with other specialist areas of expertise indicates that including gender specialists (or staff with gender expertise) as full members of the teams that devise and facilitate interventions is likely to be the most effective. Integrating gender into project management systems (e.g. TORs, performance assessment, incentives) also contributes to keeping WEE central to a project. Experience in mainstreaming gender in development work generally indicates that project leadership is the most critical factor for success³⁷.

4 FURTHER READING

- Alliances (2011) ‘Gender Analysis of the SDC-funded and the Mercy Corps-implemented ‘Market Alliances against Poverty’ Programme Area’,
<http://allianceskk.ge/files/pdf/Alliances%20SJ%20Gender%20Survey%202%20%20May%202011.pdf>
- Alliances (2011) ‘A Gendered Perspective: Livestock Husbandry in KvemoKartli’
<http://allianceskk.ge/files/pdf/Alliances%20KK%20ICCN%20Gender%20Report%20Final%202011.pdf>
- DFID (2002), Gender Manual: A practical guide for development policy makers and practitioners
<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Documents/publications/dfid-gender-manual-2008.pdf>
- Economist Intelligence Unit (2010) ‘Women’s Economic Opportunity: A New Pilot Index and Global Ranking’ <http://www.eiu.com>
- SDC, Gender Toolkit: Instruments for gender mainstreaming.
http://www.sdc.admin.ch/en/Home/Themes/Gender/General_and_thematic_tools/Gender_Tool_Kit
- Sida, (2010) ‘Indicators for Measuring Results on Gender Equality’ <http://www.sida.se>
- USAID, Overview of common gender analysis frameworks on
http://www.devtechsys.com/gender_integration_workshop/resources/review_of_gender_analysis_frameworks.pdf
- USAID, (2010) ‘A Guide to Integrating Gender into Agricultural Value Chains’
http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/cross-cutting_programs/wid/pubs/Gender_Agriculture_Value_Chain_Guide.pdf

ANNEX 1 – PRIMARY SOURCES**Nigeria**

Name	Position	Organisation
Paul Weijers	Team Leader	GEMS 2 Construction and Real Estate
Kevin Billing	Team Leader	GEMS 1 Meat and Leather
Caroline Pinder	GEMS 2 International Gender Advisor	WISE Development
Fiona MacCulloch	GEMS 3 International Gender Advisor	International gender consultant, project manager and attorney based in Kampala Uganda
Chibogu Obinwa	Gender Advisor to GEMS 2	Gender consultant, Lagos Nigeria
Tosin Akande	GEMS 2 M&E Lead	GEMS 2 Construction and Real Estate
Afolabi Imoukhuede	Intervention Lead	GEMS 2 Construction and Real Estate
Rex Oratokhai	Intervention Lead	GEMS 2 Construction and Real Estate
Chief Otunba Mayegun Ogunsanya	Chairman Managing Director	Association of Building Artisans of Nigeria (ASBAN)
Henry Freeman	Project Manager	GEMS 3 Support Improved Business Environment
Erin Rogalski	GEMS 2 Consultant in Advocacy	GEMS 2 Construction and Real Estate
Richard Sandall	World Bank PSD Advisor	World Bank Nigeria
Tony Burdon	Head of Economic Growth	DFID Nigeria
Robert Hale	Private Sector Development Advisor	DFID Nigeria
Dr Katja Jobes	Senior Social Development Advisor	DFID Nigeria
Oluwatosin Akande	Monitoring and Evaluation Lead	GEMS 2 Construction and Real Estate Sector
Tiffany Urrechaga	Knowledge Manager	GEMS 3 Support Improved Business Environment
Samuel Sanni	VP Business Development/International Operations	DFTBS – Dynamic and Forward Thinking Business Solutions

Georgia

Name	Position	Organisation
Helen Bradbury	Program Director Alliances KK	Alliances/Mercy Corps
Davidson Highfill	Program Director Alliances SJ	Alliances/Mercy Corps
Oksanna Antonian	Business Development Officer	Alliances/Mercy Corps
Khatuna Kurdadze	Business Development Officer	Alliances/Mercy Corps
Nino Lomidze	Gender Survey and Liaison Coordinator	Alliances/Mercy Corps
Dr Rudolph Schoch	Regional Director South Caucasus	SDC
Irakli Modebadze	Business Development Officer	Alliances/Mercy Corps
Nino Rukhadze	Gender, Governance and DRR Coordinator	Alliances/Mercy Corps
Irakli Kasrashvili	Country Director	Mercy Corps
Ketevan Khmaladze	Business Development Officer	Alliances/Mercy Corps
Nino Khitarishvili	Program Assistant	Alliances/Mercy Corps
Shorena Lortkipanidze	Program on Civil Society Development Manager	International Centre on Conflict and Negotiation
Sophia Svanadze	Gender and Governance Adviser	SDC
George Sadunishvili	Deputy Program Manager/ Investment Coordinator	Alliances/Mercy Corps
Maia Mosiashvili	Good Governance and Gender Officer	International Centre on Conflict and Negotiation
Lela Kobakhidze	Business Development Officer	Alliances/Mercy Corps
Davit Kveladze	Business Development Officer	Alliances/Mercy Corps
Nona Samkharadze	Liaison Officer	Alliances/Mercy Corps
AmiranJanashvili	Business Development Officer	Alliances/Mercy Corps

ANNEX 2 – MAIN DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

- Bieri, S. Fankhauser, L. Sancar, A. and Stolz, N. (2000) 'Added Value: Contributions to Gender Equitable Economic Development. *SDC, Interdisciplinary Centre for Gender Studies and Caritas Switzerland.*'
- Bradbury H. Lomidze N, Stewart T, Rukhadze N, (2009) 'A Summary of the Role of Women in Farming in 7 Villages in the Samtskhe Javakheti Region of Georgia'
- Byron, G. (2010) 'Gender Equality in Swedish Development Cooperation: Final Report'
- Coffey International Development (2010) 'GEMS 2 Proposal Document'
- Derbyshire, H. (2002) 'Gender Manual: A Practical Guide for Development Policy Makers and Practitioners.' *DFID*
- DFID (2002) 'Gender Manual: A Practical Guide for Development Policy Makers and Practitioners', <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Documents/publications/dfid-gender-manual-2008.pdf>
- DFID (2010) 'Gender Equality Action Plan (GEAP) Light Touch Review: Summary Document'
- GEMS (2012) 'Strategy for Women's Economic Empowerment'
- GEMS 2 (2010) 'Inception Report'
- GEMS 2 (2011) 'GEMS 2: Construction and Real Estate Sector - Quarter 4 Report'
- GEMS 2 (2011) 'Input Supply Market: Output Facilitation Strategy'
- GEMS 2 (2011) 'Strategy for the Promotion of Gender Equality'
- GEMS 2 (2012) 'Basic Gender Analysis Tool for GEMS Components'
- GEMS 2 (2012) 'GEMS 2: Construction and Real Estate Sector - M&E Overview'
- GEMS 2 (2012) 'GEMS 2: Construction and Real Estate Sector – Results Chain'
- Golla, A.M. Malhotra, A. Nanda, P. and Mehra, R. (2011) 'Understanding and Measuring Women's Economic Empowerment: Definition, Framework and Indicators', *ICRW*
- IFPRI, USAID (2012) 'Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index', http://www.ifpri.org/sites/default/files/publications/weai_brochure.pdf
- ILO (1998) Unit 1: A conceptual framework for gender analysis and planning: Some gender planning approaches and strategies, The Harvard Analytical Framework, *ILO/SEAPAT's Online Gender Learning & Information Module*
- ILO (2011) 'Gender Equality Tool: Definition of Gender Mainstreaming', <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/bureau/gender/newsite2002/about/defin.htm>
- Jones, L. (2012) 'Discussion Paper for an M4P WEE Framework: How can the Making Markets Work for the Poor Framework work for poor women and for poor men?' *The Springfield Centre*
- Katalyst, (2010) 'Addressing Gender: Thematic Report'
- MacCulloch, F. (2011) 'Mainstreaming Gender and Inclusion in GEMS 3'
- Market Alliances Against Poverty (2009) 'Gender Equality Mainstreaming: Checklist for Gender Equality Mainstreaming and Reporting'
- Market Alliances Against Poverty (2011) 'A Gendered Perspective: Livestock Husbandry in Kvemo Kartli'
- Market Alliances Against Poverty (2011) 'Alliances - KK Log-Frame'
- Market Alliances Against Poverty (2011) 'Alliances – SJ Mini Case Study: Southern Gates Newspaper: Product Diversification and Commercialization in a Non-Commercial World.'

- Market Alliances Against Poverty (2011) 'Gender Analysis of the SDC-funded and the MercyCorps-implemented 'Market Alliances against Poverty' Programme Area'
- Market Alliances Against Poverty (2011) 'Market Alliances Against Poverty: Gender Analysis of the Alliances SJ Program Area'
- Market Alliances Against Poverty (2011) 'Market Alliances Against Poverty in the Kvemo Kartli Region of Georgia: Final Strategy Document'
- Market Alliances Against Poverty (2011) 'Phase II of Market Alliances Against Poverty in the Samtskhe-Javakheti Region of Georgia: Final Strategy 2011-2014'
- Market Alliances Against Poverty (2011) 'Putting Gender Mainstreaming into Practice – Alliances SJ/II Phase'
- Market Alliances Against Poverty (2011) 'Report of the Gender Workshop'
- Market Alliances Against Poverty (2012) 'Market Alliances Against Poverty in the Samtske-Javakheti Region of Georgia: 2011 Annual Report'
- Mayou, L. Mackie, G. (2007) 'Making the Strongest Link: A Practical Guide to Mainstreaming Gender Analysis in Value Chain Development' *ILO*, http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/@ed_emp/@emp_ent/documents/instructionalmaterial/wcms_106538.pdf
- Miehlbradt, A, McVay, M, Tanburn, J, (ed.) (2005) 'From BDS to Making Markets Work for the Poor', *International Labour Organisation*
- MercyCorps (2012) 'Gender Procedures – Policy in Action' *Swiss Development Cooperation, Gender Toolkit* http://www.sdc.admin.ch/en/Home/Themes/Gender/General_and_thematic_tools/Gender_Tool_Kit
- Pinder, C. (2011) 'Memorandum: GEMS 2 Gender Strategy from Visit to Abuja in August 2011'
- Pinder, C. (2012) 'Strategy for the Promotion of Gender Equality in GEMS2'
- Pinder, C. MacCulloch, F, (2012) 'GEMS Strategy for Women's Economic Empowerment – Consolidated Document'
- PrOpCom (2011) 'Nigeria PrOpCom: Project Completion Report'
- Rubin, D. Manfre, C. and Barrett K (2009) 'Promoting Gender Equitable Opportunities for Agricultural Value Chains: A Handbook.' *USAID: Greater Access to Trade Expansion Project*
- SDC (2009) 'Outcome Monitoring Concept for the Domain Economic Development and Employment'
- SDC (2010) 'Concept for Mainstreaming of Good Governance and Gender Equality Principles, Economic Development and Employment Domain'
- SDC (2012) 'Transversal Themes and M4P Approach: Guiding Notes for Implementing Partners'
- SDC and the Springfield Centre for Business in Development (2009) 'Swiss Cooperation Strategy South Caucasus 2008-2011: Outcome Monitoring Concept for the Domain of Economic Development and Employment'
- Sebstad J. and Manfre, C. (2011) 'FIELD Report No.11: Behavior Change Perspectives on gender and Value Chain Development, Tools for Research and Assessment.'
- Sebstad J. and Manfre, C. (2011) 'FIELD Report No.12: Behavior Change Perspectives on gender and Value Chain Development, A Framework for Analysis and Implementation.'
- Seeley, C. (2009) 'Palama: A Campaign for Enterprise Culture', Colombo, www.entergrowth.com
- Springfield Centre (2008) 'The Operational Guide for the Making Markets Work for the Poor Approach'

United Nations (1995) 'Fourth World Conference on Women: Action for Equality, Development Peace: Platform for Action', <http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/beijing/platform/poverty.htm>

United Nations (1997) 'Memorandum of the Report of the Economic and Social Council for 1997: Gender Mainstreaming'

United Nations (2012) 'Directory of UN Resources on Gender and Women's Issues: Women and Poverty', http://www.un.org/womenwatch/directory/women_and_poverty_3001.htm

USAID (2012), 'Gender Equality and Female Empowerment Policy'

USAID (2012) Glossary of Gender Terms and Concepts, http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/cross-cutting_programs/wid/pubs/Glossary_Handout.pdf

USAID (2012) 'Promoting Gender Equitable Opportunities in Agricultural Value Chains: A Handbook', http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/cross-cutting_programs/wid/pubs/GATE_Gender_Ag_Value_Chain_Handbook_11-09.pdf

Walker, J. (2011) 'Gender Backstopping Mandate for SDC South Caucasus Regional Programme: First Mission Report, UCL Development Planning Unit'

Wanitphon, P. (2012) 'Mock Audit Report for Alliance Kvemo Khartli: Based on DCED Standard for Measuring Achievement in Private Sector Development - Draft Version VI'

World Bank, IFAD, FAO (2012) 'Gender in Agriculture Sourcebook.'

ANNEX 3 – NOTE ON PROJECT SITE VISITS

The work in Nigeria focused on the GEMS 2 project, with limited data collection and analysis on GEMS 1 and 3, as well as on a discussion on the completed PrOpCom. We began the interviews the week of March 5th 2012 with GEMS2 staff in Lagos Nigeria. Later in the week we met with DFID economic growth officers and Abuja based project staff from GEMS 2 and 3. The aim of the one-on-one project staff meetings were two-fold: first, using a semi-structured interview guide consisting of 8 questions information was gathered on a person's job responsibilities and experiences in relation to the GEMS2 WEE strategies. Our draft WEE Analytical Framework was presented and comments solicited and reviewed in a later meeting with project staff. The meetings with DFID economic growth officers asked about WEE lessons learned from other DFID M4P projects (notably PrOpCom and its successor RAMP), any feedback on the draft WEE Analytical Framework, and the GEMS gender strategy development process, which integrated WEE after the project had begun.

In actual practice, discussion of the framework required an extra session with staff. Most found it difficult to grasp. While some provided detailed comments most kept to generalities. Most had no background in gender analysis, some were still fairly new to M4P, and mainstreaming WEE was also a recent development, so this was to be expected.

The work in Georgia again used a semi-structured interview guide but added in a modified focus group approach with the Business Development Officers (called Intervention Managers in Nigeria) and Gender Advisors. Again project staff were provided a copy of the eight questions and asked for feedback at a later meeting. In depth interviews with also conducted with the two Programme Directors and SDC representatives in Tbilisi. A third focus group was conducted with women dairy farmers in the SJ Market Alliance Project's Akhaltsikhe community area. The focus group discussions with the BDOs and gender advisors considered WEE challenges, opportunities and lessons learned since 2009. The women dairy farmers were asked about their activities in the dairy sector –including accessing market services and information. The intention was to see if they themselves included constraints outside the market system itself (they did not). The field work was conducted from March 19th – March 23rd, 2012.

ANNEX 4 – COMPARISON OF PROJECT WEE APPROACHES TO THE DRAFT WEE/M4P FRAMEWORK

Table 1 – Comparison of the GEMS 2 WEE/gender approach and the WEE/M4P framework

Main characteristics/principles of GEMS 2 gender strategy	Comparison with the framework
Overall: Accepts the M4P principles, but adds the “gender lens”, including with regard to values and norms, power differences.	This confirms the framework. Analysis should go beyond the economic system and include gender roles.
Overall goal – to increase opportunities for women to participate in and receive benefits equal to men across a wider range of employment and help them move from low-paid casual work to longer term sustainable positions.	Goal is WEE, defined as increased income, better access to opportunities, assets, services, and more decision making authority. There is less emphasis on equality (progress towards equality being more realistic), more on control.
Overall strategy – integrate gender into intervention plans rather than add new ones, and do not broaden the scope to social interventions.	The framework allows for interventions or activities in interventions that target women only or specifically since there are constraints and opportunities specific to women. Discussion with project staff indicated some would see this as “bias”, while the project gender specialists agree this should be possible. One such intervention, which promotes women’s involvement in construction waste collection and sorting, is being prepared. The project’s role is the usual facilitative one.
Goal 1 – institutionalise a gender mainstreaming approach in the project through:	What is needed to mainstream gender in terms of a project’s capacity and systems is not tackled in the framework.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A policy on gender equality • Internal operational systems and processes that reflect this policy (TORs, performance assessment etc.) • Capacity and resources to deliver a gender equality approach • Promotion of gender equality in relations with partners, by making the “business case” but also by advocacy. • MEI frameworks that capture and analyse 	Not considered.

gender data

Goal 2 – Mainstream gender in programme delivery

Activities to be undertaken in each intervention area, in terms of

- Promoting inclusion of gender equality as good practice in the industry
- Attracting more women to work in semi-skilled and skilled levels (i.e. non-traditional occupations), for instance through use of role models, and inclusion of women in non-traditional occupations in promotion material.

An action plan provides detail on how to do this.

Activities cross-cutting interventions:

- Advocacy for gender equality in many forms, i.e. communications strategy, contacts with market players, inclusion in tools and guidelines

Integration of gender in the programme management cycle:

- A basic gender analysis is required for each intervention when women and men are expected to be affected differently – so far this is being done in a very informal manner.
- Intervention plans include a statement on gender sensitivity – this is done; while the statements are still fairly superficial, more work on this is foreseen.
- Gender specialist conducts gender screening of the plans – this is being done
- Results chains foresee disaggregation by sex of targets and data – they do
- Logframe, M&E framework – being done, in progress, but no specific WEE indicators

Key questions in the basic gender analysis:

- What will be the distribution of costs and benefits between women and men?
- Do women and men have equal access to

This is also covered by the framework.

These activities are in line with some of the suggestions made in the framework. This includes addressing women's strategic gender needs, i.e. those that would change their traditional gender roles – attract women to non-traditional occupations. The strategy, however, provides little guidance on how to identify and make use of adequate incentives for market actors (e.g. employers, training providers) to change gender roles. Project staff is aware of the need for this and some propose to demonstrate that women are as or more productive than men in male dominated occupations.

Gender analysis starts in phase 1 of the programme cycle in the framework. That this is not so for GEMS2 strategy is the result of WEE having been added on to the project by the donor when programme formulation and market analysis had been largely completed already. A change of direction half-way into the second year of the project was not helpful. All respondents agreed that gender should be mainstreamed from the very start, and gender analysis should be done throughout the programme cycle, when the programme is being conceived, in the market system analysis and for the different interventions when they are being planned.

These questions are also covered in the framework, except for the last. Given that M4P analysis includes consideration of formal and informal "rules", there is however no real

the resources and capacities to benefit from the proposal?

- How will cultural norms and values affect the impact of the proposal on women and men?
- Will the rights of either women or men be affected? (negatively?)

contradiction. The framework specifically states the need for consideration of women’s unpaid work, including productive and reproductive work (in the discussion paper) and community management and political roles (added by the framework we drafted).

The framework provides more detailed questions, and is more geared towards assessing gender in market systems in particular. The project realises this and expects to work on achieving this.

Use of Challenge Fund to promote gender equality – support work where changes in attitudes or aspirations are needed to remove barriers to opportunities, focus on taking up non-traditional careers. This can be outside intervention areas but should address identified systemic constraints in the market.

There is no contradiction between this and what is suggested by the framework. However, from an M4P perspective there could be a risk that “pilots’ such as these turn out to be unscalable and will contribute little to sustainable, systemic change.

Table 2 – Comparison of the GEMS 3 WEE/gender approach and the WEE/M4P framework

Main characteristics/principles of GEMS 3 gender strategy	Comparison with the framework
Overall: There is no specific reference to M4P or its principles in the strategy.	
Overall goal – gender equality, based on the rationale that capitalising on the economic growth potential of women makes sense from both a development and business perspective	Goal is WEE, defined as increased income, better access to opportunities, assets, services. There is less emphasis on equality. Consideration of the “business perspective” is fully in line with the framework.
Overall strategy – taking action and designing interventions that specifically promote equality, in particular economic equality and within the selected market system	This is in line with the framework.

Five “main themes”

Diagnostic and collection of baseline data to understand “gender issues”, to be able to improve women’s access to resources and services, and track results. This analysis should be done from the start.

This confirms the framework.

Build a clear understanding with partners on the link between gender equality and the project’s objectives, wealth creation. This will require strengthening the evidence base.

While this type of advocacy is not in contradiction with the framework, it places more emphasis on identifying and building on more tangible incentives (economic, political) of partners and other market actors.

Obtain commitments and systems for accountability in delivering gender both in-house and within partners

This is not covered by framework, though the framework does recognise the need for partners to understand WEE. It is similar to Goal 1 in the GEMS 2 gender strategy, but goes further with regard to partners.

Design activities that specifically target women within each work stream (i.e. land administration, taxation and investment promotion)

This is also foreseen in the framework. Where constraints in the market system are specific to women they may require targeted interventions.

Expand awareness externally, to “build a constituency for WEE becoming institutionally embedded within ... the government machinery in Nigeria”.

Within the M4P approach this could be seen as facilitation of broader systemic change, “crowding in” and copying. Advocacy, especially if it is in line with other incentives (e.g. legislation, policies) may result in behavioural change. However, the framework is more modest in its objectives, focussing on the selected market systems and facilitating the adoption of successful innovations by market actors.

Table 3 – Comparison of the GEMS WEE/gender approach and the WEE/M4P framework

Main characteristics/principles of GEMS WEE strategy	Comparison with the framework
Overall: “As far as practical” gender related interventions should address market failures, within the context of sustainable market systems change. There should be “no ideological	This is largely in line with the framework, but the “as far as practical” and reference to no ideological application of M4P create scope for possible exceptions to M4P principles.

application of the M4P approach”.

Overall goal – Women’s economic empowerment, project accountability on WEE

This agrees with the framework.

Overall strategy – As above (address market failures). Interventions should address constraints specific to women, especially when they have the potential to “maximise beneficial impacts on women”.

This is in line with the framework.

“Operational principles” in addition to addressing market failures

Every proposed intervention should be scoped for WEE activities and if there is potential a gender analysis should be carried out.

This confirms the framework, though the framework would start considering gender at an earlier stage, before interventions are being formulated

Every intervention should have a WEE component unless it can be justified that it does not.

While the framework advocates applying the gender lens to all stages of the project cycle, it does not state all interventions should address WEE.

Cultural and social norms should be tackled by making a business case for change. Opportunities to change norms should come out of gender analysis.

This is in line with the framework, but as for the other GEMS strategies the strategy is not specific on how a business case could be made and market actors’ incentives addressed.

Design activities that specifically target women within each work stream (i.e. land administration, taxation and investment promotion)

This is also foreseen in the framework. Where constraints in the market system are specific to women they may require targeted interventions.

Gender analysis should include a “do no harm” analysis.

This confirms the framework.

Build WEE mainstreaming capacity and systems in the projects and among partners.

This is not addressed in the framework.

Table 4 – Comparison of the Alliances WEE/gender approach and the WEE/M4P framework

Main characteristics/principles of Alliance's approach to gender mainstreaming	Comparison with the framework
<p>Overall: The projects implement an M4P approach, in which gender is addressed as a transversal theme. Strategy documents do not indicate there needs to be a conflict between the two and staff consider it in practical terms (how do we do it) rather than as if there were some contradiction in principle.</p>	<p>The framework also found there is no contradiction in principle between M4P and WEE, though the discussion paper did indicate M4P's lack of attention to women's unpaid work and lack of guidance on mainstreaming gender. This is what the projects have been trying to solve.</p>
<p>Overall goal – the equal access of women to services, inputs and markets.</p>	<p>The goal is WEE, defined as increased income, better access to opportunities, assets, services, and more decision making authority. There is less emphasis on equality (progress towards equality being more realistic), more on decision making as an essential aspect of WEE.</p>
<p>Overall strategy – “Interventions must be designed and implemented and then assessed in a way that ensures the inclusion, where appropriate, of women”³⁸. This may also result in interventions that target women specifically. Currently two are under consideration, one that would result in a bank offering a credit product for women, and one that relates to the Governance theme.</p>	<p>This is in line with the framework, which argues for mainstreaming WEE in the entire project cycle and recognises that this may mean interventions that address constraints specific to women.</p>
<p>Integration of gender in the programme management cycle:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The projects did a market systems analysis that provided sex disaggregated information. It showed what women do in the value chains, what constraints they face, how this is different from men, and how, given women's role, market actors could make them more effective participants in the market system. • More or less simultaneously, the projects conducted several gender analysis studies. These used the SDC gender toolkit, in KK's case with adaptations to focus more on issues of immediate relevance to the market system. The studies provided insight into gender roles beyond the market system, 	<p>The framework attempts to integrate gender analysis into the market analysis framework provided by M4P. I.e. one set of questions covers both. Although this would seem the most logical way to mainstream WEE, it also makes the framework heavy and complicated. While the Alliances projects have avoided this, the market analysis reports do not, on the other hand, show much evidence of the gender analysis having been taken into account. The studies have remained largely separate documents with seemingly different purposes: designing interventions (the market analysis), understanding context and impact assessment (gender analysis). This may limit the scope for addressing constraints on women that originate outside the selected market systems.</p>

- including issues of control (decision making).
 - Ethnic differences were considered in the gender analysis.
 - Women were included in the research, as focus group discussion participants, as key informants (via gender mapping), and among those who designed and conducted the studies.
 - In practice, the design of interventions draws on the disaggregated information on the market system analysis rather than the gender analysis. The latter provides “context”, “background”. It will also be used to assess impact on WEE.
 - When interventions are designed the projects try to envisage how they could affect women and men, and more research is done if needed (research may be needed to design the intervention in any case).
 - “Investment (intervention) plans” have a paragraph on “gender sensitised aspects of the intervention”.
 - Indicators for results chains are gender-disaggregated where relevant. So far no separate chains, or parts of chains, have been designed for women or men, but one is under formulation (related to women’s participation in local government).
 - Although the projects’ Outcome Monitoring Concept foresaw the development of “gender indicators” based on the gender analysis, this has not yet been done.
- Consideration of context factors such as ethnicity is also part of the framework.
- Participation of women in the research and analysis is seen as critical in the framework. The projects confirm this.
- The reiterative character of the projects’ research is in line with M4P and the framework.
- The SJ project also found that a large baseline study is not very useful. Targeted research (baselines related directly to an intervention and the women and men it is likely to affect) is more effective.
- Inclusion of gender in intervention plans is in line with the framework. However, the gender sections in the plans we saw were limited in scope, in particular with regard to consideration of possible impact on other gender roles than those in the selected market system. It may be necessary to be more specific on what gender sensitised means for these plans.
- Sex disaggregation of results chains and the possibility to have separate chains is in line with the framework.
- The framework also foresees the possibility of having indicators for mainstreaming WEE that are more than just the common indicators disaggregated.
- Key questions in the gender analysis:
 - What is the division of labour between women and men, in productive and reproductive roles, and how do women collaborate?
 - What are the gender aspects of the involvement of children?
 - How and by whom are decisions taken at the household and community level?
 - What access and control do women have over resources, services needed for their productive and reproductive roles? This
- These questions are relatively standard in gender analysis and are covered by the framework.

includes consideration of rights.

- What needs to women and men express in relation to their roles, and how do they perceive inequalities?
- What, if any, are the gender biases in the provision of services?
- In practice, interventions:
- Address access constraints, underlying causes that have been identified through a market system analysis.
- As governance is another transversal theme, they also address women's lack of participation in community decision making.
- Do not address other possible constraints beyond the selected market systems, e.g. lack of time due to other work, or household decision making.
- Make use of women who have (informal) leadership positions, who can be role models, champions for innovations the projects facilitate (e.g. the only woman vet).
- Build on a "business case", i.e. the incentives of market actors. More broadly this may be seen, with Government, as an economic or rights case, i.e. interventions for women may contribute to economic development and legislation provides for gender equality.
- Do not, generally, address limiting attitudes directly, and opinions as to the desirability or feasibility of doing so vary among project, partner, donor staff. In fact, though, an intervention to make local government aware of new gender equality legislation can be seen in that light.

This is in line with the framework, which views "awareness raising" and promotion in terms of making market actors aware of the importance of women as for instance consumers of services and inputs rather than advocacy for gender equality per se.

Capacity:

- Project strategies do not specifically address the need for gender training, but focus on M4P training.
- In practice, gender workshops and training have taken place – all staff interviewed indicated the need for more. Capacity is increasing as more experience is gained by doing.
- The projects have in-house capacity on gender.

The framework does not address capacity issues.

ANNEX 5 – FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT WEE/M4P FRAMEWORK

Consultations on the WEE/M4P analytical framework we drafted resulted in some discussion of basic principles that provide a context for the other feedback. The most important of these concerned how the analytical questions a project needs to ask depends on its goals, outcomes, etc. Most respondents were of the opinion that where Women’s Economic Empowerment is included in the project goal or as a crosscutting theme, or the intention to do “no harm” is expressed in the project strategy, gender analysis is likely to be needed, at least of women’s and men’s productive roles within the selected market system and perhaps beyond. If, going one step further, a project aims to contribute to gender equality, or women’s empowerment generally, a comprehensive gender analysis may be required, including of women’s and men’s reproductive roles and roles in the community. The division of child care responsibilities, for instance, can limit what economic opportunities women are able to take up. Women’s lack of say in community decisions may affect whether investments are made in infrastructure and services that benefit them rather than men. Going again one step further, if a project is concerned not only with “growth” but more broadly with the “quality of growth” (including gender equality but not only), an even more encompassing analysis may be needed.

This is an important discussion, which underlines once again the need to have a clear agreement on a strategic framework at the start of a project. We have assumed, though, in line with our TOR and Linda Jones’s discussion paper, that what is most needed now is a framework for projects that aim explicitly at increasing WEE, as the common denominator of many M4P projects. Anything beyond that will require analytical work by projects in addition to what the framework proposes. The framework as finally drafted does, however, provide for a Gender Analysis to be part of the market analysis normally done by M4P projects that include WEE among their objectives. Project practice indicates this offers the required sound basis for designing WEE interventions.

The comments and suggestions respondents provided were diverse and wide-ranging, but there were some clear trends. The following are the main conclusions.

- The preferred way forward was mainstreaming WEE into the M4P operational guide. This would mean gendering the language of the guide, as suggested by Linda Jones, and adding questions of particular relevance to WEE. This is an obvious solution: M4P projects can benefit from applying the gender lens throughout the project cycle, and re-writing the guide would mean asking the questions suggested for each of the project cycle phases for women and men separately.
- As it stands, the questions in the analytical framework were overall considered to be relevant. Very few suggestions were made for eliminating questions, and there was no consensus on this. Rather, the consensus was “these are the questions we should ask, or that we have asked (where analysis had been done already)”.
- On the other hand, the framework was considered to be very heavy and complicated, with too many questions especially on the front end (developing a strategic framework). This is probably partly due to the overlap between the analytical framework provided by the M4P guide and our draft. What we have tried to do is combine the M4P questions with key questions drawn from gender analytical frameworks. This has resulted in a tool that is indeed unwieldy and complex.
- Although a goal at the outset of this assignment was to set priorities or weights to the questions/issues throughout the framework, it proved difficult in practice to do this systematically. Given that the questions are logically linked this was perhaps to be expected.
- The questions for phase 1 in the project cycle, i.e. setting the strategic framework, seem to require a lot of the research that normally should be part of the market system analysis of even the intervention design phase. Doing that much research early on may prove superfluous and may reduce projects’ flexibility.
- More generally, while all questions in the framework are important, they may not all be relevant to all projects. For instance, in a sector that is male dominated and where a project does not aim to change gender roles, doing this much research on gender roles may be unnecessary. Projects could select the questions that are relevant.

- Not all the suggested questions may have to be researched in the phase in which they are placed now. This point is of course in accordance with the reiterative character of M4P research.
- The analysis of women's reproductive roles is important for a general understanding of the constraints women face and the opportunities they may have, even though it may not necessitate material changes to intervention plans.
- The framework should ask questions of access to and control over resources and services separately, as it does now. This is an important distinction that reflects the gender power relations in the household and community.
- The risk analysis questions were also singled out by some as being especially important. These consider whether interventions could have a negative impact on women's roles and gender equality, which is a minimum requirement. They also consider potential negative effects on men.
- It is important to take into account contextual factors such as ethnicity.
- The framework should combine quantitative with qualitative data and analysis.
- The framework's language was considered to be too technical and complex. A revised framework needs to avoid both M4P and gender analysis jargon.
- Practical examples would do much to improve the user friendliness of the framework.
- Using diagrams such as those included in the M4P operational guide would also help.
- The framework should be explicit on the need to involve women in the research, as respondents and as researchers.

In conclusion, the substance of the framework was endorsed overall, but there is a clear need to make it more practical and user friendly. Our recommendations for doing so are provided in Chapter 4.

ENDNOTES

¹Jones, L., "Discussion Paper for an M4P WEE Framework: How can the Making Markets Work for the Poor Framework work for poor women and for poor men", The Springfield Centre for Business in Development, Durham, 2012.

²*Op.cit.* page 8; see also the good practice note included in part B of this report.

³ The definition of women's economic empowerment used in this report is taken from: Jones, L., "Discussion Paper for an M4P WEE Framework: How can the Making Markets Work for the Poor Framework work for poor women and for poor men", The Springfield Centre for Business in Development, Durham, UK, January 2012; it can be found on the first page of Part B of this report.

⁴*Op.cit.*

⁵*Op.cit.*

⁶Most notably those developed under the auspices of the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), the Department for International Development (DFID), the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida), the World Bank/IFAD/FAO, and the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), and the International Labour Organisation (ILO)

⁷"The Operational Guide for the Making Markets Work for the Poor (M4P) Approach", Springfield Centre, 2008

⁸See Annex 2, Main documents reviewed, for references.

⁹Mayou, L., Mackie, G., "Making the strongest link: a practical guide to mainstreaming gender analysis in value chain development", ILO, 2007,

http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/@ed_emp/@emp_ent/documents/instructionalmaterial/wcms_106538.pdf ; USAID,

"Promoting gender equitable opportunities in agricultural value chains: a handbook", http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/cross-cutting_programs/wid/pubs/GATE_Gender_Ag_Value_Chain_Handbook_11-09.pdf

¹⁰ Annex 4 provides more detailed accounts of the WEE/gender approaches of the projects compared to the WEE/M4P framework

¹¹See for instance the M4P Operational Guide, pp 12, 57, 89-92

¹²GEMS 2, "Strategy for the promotion of gender equality", September 2011, p.5

¹³Jones, L., page 8; see also the good practice note included in this report.

¹⁴ GEMS, "Strategy for Women's Economic Empowerment", January 2012, page 5, 6

¹⁵*Op.cit.*, page 5.

¹⁶Market Alliances Against Poverty Samtskhe-Javakheti, "Gender Analysis of the SDC-funded and the Mercy Corps-implemented 'Market Alliances against Poverty' Programme Area", Akhalstikhe, May 2011, page 22, and interviews

¹⁷ Mercy Corps, "Gender Procedures; policy in action", 2011; Swiss Development Cooperation, "Gender Toolkit",

http://www.sdc.admin.ch/en/Home/Themes/Gender/General_and_thematic_tools/Gender_Tool_Kit

¹⁸Market Alliances Against Poverty in the Kvemo Kartli Region of Georgia, "Final Strategy", September 2011

¹⁹Jones, L., page 8; see also the good practice note included in this report.

²⁰ Swiss Cooperation Office South Caucasus, "Outcome monitoring concept for the domain economic development and employment", 2009

²¹ Walker, J., "First Mission Report Gender Backstopping Mandate for SDC South Caucasus Regional Programme", September 2011

²²See Market Alliances Against Poverty, "Gender analysis of the SJ program area", August 2011; Market Alliances Against Poverty, "Gender Analysis of the SDC-funded and the Mercy Corps-implemented 'Market Alliances against Poverty' Programme Area", Akhalstikhe, 2011

²³While the Enterprise for Pro-poor Growth project in Sri Lanka did not address gender attitudes but biases against business, it demonstrated a project that takes a facilitation role can contribute to attitude change in as short a period as three years. See Seeley, C. , "Palama: a campaign for enterprise culture", Colombo, June 2009, www.entergrowth.com

²⁴Katalyst, "Addressing Gender", October 2010.

²⁵Skype conference with Kevin Billing, Team Leader, GEMS I, March 6, 2012

²⁶The Enterprise for Pro-poor Growth project in Sri Lanka used a similar approach to assessing the impact of its work on promoting enterprise culture. It did triangulate focus group discussions findings with experimental data, though. See Seeley, C. , "Palama: a campaign for enterprise culture", Colombo, June 2009, www.entergrowth.com

²⁷See note 17 and DFID, "Gender Manual: A practical guide for development policy makers and practitioners", 2002.

<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Documents/publications/dfid-gender-manual-2008.pdf>

²⁸Jones, L., page 8

²⁹http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/cross-cutting_programs/wid/pubs/Glossary_Handout.pdf; Based on the OECD definition.

³⁰ Jones, L., page 8

³¹http://www.un.org/womenwatch/directory/women_and_poverty_3001.htm

³²<http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/beijing/platform/poverty.htm>

³³<http://www.ilo.org/public/english/bureau/gender/newsite2002/about/defin.htm>

³⁴This draws on and expands the "The Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (WEAI)", a measure to directly capture women's empowerment and inclusion levels in the agricultural sector, developed by the International Food Policy Research Institute; http://www.ifpri.org/sites/default/files/publications/weai_brochure.pdf

³⁵M4P Operational Manual pp 31-38

³⁶See Katalyst, "Addressing Gender", October 2010.

³⁷DFID, "Gender Equality Action Plan light touch review", September 2010

³⁸Market Alliances Against Poverty in the Kvemo Kartli Region of Georgia, "Final Strategy", September 2011, page