Assessing Agricultural Technologies for their Impacts on Gender Roles and Nutrition
Housekeeping

• Please make sure your line is muted.
• The presentation will last about 40 minutes and will be followed by a Q&A session.
• If you have questions for the presenters, please type them into the chat box.
• If you are experiencing technical difficulties, please send a private message to INGENAES.

Thank you.
What we stand for

Integrating Gender and Nutrition within Agricultural Extension Services
Vision & Goal

**VISION**

Empower women to better contribute to higher household incomes, increase agricultural productivity, and improve nutritional outcomes for family and community members.

**GOAL**

Reduce gender gaps in agriculture, increase empowerment of women farmers, and improve the integration of and attention to gender and nutrition, both in and through agricultural extension and advisory services.
Action areas to achieve outcomes

I. Build gender-responsive and nutrition sensitive institutions

II. Replicate gender-responsive and nutrition sensitive service delivery mechanisms

III. Disseminate technologies that enhance women’s productivity and improve nutritional outcomes

IV. Apply gender-responsive and nutrition-sensitive approaches and tools
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Today’s Agenda

• Review concepts and background for the gender and nutrition technology assessment
• Introduce INGENAES gender and nutrition technology assessment process
• Share findings from pilot activities
• Q&A
What is a G&N technology assessment?

An analytical process to understand the potential gender-related and nutritional impacts of specific agricultural technologies on men and women.
Technology

Technologies are defined as “practices or techniques, tools or equipment, know-how and skills…[alone or together] …that are used to enhance productivity, reduce production and processing costs, and save on scarce resources or inputs, such as labor or energy.”

Ragasa (2012:5)
How the assessment came about

• Gender gaps in access to inputs limit productivity gains: “If women had the same resources as men, they could increase yields on their farms by 20 – 30 percent.” (FAO 2011)

• The INGENAES project: Extension officers are responsible for promoting and disseminating technologies to men and women farmers
“Shrink it and pink it”
Social Dimensions of Technologies

Gender Roles

Technology

?
Women and men are responsible for different tasks along the agricultural value chain.

Women’s ranking of preferred traits include characteristics associated with their household responsibilities (e.g., cooking time, taste, texture).
Women spend a disproportionate amount of time on labor-intensive activities (e.g., collecting water, weeding).
Technologies can improve the quantity and quality of agricultural products, and thus their nutritional and market value.
The G&N technology assessment

• Uses gender analysis
• Intended to highlight issues related to
  • Food availability, quality, and safety
  • Time and labor
  • Income and assets
• Used to identify how gender-based constraints shape adoption process and dissemination efforts
• Used to identify specific actions to improve design, use, or dissemination of technologies
1. Understand the technology

2. Understand the actors involved in the design, use, and dissemination of technologies

3. Identify gender-based constraints

4. Link gender-based constraints to adoption process and dissemination efforts

5. Design actions and monitor the change

Food availability, quality, and safety
Time and Labor
Income and Assets

Process of the assessment
Three Areas of Inquiry

• The impact of the technology on **food availability, quality, and safety**
• The potential consequences on men’s and women’s **time and labor**
• The extent to which the technology **alters the amount or the control of the income** by men and/or women
How does the technology improve food **availability** overall, at different times of year, and for different people in the household?

What are men’s and women’s different preferences for food **quality** (e.g., for taste, for processing)?

How does the technology improve food **safety** for men and for women?

**PICS Bags:**
Storage sacks for grain (Food availability, quality)

**Aflasafe:**
A biocontrol method for reducing aflatoxin (Food safety)
Time and Labor

- What impact does the technology have on men’s or women’s time?
- In what ways does it improve or worsen labor conditions for men or women?
- In what ways does it reduce drudgery for men or women?
- Does the technology shift labor between men and women?

**Treadle pumps:**
Reduce time women spend collecting water

**Fertilizer Deep Placement:**
May reduce time women spend on weeding but increases time spent transplanting
Income and assets

- To what extent do women or men have access to and control over the income derived from increased sales of the targeted crop or product?

- Does the innovation have the potential to shift income patterns in the household?

- Does the shift in labor result in a loss or gain of income for different groups?

- In what ways might it create additional employment opportunities?

Digital Fat Tester: Provides information about milk fat %; increases economic incentives for women dairy farmers

Pond Aquaculture: Women invest more time caring for fish, but don’t know how to harvest and do not market
Technology Profiles

- Fertilizer Deep Placement (Bangladesh 2016)
- Aflasafe (Zambia 2016)
- CSISA Pond and Gardening (Bangladesh 2016)
- Digital Fat Tester (Bangladesh 2016)
- Langstroth Beehive (Bangladesh 2016)
- PICS Bags (Purdue Improved Crop Storage) (Zambia 2016)
- Treadle Pump (Zambia 2016)

http://ingenaes.illinois.edu/apply/technology-profiles/
See Technology Profiles on INGENAES website: http://ingenaes.illinois.edu/apply/technology-profiles/


Concluding Remarks

• It’s not just about the technology. Other complementary interventions matter.
• The assessment is a snapshot, not about attribution.
• Innovation introduces change. What kind of change do we want to support?
• Decisions about what to do need to weigh the potential trade-offs between multiple objectives (e.g., reducing weeding and labor opportunities).
Q&A

For more information, please contact Cristina Manfre, Senior Associate cmanfre@culturalpractice.com and Caitlin Nordehn, Program Associate, cnordehn@culturalpractice.com.

View Technology Profiles here: http://ingenaes.illinois.edu/apply/technology-profiles/
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