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1. Introduction

The African Chicken Genetic Gains (ACGG) program is an Africa-wide collaboration led by the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) with diverse stakeholders including universities, national research institutes and private sector partners in Ethiopia, Nigeria and Tanzania. ACGG tests and makes available high producing, farmer preferred genotypes that increase smallholder chicken productivity in Africa. ACGG works in partnership with rural communities to test the productivity of improved breeds. ACGG was initiated in 2014 and runs until 2019.

While gender equality concerns and women’s empowerment were considered in the overall design of ACGG, it did not automatically translate into a systematic and meaningful integration of gender concerns into program implementation. Halfway through the program’s life, the key question for ACGG was not whether to integrate gender in the program but ‘how’. In October 2016, ACGG and ILRI therefore commissioned KIT Gender\(^1\) to lead a one year program-wide process of co-creation and learning to develop an ACGG gender strategy.

The result is a gender strategy that:

- guides ACGG on how to integrate gender into its research in a meaningful, effective and feasible manner;
- provides the basis for a common understanding in ACGG of what women’s empowerment and gender integration means in the context of the program;
- clarifies what change is expected, the mechanisms through which this is expected to happen and what is required from different ACGG team members; and
- has a strong focus on ongoing learning, knowledge creation and documentation.

This gender strategy document starts with some background to the ACGG program including how gender concerns feature in the original program design. Section 3 presents the conceptual framework for ACGG’s gender integration work based on the translation of a recent model of women’s empowerment in the ACGG context. This is followed in section 4 with an introduction to the gender-responsive theory of change (ToC) for ACGG. Section 5 offers an overview of the four goals and five action areas of the strategy, while section 6 and 7 how to operationalize these into concrete interventions and activities. Section 8 offers the details of ACGG’s gender strategy monitoring framework, including key indicators and milestones. The concluding section 9 focuses on the program- and country-level implementation plans of the Gender Strategy.

Finally, Annex 1 gives more detail about the activities and outputs produced during the gender strategy development process. Annex 2 presents ideas for a protocol for making CIPs more gender responsive. The country and program implementation plans are laid out in two separate documents: the ACGG gender strategy country implementation plan and the ACGG gender strategy program implementation plan.

\(^{1}\)Annex 1 provides more details on what was done and produced during the gender strategy development process.
1.1 Guiding principles for the ACGG gender strategy

The ACGG gender strategy is based on a number of guiding principles.

Firstly, the gender strategy is developed with 'the active participation of key ACGG managers and staff'. An ACGG gender strategy advisory team (GSAT)\(^2\) has been providing advice on the gender strategy process, functioning as ‘sparring partner’ to KIT Gender, and taking part in working out the gender strategy and related implementation plans. Throughout the process, staff have been encouraged to give input into the design of the strategy, participate in joint analysis of problems, give feedback to findings and take part in setting priorities for future work.

Secondly, as ACGG is an agriculture research-for-development project, this gender strategy has a dual emphasis on gender integration into:

- the ‘mainstream of ACGG’s technical research’ so that there is data to analyse: i. the short- and long-term impact of the program on gender relations and women’s empowerment (how does improved technology impact gender relations), and ii. the gender dimensions of technical research questions (how do gender relations impact technology adoption); and

- the ‘day-to-day development operations’ of ACGG so that the program improves the lives of participating chicken farmers.

Thirdly, there are entry points for gender integration ‘throughout ACGG’s research and program cycle’ such as in the design and conceptualization of research methods and program activities, as well as in their planning, monitoring and reporting, and in related capacity development of staff. By introducing a common conceptual framework, a gender-responsive ToC and a monitoring framework, the gender strategy ensures that linkages are established between gender integration at different moments of the research and program cycle.

Finally, ACGG is more than halfway through its program life and almost all intervention and activity areas are already being implemented. For gender strategy implementation, this means focusing on entry points for gender integration as much as possible through the adaption or improvement of ‘existing’ tools, processes and mechanisms of the program and introducing ‘new’ ones when needed. For gender strategy monitoring, this means linking to existing ACGG monitoring and reporting, in particular to the ACGG Results Tracker i.e. overall monitoring and reporting requirements to the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF).

---
\(^2\) For more details, please refer to the ACGG gender strategy Inception Report (including the GSAT terms of reference (ToR) and a list of GSAT members) at [https://acgg.wikispaces.com/gender](https://acgg.wikispaces.com/gender).
2. Gender concerns in ACGG design and practice

The program’s overall purpose is to ‘catalyse a farmer-centric public-private partnership model for chicken genetic improvement and testing, multiplication and delivery as a sustainable pathway to productivity growth, poverty reduction, increased household animal protein intake and empowerment of women farmers in rural communities’ (ILRI 2014, p.3).

**Gender integration vision**: ACGG has from its outset recognized women as key actors in the smallholder chicken value chain and acknowledged the particular constraints women chicken farmers face due to unequal gender relations. A closer reading of ACGG’s proposal to the BMGF reveals that women’s empowerment is articulated at outcome, objective and activity level of the program (ILRI 2014). A two-pronged approach for women’s empowerment through ACGG is specified in the proposal: firstly, ensuring that gender equality and women’s empowerment is inherent in all that the program does (i.e. on-farm testing as well as innovation platform – IP interventions), and secondly, directly targeting gender inequalities.

Furthermore, placing ‘women at the centre to ensure success’ is considered one of the program’s five key pillars (ILRI 2014, p. 7). Concretely, this is meant to happen by focusing on women ‘right from the identification of the constraints, definition of breeding objectives, testing of the improved lines for suitability as well as participation in the IP meetings’ (Ibid p. 5). The proposal also stipulates that all data collection and analysis should be gender disaggregated, that gender segregated benefits and impact of introduction and adoption of improved chicken lines need to be understood, and some targets for women’s representation in project activities (Ibid).

‘On-farm testing’ of improved breeds is the main mechanism of ACGG for researching what chicken and service delivery models different farmers prefer. From a gender perspective, that would imply collecting data to understand: the different trait preferences of women and men, how gender relations affect women’s access services, inputs and markets, how the new technology brings them benefits and local interpretations of women’s empowerment.

‘IPs’ are facilitated by ACGG at the national level for public-private sector partnerships to emerge that can make farmer preferred lines available and accessible, and at the community level to create awareness about available chicken breeds and to help find solutions to local challenges, especially those faced by women farmers. IPs are expected to act as important vehicles to engage women as stakeholders in the chicken value chain. At the community level, in particular, an expected outcome of the IPs is ‘a functioning mechanism developed for ensuring the empowerment of women smallholders to participate in the chicken value chains and to lead efforts to generate and share knowledge … on improved and profitable chicken production’ (ILRI 2014, p.8). For this outcome to be realized, it would imply explicitly identifying in community innovation platforms (CIPs) gendered needs and constraints experienced by women in the value chain and addressing them by the program. National innovation platforms (NIPs) are ACGG’s main mechanism for forming public private sector partnerships in order to make ‘farmer preferred lines’ available and

---

3. Outcome 4. Increased empowerment of women smallholder farmers in the chicken value chain to be seen across rural communities (ILRI 2014, p. 2); Objective 8: develop and nurture community and subnational innovation platforms (IPs) focused on empowering poor smallholder farmers, especially women (Ibid p. 7); and Activity 10.1 Women’s empowerment (Ibid p. 16).
accessible, and ensuring an enabling environment for the preferred lines to thrive (i.e. adequate and equitable access to required services, inputs and information). The work of the national level IPs is expected to be informed by gender issues captured at CIP level and brought to the NIPs through feedback loops envisioned between community and national levels.

**Gender integration experiences:** While gender concerns were considered in the design of ACGG, it did not translate into a systematic integration of gender concerns in program implementation. At the beginning of the Gender strategy development process, gender-disaggregated data had not been systematically collected from ACGG supported households as part of on-farm testing. Data collection had so far not been initiated around intra-household decision-making (e.g. who decides when to sell and slaughter, use of income from chicken sales, when to consume etc.) and how these in turn influence how benefits are distributed to different individuals in the household, let alone how they empower women. Similarly, gendered needs and constraints experienced by women had not been systematically identified in CIPs and addressed by the program and feedback loops between community, and national level IPs had not been established to ensure that gender issues captured at CIP level were brought to and addressed at NIP level. While the number of women participants at CIP level had been fairly high, the representation of women at NIP level had been low.

4. For more details on gender integration in ACGG, please refer to the three ACGG country gender strategy summary trip reports at https://acgg.wikispaces.com/gender.
3. Conceptual framework

An important aim of the gender strategy development process was to create a common understanding of what women’s empowerment and gender integration means in ACGG. To this end, the KIT gender team facilitated participatory gender analysis exercises with key ACGG staff and partners in all three program countries to unpack the program’s ToC from a gender perspective and to introduce and make relevant key gender concepts. Findings from these country-based analyses fed into the final gender strategy workshop (Addis Ababa, September 2017) during which key conceptual and operational building blocks of the strategy were further clarified and enriched. This section presents the resulting conceptual framework of the ACGG gender strategy. Section 3.1 focuses on defining four conceptual tools as a basis for conducting gender analysis in ACGG. These tools are presented as four dimensions of gender relations, which interact to affect the empowerment of women chicken producers as they are the primary target group ACGG. The gender strategy also provides room to work with other women value-chain actors, especially from the perspective of upgrading chicken producers in the value chain and in terms of ensuring the voice of women entrepreneurs is heard and acted upon in ACGG-facilitated IP work. Section 3.2. presents the conceptual basis for ACGG work on women’s empowerment.

3.1 Different dimensions of gender relations

The conceptual framework of the strategy draws on a perspective that views ‘gender as a social relation’. The concept of social relations of gender was introduced to shift attention away from looking at women and men as isolated categories to looking at the social relationships through which they were mutually constituted as unequal social categories (Kabeer and Subrahmanian 1996). A gender relations lens implies an acknowledgement that the social position of people is shaped through social relations of gender, class, age, ethnicity, location (rural/urban) etc. (Kabeer 1994). Women and girls (as well as men and boys) are not a homogeneous group, and gender is not the only basis on which disempowerment occurs and is experienced. The way gender relations manifest themselves varies from society to society and also changes over time. Still, these relations define the way in which gender roles and responsibilities are assigned and the way in which women and men and their ascribed roles are assigned a relative value. Social relations of gender explain why women and men are valued differently and how this affects their relative opportunities and life chances.

For the conceptual framework of the gender strategy, the gender relations lens described above has been translated into a focus on four dimensions of gender relations: gender division of labour, gender norms, access to and control over resources and benefits, and decision-making. Figure 1 presents a visual image of key elements under the four different dimensions (Eerdewijk and Danielsen 2015) and also shows how the dimensions relate to each other and impact women’s empowerment as chicken producers.

The first dimension of the framework is the ‘gender division of labour’, which concerns gender analysis of women’s and men’s different productive functions, tasks and roles (related to all livestock, chicken, crops, vegetable garden and income generating activities), and reproductive tasks and community related roles. A gender analysis calls for unpacking what labour is provided by different male and female members of the household and the implications this
may have to tasks related to chicken production. For ACGG, it is particularly important to identify where different household members experience labour intensity vis-à-vis chicken production (such as purchasing inputs, feeding (collecting and preparing), watering, cleaning chicken shelter, egg collection, selling of chickens/chicken products, disease control and caring for sick chickens).

The second dimension concerns ‘gender norms’ understood as a set of social rules and assumptions about what men and women should do, how and with what resources, and the status of individuals and their relative value in society. Gender norms are likely to affect women’s roles, constraints and opportunities in chicken production. For ACGG, one concern is to understand how women’s labour in chicken production is recognized. Also, gender norms affect how women benefit from ACGG, such as norms related to who in the family is allowed to eat first (often the man) as well as norms restricting women’s involvement in financial transactions and norms constraining women’s mobility which influence women’s ability to go to the market to purchase inputs (e.g. feed), access vaccinations and sell chicken products.

Unequal distribution of resources between women and men is referred to in terms of ‘access to and control over resources and benefits’ and this is the third dimension in ACGG’s gender conceptual framework. Access refers to the opportunity to use resources and benefits, whereas having control is being able to define and decide their use. Inputs for chicken farming are important resources, and can include feeds, water, medicine, veterinary services and medicines, fuel, as well as credit, but also knowledge, information and extension services.

Other potentially relevant resources include access to groups and organizations. A key resource in terms of control is labour, both one’s own and the labour of others in or outside the household. Important benefits of chicken production are obviously income and nutritious food (including meat and eggs) and gender analysis entails examining how these are distributed by gender and how this is affected by gender relations.

A fourth and strongly related dimension is ‘decision-making’, which concerns the analysis of who is involved in which decisions in chicken production, and unpacking the nature of that involvement. For ACGG, it is critically important to understand decision-making around: i. engaging in chicken production, ii. labour allocations and iii. income and benefits from the production (including consumption of meat and eggs). This focus increases its importance once smallholder chicken farming becomes more productive and profitable as this might result in shifts in decision-making from women to men. This dimension of decision-making is strongly related to the second dimension of the framework because gender norms can reinforce power relations in chicken producing households and communities. It is also related to the third dimension as control over resources and benefits concerns being able to decide their use.
Figure 1: Four dimensions of gender relations.

**Gender Division of Labour**
- Women responsible for food security, child care and care for the sick
- Men dominate in functions of authority
- Few women in value chain above producer’s level
- Access to and control over resources and benefits

**Gender Norms**
- Women expected to stay close to homestead and reproductive tasks
- Assumption man is the ‘knower’ + ‘breadwinner’
- Employment in chicken value chain until marriage
-Norms about men getting more food and getting served first

**Access to and control over resources and benefits**
- Bias in extension towards men
- Male ownership of land, assets and income

**Decision-making**
- Women’s limited access to resources:
  - Inputs (feed, vaccines etc.)
  - Knowledge, skills
  - Capital, credit, savings
  - Markets, social networks
  - Transport, mobility
- Empowerment of women chicken producers
- Weak bargaining position of women
- Men take over when productivity and scale increases

**Empowerment of women chicken producers**
- Women’s access to improved breeds
- Women’s control over income
- Men take over when productivity and scale increases
- Independent decision-making by women

**Cross-links**
- High work burden = time poverty of women
- Women’s limited access to land, assets and income
- Women in female-headed households have more control
- Women talking to men that are not family
- Norms about men getting more food and getting served first
- Weak bargaining position of women
- Men take over when productivity and scale increases
- Independent decision-making by women

**Gender Gains**
- Women’s expected to stay close to homestead and reproductive tasks
- Men dominate in functions of authority
- Access to and control over resources and benefits
- Norms about men getting more food and getting served first
- Norms against women’s independence
- Norms against women talking to men that are not family
- Norms against women voicing concerns
- High work burden = time poverty of women
- Women’s limited access to land, assets and income
- Women in female-headed households have more control
- Women talking to men that are not family
- Norms about men getting more food and getting served first
- Weak bargaining position of women
- Men take over when productivity and scale increases
- Independent decision-making by women
3.2 Women’s empowerment and ACGG

For the purpose of the gender strategy, a distinction is made to define women’s empowerment ‘subjectively’ and ‘objectively’.

‘Subjectively’ defined women’s empowerment signifies how the ‘abstract notion’ or ‘state of being’ of empowerment is articulated and understood in local contexts by chicken farmers themselves, especially women. Women’s empowerment means many different things to different people across countries, and agro-ecological and cultural systems. It also depends on other social identities of individuals, such as class, ethnicity and age. Exploring women’s empowerment ‘subjectively’ defined requires investment into qualitative research on local understandings of empowerment (see section 7, action area 2.d.).

‘Objectively’ defined women’s empowerment is used to denote an understanding of women’s empowerment based on existing state-of-the-art research and literature on the subject, which forms the starting point for ACGG’s gender integration work under the guidance of the gender strategy. Key dimensions of this ‘objective’ understanding of women’s empowerment are translated into workable concepts in the context of ACGG (expanded choice and strengthened voice) and reflected in the gender-responsive ToC, goals, indicators and milestones of the gender strategy.

The basis for ACGG’s ‘objective’ definition of empowerment is a recent conceptual model of women’s empowerment developed by KIT Gender for the BMGF (Eerdewijk et al. 2017).

Women’s empowerment: In ACGG, empowerment of women chicken farmers is a process of developing a combination of expanded choice and strengthened voice.

‘Expanded choice’ concerns the ability of a woman chicken farmer to influence choices that affect her life and future as a successful chicken producer and to contribute to her family’s wellbeing. This is influenced, among others, by whether ACGG’s research and program activities engage directly with her to solicit information about her experiences and preferences, and her access to and control over key resources (in particular services, inputs and markets), as well as benefits (in particular income, nutritious animal protein and food).

‘Strengthened voice’ concerns the capacity of a woman chicken farmer to speak up and be heard, and to shape and share in discussions and decisions (in public and private domains) that affect her life and future as a successful chicken farmer. This is influenced, among others, by ACGG’s efforts to create safe spaces for women to express their concerns (such as an IIP) and the responsiveness of the program to concerns expressed. It is also affected by the extent to which women get recognized as knowledgeable chicken farmers by ACGG and in their communities.

Women’s empowerment is a ‘dynamic process underpinned by the transformation of gender relations’. This transformation happens as women chicken farmers increasingly exercise agency through making decisions and grow in their self-esteem as knowledgeable successful chicken producers. It also happens as resources are redistributed so that women’s access to technology, inputs, services and knowledge increases, and through shifting institutional structures (such as the gender norm about who should eat first) that shape women’s choice and voice at the household level, in the community but also in the ACGG program itself.
4. A gender-responsive ACGG theory of change

ACGG’s ToC constitutes a chain of connected outcomes: access to high producing ‘preferred genotypes’, improved ‘management practices’ and increases in ‘production and productivity’ are expected to facilitate ‘access to markets’ and pathways to ‘women’s empowerment’ that will lead to benefits through increased ‘income’, improved ‘dietary diversity’ and improved ‘livelihoods’.

Gender biases and assumptions continuously inform and shape the content of the ACGG by privileging concepts (such as ‘productivity’) and research methods (mainly quantitative) with the effect that important gender concerns are not captured though ACGG research and program activities or addressed even when they appear to be preconditions for the success of the program. The participatory gender analyses of ACGG’s ToC, carried out with ACGG country teams and partners in the three program countries, made explicit the gender biases and assumptions underlying the program’s design logic including the main cause-effect relationships between program activities and the outcomes they are expected to produce. The analyses made it clear why gender relations and women’s empowerment are not an integral part of ACGG program implementation, despite the aspiration of placing ‘women at the centre of the program’ and women’s empowerment featured in the original ACGG ToC.

A gender-responsive ToC for ACGG is presented in Figure 2. The chain of ACGG outcomes is depicted as blue rectangles, the cause-effect relationships between the outcomes as purple arrows, the gendered preconditions in boxes (green boxes for on-farm testing and pink boxes for IP work) and gender strategy indicators as yellow stars.

For the cause-effect relationships of ACGG’s ToC to remain valid (arrows), ACGG needs to consider the perspectives and positions of women, including their differential needs, preferences and constraints, in the design and implementation of all program activities (green and pink boxes). The gender-responsive ToC makes explicit what gender concerns need addressing for each cause-effect relationship (green and pink boxes). It furthermore makes links to ACGG’s gender strategy monitoring framework as it shows what and where to measure progress towards the expected goals of ACGG’s gender strategy implementation (yellow stars).
5. Gender strategy goals and action areas

The ACGG gender strategy has four goals (Box 1).

Box 1: Goals of the ACGG gender strategy:

**Goal I:** to adapt ACGG research design, tools and processes and IPs to the different needs and concerns of both women and men

**Goal II:** to achieve more gender equity in access to ACGG resources including technology, knowledge/skills and other services

**Goal III:** to achieve progress towards women’s empowerment including expanded choice and strengthened voice

**Goal IV:** to contribute to developing the evidence base on gender dynamics of chicken value chains.

In line with these four gender strategy goals, the strategy includes five interconnected action areas with one overarching action area 1 that focuses on creating an enabling environment for gender strategy implementation, and action areas 2–5 corresponding with the two main interventions areas of ACGG, i.e. on-farm testing and IPs (Box 2).

Box 2: Action areas of the ACGG gender strategy:

**Action area 1:** to ensure that sufficient human and financial resources and appropriate systems (including gender-responsive monitoring, communication and capacity) are in place to implement the ACGG gender strategy

**Action area 2:** to increase the understanding of:

a. gendered trait and strain preferences and the gender dynamics behind them to inform decisions on the release of farmer preferred genotypes

b. gendered constraints of women and men farmers in their access to services, inputs and markets

c. how intra-household gender dynamics affect the distribution of benefits of improved chicken production

d. how chicken production contributes towards women’s empowerment

**Action area 3:** to ensure that CIPs are gender responsive in all aspects (preparation, implementation, follow up and reporting) to enable women to speak up and that their voices are heard

**Action area 4:** to establish feedback loops between IPs at different levels to ensure that strategic gender concerns emerging at community level inform agenda setting, discussion, decision-making and actions at national level

**Action area 5:** to increase meaningful and gender balanced NIP representation and integrate gender concerns into the mainstream of NIPs

Each action area is presented in detail in section 6 (action area 1) and section 7 (action area 2–5).
Figure 2: African Chicken Genetic Gains program gender-responsive theory of change.
6. Creating an enabling environment for gender strategy implementation

This section outlines the strategy’s overarching ‘action area 1’ of ensuring that sufficient human and financial resources and appropriate systems (including gender-responsive monitoring, communication and capacity) are in place to implement the ACGG gender strategy.

**Action area 1: human and financial resources and systems in place to implement gender strategy**

In order to create an enabling environment for the implementation of the gender strategy, a number of institutional measures will be taken.

**Gender expertise and structures:** ACGG will ensure that there is sufficient gender expertise available to lead the overall program-level gender strategy implementation (ILRI gender scientist) and to support its implementation at country level. Uniform Terms of Reference (ToR) will form the basis for country gender focal persons (GFPs) to be formally contracted as part of the ACGG country teams. A Gender Taskforce (led by ILRI gender scientist and with country GFPs and program director as members) will be the formal mechanism for ACGG gender experts to liaise on a regular basis, and reflect, troubleshoot and learn from the progress of gender strategy implementation.

**Financial resources:** A ring-fenced budget will be allocated for gender strategy implementation at program level (for ILRI gender scientist to lead on strategy implementation) and at country level for the work of the GFP as well as for activity implementation.

**Monitoring, reporting and communication:** ACGG will monitor the progress on ACGG gender strategy implementation based on its gender strategy monitoring framework, which specifies indicators and milestones, and clarifies exact roles and responsibilities of staff at different levels (for more details see section 8 and Table 1). Reporting on gender strategy implementation will include ongoing progress updates and communication with ACGG Management. In addition, findings from all ACGG gender-research activities and outputs (on-farm testing, focus-group discussions, women’s empowerment monitoring, and gender integration into CIPs and NIPs) will be collated on a half-yearly basis and ACGG gender strategy progress reports at program and country level will be prepared. These reports are key research outputs as well as a key monitoring and adaptive learning instrument for ACGG, i.e. they will include reporting on progress on all indicators and milestones and suggest corrective action if needed and highlight best practice.

**Gender capacity development:** A number of gender-capacity development activities and trainings will be provided to selected enumerators, field officers and subnational coordinators (SNCs) as part of the gender-responsive (re) design of research methods and activities. Capacity development for ACGG program management and country-team...

---

5. Proposed activities are in line with recommendations of the gender capacity assessments conducted by Transition International in 2017. See https://acgg.wikispaces.com/gender.
scientists will focus on gender-responsive research and monitoring. Furthermore, ACGG will establish a mechanism for supportive supervision of enumerators, field officers and SNCs in their day-to-day efforts to integrate gender into their work. This also implies establishing lines of communication between ACGG gender experts and staff at different levels and agreeing on support/monitoring visits as needed.
7. Gender integration in on-farm testing and innovation platforms

This section forms the core of the gender strategy for ACGG and outlines four action areas across the two main intervention areas of ACGG: on-farm testing and IPs.

7.1 On-farm testing

ACGG’s on-farm testing activities constitute the main moments of program interaction with farmers at the community level, where program enumerators and field officers use the ‘on-farm testing tool’ to collect data on a regular basis. These moments of data collection are also a key opportunity for the program—through its staff—to diagnose and troubleshoot key challenges, give immediate advice, disseminate knowledge and strengthen skills of women and men farmers on improved chicken management practices.

On-farm testing offers a number of strategic opportunities to explore the gendered nature of smallholder chicken production in the ACGG program countries. Action area 2 combines activities related to understanding gender dynamics of trait and strain preferences (2a), gendered constraints of men and women in accessing inputs, services and markets (2b), intra-household distribution of benefits (2c) as well as women’s empowerment as it relates to chicken production (2d).

Core activities across 2a–d include:

- adapting and/or developing new research tools
  - adapting on-farm testing tool by adding the gender of the respondent and developing a new separate form on intra-household benefits.
  - develop a semi-structured interview guide for focus-group discussions and gender-dynamics research protocol.
  - refine tool for participatory monitoring of women’s empowerment and the related research protocol.
- provide training to field staff in administering the research tools and protocols.
- data collection, analysis and write up (monitoring reports and research outputs).

Core outputs across 2a–d include:

- revised on-farm testing tool (gender disaggregation of respondents as well as gendered-benefits form added).
- on-farm testing data set and analysis of gender-disaggregated trait preferences.
• qualitative semi-structured interview guide for focus-group discussions and gender-dynamics research protocol.

• participatory women’s empowerment monitoring tool including research protocol.

• preliminary and final synthesis reports (at program and country level) on progress of measuring locally defined indicators on women’s empowerment.

• publication on local understandings of women’s empowerment.

• half-yearly ACGG gender strategy progress reports at program and country level.

In addition, gender data and analysis produced under this action area will feed into the planned ACGG publication on the relationship between an increase in productivity and an increase in consumption (BMGF Results Tracker Outcome/Output 1.1.3, Target/Milestones for Period 5).

Action area 2A: gendered trait and strain preferences and gender dynamics behind them

Identifying the farmer-preferred genotypes in each agro-ecological zone is a key foundation of ACGG. It is fundamentally about giving farmers a chance to influence choices that affect their lives and futures, i.e. the final choice of what genotypes to release. As chicken production takes place in the context of intra-household gender relations—which manifest themselves in different gender roles, and access to and control over resources and benefits—women’s and men’s trait preferences are likely to be different.

In order to capture these gender differences in trait preferences, ACGG will revisit the current means of data collection. This includes ‘adding the gender of the respondent to the on-farm tool’ so that it will be possible to analyse differences in women’s and men’s gendered trait preferences. Besides the short-term advantages this will have for the program, this action will also contribute to a broader aim, i.e. gender integration into quantitative data sets of technical agriculture research for development programs (see section 1.1. on Guiding principles).

In addition, ACGG will initiate qualitative research to allow for a more nuanced understanding of the gendered dynamics of trait preferences including how these may change over time as productivity of chicken change, market dynamics evolve and in response to different environmental shocks etc. This will be done through ‘focus-group discussions’ with farmers (combined with questions related to 2b and 2c, and to the extent possible in conjunction with CIPs).

Action area 2B: gendered constraints in access to services, inputs and markets

A core assumption in ACGG’s ToC is that access to preferred genotypes and improved management practices will increase the production and productivity of chicken. To ensure that all farmers, irrespective of gender, can increase chicken production and productivity, ACGG needs to take into account the gender dynamics around availability, access and uptake of different chicken services by women and men smallholder chicken producers, that is, how gender relations affect women and men’s ability to access knowledge about key services, access inputs to improve practices, and put into practice new knowledge and skills. It also relates to understanding different experiences of accessing markets of women and men.

To this end, ACGG will carry ‘focus-group discussions’ with farmers, to allow for a more nuanced understanding of the gendered dynamics around service delivery, and as an input to ensuring improved gender-responsive programming (combined with questions related to 2a and 2c).

Action area 2C: how intra-household gender dynamics affect the distribution of benefits

ACGG’s on-farm testing will expand its focus from capturing data on changes in production of chicken and eggs (and to a limited extent, improvements in income and nutrition at the household level) to collecting data around intra-household decision-making (e.g. who decides when to sell and slaughter, use of income from chicken sales, when to consume etc.) and how these in turn influence how benefits are distributed to different individuals in the household. In doing so, ACGG will be able to analyse how improved breeds ultimately benefit households overall, and who within
the household benefits, which is a concern once production becomes more profitable. These questions also directly relate to understanding the ‘expanded choice’ and ‘strengthened voice’ dimensions of women’s empowerment. Significant areas of inquiry to understanding ‘benefits’ are:

• understanding the nutrition benefits of improved chicken.

• the economics of use of chicken products to generate income and access finance, and market dynamics around women’s engagement.

• the impact of improved breeds on labour allocation and workload.

To this end, ACGG will revise the on-farm testing tool by ‘adding a new separate form’ with 6 to 8 questions on gender dimensions of control over benefits (e.g. nutrition, revenues, labour). Also, the program will research these dynamics qualitatively through ‘focus-group discussions’ with farmers (combined with questions related to 2a and 2b).

Action area 2D: women’s empowerment

Recognizing that there are different understandings of what women’s empowerment means in relation to chicken production, ACGG will develop a ‘dedicated participatory monitoring tool’ to capture local understandings of empowerment. A tool has been piloted by the ACGG team in Tanzania (summer 2017), which will be adapted by ACGG and rolled out on a small scale in the three program countries. It can be used to identify participatory empowerment indicators to track changes in benefits and expectations of change which can support the understanding of changes in empowerment processes over time. A research protocol will be developed with detailed guidance in terms of how to set up the monitoring groups that will define and track the local empowerment indicators, how many groups and where to set them up, and how to facilitate the group process.

7.2 Innovation platforms

This section of the ACGG gender strategy gives strategic guidance on how ACGG can realize its vision of women’s empowerment through IP work in meaningful and effective ways. The focus is on overcoming gendered constraints to women’s access to IPs, and to women voicing their concerns and having their voices heard. This in particular implies establishing feedback loops between ACGG supported IPs at different levels, and acknowledging that efforts need to go beyond targeting individual women participants to engendering institutional systems and structures. To improve the gender responsiveness of ACGG’s IP interventions, activities are elaborated around three action areas:

1. to ensure that CIPs are gender responsive in all aspects (preparation, implementation, follow up and reporting) to enable women to speak up and that their voices are heard.

2. to establish feedback loops between IPs at different levels to ensure that strategic gender concerns emerging at community level inform agenda setting, discussion, decision-making and actions at national level

3. to increase meaningful and gender balanced NIP representation and integrate gender concerns into the mainstream of NIPs

Core outputs across action area 3–5 include:

• a protocol for CIP implementation.

• CIP and NIP reporting formats that capture gender dimensions of platform deliberations.

• gender-responsive CIP and NIP reports.

• a gender brief on NIPs (for input into CIPs).

• half-yearly ACGG gender strategy progress reports at program and country levels.
Action area 3: gender-responsive CIPs to enable women to speak up and that their voices are heard

ACGG will focus on what needs to happen prior to, during and as a follow up to the CIPs to: i) stimulate women’s representation, ii) provide a space for women to speak up and voice their specific needs, concerns and interests, and iii) ensure that women’s voices are heard. This means, as a follow up to the CIPs, raised concerns will be acted upon by program/other relevant stakeholders and subsequent CIPs will serve as space for follow up, troubleshooting and working out and/or fine-tuning solutions. ACGG will also take advantage of the CIP meetings as a space to do some community gender sensitization to avoid/minimize/monitor unintended backlash of the program (such as when men take over chicken production once it gets profitable), and as a mechanism for participants to access knowledge and information on improved breeds and management practices.

Furthermore, by investing in the documentation, reporting and monitoring of the progress and results of engendering the CIPs, ACGG will realize the program’s intent of establishing CIPs as a chief mechanism for women’s voices to inform the breeding program and chicken value-chain development.

For this to happen, the gender strategy proposes careful attention to the ‘preparation, delivery and follow up’ of CIPs. To this end a ‘protocol’ will be developed (a draft protocol is provided in Annex 2), CIP reporting formats will be revised and training for enumerators, field officers and SNCs on gender-responsive CIP facilitation and reporting will be organized.

Action area 4: feedback loops between innovation platforms at different levels

As highlighted earlier, from the outset of the program, CIPs are considered ACGG’s chief vehicle to collate information on the gender dynamics of preferred lines and the different gender constraints and opportunities in chicken production. In order for data on these issues to be considered and when necessary acted upon at the national level, ACGG will establish country-specific feedback loops between CIPs and NIPs. This implies that ACGG will ensure that concerns raised at the CIP level (or based on other interaction with women farmers such as day-to-day engagement with enumerators/field officers, focus-group discussions (FGDs) and women’s empowerment monitoring) are collected and synthesized-packaged in a way that is conducive to inform NIP discussions so that women’s voices can be ‘heard’ and ‘acted upon’ (such as half-yearly ACGG gender strategy progress report and/or gender brief, and presentation of gender concerns during NIPs – for more details see action area 5). ACGG will also use the country-specific feedback loop to ensure that relevant information from NIPs can be shared at CIP level (such as preparing gender briefs of NIP discussion for CIP audiences). ACGG will monitor how the feedback loops are functioning to ensure that key gender concerns emerging from on-farm testing and CIPs inform NIP agenda setting, discussion, decision-making and actions. Also, to the extent possible, ACGG staff will liaise with national policymakers to monitor whether gender constraints are addressed at the policy level.

Action area 5: women’s representation and gender in the mainstream of NIPS

To ensure that women’s concerns are listened to and acted on, ACGG will integrate gender concerns into the mainstream of the NIPs. To this end, ACGG will introduce gender knowledge into the discussions and design of solutions to systemic challenges and in the identification of new business opportunities to trigger new partnerships. ACGG will prepare agenda and content of each NIP to allow for strategic gender concerns to be discussed. A summary of ACGG’s gender strategy and country implementation plan will be presented at the first NIPs organized after the finalization of the strategy to create awareness and buy in to ACGG’s efforts. In future NIPs, a presentation on the progress of implementing the gender strategy will be made with a focus on emerging gender issues and progress of addressing them based on half-yearly ACGG gender strategy progress reports at program and country (feedback loop – see action area 4).

6. Concrete ideas emerged during the gender strategy country visits: a) developing gender-responsive feed interventions (Ethiopia), b) improving access to chicken health services and information of women chicken producers (Ethiopia), c) upgrading women in the value chain as non-vet vaccinators (Nigeria), d) developing more inclusive financial schemes and business models supporting women’s upgrading in the chicken value chain (Ethiopia and Nigeria) and e) access to credit (Tanzania).
ACGG will also make an effort to ensure that gender concerns are integrated into the work of the NIP taskforces/working groups, and at the same time make an explicit effort to learn from NIP participants about gender roles and relations in the chicken value chain. Support will be provided, in particular, to taskforces that show interest and enthusiasm to work on gender concerns. Ideally, the work of such taskforces should be informed by gender concerns raised at the community level possible linking of taskforces to CIPs could be further explored (for information exchange upward and downward).

ACGG aspires to improve the gender balance of NIP participants. So far, women’s representation has been low despite the country teams’ efforts to invite women representatives from participating organizations. ACGG will set SMART (specific, measurable, assignable, realistic and timebound) targets for women representation in NIPs (i.e. increasing gender balance over time), and will make a concerted effort to identify and invite women participants from different sectors of the chicken value chain. In some countries, ACGG will consider providing sponsorships for women if needed. Progress on women’s participation will be monitored at country and program level.

ACGG will monitor progress on gender balanced participation and progress on integrating gender concerns into the mainstream of the NIPs. This will be done during the NIPs themselves, i.e. at each NIP a discussion will be facilitated of what can be done to improve gender-balanced participation and addressing gender issues for the following NIPs. Also, ACGG will adapt the NIP report format to document and monitor progress with integrating gender into the mainstream of the NIPs, including how gender concerns inform NIP discussions, decisions and actions as well as progress on gender balance of participants. Across the program, a key monitoring mechanism will be the ACGG Gender Taskforce meetings during which GFPs will share experiences of successful approaches to increasing meaningful and gender-balanced NIP representation, after which the findings will be fed back to the country teams.

Finally, ACGG aspires to contribute to closing a gap in current literature by developing an evidence base on key barriers and constraints faced by women at different levels of the chicken value chains and propose gender-responsive solutions. To this end, and depending on resources available, some country teams aim to consolidate existing evidence on gender concerns in their country chicken value chains (such as drawing on work/knowledge of GFPs and ILRI gender scientists as well as pulling in master/PhD students to carry out literature reviews).
8. Gender strategy monitoring framework

The ACGG gender strategy monitoring framework is included in the strategy document as Table 1.

The starting point of this monitoring framework is the four gender strategy goals. For each goal, a number of ‘indicators and milestones’ are specified, as well as ‘deadlines, means of verification’ and what staff are responsible for the monitoring for each milestone. The means of verification column is as much as possible based on existing ACGG reporting mechanisms (i.e. CIP/NIP reports (revised format), bi-yearly program management team meetings, end-line evaluation) but also drawing on new outputs foreseen from implementing the gender strategy (i.e. Gender Taskforce, Gender briefs for NIPs, half-yearly gender strategy progress reports etc.).

The framework is linked to the ‘ACGG results tracker’ (i.e. the overall monitoring and reporting framework to the BMGF—see Table 1) to ensure that monitoring of gender strategy implementation to the extent possible contributes to meeting existing ACGG monitoring and reporting requirements.

Some elements of the monitoring framework have intentionally not been completed. In particular, milestones and timeframe for indicator 3.1–3.3 still need to be worked out (most likely by the ILRI gender scientist) as they depend on the final adaption of existing research tools and the development of new ones. Also, various targets still need to be established (at program and country level).
9. Gender strategy implementation plans

Program- and country-level gender strategy implementation plans were prepared during a final gender strategy workshop (Addis Ababa, Ethiopia September 2017) for members of the GSAT. The plans are structured according to the five action areas of the gender strategy, incorporate the content of this gender strategy document and specify the roles and responsibilities of ACGG staff. The final plans are aligned and make direct linkages between planned activities, and the indicators and milestones of the gender strategy monitoring framework (see section 8).

The program-level plan includes activities such as coordinating program-level learning, refining and developing research tools and protocols, leading on program-level data analysis, and reporting and development of research outputs. The country-level plan mirrors the program-level plan but activities are focused on the actual rolling out of new or revised research activities at the field level, including country-level data collection, as well as country-level analysis and reporting.

The comprehensive country-implementation plan will provide the basis for ACGG program and country teams to flesh out detailed plans for its gender strategy implementation in each country. Program- and country-level gender strategy implementation plans are two separate documents developed based on this gender strategy document.
Table 1: ACGG gender strategy monitoring framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
<th>Responsible for monitoring</th>
<th>Remarks and links to ACGG results tracker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To adapt ACGG research design, tools and processes and IPs to the different needs and concerns of both women and men</td>
<td>1.1 Gender disaggregated questions are included in on-farm tool, and end-line evaluations, NIP/CIP reporting formats and new additional tools.</td>
<td>1.1.1. Develop ToR and formally contract ACGG country team GFPs</td>
<td>Q4-17</td>
<td>Uniform ToR, Contracts</td>
<td>ACGG program director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.2. Gender disaggregation of on-farm testing tool completed</td>
<td>Q1-18</td>
<td>On-farm tool</td>
<td>ACGG program director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.3. Gendered-benefits form added to on-farm testing tool (6-8 questions regarding intra-household benefit sharing)</td>
<td>Q1-18</td>
<td>On-farm tool</td>
<td>ILRI gender scientist and ILRI socio-economist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.4. Participatory empowerment monitoring tool finalized</td>
<td>Q1-18</td>
<td>Participatory empowerment monitoring tool</td>
<td>ILRI gender scientist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.5. Qualitative FGD discussion tool developed</td>
<td>Q1-18</td>
<td>Qualitative FGD tool</td>
<td>ILRI gender scientist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.6. CIP reporting format adapted to capture gender dimensions of platform deliberations</td>
<td>Q1-18</td>
<td>CIP reporting format</td>
<td>PICO-EA and ILRI gender scientist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.7. NIP reporting format adapted to capture gender dimensions of platform deliberations</td>
<td>Q1-18</td>
<td>NIP reporting format</td>
<td>PICO-EA and ILRI gender scientist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.8. Endline evaluation design is gender responsive</td>
<td>Q2-19</td>
<td>Endline evaluation design</td>
<td>Program director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To achieve more gender equity in access to ACGG resources including technology, knowledge, skills and other services</td>
<td>2.1. Increase in women reporting improved access to different types of program services (disaggregate by service type, inputs, market access)</td>
<td>2.1.1. Benchmark regarding women's access to program resources established based on: a) first round of FGDs, b) regular enumerator reports, c) regular SNC reports.</td>
<td>Q2-18</td>
<td>Report on FGD, enumerator reports, SNC reports</td>
<td>NPCs, ILRI gender scientist, program director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.2. Trends in women's access to program resources analysed and documented in gender strategy progress report based on: a) FGDs, b) regular enumerator reports, c) regular SNC reports.</td>
<td>Bi-annually</td>
<td>Report on FGD, enumerator reports, SNC reports</td>
<td>NPCs, ILRI gender scientist, program director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.3. 60% increase in accessing of value-chain products and services among women beneficiaries*</td>
<td>End of project</td>
<td>Report on FGD, enumerator reports, SNC reports</td>
<td>NPCs, ILRI gender scientist, program director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2. Increased women's representation in CIPs and NIPs</td>
<td>2.2.1. Benchmark of women's representation established (1st NIP reports)</td>
<td>Q1-18</td>
<td>NIP reports</td>
<td>PI, NPC, program director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.2. Benchmark of women's representation established (1st CIP reports)</td>
<td>Q1-18</td>
<td>CIP reports</td>
<td>NPCs, SNCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.3. At least x% NIP participants are women (2018)</td>
<td>NIP 2018</td>
<td>NIP reports</td>
<td>PI, NPC, program director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.4. 70% of CIP participants are women (2018 and 2019)*</td>
<td>CIP 2018 + 2019</td>
<td>CIP reports</td>
<td>NPCs, SNCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.5. At least x% NIP participants are women (2019)</td>
<td>End of project</td>
<td>NIP reports</td>
<td>PI, NPC, program director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Gender strategy: African Chicken Genetic Gains program

### Goals

| 2.3. IP deliberations at community and national levels are informed by the requests and needs of women.* |
| 2.3.1. IP feedback loop established* |
| 2.3.2. NIP agenda informed and gender presentations prepared based on half-yearly gender strategy progress report (country level) (2018, 2019) |
| 2.3.3. At least # taskforce(s) taking action to respond to expressed requests and needs of women* |
| 2.3.4. Gender brief (or other appropriate means of communication) prepared on NIPs and used as input into CIPs.* |

### Indicators

| 3.1 Women reporting they are influencing decisions on chicken and eggs [women's empowerment objectively defined: choice] |
| 3.2 Women reporting they are influencing decisions on the sale of chicken and eggs [women's empowerment objectively defined: choice] |

### Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
<th>Responsible for monitoring</th>
<th>Remarks and Links to ACGG results tracker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q4-17</td>
<td>Program management team minutes</td>
<td>Communique from program director</td>
<td>*Results tracker, outcome/output 4.1. as well as target/milestones 4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIPs 2018 + 2019</td>
<td>Country synthesis reports, NIP agenda, NIP gender presentation, NIP reports</td>
<td>GPPs</td>
<td>To ensure farmer feedback informs NIP deliberations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIPs 2018 + 2019</td>
<td>NIP reports</td>
<td>PICO-EA, PI, co-PI, NPC, program director</td>
<td>Countries to decide on target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIPs 2018+2019</td>
<td>Gender briefs</td>
<td>NPC, SNCs, ILRI gender scientist</td>
<td>*Results tracker, indicator 4.2.2: IP feedback system is focused on sharing information on smallholder opportunities in the chicken value chain with a focus on women.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. To achieve progress towards women’s empowerment consumption of chicken and eggs including expanded choice and strengthened voice*

- ILRI gender scientist to select milestones based on new questions included in on-farm testing tool as well as design of FGD tool.
  - NB: should provide information to understand the factors that affect women’s ability to influence decisions.
  - ATONU recommendation: include question about “who eats first in household” in new form on on-farm testing tool.

- ILRI gender scientist to select milestones based on new questions included in on-farm testing tool as well as design of FGD tool.
  - NB: should provide information to understand the factors that affect women’s ability to influence decisions.

### Remarks and Links to ACGG results tracker

- On-farm testing data (new form), reports on FGDs, CIP reports, enumerator reports, SNC report
- ILRI gender scientist

### ATONU recommendation

- Include question about “who eats first in household” in new form on on-farm testing tool.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
<th>Responsible for monitoring</th>
<th>Remarks and Links to ACGG results tracker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3. Women reporting they are comfortable speaking up in CIP</td>
<td>ILRI gender scientist to select milestones based on questions in FGD tool</td>
<td>NB: should include qualitative information to understand the factors that affect women's ability to participate in and voice concerns in CIPs.</td>
<td>Q1-18</td>
<td>Preliminary country-synthesis reports</td>
<td>NPC, GFPs, ILRI gender scientist</td>
<td>Country teams to decide how many groups per country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[women's empowerment objectively defined: voice]</td>
<td>3.4.1. At least xx # of participatory monitoring groups established per country</td>
<td>Q4-18</td>
<td>Preliminary country and program synthesis reports</td>
<td>NPC, GFPs, ILRI gender scientist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4. Participatory monitoring of women’s empowerment groups reporting positive change on locally defined context specific empowerment indicators</td>
<td>3.4.2. Preliminary synthesis reports prepared (per country and at program level) on progress of (measuring) locally defined indicators on women’s empowerment</td>
<td>Q4-18</td>
<td>Preliminary country and program synthesis reports</td>
<td>NPC, GFPs, ILRI gender scientist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4.3. Final level synthesis reports prepared (per country and at program level) on progress of (measuring) locally defined indicators on women’s empowerment</td>
<td>End of Project</td>
<td>Final country and program level synthesis reports</td>
<td>NPC, GFPs, ILRI gender scientist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To contribute to developing the evidence base on gender dynamics of chicken value chains</td>
<td>4.1. Research data sets and outputs on how chicken production empowers women and gender dimensions of chicken value chain</td>
<td>4.1.1. On-farm testing data set and analysis of gender disaggregated trait preferences publicly available*</td>
<td>Q4-19</td>
<td>Data set</td>
<td>Program director, ILRI gender scientist</td>
<td>*Results tracker outcome/output 1, Target/Milestones for period 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.2. Gender concerns integrated into planned paper on the relationship between an increase in productivity and an increase in consumption*</td>
<td>Q4-19</td>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>Program director, ILRI gender scientist</td>
<td>*Results tracker outcome/output 1.1.3, Target/Milestones for period 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.3. Publication on local understandings of women’s empowerment (and how change is influenced by chicken production)</td>
<td>Q4-19</td>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>Program director, ILRI gender scientist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: list of abbreviations: ACGG – African Chicken Genetic Gains program; ATONU – Agriculture to Nutrition; CIP(s) – community innovation platform(s); Co-PI – co-principal investigator; FGD(s) – focus-group discussion(s); GFP(s) – gender focal person(s); ILRI – International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI); IP(s) – innovation platforms; NB – [UNK, please provide]; NIP(s) – national innovation platform(s); NPC(s) – national program coordinator(s); PI – principal investigator; PICO-EA – Institute for People Innovation and Change in Organizations in Eastern Africa; SNC(s) – subnational coordinator(s); ToR – Terms of reference.
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Annexes

Annex 1: Gender strategy development process

This ACGG gender strategy is informed by activities carried out and outputs produced between November 2016 and November 2017.

Key ACGG gender strategy development activities:

Phase 1 (November 2016–January 2017): inception
- Literature review and key informant interviews
- KIT gender inception mission and participation in program management meeting (Nigeria)
- Establishing GSAT

Phase 2 (February–April 2017): country visits
- Tanzania (March)
- Ethiopia (April)
- Nigeria (May)

Each country visit entailed a workshop with the participation of core ACGG country management team members, SNCs and the GFP, and where possible Agriculture to Nutrition (ATONU) staff (Ethiopia and Tanzania), as well as key partners such as from government ministries. During the workshop, KIT Gender facilitated a participatory gender analysis to unpack the program’s ToC from a gender perspective to make explicit the underlying gendered assumptions around how the two main intervention areas (on-farm testing and IPs) empower women and to introduce and make relevant key gender concepts. Field visits were used to ground the ToC activity in country-specific examples and test key gender analysis and women empowerment tools. Interviews with key informants from the NIP tasks forces, ILRI socio-economists involved in analysis of ACGG baseline data and ATONU colleagues were also conducted. In addition, KIT Gender drew on the Transition International Gender Capacity Assessment reports as preparation and input to each country visit. During this phase, KIT Gender also analysed ACGG’s baseline reports and on-farm testing tool to produce a baseline analysis guide and an on-farm gender screening tool.

Phase 3 (June-August 2017): coaching trajectory to support learning on gender integration in ACGG

During this phase, KIT Gender worked with the GFPs and core GSAT members to pilot key entry points and ideas generated during the country visits. This involved trialing ideas of increasing women’s representation in the NIPs (Ethiopia), testing a women empowerment monitoring tool (Tanzania) and generating gender analysis data from the CIPs (Nigeria). During this phase, KIT Gender prepared a guidance note to increase women’s representation in NIPs and a tool to pilot participatory monitoring of women empowerment (with ILRI).
Phase 4 (September–November 2017): finalization of gender strategy

- Final gender strategy workshop with GSAT members and other key staff to finalize gender strategy and draft implementation plans for the program in each country
- Finalization of ACGG gender strategy, including gender strategy monitoring framework as well as program- and country-level implementation plans

**Key outputs produced by KIT gender during the gender strategy development process:**

1. Inception report (January 2017)
2. Tanzania trip summary report (April 2017)
5. Baseline gender analysis guide (May 2017)
6. On-farm testing gender screening tool (May 2017)
7. Tanzania coaching plan (June 2017)
8. Ethiopia coaching plan (June 2017)
9. Nigeria coaching plan (June 2017)
10. Synthesis of three country entry points: on-farm testing and IP interventions (July 2017)
11. Implementation plan format (July 2017)
13. Pilot ACGG empowerment tool (August 2017)
14. Gender strategy building blocks document (September 2017)
15. Program-level implementation plan (October 2017)
16. Country-level implementation plan (October 2017)
17. ACGG gender strategy monitoring framework (October 2017)
18. ACGG gender strategy (November 2017)

For more details please refer to [https://acgg.wikispaces.com/gender](https://acgg.wikispaces.com/gender).
Annex 2: Key elements of a CIP protocol

**Preparation of CIP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Who</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work-out and implement process of pre-engagement and community mobilization</strong> to ensure that: i) women's needs and interests inform the agenda of the CIPs; ii) separate preparatory meetings for women are facilitated to ensure a 'safe space' for women to discuss gender concerns and support their preparation of speaking up at CIPs.</td>
<td>Work-out process: ILRI gender scientist Implement: SNCs/enumerators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identify and invite CIP participants</strong> (for preparatory meeting and CIP) by engaging with community level women leaders/focal persons/role models (such as successful women entrepreneurs in value chain) and through local women's organizations, community leaders/ groups etc.</td>
<td>SNCs/enumerators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Invite members of participatory monitoring groups.</strong></td>
<td>SNCs/enumerators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review 'findings' of participatory monitoring group on local understandings of empowerment (where relevant)</strong></td>
<td>NPC/GFP with support of SNCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review on-farm testing findings</strong> (gender dashboard) and identify issues that are relevant to discuss in CIP/take into consideration in the preparation and/or delivery of CIP.</td>
<td>NPC/GFP with support of SNCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review experiences from day-to-day engagement with farmers of enumerators</strong> or other ACGG staff and identify gender related issues that are relevant to discuss in CIP/take into consideration in the preparation and/or delivery of CIP.</td>
<td>SNCs/ enumerators with support of NPC and GFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finalize agenda for CIP</strong> informed by issues emerging from preparatory meeting with women; on-farm testing and farmers engagement with program staff (in particular enumerators).</td>
<td>SNCs with input from enumerators and support from NPC and GFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule CIP at convenient <strong>times</strong> taking into consideration the workload/peak of women participants.</td>
<td>SNCs with advice from GFP + enumerators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule CIP at appropriate <strong>places</strong> taking into consideration distance (accessibility/mobility) and acceptability of women voicing their concerns</td>
<td>SNCs with advice from GFP + enumerators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Delivery of CIPs**

| Facilitation of the CIP: gender sensitive facilitation of CIP, including attention to whether all participants feel safe to speak up, and probing for specific gender dimensions of issues raised. Also, ensure that there is a wrap-up session at the end of CIP where gender concerns raised are summarized and follow-up actions understood and agreed by all. | SNCs/ enumerators with support from GFP                              |
| Simultaneous community mobilization: use CIP as a forum to sensitize community members (including non-ACGG participants) on the overall purpose of ACGG including women's empowerment and probe for reactions/resistance (such as from husbands/men). Also, use CIP to identify GFPs in the community, e.g. community leaders, male elites, women leaders who can mobilize support for ACGG and be involved in the monitoring of backlash (i.e. resistance or opposition to change in women's position and/or men taking over benefits of chicken production once it becomes more lucrative). CIP can also serve as a moment for knowledge dissemination to address challenges highlighted in on-farm testing work such as related to improve mortality of chicken. | Work-out process and tools: GFP Implement: SNCs/ enumerators with support of GFP |
| Optional additional data collection: piggyback a focus group or similar method to CIP in order to follow up on: i) women's experiences with CIP including if they feel comfortable to speak up in presence of men etc.; ii) key gender concerns emerging from on-farm testing or to fill data gap (such as on gender dimensions of access to the markets, benefits etc.). | ILRI gender scientist/GFP in selected communities                    |

**Follow up of CIPs**

<p>| Immediate follow-up action on CIP gender concern/issues that can be solved quickly through establishing link between smallholder chicken producer and relevant value-chain actors. | SNC with NPC and GFP                                                  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Who</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Documentation and analysis:</strong> adapt CIP reporting formats to ensure</td>
<td>Adaptation of report formats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that key gender dimensions of chicken production and the chicken</td>
<td>ILRI gender scientist/PICO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>value chain are captured: i) women’s representation, ii) women’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs, concerns and interests in value-chain (among others this</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>could focus on labour, access to/availability of services and market,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) control over benefits and gender norms (if CIP is used for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community mobilization/gender sensitization/monitoring of backlash,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this should be reported here as well), iv) proposed solutions to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>addressing women’s concerns, and v) immediate follow-up action.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As CIP process progresses (i.e. more CIPs in same community),</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>documentation of results of actions in between CIPs (gendered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>constraints/opportunities addressed/arisen) should be included in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monitoring:</strong> monitor women’s representation/meaningful participation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) document efforts and experiences with engendering CIP (CIP reports),</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) women quantitate representation (ACGG Results Tracker, Outcome 4.1:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at least 70 % participants will be women), and iii) women’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experiences with CIPs (analysis of select interviews with women CIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participants).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) NPC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) SNCs/NPC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) GFP/ILRI gender scientist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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