

Incorporating Gender into PHE Strategies: Experiences from Conservation International

September 2008

This document was prepared by Janet Edmond, based on documents and research compiled by Carol Boender, Wayne McCallum, Chanthy Hot, and many other CI staff and partners. We are grateful to everyone who contributed to the preparation of this document. We thank USAID, DevTech Systems, Inc. and Cultural Practice, Inc. for supporting our efforts to increase awareness of the importance of incorporating gender analysis and equity in health and conservation projects.



This publication is made possible by the generous support of the American people through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) under the Healthy Families, Healthy Forests project (GPO-A-00-05-00030-00). The views and opinions expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID or the United States Government.

INCORPORATING GENDER INTO PHE STRATEGIES: EXPERIENCES FROM CI

Introduction

Since 2002, Conservation International (CI) has received funding from the U.S. Agency for International Development's (USAID) Office of Population and Reproductive Health (OPRH) to implement the Healthy Families, Healthy Forests project. Our project sites included the Cardamom (Mountains) Conservation Landscape (CCL) in southwestern Cambodia, the Zahamena-Mantadia Biological Corridor in eastern Madagascar, and the Sierra Madre Biodiversity Corridor (SMBC) in northern Philippines. In these three sites, we worked with partners to improve access to family planning and reproductive health (FP/RH) services and information, increase awareness of the links between health and environment, and provide alternative livelihoods that are compatible with biodiversity. These integrated Population, Health and Environment (PHE) efforts represent CI's commitment to improving the wellbeing of the world's stewards of biodiversity, those individuals on the frontlines of conservation.

The purpose of this document is to highlight CI's experiences incorporating gender into PHE project strategies. The information is derived from several research documents and project reports produced by CI staff and partners during the 2005-2008 phase of the project.

CI's mission is biodiversity conservation. Why should CI care about gender? What do "women's issues" have to do with protected areas, endangered species, and biodiversity science? Conservation biologists understand the importance of animal behavior: they study and map an animal's range, feeding habits, preferred water sources, and habitat needs in order to plan for conservation success. Likewise, to recognize human-induced conservation opportunities and threats, conservation practitioners need to know how humans interact with the environment and why, and what systems govern these interactions. Gender is one such social system.

Paying attention to gender is not the same as promoting "women's issues." Gender is the economic, social, political, and cultural attributes and opportunities associated with being male or female. Gender relates to the

socially constructed differences and relations between men and women within a given context.

Based on our research and on-the-ground field project experiences, we acknowledge that women and men have gender-defined roles and responsibilities that affect their ability to engage in conservation activities and how the benefits and costs of conservation interventions are distributed (CI 2005). Therefore, we believe that gender analysis of the constraints and opportunities is a critical step in building broad-based strategies to achieve health and conservation outcomes.

Gender and Conservation

In and around protected areas worldwide, women and men have different gender-based roles and responsibilities in their own lives, families, households, communities, societies, and nations. They have different knowledge of, access to, and control over biodiversity resources and different opportunities to participate in decisions that impact biodiversity directly and indirectly. They are also affected differently by environmental and climatic change.

There are many ways in which gender-based differences are important to the success of conservation, and historical evidence suggests that certain improvements in gender equity may lead to improved conservation results. In order to achieve conservation outcomes through efficiently designed approaches, we consider gender differences in resource management through the lens of:

- Roles and responsibilities;
- Tenure and access;
- Knowledge and information;
- Participation and power; and,
- Income and education.

Roles and Responsibilities: Women and Men Have Different Impacts on Biodiversity

In all societies, men and women tend to have different roles in providing food and income for the family, caring for children and other dependents, participating in public fora and making decisions for the family. Children learn these roles as they grow up through parental instruction and observations of the differences in roles and responsibilities between women and men.

Women's uses of and impacts on biodiversity and ecosystems are often overlooked. Their roles as managers of biodiversity resources are much larger than what conservationists tend to recognize. Women collect close to 80 percent of the wild vegetable food consumed across 135 societies around the world (Howard, 2001). Half of all the wood harvested in the world is used as fuel for home heating and cooking, mostly in developing countries. Women across developing countries spend between 2 and 9 hours a day collecting fuelwood and water for their families, while men spend around one-tenth of this time for these tasks (UNIFEM, 2002).

In marine ecosystems, women tend to be the gatherers of small shellfish in mangroves, estuaries, and inter-tidal zones, catching around one-quarter of the world's total seafood harvested (Aguilar and Castaneda, 2001). Men tend to work further out from the coast, in open water, although women are often the ones responsible for maintaining nets and processing catches. Women also use biodiversity to: prepare wild meat and fish; collect non-timber forest products (NTFP), shellfish, seaweed, and other products; use wild plants for medicine; grow small food plants or ornamentals; perform traditional rituals using wild species; and tend livestock. Even where women are physically secluded in the home, such as in Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Pakistan among others, their activities include home-based production, such as bee-keeping, dairy animals, flowers, fruit trees, and poultry.

Women are more than users and beneficiaries of water, wood, plants, animals, and other forest and marine products. In many settings, they are indigenous resource managers and decision-makers. In Laos, researchers found that women collect 18 animal species and recognize and use 37 nutritive plants and 68 medicinal products (ADB, 2003). In Burkina Faso, rural women depend on the fruits, leaves and roots of native plants such as the baobab (*Adansonia digitata*), red (or Jamaican) sorrel leaves (*Hibiscus sabdarifa*), kapok leaves (*Ceiba pentandra*) and tigernut tubers (*Cyperus esculentus L.*) to feed their families, supplementing agricultural grains such as millet and sorghum. Over 800 species of edible wild plants have been catalogued across the Sahel alone (Easton and Ronald, 2000). In Zimbabwe, over half of the 800,000 families living in

communal areas are female-headed, and women manage the forest collaboratively through woodlots, tree planting, and nursery development groups (FAOb, 1995).

In traditional indigenous tenure regimes, different clans or families may hold claim to certain features in a forest or coastal mosaic but not others. For example, a family may have rights to a particular tree or grove, but not have access to other neighboring trees, plants, or animals. The ownership scheme may further break down by gender—women in the family may have rights to the tree’s leaves, nuts, or small branches, while men are more likely to lay claim to the sap, rubber, large branches, and timber that the tree provides.

As producers and consumers in national and international markets, men are more likely to be the end consumers of exotic species than women and are more likely to engage in commercial fishing or grow cash crops than women (FAOd, 1998). In Tanga, Tanzania, two-thirds of licensed fish traders are women, who trade fish caught by their male family members. But women do the shallow water shrimp fishing themselves, working in pairs to herd the shrimp into nets. Farming practices are similarly gender-differentiated, as men grow cash crops like coconut and cashew trees, and women (who make up 55-80 percent of all farmers) cultivate rice. Women have also recently begun to farm seaweed (van Ingen, Kawau, and Wells, 2002).

Tenure and Access: Women’s Land and Sea Tenure is Good for Conservation

The person or groups of people who have rights and access to public lands, protected areas, important forest and marine habitats, and the species living within them affect the outcome of any conservation intervention. Land and sea tenure patterns among women and men have powerful implications for biodiversity.

In many societies, women are disadvantaged in their rights to use productive assets and resources, including land and marine spaces, although they play major roles in food production around the world. In Sub-Saharan Africa and in the Caribbean, women produce about 80% of food consumed, and in Asia women perform 50 to 90 percent of the work in rice fields (UN Millennium Project, 2005). Little data exists on the global gender disparity in land holdings and use rights to other natural resources, but only 1 in 10 female farmers in India, Nepal, and Thailand own land (Lara, 2004). In Cameroon, women do more than 75

percent of the agricultural work but hold fewer than 10% of land certificates (Mason and Carlsson, 2004). Customary law does not always change in concert with statutory law, with the result that even where women's rights to own productive assets like land are legally guaranteed, a woman's access continues to rely on her relationship to a man (IFPRI, 2005). In many parts of Africa, men allocate a portion of land to their wives for household food production but may revoke women's use of that land at any time (FAOa, 1995; Rojas, 2004). Furthermore, land-grabbing from widows and orphans is a widespread practice throughout Africa.

Secure land tenure supports sustainable resource use by individuals of either gender because people are more willing to make investments in the land for soil conservation, plant diversity, and healthy, productive coastal zones (Margoluis *et al.*, 2001; Leach and Mearns, 1991; Fortmann, Antinori, and Nabane, 1997). Where women cannot gain title to land, they face difficulties getting credit and labor that would allow for agricultural intensification (rather than extensification). Women farmers in several African countries work the land as efficiently as their male counterparts, but without the same level of inputs (seed, agrochemicals, irrigation systems, labor, etc.) that men use on average. If the playing field were leveled, women would outproduce men by an estimated 6 to 22 percent (Alderman *et al.*, 2003). In Gambia, control of cereal production by women added 322 more calories (per adult equivalent) to daily diets (Kennedy, 1994).

The HIV/AIDS epidemic has had a huge impact on women in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Women comprise about half of all people living with HIV worldwide. In sub-Saharan Africa, where the epidemic is worst, they make up 57 percent of people living with HIV, and three-quarters of young people infected on the continent are young women aged 15-24 (UNAIDS, 2005). During a family member's illness from HIV/AIDS, women are usually the caregivers, leaving women less time for sustainable productive activities. The death of economically active household members means the loss of salaries and labor sources. Social structures of resource management may break down as community members and conservation champions die and take their knowledge of the local biodiversity with them.

Widowed and divorced women, especially in Africa, rarely have inheritance or separation rights to their husband's lands, tools, and other assets, which often go to the husband's family, a brother or a son in a separate household. In a food security crisis, direct reliance on wild plants and animals increases (Kenyatta and Henderson, 2001; <http://www.fao.org/sd/WPdirect/WPan0025.htm>). The forest

and the coast are safety nets for poor people, especially women, around the world. Due to these factors, the HIV epidemic and political conflicts have been linked to increases in hunting, fishing and charcoal-making in many areas as mothers and grandmothers try to survive with their children.

Knowledge and Information: Women and Men Have Different Sets of Knowledge about Biodiversity

Because men and women interact with the environment in different ways through their gender roles, they have different sets of knowledge about biodiversity. Just women's roles in managing biodiversity are often overshadowed by men's roles, the knowledge that women have about the natural world is greatly underestimated.

Ignoring women's knowledge leads to incomplete or erroneous results about the characteristics and uses of plants, other NTFPs, and marine species such as shellfish, including management techniques, seasonality, and changes in distribution. Furthermore, women represent a missed opportunity in conservation action when they are not consulted. For example, cooking recipes used through time are a valuable source of data about availability, types, and quantities of species used in family and communal diets over generations. In Sierra Leone, men could name 8 different uses of trees in forests while women could name 31 uses (Hoskins, 1982; Domoto, 1994).

In many cases, women have specialized information about rare or unresearched species. For example, in Thailand, research on home gardens discovered that women had rescued 230 different plant species from nearby forests before they were cleared, thereby creating a local genetic reserve (www.fao.org/FOCUS/E/Women/Biodiv-e.htm). As the world's caregivers and protectors of family health, women hold a vast body of knowledge about medicinal uses of wild plants and animals. Indigenous women in India were found to know medicinal uses for almost 300 forest species (<http://www.fao.org/GENDER/en/fore-e.htm>). This information is valuable for species identification and arguments for protected status.

The tendency to give men's activities and knowledge more attention is sometimes related to the greater visibility of men in public spaces outside the home, such as fields, forests, shorelines, and commercial spaces like markets and businesses. Yet the spaces that women use (such as home gardens, small plots, shifting agriculture near the home, estuaries, base camps on hunting and

fishing trips, and water sources) are equally essential to preserving a diverse genetic pool and conducting biodiversity research.

Based on their different sets of knowledge about wild and agricultural species, women's and men's preferences for crop and garden varieties may differ. Women are more likely to choose seeds based on cooking time; nutritive quality and taste; resistance to bird damage; ease of collection; processing factors like suitability for thatching, basketry, and fodder; and preservation and storage requirements. Men often consider yield, suitability for soil types, and profitability (Howard-Borjas, 1999; Bunning and Hill, 1996). While most production systems use a single crop from a single seed variety, women in Africa, Asia, and Latin America have continued to plant multiple types of seeds and produce diverse crops. In Uttar Pradesh, men primarily use forest plants for fodder and mulch, while women collect forest products for medicines, tonics, cleansers, fibers, food and tools (Flickinger, 1997). Gendered domains of knowledge tend to be complementary in this way.

Because women are overwhelmingly the fuelwood gatherers of the world, they tend to know which local trees provide the best burning wood and the location of these trees. Women also have the most reliable information about water sources, quality, seasonal flows, and water management methods and benefits. Women are critical to water resource management, yet water users' associations disproportionately represent men. For example, in Jau National Park, Brazil, a technical biodiversity team was only able to determine the extent of hunting in the park after talking to women. Although the hunters were men, women prepared and distributed the meat and were able to give precise information on consumption patterns, varieties of meat, and the frequency and seasonality of hunting (Oliveira and Anderson, 1999).

Participation and Power: Women Are Key Stakeholders

When women's use, knowledge, and impact on biodiversity are made visible, it is clear how important it is to involve them in conservation activities and planning. Without women actively contributing to decisions about land use, community planning, sustainability schemes, policy development, enforcement, protected area creation and management, and biodiversity research, one half of the stakeholder constituency is left marginalized, disenfranchised, and unlikely to adhere to community agreements or national policies. Yet men are overrepresented in conservation work, from international to local levels. Who sits

on conservation boards, protected area management committees, or in ministries of natural resources? Who consistently comes to conservation training sessions or community planning meetings? Who speaks at those events?

Conservation programs can plan to succeed by taking steps to ensure women are active in decision-making related to biodiversity. Including male and female extension agents, for example, ensures better access to a range of actors and spaces used by both genders, an opportunity missed when conservation or agroforestry programs are designed and run only by men. In Kenya, an information campaign targeted to women farmers increased yields per hectare of maize by 28 percent, beans by 80 percent, and potatoes by 84 percent. Yet women receive only 5 percent of all agricultural extension services worldwide (www.futureharvest.org/people/women.shtml). At professional levels, women are poorly represented in protected area staff, planning, biodiversity research, and government ministries. Quotas can help overcome this disparity. For example, a National Water Authority regulation in the Dominican Republic mandates that at least 40 percent of Water Committee members be women (Thaxton, 2004).

Supporting women to participate fully, however, requires responding to the practical needs associated with their roles in families and communities. Too often program planners believe that women do not want to participate because they have not investigated these needs. Women are much less likely to have free time for activities not related to work and the household, because they are the main caregivers for children and work much longer hours daily than do men. It is essential to understand at which points in women's and men's daily and seasonal routines they are most available for conservation meetings, co-management planning, and education sessions, and where these events should be located to facilitate their attendance. Women are more likely to complete professional conservation education programs when they offer flexible class hours, childcare, and fee adjustments. Other strategies to promote involvement include: providing child care, both at community and staff levels; encouraging women to bring children; involving men in childcare; tapping into pre-existing women's and men's groups to accommodate both genders; and meeting women in places they gather, such as waterholes, wells, community centers, and religious sites.

Income and Education: Women's Status Shapes Human Consumption Patterns

Poor families are much more likely to rely directly on forest and marine products for their livelihood, nutrition, and income. Studies from Zimbabwe show that environmental resources in some rural areas accounted for more than 30% of average total household income, and the poorer the household, the greater the share of income from the environment (Cavendish, 1997). A study of 80 villages in dry zone India found that common property resources provided 15-23% of total income for the poorer households of Andhra Pradesh, but only 1-3% for the larger farm households (Jodha, 1986). In Thailand, 60% of all food in rural areas comes directly from the forest (<http://www.fao.org/GENDER/en/foreb2-e.htm>). Women represent 70% of the world's poor, according to calculations by the International Labor Organization in 1996. In Uttar Pradesh, India, women get 33-45% of their income from common area forests, compared to 13% for men (<http://www.fao.org/GENDER/en/fore-e.htm>).

Common wisdom holds that households use resources to the benefit of all household members. However, men and women often have different priorities and therefore practice varying patterns of consumption. Directing control of resources to women—in terms of education, cash and in-kind income, and natural resources—can impact the investments households make for the next generation. Women's education and individual income have independent effects on children's education, health, and nutrition, which are much greater than the benefits to children associated with men's education and income—the marginal effect of female income on child nutrition is 4 to 8 times higher than that attributable to male income.

This is likely related to evidence from all the world's major regions showing that women are more likely than men to use the income they control to improve their children's nutrition, health care, and education, even where it is considered a man's responsibility to pay for his children's schooling. Men are more likely to spend a portion of their income on recreational purchases like alcohol and tobacco or the expansion of commercial activities (Malhotra, Schuler, and Boender, 2002; World Bank, 2001). For example, in Rwanda, holding income constant, members of female-headed households consumed 377 more calories daily (per adult equivalent) than those of male-headed households (von Braun et al., 1991). In Kenya and Malawi, moderate to severe levels of malnutrition were significantly lower in children from female-headed households, compared to male-headed households, in spite of the contributions provided by two parents versus a single parent (Kennedy, 1994).

Among women, education leads to smaller families, and healthier, more capable, and better-educated children (Jejeebhoy, 1995). Educated women, even those who only attend primary school, are more likely to practice good hygiene and make better health care, vaccination, and food choices for their children than less educated women, and they are more likely to use family planning methods for birth spacing. Nutritious foods are fundamental to the proper brain development and mental acuity required to break cycles of poverty. Increased educational levels create more diverse livelihood opportunities for both women and men, and reduce direct reliance on biodiversity goods. In several studies, such as one in Nepal, positive conservation attitudes were more likely among the better educated (Shrestha and Alavalapati, 2006).

Because of the relationship between gendered control of resources and consumption patterns, it is important to plan who receives the benefits of payment-for-environmental-services (PES) and sustainable production programs. Failing to distinguish household income from individual income and how each are used can lead to unintended results. For example, sometimes men who receive cash subsidies for activities prioritized by women (such as watershed protection for clean drinking water, latrines, and food supplements) misdirect the funds, since men seldom value these benefits of environmental programs as much as do women (Commission on Sustainable Development, 2005; IDS, 1999). Where international agricultural companies engage in contract farming with small producers, contracts are nearly always given to the men, with the assumption that men are the primary agriculturalists. Often, especially in Africa and some parts of Asia, women's roles dictate that they assume the bulk of agricultural labor. Yet, men receive the payments and control the income. Men in Kenya engaging in contract farming often take back the land they had formerly given to their wives for subsistence food production (Rojas, 2004).

Experiences with Gender and Conservation

CI and USAID¹ are long-standing collaborators on numerous international conservation projects, such as the Global Conservation Program and the PHE project. With the support of USAID, CI implemented three gender and

¹ Through its Automated Directive System, USAID requires all operating units engaged in strategic planning processes to examine two key questions with regard to gender issues: 1) How will gender relations affect the achievement of sustainable results? and 2) How will proposed results affect the relative status of men and women?

conservation training workshops for staff and partners in 2004. DevTech Systems, Inc. and Cultural Practice LLC. provided the training in gender analysis and strategy development in collaboration with USAID's Women in Development (WID) office. In June 2004, staff and partners from CI's PHE programs in Cambodia, Madagascar, Mexico² and Philippines increased awareness and understand of gender analysis to improve outreach and education activities and to understand roles in the community concerning PHE. This increased awareness among staff and partners led to a sharper focus on incorporating gender in order to maximize our health and conservation outcomes.

From September 2005 to September 2008, CI continued the PHE project in the three target zones in Cambodia, Madagascar and the Philippines with USAID support. In order to increase our gender analysis and strategy development capabilities, we designed our project Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP) to include gender specific or sensitive indicators. These indicators included;

- Participation in IEC events, numbers of people reached – disaggregated by men and women;
- Number people trained in PHE – men and women;
- Male participation in FP/RH activities; and,
- Female participation in natural resource management (NRM) activities

Cambodia

Beginning in 2004, CI began working with CARE Cambodia, and other NGOs in the villages in and around the CCPF to explore and implement activities that promoted the relationship between healthy communities and environmental protection. The goal of the project was to reduce population pressures on biodiversity in the CCL – which would reduce the number of people that must rely on illegal use of the natural resources that exist within the protected areas.

CARE provided essential support and capacity building to the provincial health care system, for the delivery of primary health care and FP/RH services to remote areas. In addition, CARE conducted outreach health and IEC visits to the remote communities in the CCL, and implemented a youth center to increase adolescent knowledge of PHE approaches.

² The Meeting Health and Conservation Needs in the Selva Lacandona” Project was funded by the David and Lucile Packard Foundation from 2000 to 2006.

At the same time, CI helped foster the adoption of Participatory Land Use Planning (PLUP) to determine the best use of local lands for both economic and conservation purposes. Members of the communities and Commune Natural Resource Management Committees (CNRMCs) created maps to illustrate the current uses of their land, and then worked with CI to determine how to change their practices to ensure environmental preservation. PLUP, besides proving to be logistically successful, carried special significance in Cambodia. The democratic process is just beginning in this country, and the free democratic elections used to select environmental leaders for PLUP were among the first such elections in which the people participated. Since the process began, more than 1,000 men and women have participated.

In addition to CARE Cambodia and ABE, our partners in Cambodia included: the Cambodian Center for the Study and Development in Agriculture (CEDAC), the Forestry Administration, Save Cambodia's Wildlife (SCW), Wildlife Alliance (formerly WildAid), Flora and Fauna International and the semi-government Decentralization Agency (SEILA).

The project's objectives were to:

- Enable target communities to adopt safe FP/RH practices, to improve access to quality FP/RH and primary health care services and thereby mitigate population pressure on key biodiversity areas.
- Support effective integration of "population and environment" into local government planning, and to build local capacities for natural resource management and biodiversity conservation.

Following on the gender training provided by DevTech Systems and Cultural Practice in 2004, CI Cambodia staff began to explore gender analysis as part of its community engagement program, which includes the PHE project. Recognizing the important role that women play in the provision of food security and health care at the household level, Women's Associations were established in two communes in order to empower women through supporting livelihood activities such as home gardens and a pig bank in 2004. In addition, CI also ensured the inclusion of women participants in CNRMCs. These committees are democratically elected to represent communities in conservation activities.

In addition, CI also brought on staff a female community development outreach worker, Chanthy Hot, who completed graduate research on gender

dynamics in the CCL. Chanthy, together with PHE technical advisor Wayne McCallum, compiled a report on gender roles in community conservation efforts, based on extensive key informant interviews, focus group findings, case studies and literature review. This report, *Gender, Community and Conservation in the Cardamoms: Gender Analysis and Strategies for the Central Cardamoms Protected Forest Programme*, describes how productive activities are distributed between men and women in the CCL. The observations included:

- Both men and women engage in agricultural production of annual crops such as dry rice, bananas, corn, sugar cane, peppers and chiles in the chamkar (household vegetable garden, in Khmer). Women have the primary responsibility for the care and maintenance of the rice seed, including husking the seed soaking the seed prior to rice planting. Women also sow the seed into the nursery plots for paddy rice.
- Men engage in the collection of NTFPs such as resin, which have market value, while women gather NTFP used in individual households to meet family dietary requirements, such as bamboo shoots.
- Men do fewer activities associated with the immediate care and maintenance of the households, such as childrearing).
- There is a significant spatial difference between genders, with men going deep into the forest to collect high value NTFPs and snare wildlife, while women's activities keep them primarily around the house and village.
- Based on interviews, men tend to have power over decisionmaking related to livelihoods, yet women make the decision about when to harvest the rice.
- Women have considerable decisionmaking power within the household, but women are generally not very active participants in meetings and other public discussions. This may be related to the women's need to stay close to the home, or it may reflect the fact that women have not achieved the same level of formal education as men.

The report also makes recommendations for CI leadership to implement a comprehensive gender strategy to build staff awareness and training in gender analysis, provide tools for gender analysis and monitoring and evaluation, and develop strategy for incorporating gender into future community conservation initiatives.

Philippines

The Sierra Madre Biodiversity Corridor (SMBC) in northern Luzon is a critical area for biodiversity, where rapid population growth due to high fertility rates and internal migration threatens both natural resources and the livelihood of rural Filipinos who depend on these resources. One of the key municipalities in this area is Baggao, where surveys have shown pressing needs for both increased access to reproductive health care and strengthening of community forest management and forest protection.

As part of this project, CI and partner organizations focused efforts on reducing population pressure on natural resources and improving the quality of life in communities surrounding key biodiversity areas within the proposed Northeastern Cagayan Protected Landscape and Seascape and SMBC. CI and their NGO and government partners attempted to address the lack of access to FP/RH services in communities inside or near the forests where in-migration and fertility were high. The lack of these services contributed to rapid population growth, thereby causing increased unsustainable use of forest resources. Many of these forests were included in concessions as community-based forest management (CBFM) areas and Certificate of Ancestral Domain Claims (CADC) of indigenous peoples. However, they remained inadequately managed. Thus, uncontrolled timber poaching and clearing of forestland continued to destroy the forest. This further reduced the forest's capacity to: meet the future needs of the communities, serve as habitat to diverse flora and fauna, and sustain environmental services critical for the communities' survival, including supplying water for irrigation of their farms and for domestic use.

The project objectives were to:

- Encourage and enable residents of reproductive age (15 to 49 years) in six barangays to adopt safe and appropriate FP/RH practices; and
- Build the capacity of target communities to effectively manage their CBFM and CADC projects for sustained resource yields and biodiversity protection.

Our partners in the Philippines included: the Local Government Unit (LGU), Barangay Health Workers (BHWs) and midwives, Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR), Municipal Environment and Natural Resource

Office (MENRO), MHO, PHE Network, PROCESS Luzon, National Commission on Indigenous People (NCIP), and CBFM People's Organizations.

As part of our FP/RH activities, we implemented a gender-sensitive approach to increase the number of men receiving FP/RH information and services. We reached men regularly through family planning couples' counseling sessions, conducted by the BHWs. This approach is in line with the governmental initiative to promote responsible parenting. At the same time, we worked to increase participation of women in natural resource activities, such as forest management committee management.

The BHWs participate in a range of PHE outreach activities, such as educational campaigns in schools and youth groups, FP/RH counseling and responsible parenting sessions for married couples, and community based natural resource trainings. In fact, the BHWs and local midwives demonstrated their commitment to the environment by reporting to local law enforcement officials incidences of timber poaching, slash-and-burn agriculture, and illegal logging activities, proving that they are committed environmental stewards as well as health workers.

Other CI Project Examples

CI has also worked to incorporate gender into our conservation activities in other geographic areas. The following two examples illustrate gender-related aspects of project implementation.

Conservation International-Peru conducted a preliminary social assessment among the Matsigenka indigenous group of the Amazon. They identified Dona Vilma, town midwife, as the local expert in medicinal plants. Dona Vilma worked with an anthropologist and an assistant to gather more than 150 samples of medicinal plants. They recorded their work in reports in both Matsigenka language and Spanish, ensuring that this traditional knowledge is accessible to future Matsigenka generations and national and international conservationists who seek to preserve plant biodiversity (USAID, 2001).

CI's Population Environment Project in Chiapas, Mexico, aimed to establish a community center for women and youth where craft-making skills could be developed and conservation awareness events sponsored. Because the center would primarily be used by women, local officials resisted the project because men were not included as part of the target audience for center. It took several

months of local women learning to speak up for their needs, talking to officials and male family members, and eventually convincing the community leaders to approve the plans and open the center. The community did operate the functioning center focused on women's and youth's ecologically sustainable economic activities, designed to help increase women's incomes, and therefore their families' wellbeing (CI, 2006).

Recommendations

Based up on our experiences in PHE and gender analysis, CI's PHE program makes the following recommendations for developing future interventions with a gender-sensitive approach.

1. Increase awareness of the importance of addressing gender in conservation in order to improve effectiveness.
2. Garner leadership buy in for commitment to incorporating gender into conservation activities.
3. Build capacity of project staff and partners to conduct gender analysis and evaluate gender aspects of project activities. Also develop staff expertise in planning activities based on gender analysis and to make recommendations for adaptive management based on gender disaggregated monitoring data.
4. Ensure a "learning approach" is inherent as part of conservation and health projects and activities. A learning approach includes a process of threat assessment, stakeholder analysis, project implementation, monitoring and evaluation, followed by adjustments in activities or strategies as needed.

References

CI 2005. *Combining Conservation and Care: Incorporating gender*. Washington, DC: CI.

Aguilar, Lorena, Montserrat Blanco and Paula Zúñiga. 2004. *Protected Areas: Gender Makes the Difference*. IUCN Factsheet for World Conservation Congress 2004, Bangkok.

Aguilar, Lorena and Itza Castaneda. 2001. *About Fishermen, Fisherwomen, Oceans and Tides: A Gender Perspective in Marine-Coastal Zones*. San Jose, Costa Rica: IUCN-ORMA.

Alderman, H., J. Hoddinott, L. Haddad, and C. Udry. 2003. "Gender Differentials in Farm Productivity: Implications for Household Efficiency and Agricultural Policy." IN *Household Decisions, Gender, and Development: A Synthesis of Recent Research*, ed. A. Quisumbing. Washington, DC: International Food Policy Research Institute.

Asian Development Bank. 2003. *Gender Issues in Forestry and Watershed Management*. In *Gender Checklist: Agriculture*.

Baden, S., A.M. Goetz, C. Green and M. Guhathakurta. August 1994. *Background Paper on Gender Issues in Bangladesh*. BRIDGE Report No. 26.

Baden, Sally. May 1999. *Practical strategies for involving women as well as men in water and sanitation activities*. Report No. 11, Gender Office, Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida). Institute for Development Studies, University of Sussex.

Boender, Carol. 2006. *Why Does Conservation International Care about Gender?* Unpublished.

Braun, J. von, H. de Haen, and J. Blanken. 1991. *Commercialization of agriculture under population pressure: Effects on production, consumption, and nutrition in Rwanda*. Washington, D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute.

Bunning, Sally and Catherine Hill. June 1996. *Farmers' Rights in the Conservation and Use of Plant Genetic Resources: Who are the Farmers?* Women in Development Service (SDWW), Women and Population Division, Food and Agriculture Organization.

Buvini, Mayra. 1999. Hurricane Mitch: Women's Needs and Contributions. Inter-American Development Bank, Sustainable Development Department Technical Papers Series.

Chanthy, Hot and Wayne McCallum. 2007. Gender, Community and Conservation in the Cardamoms: Gender Analysis and Strategies for the Central Cardamoms Protected Forest Programme. Phnom Penh, Cambodia: CI

Commission on Sustainable Development. 2005. Women's Statement, Intergovernmental Preparatory Meeting, New York, 28 February-4 March 2005.

Dasgupta, Jasodhara and Abhijit Das. 1998. Health effects of women's excessive work burden in deforested rural areas of Uttarakhand. Paper presented at the Conference on Health and Environment, Centre for Science and Environment, SAHAYOG, Almora, Uttar Pradesh.

DevTech Systems, Inc. October 2004. Conservation International Workshop on Integrating Gender into Conservation Strategies. Washington, DC: DevTech Systems, Inc.

Domoto, Akiko. 1994. "Women and the Convention on Biological Diversity." In *Widening Perspectives on Biodiversity*, ed. Anatole F. Krattiger, Jeffrey A. McNeel, William H. Lesser, Kenton R. Miller, Yvonne St. Hill, and Ranil Sendanayake. Geneva: International Academy of the Environment, IUCN. 219-24.

Flickinger, D. 1997. Rehabilitation of Degraded Tropical Forests in India's Western Ghats: silvicultural and socioeconomic implications of multiple species plantations. PhD thesis, University of Florida. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms International.

Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). 1995. *A synthesis report of the Africa Region—Women, agriculture and rural development*. Rome: FAO.

FAOb. 1995. *Fact sheet: Zimbabwe - Women, agriculture and rural development*. Rome, Italy: FAO.

FAOc. 1997. *Women's Participation in National Forest Programmes*. Rome, Italy: FAO.

FAOd. 1998. Coastal Zone Management and Equality between Women and Men. Accessed online at www.fao.org on June 19, 2006.

Fortmann, Louise, Camille Antinori, and Nontokozi Nabane. 1997. Fruits of Their Labors: Gender, Property Rights, and Tree Planting in Two Zimbabwe Villages. *Rural Sociology* 62(3): 295-314.

Hoskins, M. 1982. Observations on indigenous and modern agroforestry activities in West Africa. Paper presented at UN University Workshop on Problems of Agroforestry, University of Freiburg.

Howard, P. 2001. *Women in the Plant World: The Significance of Women and Gender Bias for Biodiversity Conservation*. San Jose, Costa Rica: IUCN-ORMA.

Howard-Borjas, P. 1999. "Some Implications of Gender Relations for Plant Genetic Resources Management." *Biotechnology and Development Monitor*, No. 37, p. 2-5.

IFPRI. 2005. *Women: Still the Key to Food and Nutrition Security*. Washington, DC: International Food Policy Research Institute.

International Labor Organization. July 30, 1996. Women Swell Ranks Of Working Poor, Says ILO: Lower Wages, Longer Hours, Hinder Women's Progress.

Jejeebhoy, Siren J. 1995. *Women's Education, Autonomy, and Reproductive Behavior: Experience from Four Developing Countries*. International Studies in Demography, IUSSP. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Kennedy, Eileen. 1994. "Health and Nutrition Effects of Commercialization of Agriculture." IN *Agricultural Commercialization, Economic Development, and Nutrition*, eds. Joachim von Braun and Eileen Kennedy. Johns Hopkins University Press for International Food Policy Research Institute.

Kenyatta, C., Henderson, A. 2001. The potential of Indigenous Wild Foods. *Workshop proceedings, 22-26 January 2001*, eds. C. Kenyatta and A. Henderson.

Kenyatta and Henderson, 2001;
<http://www.fao.org/sd/WPdirect/WPan0025.htm>).

Lara, Silvia. 2004. *Poverty and Environment: Gender Makes the Difference*. IUCN Factsheet for World Conservation Congress 2004, Bangkok.

Leach, Melissa, and Robert Mearns. 1991. *Poverty and the Environment in Developing Countries: an Overview Study*. Report to Economic and Social

Research Council and Overseas Development Administration, UK. Brighton, England: Institute for Development Studies.

Malhotra, Anjou, Sidney Schuler, and Carol Boender. 2002. Measuring Women's Empowerment as a Variable in International Development. World Bank Background Paper, Gender and Development Group and Social Development Group of the World Bank. Washington, DC.

Margoluis, Richard, Vance Russell, Mauricio Gonzalez, Oscar Rojas, Jaime Magdalene, Gustavo Madrid, and David Kaimowitz. 2001. Maximum Yield: Sustainable Agriculture as a Tool for Conservation. Biodiversity Support Program.

Mason, K. and H. Carlsson. 2004. "The Impact of Gender Equality in Land Rights on Development." Paper presented at the Human Rights and Development: Towards Mutual Reinforcement conference hosted by the New York University School of Law, March 1, 2004, New York.

Myers, Norman. May 2005. Environmental Refugees: An Emergent Security Issue. 13th Economic Forum, 2005, Prague.

Oliveira, Regina and Elza Suely Anderson. June 1999. Gender, Conservation, and Community Participation: The Case of the Jaú National Park, Brazil. MERGE Case Study No. 2. Gainesville, Florida: University of Florida.

Oxfam International. March 2005. Oxfam Briefing Note: The tsunami's impact on women.

Pereira, G. N/D. Women in Fisheries in Latin America. Uruguay: INFOPESCA.

Rojas, Mary Hill. 2004. Agriculture: Gender Makes the Difference. Factsheet for IUCN's World Conservation Congress 2004, Bangkok.

Shrestha, Ram K. and Janaki R. R. Alavalapati. 2006. "Linking conservation and development: an analysis of local people's attitude towards Koshi Tappu wildlife reserve, Nepal." *Environment, development and sustainability* 8 (1, 2006): 69-84.

Thaxton, Melissa. 2004. Water: Gender Makes the Difference. IUCN Factsheet for World Conservation Congress 2004, Bangkok.

Tropical Research and Development, Inc. 1998. Parks in Peril: External Evaluation of LAC Region. Gainesville, Florida: USAID and Tropical Research and Development Inc.

Turner, Terisa E. with Leigh S. Brownhill and Wahu M. Kaara. March 2000. "Women Farmers and the Sustenance Economy in Kenya." *Gender, Food Security and Foreign Policy Toward Africa*. Ontario, Canada: York University Centre for International and Security Studies.

UN Millennium Project 2005. *Taking action: achieving gender equality and empowering women*. Taskforce on Education and Gender Equality. Lead authors, Caren Grown, Geeta Rao Gupta, and Aslihan Kes.

UNAIDS. 2005. AIDS Epidemic Update 2005.
<http://www.unaids.org/epi/2005/index.asp>. Accessed on May 2, 2006.

UNEP. 2004. Women and biodiversity: the core of existence. *Women and the Environment*. Geneva.

UNEP. 2004-5. Global Environment Outlook Yearbook 2004-5.
<http://www.unep.org/geo/yearbook/yb2004/097.htm>.

UNIFEM. 2002. *Progress of the World's Women 2002*. UNIFEM Biennial Report. New York, USA.

USAID. June 2001. Gender Matters Quarterly No. 3, USAID's Office of Women in Development.

Van Ingen, T., C. Kawau, and S. Wells. 2002. Gender Equity in Coastal Zone Management: Experiences from Tanga, Tanzania. IUCN Eastern Africa Regional Programme.

WEDO. 2003. *Common Ground: Women's Access to Natural Resource and the United Nations Millennium Development Goals*. New York, USA.

Women's Commission for Refugee Women and Children. 2004.
<http://www.womenscommission.org/donate/index.shtml>.

World Bank Group. 2005. World Development Indicators.

World Bank. 2001. *Engendering Development: Through Gender Equality in Rights, Resources, and Voice*. World Bank Policy Research Report. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

World Health Organization (WHO). June 2005. Indoor air pollution and health. Fact sheet N°292.

Annex 1. Guidelines for Addressing Gender in Proposal Writing

Conservation International

Rationale

The purpose of these guidelines is to assist staff and partners who write proposals to consider gender analysis as part of conservation program implementation and effectiveness on the ground.

The most effective way to ensure that gender aspects of resource management are addressed is to emphasize community participation and stewardship combined with solid stakeholder analysis (by explicitly defining who is using what resources and how, and who will be affected by resource use and how.)³ Since men and women access, use and control resources differently, CI and partners must be aware of these differences, and use that information to design strategies which take into account and integrate gender roles and analysis throughout an implementation plan.

The first step to understanding gender analysis is to understand the difference between gender and sex. **Gender** refers to “the economic, social, political, and cultural attributes and opportunities associated with being male and female”⁴. It is not the same as **sex**, which is biological and defined by physiological and sexual characteristics. Gender is a social construct, which does not imply addressing only women’s roles, but the simultaneous consideration of both male and female roles and their interaction in society. For CI and partners, we must have a thorough understanding of gender dynamics in our project activities in order to achieve sustainable and effective conservation outcomes.

5 Points to Consider (or How to Incorporate Gender)

In order to guide you through the process of integrating gender into your proposal, keep the following points in mind.

1. Overall Project Strategy Design
 - a. In what ways do gender relations differentiate people’s connections with natural resources and ecological systems? (including knowledge, use, access, control, and impact on natural resources and attitudes toward conservation)

³ Comprehensive stakeholder analysis also includes examining aspects of age, class, ethnicity and socioeconomic status. These guidelines consider only gender, but the same questions can be applied to these other factors.

⁴ OECD, 1998.

- b. How do existing gender roles affect the achievement of conservation outcomes? And how would the project impact these roles and program effectiveness?
 - c. What are some gender-based constraints to achieving conservation outcomes? What are some opportunities and how will the project address these?
2. Activity Design
- a. What would be the program's effect on women?⁵
 - b. What would be the program's effect on men?
 - c. What are some possible unintended consequences of this intervention?
 - d. What are the different ways that women and men access, use and control resources, goods and services?⁶
 - e. How are decisions made in the family, household and/or community?
 - f. What forms or methods of communication networks reach women? And men? If these are different, how does the project address targeting different gender-based messages for conservation?
 - g. Are technology methods, meeting time and locations and communication strategies appropriate for women? And for men?
3. Community and Household Impact
- a. What would be the activity impact on household and social gender structures? Examples include:
 - i. Impact on division of labor at the household and community levels?
 - ii. Impact on time constraints of a particular gender?
 - iii. Impact on subsistence activities?
 - iv. Impact on traditional rights?
 - b. What would be the impact on policy and regulatory changes affecting gender participation?
4. Monitoring and Evaluation
- Sex-disaggregated indicators are preferable (if budget allows for collecting detailed data)
 - Potential Sex-disaggregated and Gender Indicators include:
 - Number of men and women participating in activity and percentage of total of their population
 - Community knowledge, attitudes and practices (KAP) about female participation and leadership

⁵ Debbie Caro, Integrating Gender Strategies in Conservation Strategies Workshop, 2004.

⁶ Lorena Aguilar, A Good Start Makes a Better Ending, IUCN, 1999.

5. Staffing

- Consider budgeting a gender specialist to conduct a gender assessment and regular follow-up
- Assign gender management responsibility to project team member (may include hiring a consultant to conduct appropriate interventions during life of grant)

Additional Tools and Resources

- Managing Resources and Ecosystems with Gender Emphasis (Merge) project website, <http://www.latam.ufl.edu>
- IUCN gender website, www.genderandenvironment.org (also in Spanish, www.generoyambiente.org)
- CD Resource from the Community Conservation Coalition (CCC), "Putting Conservation in Context: Social Science tools for Conservation Practitioners"