

WORKSHOP:

IGNITE GENDER DIAGNOSTIC TOOL EXERCISE

Workshop Leader: Sarah Sahlaney

October 14, 2020 - 11:00 AM - 12:30 PM

Barbara Stinson

President - World Food Prize Foundation

Welcome to one of our featured International Borlaug Dialogue Workshops. We're offering a new, interactive concept with these workshops, focused on the tools needed for achieving safe, affordable, nutritious and sustainable food systems. This year's workshops offer an opportunity to better understand and engage with the policies, statistical and scientific tools that translate concepts into action. In this upcoming workshop, you will collaboratively define the key issues related to mainstreaming gender in policy. You'll explore problems and generate potential solutions. Many institutions want to understand how they can improve their gender and nutrition outcomes to promote gender equality and improve household dietary diversity. Impacting gender and nutrition through Innovative, Technical Exchange in Agriculture, or the IGNITE tool, helps institutions such as nongovernmental organizations, governments of all types, and businesses assess how their organization is currently performing in order to understand the types of outcomes that they can achieve in gender and nutrition. It was an immense pleasure to work with Tanager International to prepare this workshop session for you. We hope you will find the IGNITE gender diagnostic tool to be helpful in using your expertise to evaluate current gender and nutrition programs and to make our food systems more resilient.

Introduction

Sarah Sahlaney

Director of Gender & Social Inclusion, Tanager

Good morning, everyone. Good afternoon. Good evening to those of you who are joining us from around the world. Thanks so much, Barbara, for that really lovely introduction. We're very excited to be having this conversation with you this morning and to introduce both the IGNITE program as well as the IGNITE diagnostic tool. So I will be kicking us off. My name is Sarah Sahlaney, and I am the Director for Gender & Social Inclusion at Tanager. I am based in DC, and I'm also the Program Manager on the IGNITE project.

Before we dive into the diagnostics and the detail of the diagnostic, I wanted to just give a little bit of background about IGNITE in general. So the IGNITE project is a five-year program that is implemented by Tanager as well as its partners, Laterite and 60 Decibels.

And the main goal of IGNITE is really to strengthen African institutions' ability to integrate gender and nutrition into their work at two levels. So the first level being the programming

level and the actual intervention level as well as looking at how to integrate gender and nutrition into institutions' way of doing business at that broader institutional level. And the diagnostic plays a really key part of this, and it's an incredibly important tool that IGNITE has used throughout the process.

Before we go further, I just want to introduce the full IGNITE team, many of whom you'll be working with today. So I've introduced myself already, but you'll be hearing from Maureen Munjua, the IGNITE team leader. You will also be hearing from Tessa Ahner-McHaffie, who is an embedded research associate with the IGNITE program through Laterite. You'll be hearing from our gender expert, Caroline Mukeku and your gender expert, Benson Mutuku. You'll be hearing from Dr. Catherine Macharia-Mutie, who is our nutrition expert. You'll be hearing from Angela Kangori, who is our Deputy Team Leader, and John DiGiacomo who is a research associate with Laterite. So we've got the full team on board today, especially during some of these breakout sessions, and we'll be very happy to walk through the diagnostic tool. (Next slide, please.)

So I just want to go over a little bit of what we'll be talking about today. So we have an opening presentation, and really the goal of this is to kind of provide a little bit more context around IGNITE as well as around the IGNITE approach and the diagnostic and to give you some example and key lessons that we have learned from the diagnostic. And then we go into breakout groups, so this is really your opportunity to talk with some of the IGNITE experts and to work through a case study that we have devised that really shows you that IGNITE diagnostic process and how we can start to identify some of these opportunities at the institution level. For those of you who are not in a breakout group, that's fine. You can stay with us in plenary, and we've brought some additional material to work through. And then finally we'll go to a plenary and closing.

Before we launch into the session itself, I just want to share some of the objectives. So we of course wanted to share the diagnostic approach and introduce that and give you a little bit of information on that. And also understand how the diagnostic and some of the domains and components of the diagnostic can support institutions to mainstream gender and integrate nutrition in their way of doing business. So there is quite a bit of dense technical material here today as well.

I would be remiss before we go to the next slide if I didn't mention, first of all, that this diagnostic is built on the work of a lot of other really recognizable institutions as well as that of our own technical experts. So before we go any further, I did just want to give credit to the Gender Practitioners Collaborative, which developed the gender-minimum standards upon which this diagnostic is based. I also do want to mention our technical colleagues at ACDI/VOCA as well as those at Tanager and Laterite who contributed so much thought leadership to this tool, as well as to a consultant named Stephanie Sullivan who also contributed to the tool.

So without further ado, I'd like to hand the microphone over to our team leader, Maureen Munjua to talk to the approach a little bit more.

Maureen Munjua
Country Representative, Kenya

Thank you, Sarah. Let's start from the beginning. Yes, my name is Maureen Munjua, and I am the IGNITE team leader, and I will be doing the presentation with my colleague Tessa who is also the IGNITE family expert. The slides seem to be acting up a bit on me, but I just wanted to start us off with two questions.

Why does gender and nutrition matter in agriculture? And, two, I think reflecting about what should we do better in mainstreaming gender and nutrition in our work as decoders?

So growing up in a rural setting in the highlands of Limuru, I had fun accompanying in the farm, especially during the school holidays. And evidence has shown that indeed women do 85% of the labor work in the ag sector. But still are limited to times of access to productive land and quality inputs. But we also know that if women had equal access to this productive assets as men, then farm productivity would increase by about 20 to 30 percent. That means more food, better nutrition, increased income, better health, better education for the households. But we also know that agriculture programs can contribute significantly to the impact on women and children's diets, especially when they are designed deliberately to impact on nutrition and to include women's hormones.

Lastly, we are seeing a shift by private sector moving not just corporate social responsibility but really creating shared value. That means reconsidering their products and markets, really knowing who their customers are, their preferences and really finding these business value links to be more inclusive. You see more inclusion of smallholder farmers supply basis.

So IGNITE, through offering technical assistance and capacity building... And, IT, if you could share your screen, I think my screen is frozen.

(Sarah - No problem. Coming up.)

Thank you. IGNITE, through the technical assistance and capacity building, talking with African agriculture institutions, they are really looking to build institutional capacity for them to better mainstream gender and integrate nutrition into their work, really making it part of their DNA.

IGNITE, as Barbara started by saying, is working with the private sector. We are working in government, and we are working with NGOs in the agriculture sector. Our three main objectives are really capacity strengthening, for institutions to better deliver on gender equality and improve nutrition through agriculture. But, too, it's working at institutions to identify the models that move the pin for gender equality and improved nutrition and examining these institutions, how can we scale these models for greater impact. And then our last and what we look at for a sustainability objective is really identifying local service providers that can bring gender-technical and nutrition-technical assistance to scale within the sector, so being able to provide more of what IGNITE is providing in this five years.

So we are uniquely working with being that intersection point of agriculture, gender and nutrition-sensitive agriculture. I think over the last three years IGNITE has really been asking the questions, and institutions have been asking us the questions. We are seeing a lot of interest for institutions to mainstream gender and integrate nutrition, but they don't always know the first step. So it is important for them to understand where they are in order to understand

where they are going. So for us the IGNITE diagnostic tool is really that “true north” for the institutions that we are working with.

So IGNITE guides institutions through a client journey. And the journey really is where you see the diagnostic, but the diagnostic is not an end in itself. But it is a systematic way that allows institutions to know what they are already to bring, identify where they are got and their opportunities. So then we walk them through the action planning and implementation, and that's where we do the technical assistance and capacity building.

So the diagnostic process allows us to know our institutions better. So we have several steps that we take along the institutions, and these steps really help us to understand the client more, very close engagement with the client and documentary view. Sort of that's helping us to see what really exists in terms of structure, in terms of systems, processes, tools. And then we do a lot of interviews and field visits to have a deeper understanding through those interviews. We start measuring perceptions, and you are able to see, staff awareness on areas around gender and nutrition. But you are also able to validate what's in the documents and how that is cascading down to practice by the different staff members.

Then ignite does go through a scoring process, which we'll be doing later today, and developing those opportunities and really seeing these are areas where institutions can start working on towards that gender institution. And we do... This is a very collaborative process, so we do a lot of discussions with our clients. We are also finding these are the opportunities that we see, and this is where we can prioritize to start action planning and really build out more of the technical assistance support. And this support could bring from six months to about five years, about four years for southern clients, depending really on the need, depending on where we place them on the spectrum.

Next slide. So the diagnostic examines an institution across eight domains, as you can see here. And the first domain really looks at the structures, the strategies, the policies, the DNA. It's looking at the vision and the mission – what drives this institution and what is their commitment towards general nutrition?

And then the second one is really looking at the gray matter. It's about the technical capacity of staff. It's about the culture of the organization. Do they have tools, do they have guidelines on how to actually implement gender and nutrition within their programming, consider gender considerations within their institution. And very closely related will you make it to the first and the second is really – are we allocating resources to be able to actually see this change that we envision for gender equality and nutrition approaches? And four and five, very closely related, looking at collecting evidence. So are we looking at the right indicators? Do we have the right indicators? Do we have the right framework? And are such assumptions correct? Are we desegregating our data? Because then how you analyze and use that data is quite critical to then inform program design, to inform redesigning and looking at assumptions that you made during design but also for institutional learning. A lot of agriculture programs sometimes do consider the home but sometimes do not. So really pushing institutions to think about risk assessment and mitigation at the beginning of the design, and what is their work? Actually, how is their work impacting on potential risks for gender and nutrition?

And number 7 is really close too. How are we holding ourselves accountable to the commitments that we make as an institution towards gender equality and including nutrition? Are we tracking these? Are we monitoring how we are making progress? And do we have someone driving this accountability internally.

And then the 8th one is really pushing institutions to... And I started by saying IGNITE is uniquely working in that space, bringing institutions to think about gender and nutrition in agriculture. And this is what the 8th domain is really looking at. How can institutions start looking at this as a one rather than different silos.

So out of those eight domains we can go to the next slide. After looking at an institution through these eight domains, then we do score and place the institution along the gender and nutrition spectrum. And this spectrum allows the institution to measure themselves, to measure their progress towards institutionalizing gender and nutrition. It has five stages, so when an institution is at nascent, what it really means is that they're just beginning to consider and mainstream elements of gender and nutrition in their work. And that's still not there. And the other end of the spectrum, then it really shows that an institution has fully mainstreamed gender and nutrition issues, so really being part of the DNA.

So at this point I'll hand it over to Tessa who will take us to the next slides for scoring and how that relates to the spectrum. Thank you.

Tessa Ahner-McHaffie

Research Associate, Laterite

Thanks so much, Maureen. I am the research advisor on the IGNITE team, and I'll just be taking us through a couple different examples on how we actually score with the diagnostic tool. So you can see here on this slide we have an example slide for the first domain, the policies and approach system. Each domain has a sub-domain under the domain, which is how we score. So each sub-domain has a minimum standard, and that minimum standard the institution can either meet the minimum standard or not meet the minimum standard. If they meet the minimum standard, they get a score of 1. If they do not meet the minimum standard, they get a score of zero, so it's a binary scoring system. And once they've gone through each of the sub-domains we average out the zeroes and ones and we get an institutional score. In this case the gender score is .67, which translates to expanding on our spectrum.

So, for example, the minimum score, core values and mission for gender is the institution includes gender in its mission, vision or core values. So this particular client did not meet minimum standards, so they got a zero for this particular score. So if we can move to the next slide, so once we've gone through each of the domains, which each have sub-domains under each of them, we're able to put together a broad picture like you see here. So each of these scores on gender and nutrition are mapped for each of these domains. You can see that this particular institution has scored higher on gender than they did on nutrition in most areas, so that tells us a couple things. It tells us the institution is investing probably more in gender mainstreaming in the past, but it means there might be more opportunities for nutrition to grow at this particular institution.

You can also see here that Domain 4 which is focused on collecting evidence is growing plants and thus better nutrition. So we can say they are doing quite well there, and maybe there will be less opportunities there. As compared to Domain 6 and Domain 7. So they're scoring quite low there. So you can see that there might be more opportunities for work for growth within the institution. So if we go to the next slide.

Yes, so the reason we do scoring is we use it as a tool and a guide when we're going through this process. So scoring is not our primary goal. It's a way for us to get to the key findings and

opportunities that we're looking for in this [inaudible]. So I wanted to close here with this slide, because I think it shows the balance quite well. You can see with this example we have a high percentage of clients focusing on domain 1. We have this frame here to the left. You can see they scored in expanding their gender. And right at the top of there for nutrition. And you can see that with the scoring on the side, most of what we're talking about are the qualitative stuff the key findings and opportunities.

That's stuff we pulled from document review from the interviews. So we can use these sub-domains in this scoring to help identify these areas. So, for example, with this particular client they were going to be held accountable to nutrition outcomes at the end of their project. But most of the staff that we were talking to still didn't know what approaches they should be using and did not know how they were going to meet these outcomes. So one of the opportunities that we identified with this process was developing a nutrition-sensitive programming roadmap to be able to map out their sentry points for nutrition in the activities that were already happening within the skills. So we can answer more questions about that later, but I'll hand back to Sarah, and she can explain the breakout groups.

Sarah Great, so we realize we've just had a lot of information that we shared on that. And we wanted to really give people an opportunity to really work with this tool in a little bit more depth. So here is what we're going to do. If you signed up for a breakout group previously, go to the email and click on the link that you have already been provided. You'll be assigned to a breakout group, and with one of the IGNITE team members, you will then through either Exercise 1 or Exercise 2 in a small group. If you did not sign up for a breakout group, stay where you are. Starting on the next slide, Maureen and I will walk you through Exercise 1. There won't be an opportunity to talk one-on-one or discuss verbally, but we can walk through everything and answer questions in the chat.

So very quickly, now is the time to break out. We will assume that from this moment you are signing into your breakout groups, and you'll be met by an IGNITE team member on the other side. So go ahead and do that now.

Okay, so for those who are still in the plenary, we're going to move into the next elemental session. And really we had to do the breakout group sessions because there weren't enough facilitators to lead a huge, huge group of people. But we did want to provide kind of the same type of information, the same contacts. So I'm going to turn over the mic to Maureen, and she's going to walk through the plenary exercise guidance. And we're happy to answer any questions via chat. Unfortunately, you won't have mic access, but we can see your chat. So go ahead, Maureen and explain the next few steps.

Maureen Thank you, thank you, Sarah. So on the plenary exercise we do have an exercise that was shared previously by the World Food Prize team. But no worries – if you don't have it, we will project it in a couple of slides. But I think it would be interesting to just have a look at it. So we'll give you five minutes to read through that exercise. You will be focusing on Domain 1, which is primarily around strategies, policies, and structures, and then we want you to take the exercise to try and score the hypothetical institution on whether they meet the minimum standards for each sub-domain within this domain. So we'll be able to project those slides for you, and on the chart you can quickly say, you know, a 1 equals meets minimum standard, and a 0 is when it does not meet a minimum standard. So we will project for you the sub-domains and the

minimum standards, and then we'll give you a statement at the top, and then you are able to score. But more importantly and why we say the diagnostic is really, it doesn't stop at just a diagnostic, it's really identifying these opportunities. So think about one opportunity for subdomain that you would recommend to this institution and post that alongside the score that you put for the sub-domain. And then we'll have a discussion. But this is also, I think, an opportunity if there are any questions from the bigger presentation that you would like to post that the team can then address – when we come back to plenary with everyone else, this would be an opportunity.

So we'll give you five minutes. If you do have access to the exercise via the documents that were sent to the World Food Prize in advance, then go to Exercise 1. If not, Sarah, you can project the next slide, please. So the case that issued focus on Agriculture for Food, A4F Limited, a company that's been working in Ethiopia. They're mainly working on staples but has an interest to think strategically about gender equality and nutrition integration in their work. So IGNITE has created a diagnostic with this organization and has determined those areas are for support to provide to them.

So the process, as we envisioned earlier, you know, we review a lot of documents when we do carry out interviews with field officers but also headquarters with people now from the institution. I think from the chart maybe we can inquire if people have access to that and if they need a bit of time to just read through, or we can just move forward with projecting the slides.

Sarah Yeah, so for those of you who are in the chat, could you please note if you would like more time or if you would like to move forward if you've had enough time? Okay, I don't see anything in the chat.

Maureen Yeah, I don't see any chats coming through, so...

Sarah We can search for some chats coming through, but let's move forward in the meantime.

Maureen Yeah, so we can move forward and to the sub-domains. So the first subdomain under Domain 1 is really looking at the core values, vision, and mission and how the institution aligns itself with regards to gender integration within the institution. So the minimum standards here is that the institution needs to include gender in its mission, vision or core values. If you read the statement at the top, it sort of gives you the findings from the interviews that we did. And this were basically the findings from... This one loads from the interviewer. So on the chart, if you read that first statement on Domain 1.1, how would you rate this institution, given that its gender minimum standard should be that it includes... The gender minimum standard for this subdomain mentions that the institution needs to include gender in its mission, vision and values.

So, Cat no worries I think we can use the slides to guide you. So if you can just quickly post on the chart. So if you feel that it meets, if it meets that minimum standard, you put a "1," and if it doesn't meet, you put a 0, and we'll be able to see that. I'm not seeing any chats yet.

Sarah Yeah, so go ahead and add to the chat. It would either be a 1 or a 0, depending on whether it meets or does not meet the standard.

Okay, so there are not many chats coming through, and I am wondering if there is a delay. So, Maureen, if it were you doing this, what score would you assign to the standard?

Maureen So given that we are thinking about the gender minimum the standard, I would say it does not meet, because in the notes from the interviewer and from the documents that were referenced, there was no mention of women's empowerment, equality of gender in their mission or values in the institution. So I would score it as a does not meet.

Sarah Great. I would agree with that. So if you scored the same as Maureen, then that would be exactly how you would score this. Should we go to the next one?

Maureen Yup. So under Domain 2, this one looks at institutional policies, and it's basically looking at policies, strategies, action plans that do guide the institution with regards to gender equality. So there was a lot of times you will see that this come from either strategies that you would be handed during the documentary time.

So given the statement at the top, how would we rate this institution? Do we think that it meets the minimum standard, that it has again a policy strategy or action plan, or does it not meet?

Sarah So, Maureen, I would say because there is a gender policy, strategy or action plan—and it's clear that that exists and that it's available—I would say that it does meet the minimum standard. Would that be correct?

Maureen That would also be also correct. And I could ask you also—what is the opportunity you see? Let's not get stuck in the scoring, so we're also looking at what are our opportunities? Where can this institution also improve?

Sarah Yeah, absolutely, so let me know if you think this is correct. So I think it's high level—there's no real implementation plan. So for those ought to have worked on strategic or worked with high-level strategies before, sometimes those don't always tell us how to do our jobs correctly or what that really means for our day-to-day work. So I would say one opportunity here, even though there is a gender strategy. But one opportunity would be to build out an action plan for gender and gender integration within both the institution and within the activities.

Maureen Yeah, I would say that is correct. So the sense of this is that, even if an institution does have certain structures but it does not have..., like they're not fully developed, I think it's still an opportunity to support the institution to do better; because it is that implementation plan that really heats the ground and really you start seeing results. So having policies is nice, having strategies is good, but also implementation plans is even better. So we can go to the next slide, and I think the tech team at the bottom is taking supporters with the chat function to get some more interruption from the team. I think that would be good. So subdomain 3 is really looking at national practices and policies. And these are national practices and policies related to gender laws, policies and guidelines set by, In Africa you would think about the National Guardian, but there is also the African Union, commitments. So thinking through this

institution and looking at the statement that you see there at the top, it seems like they are having, A4F is having a close collaboration with the Ministry of Agriculture and really working to align their work through the value chains that have been prioritized for government. But then speaking deeper with the institution, you also realize that they are actually not having any collaborations with the ministry of women, children and youth and don't... You know, they don't talk about coordinating with any gender experts at the Ministry of Agriculture, in as much as they're collaborating when it comes to value chains. So given that situation and given our gender minimum standards... And this is, I think, also a case you see with a lot of governments, that the ministry of gender and women affairs or children and youth is very separate from other ministries, yet there is that collaboration that's needed. How would you score this institution? Does it meet? Does it not meet? Sarah, what do you think? I don't know if we still have...

Sarah Yeah, so we're getting some tech support so that we can hopefully see the chats from the participants. So, participants, if you hang with us for a minute, hopefully we'll be able to hear from you a little bit. But I'm working through some of these examples, as you are. So it's a good opportunity for us all to work together. So if this sub-domain is really looking at alignment between national laws and policies and institutional policies, that really helps leverage things. So we're seeing – even though that helps leverage things and there is that alignment, we don't see that collaboration. So there's not a lot of collaboration or coordination going on there. We're getting actually some comments in. Meghan, thank you so much for sharing. Some folks are suggesting zero, that it doesn't meet the gender minimum standard. Maureen, what would you say for that?

Maureen I would agree. Does anyone disagree with this one or have a different opinion? Sarah, what do you think?

Sarah Yeah, I mean I think this could go either way – right? So often national policies have a lot of different directions, so as we say here, they're coordinating all approaches and policies to align with different value chain approaches; but there's not a lot of collaboration. So while there is alignment, you could say that it meets the minimum standard for alignment. But there's a huge opportunity for collaboration here. So if I were scoring this, I probably would say that it does align, it does technically meet the minimum standard, but without that collaboration you're not really getting the full benefit of the alignment. So I think Stelle says agree for zero on 1.3. So, yes, I think the crowd is mixed, and I think there is a huge opportunity here as well to say that there really needs to be some more collaboration.

Maureen Indeed, indeed. And I think that's also the reality when it comes to issues around gender and nutrient. In certain countries you will find that those are two different ministries and that collaboration by institutions working in the sector is quite critical.

Sarah Great, so we can go. It seems really difficult to rank this... Yeah, go ahead, Maureen.

Maureen Do you want to read the comment?

Sarah Sure.

Maureen Or do you want to go to the next slide?

Sarah Sure. Let me read the comment really quickly. It seems really difficult to rank this on a present/absent scale, so a 1 or a 0. Has the group tried a quantitative scale? That's a great question, Stella, and we haven't tried a quantitative scale, primarily because we want to keep the tool as simple as possible. And usually for many of these approaches, the policy or the plan or the alignment, it either does exist or it doesn't. With that being said, that quantitative or that nuance really comes in at the opportunity. So very rarely do we look at these sub-domains and find that an institution is doing everything perfectly and that there's no opportunities. Usually it's much more that maybe something is present but there is an opportunity to improve it. Or it's not present at all, it doesn't meet the standard and therefore would be an opportunity to introduce that standard. So it's a great question.

Maureen Yup, it's a great question. Thank you, Stella. Thank you, Sarah. So going to Domain 1.4, we are looking at institutional funds, so this is broader than the gender strategy itself or the nutritional approach itself. It's really looking at the institutional plan, the strategic plan or the business plan. And we are really looking at institutionalizing gender and nutrition within the way that they work. So it's not just having a program that's focused on gender and nutrition, it needs to be in the DNA of the institution. So that's why we really also wanted to look at the overarching guidance, be it a plan or a business plan for the institution. How is gender equity or how is gender equality incorporated within these plans?

So if you look at the statements at the top... And it can relate a bit also. There is a lot of interrelation between some other domains that we probably looked at. But how would we score this institution with regards to meeting the minimum standard?

Sarah So the chat is up and running, so folks are welcome to enter their response into the chat as well.

Maureen Martin and Stella C, this is for you. What do you think, Sarah?

Sarah Yeah, I would actually be very interested in hearing a little bit more in the chat from Martin and Stella about why they've given this a zero to say that it doesn't meet. So currently we know that A4F does have women's empowerment as an outcome of interest. And it does have a strategic or business plan that incorporates gender equality. So it would technically meet. And again this isn't a hard and fast rule. They have the outcome, they have a focused area, and they have the business plan, and it does incorporate gender equality. So that's important, but there are a lot of opportunities here if staff don't know who to reach out to and they have limited resources to help them accomplish that – then there is an opportunity. And Stella responded and Martin and I are harsh, harsh critics. And Martin says, "Explicitly incorporate sounds like you need the on-the-ground knowledge," that without that explicit knowledge there that maybe it doesn't meet that standard. So, yeah, I would agree, Stella, you and Martin are harsh critics. I would have given this a 1. But again I think it's important to say like even if you get that gender score, very rarely do we come out of this tool without some pretty clear recommendations about how to improve. So even if you're finding that this isn't quite up to standard, then you could still obviously recommend those opportunities.

Maureen And I think one of the things that I mentioned, I think, during my presentation was that we do have these conversations with our clients once we do this scoring. Because

we are talking to a handful leading an institution. We are reviewing documents. There are some documents that at times we don't get a chance to look at but have probably a bit more information. So we really take that opportunity to also see how would an institution really fit within the minimum, fit within the spectrum. But I think as Sarah says, the big opportunity is where, what are the opportunities to improve.

So going to subdomain 1.5 around programming and really looking at the business of things and the projects and programs that the institution is implementing. Do staff integrate? Is gender integrated into the design and implementation of activities, even the data that you've been given at the time? I hate to say but it is a zero. Thanks a lot.

Sarah So, Maureen, how would you look at this one? Martin and Stella. Surprise, surprise – both say zero. What would you score this, Maureen?

Maureen I would say it does not meet, and I can explain the why. I think they do not report that they think about... They do not report that they integrate gender into the design, but they are going to sex-desegregated data, but they are not using that to inform how they are designing the programs. So it's one thing that they're sex-desegregated data exists. But if you're not using that to inform how you're designing for both men and women and how you're thinking about how the project impacts men and women differently, then you really don't meet those..., you don't meet your objectives with regard to impact on women and men.

Sarah Yeah, absolutely, so I think unanimous agreement here, that this wouldn't meet. It's just not really meeting that initial threshold, so... All right, let's go to...

Maureen Sarah, just on this one, Sarah, what would you think as a recommendation or as an opportunity that people can think about in this domain, in this sub-domain?

Sarah Yeah, first of all, the sex-desegregated data is really critical, but it's only critical if staff understand what it means and how to update or adjust or make changes to programming based on the findings of that data. So while the collection is important, the analysis and use of that data is also really important. I would recommend building some capacity around what that data means and some action planning all right, you know, once you get that data, how do you use it, how do you make updates and adjustments to programs? This can also tie into some of the action planning that we talked about..., and I think of Domain 1.2. So that could be really relevant here. I would make a recommendation for that. And it's looking here like staff, if they're not really thinking about how their program affects men and women differently, that might also be an opportunity just for some basic sensitization to really alert staff of the impact of this work. So awareness-raising in that sense.

Maureen Great. We're doing great, guys. We really appreciate the engagement as well on the chat. So subdomain 1.6 is really about partnerships and how institutions build partnerships with other stakeholders within the sector. So A4F does not happen every day other institutions. We could not tell any other institutions that they're partnering on, especially around the areas of really strengthening gender within the programming. I think earlier where they are walking very closely with the Ministry of Agriculture, not really working with the Ministry of Youth. So given that

background, what would you say? How would you score this institution, and does it meet, does it not meet?

Sarah So, Maureen, in the interest of time, people are welcome to enter this into the chat, and I see Martin's responding. This points back to some of the initial alignment components in one subdomain 1.3. But we do have gender considerations as a part of that alignment with the government of Ethiopia. Beyond that, though, they are not considered for any other formal partnerships. So while I would say that this does meet the score, it does meet the minimum standard under what we discussed in 1.3, there are a lot of opportunities here as A4F looks at other partner institutions possibly in the future to build those gender considerations in. I would also say that A4F could absolutely strengthen those gender considerations with its partnership with the government of Ethiopia. We had mentioned before, like that wasn't super clear. And Stella has a really good point as well where the partnership decisions... You know, there are plenty of opportunities to actually identify a partnership that includes gender expertise. So to build that gender expertise into partnership considerations is really important. And Stella noted that it... She marked it a zero because they would partner with the government of Ethiopia, regardless. So that's a helpful point, Stella, that maybe if they're not taking that into consideration with their partnership with Ethiopia, then it doesn't really count towards that standard.

In the interest of time, we've got about two minutes left, so I'd like to move to the next sub-domain, and, Maureen, maybe we can discuss this one, and quickly 1.8.

Maureen Yeah, I think we have two more to go, but I think we can quickly look at this. But this is really around leadership representation, so it could be a board. It could be a board level, it could be a senior leadership level. The minimum standard is that at least it needs to meet 30 percent of representation. Given that statement at the top, I think it's giving, but what do we... How do we rate it?

Sarah So feel free to enter in the chat. Maureen, how would you rank this?

Maureen I would rank does not meet.

Sarah Yeah, I would, too. This one's a pretty clear yes/no. Okay, let's move on to the last one, and then we'll welcome everybody back into the plenary. I think we already do have some groups who are coming back from the breakout. So really quickly, Maureen, how would you rank subdomain 1.8, with no clear leadership development in any of the HR documents?

Maureen I would say it meets, because there's a plan by the HR. but I would see the opportunity of being very deliberate to develop that plan. So, yes.

Sarah Okay, so you would rank this as a meets. And I do see a question from Stella on 30% representation as a minimum requirement. Stella, that was based on kind of a landscape review of what existed and was set to be realistic but also ambitious across the clients that IGNITE works with. And we're happy to talk about that a little bit more in the plenary session, too, which I think we should move to, since many folks are coming back from focus groups or from their breakout groups.

Great, so let's give everyone just a moment to come back, and we'll start back. I did want to just give everyone a moment to come back into the room. But for those of you who are already here in the plenary, it would be great for you to just reflect a little bit individually on some of the opportunities that you saw in this session on some of the opportunities for this potential institution. What were some areas that were surprising for you, any questions that you had, or just any of the elements of the domains that you thought were interesting or might be helpful for you in your work. So we'll give that just a minute and let people come back in.

Maureen Do we have all the groups back in?

Sarah Yes, so all the breakout groups. We'll have everybody back with us in about 30 seconds or so, so we're going to give it about ten more seconds before...

Great, so welcome back if you are just coming back from the breakout groups. We hope they were useful and hope they gave you a little bit of an opportunity to just kind of work through the tool. We also have... For those folks who were not signed up for a breakout group, Maureen and I conducted a more informal, I think, plenary session just talking through some of the domains, so thank you for the participation in that forum as well.

I wanted to first open it up, as we come back into plenary. We'd love to hear some reflections from you all on the tool on what you thought was useful, on some additional ideas for opportunities you had. And to kick us off, I'd really like to hear from Benson if Benson can share out some of the opportunities from his group and some of the discussion. My understanding is that his group was quite small but had a really good discussion. So, Benson, are you able to share with us what you discussed?

Benson Yes, Sarah, and thank you so much for that opportunity. And in regards to the discussion, we were looking at the main tool, which was focusing on developing organizational culture in capacity. And that was from farmers for development and organization in Burkina Faso. And so in regards to our scoring, it was really clear in this domain stage that the institutional score was 0.70, meaning that it is at its expanding stage. And some of the reasons that came into place in regards to this were they have gender experts, they have experience in terms of conducting gender analysis. They are as well working on training all staff, and they have a calendar in place with regard to this. However, they have a few areas where they did not meet standards in regards to where they do not have manuals to facilitate these trainings and also having a senior management. But that does not include the gender specialties in regards to how that needs to be managed from top to bottom in regards to sharing inspiration in regards to gender mainstreaming. And therefore some of the opportunities that can fit that this institution would be a board to work on as part of the recommendation is ensuring that the training is provided for all staff as soon as possible and ensure the senior leadership understands the mechanisms for gender integration. And also come up with modalities that would also ensure that women's empowerment is given a priority. So thank you so much, and those are some of the discussions that were shared during our breakout session. Thank you, Sarah, back to you.

Sarah Thank you very much, and we're excited to see some comments coming in on the chat as well, in response to some of this reporting out that Benson is doing. So Alana,

Alana Calhoun says there are a lot of different components to determining a score, lots of analysis and considering every factor. And that is really very true. You know, although it is a binary score in terms of a yes/no, there's an awful lot of nuance in some of these findings. Yes, they might have a policy, but if no one is familiar with the policy and no one is aware of it, how do you really score that? Which is not to say that it's subjective, and I'm happy to open it up to the IGNITE team to talk about little bit more about this. But it's not to say that it's subjective, but really this is a framework to give a lot of thought to some of these more important kind of considerations and domains. So thanks, Alana, for that.

Caroline, are you able to report out on some of what your group discussed? Is your mic working?

Caroline Yes. Thank you very much. I had quite an interesting team, and my team, we were handling the first domain, so we were assessing Africa for food in Ethiopia, company limited in Ethiopia. And we were assessing the extent to which they are being able to integrate gender within their programs and had quite a very enthusiastic team who actually, along the spectrum, called the institution as nascent and realized that this institution had so many gaps in terms of at the early institution never in setting up, they left a vision that meant their values did not have gender consideration. They had, yes, a very strong gender strategy, but they lacked an actual plan. And the team was of the opinion that having an actual plan is important so that it guides the implementation for achieving the outcomes of this gender strategy. When he got the tools realized is that the project in itself, the organization has projects and programs, but the staff reported they did not have knowledge and experience on how to integrate gender in their inception, design and implementation of the program. And so the team actually proposed if the A4F company limited, would actually develop a system or tools that drives the team on gender integration and capacity-building, so that they're able to know how to use these tools and in the design and implementation of the programs. Then we also observed that in terms of partnerships, their institution was not working in close partnership with the ministry and also did have progress in their programs but had no gender considerations in the commitments. And so we proposed that they should consider forging agreements with experts and all those institutions to work together to collaborate with the ministry. And considering developing agreements also developing tools that guide the partnership on how to ensure that the programs are more inclusive, gender inclusive. Thank you very much.

Sarah Thank you so much, Caroline. So I think both Caroline and Benson have really provided a good sample of, first of all, how the scoring can work, and second of all, some of the opportunities and ideas that can come out of it, which I think the IGNITE team arguable feels like are just as important if not more important than the scoring itself. Although the scoring does really help us track progress and understand how institutions are moving forward in these areas.

I wanted to provide an opportunity for folks to respond, the general participants in the plenary, to respond in the chat. And I think we'd specifically like to hear additional ideas that you may have had around some of the domains. Right? So we know that there are a lot of opportunities that come up throughout the course of this diagnostic that we can recommend to institutions, and we'd love to hear from you all. What were some of those ideas that you thought might be helpful or interesting for

either of the institutions in the case study to consider? And I am going to open this up to the IGNITE experts as well to feel free to report out from some of their groups. So we'll keep an eye on the chat.

Thank you, Lauren. So while we're waiting on some of the chats to come in, I want to give the World Food Prize folks some time to also process those.

But I think one of the questions that we got as we looked at some of the scoring was around leadership. And so, Stella, I'm going to share your question out if that was okay. There was a question around, when we looked at the domain for leadership, the 30% female leadership kind of quota or percentage and why that was set at 30%. I thought that was a great, great question that we are happy to share. So we kind of looked across IGNITE institutions and comparable institutions and institutions that were similar to the clients that we work with and really tried to determine what would be feasible and realistic but also ambitious. And so looking at kind of the literature around the percentage of female leadership at these types of institutions, that was the percentage that we came up with in terms of something that was ambitious but also realistic.

Great, so Catherine, our nutritional expert on IGNITE, is also sharing that there was a conversation on whether women's empowerment can be considered as gender equality or just part of it and that we scored a zero with the team that was really different from what we had ordinarily scored. So that maybe looking a little bit differently at some of the domains and maybe, Catherine, you can share a little bit more about that if you're able. So how do we think about women's empowerment versus gender equality, and how does that affect our scoring on some of the domains?

Catherine Thank you, Sarah, and that was for me quite a conversation opener, when you start thinking about what then do we include when scoring gender equality. And also we talk about women empowerment, [inaudible] translated to gender equality. And maybe just for a mention, so then within IGNITE we look at women empowerment as a key start-off point to gender equality. And so when an institution is already maybe having some focus or some outcomes, you know, measuring outcomes in women empowerment, we already consider that institution to like probably having met some women standards to gender equality. Of course, in the context of things, it could be that the institution still has potential for growth. And this women's empowerment is also a very interesting one because it explains the connection point for nutrition-sensitive agriculture as well as gender in agriculture. That's one of the areas where you can focus from either gender side but also from a nutrition side. So for me it was an interesting one.

And then having sat with the team idea, thinking about what would this score be. And then now going into my breakout room and we get a different answer, I think I just realize how sometimes assumptions also can come and it's causing me to give an opportunity to agree as a team. And so you could end up having very different opportunities as well for the same client. Thank you.

Sarah Thanks, Catherine. That's such a good point. I think some of the value of this tool, and as those people who are in the plenary are thinking about, you know, how do we use this tool and why might it be helpful, it's not just the score or the yes/no of the score or even identifying those opportunities or providing that tracking over

time – that’s how an institution score changes. It also has been really fundamental for the IGNITE team to engage in a process just like this where all the members of the team are able to sit and really examine an institution’s response to this and the documentation they have provided, and to really discuss, where does this institution fall? Where could it see some opportunities for strengthening under these domains? So that’s a really great point, Catherine, about also the value of the process, that being collaborative not just with the institution but also within the IGNITE team. So if you’re in the plenary and are trying to think through what might a process look like for you in your day-to-day work, I think that is some of the value of this tool as well.

I see a question in the chat from Alana. What are the main institutions you use this tool for? And have you used it for communities? That’s a great question. So IGNITE uses this on institutions that are technically our clients, meaning that they work with us. It’s not a typical client setup where they necessarily reimburse us for services, but they’re our clients. We’ve gone through a fact-finding relationship with them, and we have kind of a long-term agreement in place. So we use these across African institutions who are working on agriculture. And that connected with research institutions, it can include NGOs and development institutions. It can include government units or ministries. They run the whole gamut. We have not used the tool for communities, usually, because communities don’t necessarily have components like a gender policy or a strategy or some of the other domains that we look into. But it’s an interesting idea, for sure. I don’t think we’ve discussed that before, so thank you for that.

Another question from Madeline. What do you see as the future of this tool moving forward? I would like to turn that over to Maureen and the IGNITE around, yeah, how do we see this tool moving forward? What are the plans for it?

Maureen Thank you, Sarah, and yeah, I can attempt but really also give the opportunity to the team. I think when we started off, we say, you know, institutions, usually we don’t know where to start from. And for us, the diagnostic tool has been the “true north”, where we’re able to actually work an institution through a journey. We start with the diagnostic to see where you’re scoring but working with you to see how do we move you along the spectrum? So it is an open access tool. We have piloted it with... We have done about four diagnostics now and hoping to do more and really improve the tool. But we do want to see these as a tool that institutions can actually fall back to and say – We would like to know how we are doing and how we can improve when it comes to gender and nutrition integration. So we really want it to be an industry-standard tool that can be used to really assist institutions to institutionalize gender and nutrition.

And maybe to add a bit to Alana’s question on how disconnects, I think there could be a connection to how it connects to communities, because a lot of the institutions that we are working with are working with communities. And that’s where you are really impacting on gender and nutrition. Now you want to improve the nutrition household level. You want to empower the women within the communities, and men as well. So I think through this process, through taking out lands through that journey the diagnostic and really identifying some of these opportunities, in the end we have the communities and the households in mind and how the institutions that we are working with will actually impact on those communities from a gender and nutrition perspective. And that’s where we connect that to the second objective

around identifying models that are actually working and moving that gender equality and improving nutrition to really examine, what is that impact that the work that institutions we are working with have with regards to gender and nutrition integration. So working very closely with our partners, Laterite and 60 Decibels to really help us learn as we go along with the different institutions that we are working with and seeing where to tweak a model. It could be implementing a model in one way, but it's really not impacting gender equality and improving nutrition. So it is a learning process. We see a lot of our clients that we are learning at the same time...

Sarah Great. Thank you, Maureen. And there's another comment in the chat, and it will probably be the last comment that we're able to address today, but it's from Stella. And it's looking at... Thanks for the effort to define what gender inclusivity looks like from an organizational and programmatic perspective. How are organizations making the connection between high-scoring under IGNITE, so getting a really kind of a good, institutionalized score and delivering on increases in effectiveness for productivity for the Sustainable Development Goals. For example, empowerments that cause improvements to the bottom line. And first of all, I want to ask Tessa to answer this. I do think, looking at the Sustainable Development Goals, there are clear links between women's empowerment. Obviously, it's sustainable at SDG-5, but also clear links between women's empowerment, not just in SDG-5 but in some of the other SDGs as well. So there is a clear through line there. But, Tessa, can you provide a little bit more insight on this question?

Tessa Sure, absolutely. This is such a good question, Stella. Thank you for asking it. So I think the first thing I'll start with is – most of the institutions we're working with now, I'd say are in more of the middle of the spectrum. And institutions that are quicker to being high-scoring maybe wouldn't need our partnership as much. But as we're working through the process with them, and we're hopefully moving them along the spectrum to be high-scoring and mainstreaming gender and integrating nutrition into their work. Part of IGNITE's job is to be evaluating how the things that are happening at the institutional level are trickling down to households. So speaking to the effectiveness or productivity under the SDGs.

So one of our goals as a project is to look at how these things that are happening at the institution level can actually impact households. So we have a couple different methodologies that we're working through, and I won't go too much into them, because we only have a couple more minutes. But we're hoping to publish some stuff for the next couple years and do some lessons learned qualitatively as well as doing some more rigorous research.

Sarah Great, thank you, Tessa. So with that, we're going to wrap up the session. But a few kind of parting notes before we go. First of all, we hope this tool was really helpful, even if it's not necessarily taking the tool. We're happy to share the tool and to provide additional resources on it (our contacts are on the screen), but even if that's not helpful, with those domains and thinking through all of the elements around what it actually takes on, as Stella said, to institutionalize and really build capacity and commitment to gender inclusivity and nutrition in programming as well as at an institutional level, that those domains can really help to kind of provide a framework and almost a mental checklist around – here are kind of the components that that really takes.

So we hope that this is a helpful session. We hope it gave you something to kind of think about and reflect on. And please do reach out to us. Our contact information is on the screen. We also have a presence online, so you're welcome to look into the IGNITE project as a whole. And we hope that this is a helpful session for you. Thank you so much to the World Food Prize for the wonderful work that you're doing as well as the great facilitation of this platform. And we look forward to hearing from all of you soon. So thanks so much for your participation today. Thank you all.