Gender and Adaptation Technical Paper Outline:
Leanne Wilson

[Draft Outline]

The United Nations system is formally committed to gender mainstreaming within all United Nations policies and programmes[1]. UNESC (2004) maintain that gender mainstreaming will not be achieved unless gender equality issues are highly visible in organisational and sectoral policies and programmes, including the need to systematically include gender perspectives within existing frameworks and analyses. Therefore, while this paper does address a gap within the Adaptation Policy Framework (APF) so far, it is insufficient to include a 'technical chapter' on gender. Unless gender is explicitly provided for throughout the entire APF, including the technical paper series, then one 'paper' becomes little more than a tokenistic gesture.

According to Decision 28/CP7., there are ten guiding elements that can steer the preparation of adequate (policy) responses to climate change adaptation, one of which is gender equality. Furthermore:

> "*Climate change will have different impacts on men and women, and in most cases, the adverse effects of climate change disproportionately affect women. For example, with increasing drought it is women who have to walk longer distances to collect water. Women are often the main repositories of vital local and traditional knowledge*" (LEG, 2002, p3)

Gender refers to the social construction of identity, based upon sex, but also interacts with other social influences such as income, nationality, religion, language and so on. In terms of climate change, a multitude of authors have raised the gender issue as fundamentally a response to the feminisation of poverty, as well as the invisibility of women at most scales of the climate change debate (Denton, 2000). This is surprising given that addressing gender issues can increase the efficiency as well as the equity of a range of interventions, especially in relation to adaptation (Wamukonya and Skutch, 2002). Gender is a cross cutting theme throughout the Millennium Development Goals, and development financing more generally. Literature and experience all steer towards the conclusion that gender equality (i.e. women and men) is pivotal in developing successful initiatives. This is due in part to the bitter experience of many 'women in development' programmes which by focussing upon the most subjugated, evaporate the wider political, economic, and ideological contexts which 'create' the subjugation (Østergaard, 1992; Longwe, 1997).

It is perhaps a strategic dilemma that has rendered the gender agenda fairly invisible throughout various climate change debates and negotiations. Perhaps this explains why there is no reference to gender in the IPCC Third Assessment Report; and barely lip service within the first round of technical papers to the APF. The strategic dilemma refers to the fact that if 'gender' is an explicit focus of policies, often this

[1] The United Nations General Assembly Resolution 57/182.

translates to ineffectual strategies to enhance only women's access to resources, becoming the domain of a specialised (and/or inexperienced), all women gender team when actually gender issues are multi-sectoral (cross cutting) and not the sole concern of women (Longwe, 1997; Wamukonya, 2002). This is due in part to the fact that at least on paper, 'feminised' covert *relational* processes become hidden within overtly *rational* (or 'objective') scientific and institutional contexts (Ross-Smith and Kornberger, 2004).

Development initiatives, whether through multi- or bilateral or NGOs have already produced vast compendiums of practical toolkits and methodologies that could mitigate negative gendered impacts, and enhance positive gendered capacities through a cacophony of sectoral or thematic interventions (for example the Bridge network). It is generally well understood, that women (in particular) who are reliant largely upon natural resources, are expert environmental managers who often follow highly sophisticated risk minimisation strategies. It is clearly not the absence of empirical and technical knowledge that obfuscates the inclusion of gender as a key issue within the climate change debate.

A key objective of the APF is to mitigate maladaptation to climate change. It is broadly structured with the intent to harmonise rather than dictate adaptation policy. The purpose of this paper is not to argue for the integration of gender tokenism into emerging adaptation projects, but merely to gently remind about the wealth of 'common knowledge' upon the practical successes and failures of project interventions which do not acknowledge that the various actors in any given process operates through a series of power relationships. Migdal (2001) provides a holistic yet succinct analysis of the multiscalar power dynamics that exist between and within various constructed groups and societies. In particular, the politics of implementation are explored in detail, a key aspect of increasing the sustainability of interventions and actions. However, the politics of implementation are commonly not addressed in reportage: "p*articipatory processes have been increasingly approached as technical management solutions to what are basically political issues*". (Guijt and Shah, 1998, p 3).

Although many up and coming adaptation projects are likely to follow traditional 'development' sectoral pathways there is a certain generic level of questions which can be incorporated easily into sectoral interventions. This is not to suggest that there is not massive divergence between sectoral issues – as well as for example, geopolitical concerns – but merely grounds some appropriate starting points for analysis. It is fundamentally important to retain the easily 'forgotten' knowledge that consultation with a woman's group alone does not mean that you can 'tick off' the gender box on project documents. Women and men will participate differently given a whole range of influences including class, ethnicity, religion, education and so forth. There is often a sense that speaking to the women (or men) with higher status means that the needs and priorities of those with lower status have been adequately addressed. Furthermore, there is still a tendency to view 'local communities' as harmonious (bounded) entities whose members only concern is that of the 'greater good' – the romanticised paternalistic approach partly contributes to 'white elephant' projects.

Some simple gender considerations, easily incorporated within all adaptation research and projects:

- What are the workloads and tasks for women, girls, boys, men? How and why are they shifting? In what way would new proposals help whom? How could any existing work overload of women and girls be reduced, and how would that extra time be spent?
- What labour obligations (women to men, men to women and intra-generational) currently exist, and how are these evolving? Are women 'compensated' for extra work, and if so how? What actions can avoid increasing women's total workload and/or deterioration of household food and nutritional security?
- How are household budgets divided in terms of income sources and expenditure obligations? To what extent has increased market involvement shifted obligations regarding food, child care, and other household provisioning? What extended family budgetary processes exist? How can women's incomes be augmented, and provisioning obligations be made less onerous?
- What has been the historic pattern of access to land (individual or household basis)? How were women's rights to land to meet provisioning obligations ensured? What steps, beyond recognition of female headed households and granting equal access can redress the increasingly inequitable position of women?
- Are water and fuel supply purely women's/girl's obligations? Are construction and maintenance/operation tasks male and/or female? What are the implications for voluntary male input into reducing women's subsequent workload (for water-source/tree management structures, and improved water, wood, tree access)?
- How real is the apparent gender sensitivity of health services? How much of whose time would be saved by universal primary healthcare? How much would it reduce poor household vulnerability? Can community, especially women's, participation in design, provision and management (not just funding) be increased? If so, how?
- Why are women farmers largely invisible to agricultural extension services (even when they do, in fact, address them)? How does this impede the functional efficiency of extension services and, especially, of female headed households? Are new crops/techniques assessed in terms of gender impact? Do small stock, crops, and trees particularly relevant to women receive adequate attention? Why not (e.g. because nobody knows which they are)? How can nutrition (and especially child feeding) linked to agriculture and health services be an entry point for participatory female-led initiatives (including income generation)?

(Green, 1998, in Guijt and Shah, 1998, p76-77)

However, the tendency to promote 'non-prescriptive' technical language is prevalent, specifically though not exclusively throughout much climate change discourse,

disguising the overtly political nature of development interventions. The discourse used more generally, and also specifically within the APF limits action for women's needs to increasing access *to resources* within the existing social systems - as opposed to increasing access *to decision making arenas*. This is a significant institutional issue as the underlying assumption is that poor, especially non-literate women need to be empowered, but this empowerment relates specifically (and therefore only) to the 'lower' scales of the institutional skeleton – beneficiaries, not colleagues. Further, this non-prescription of gender issues is interesting given that other members of the UN architecture happily prescribe structural adjustment (Longwe, 1997).

Even in the more technically oriented methodologies, Grimble and Wellard (1997) distinguish between stakeholders who affect and are affected by decisions, terming these respectively as active and passive stakeholders. They distinguish target beneficiaries as primary stakeholders, and also differentiate between relative importance and influence – importance referring to those whose interests are viewed as the priorities of aid, while influence refers to those who hold power (active stakeholders). While they acknowledge the fluidity of their boundaries, the value lies within the typology. Without any such technical typology, 'everyone' remains a 'stakeholder', and this is the complex arena where gender issues are most easily and/or conveniently deferred, forgotten or simply ignored.

APF Technical paper 1: Project Scoping and Design implicitly includes stakeholder analysis in Annex 2. Stakeholder analysis can at least make explicit which gender assumptions and omissions have formed the basis of any particular project. This provides useful, *easily obtainable* data in order to improve and enhance ongoing and new projects, particularly though not exclusively in relation to gender issues. Gendered stakeholder analysis even in a simple form can be integrated into all projects without extra cost implications (well, unless the project designers and implementers are paid by the hour)! This provides a more lucid account of strengths and weaknesses for future activities to accommodate lessons from previous adaptation projects. Gendered stakeholder analysis is particularly relevant in the context of natural resource management, which necessarily includes most adaptation to climate change projects. For example it is useful in considering the following contexts:

- Cross cutting systems and stakeholder interests, for example aquifers or watersheds.
- Multiple uses and users of the resources, for example forests.
- Non market dimensions, such as;
    - Negative, and positive externalities
    - Politics – it may not be in the interests of a farmer to improve the quality of her farming system if it will vastly increase the rent she has to pay for her land!
    - All environmental goods and services cannot, or at least *have not*, been given a market value from which to make rational trade offs.
- Non-renewable resources, for example land management. Although technically soil is 'renewable' it takes around 100 years to replenish one inch of topsoil; degradation is easier to prevent than reverse!
- Multiple objectives and concerns, for example between small holders and landless people, or between government departments and pastoralists and so on

- Poverty and under-representation, for example women.

(Grimble and Wellard, 1997).

The value of incorporating gendered stakeholder analysis into adaptation projects, is obviously not in the portrayal of poor women as victims who need to be saved. Clearly, to survive with little resources and power takes a vast amount of expertise and ingenuity. Similarly, the point of gender analysis is not to reinforce binary oppositions or to place men in a subordinate role, it is simply to sophisticate the scope of multiscalar analysis – whether practically, academically, or institutionally. Clearly the UN system, as outlined in the first paragraph recognises the problems faced by professional women, in the advocation of increasing male gender specialists. At the end of the day, if gender remains excluded from 'vulnerability' definitions within the APF then it would be expedient to concentrate solely on cost benefit analysis. While conceding that gender may not always be the primary lens with which to view vulnerability, if it is not significantly addressed then evidence as to why not should be forthcoming - it is too easy and too common to say 'gender wasn't relevant'. Why not? Fordham (2004), explores the need to develop a gender fair approach to vulnerability analysis. She also points out that vulnerability analysis remains partial if unaccompanied by corresponding capacity analysis. Active gender intervention is necessary both to increase both the efficiency and social justice aspects of adaptation projects.

In summary, gender analysis is not about polarising the differences between men and women. A whole range of influences compound relative power, and gender is not always the most significant. But, if gender dynamics remain 'invisible' or are seen as polarised, then this obfuscates meaningful analysis and intervention. The sustainable livelihoods framework does not accommodate intra-household and 'community' dynamics though it is currently the most widely used development framework. Vulnerability analyses that evolve from a sustainable livelihoods approach can only ever produce a partial understanding of a more complex reality. Despite practical constraints on project scoping, design, and participation, neglecting fundamental intra-household or 'community' dynamics will rarely conclude in sustainable interventions, let alone any level of self determination. People who have tenuous livelihoods often have tremendous time and energy burdens, and in most social constellations this is especially true for women. This time burden, in addition to other constraints (such as levels of education, health or self confidence) will often exclude those whose input is vital in the sustainable implementation of appropriate interventions.

In conclusion, gender analysis and action has clear added value in at least three key areas of the APF. The first is vulnerability - the need to take account of the different forms of (and reason for) vulnerability of men and women and inequalities in the level of vulnerability between men and women, as well as compounding influences of other social characteristics. The second is adaptive capacity - the need to analyse the difference in options/potential and consequences for women and men in different areas of adaptive capacity. The third is in policy making - how to ensure that women and men have an equal, or equitable influence in knowledge production and decision making at all levels, and the policymaking resulting from the whole NAPA process

In all three areas gender-analysis can be approached as an essential element both in terms of programme-efficiency and in terms of empowerment.

REFERENCES:

Denton, F. (2000). Gender Impact of Climate Change: a human security dimension. *Energia News*, 3.3:
http://www.energia.org/resources/newsletter/en-102000.pdf

Fordham, M. (2004) *Gendering Vulnerability Analysis: Towards a More Nuanced Approach*. In: Bankoff, G., Frerks, G., and Hilhorst, D. (2004) *Mapping Vulnerability. Disasters, Development & People.* Earthscan Publishing, UK

Grimble, R., and Wellard, K. (1997) *Stakeholder Methodologies in Natural Resource Management: a Review of Principles, Contexts, Experiences and Opportunities*. Agricultural Systems **55**(2), 173-193

Guijt, I., and Shah, MK. (1998) *The myth of community. Gender issues in participatory development.* ITDG Publishing, UK

LEG (Least Developed Countries Expert Group) (2002) *Annotated guidelines for the preparation of national adaptation programmes of action*. UNFCCC

Longwe, SH. (1997) *The evaporation of gender policies in the patriarchal cooking pot.* Development in Practise **7**(2), 148-156

Migdal, J. (2001) *State in Society: Studying How States and Societies Transform and Constitute One Another*. Cambridge University Press, USA

Østergaard, L. (1992) *Gender and Development: A practical Guide*. Routledge Publishers, UK

Ross-Smith, A., and Kornberger, M. (2004) *Gendered rationality? A genealogical Exploration of the Philosophical and Sociological Conceptions of Rationality, Masculinity and Organisation*. Gender, Work and Organisation **11**(3), 280-305

Skutch, M. (2002) *Protocols, treaties and action: the 'climate change process' through gender spectacles:*
http://www.energia.org/resources/papers/skutsch_climate_gender.pdf

UNESC (2004) *Measures taken and progress achieved in the follow-up to and implementation of the Fourth World Conference on Women and the special session of the General Assembly entitled "Women 2000: gender equality, development and peace for the twenty-first century", especially in mainstreaming gender perspectives in entities of the United Nations system.* Report of the Secretary-General. UNESC Commission on the Status of Women Forty Eigth Session (1-12 March 2004). Item 3 of the Provisional Agenda: Follow up to the Forth World Conference on Women and to the special session of the United Nations General Assembly entitled "Women 2000: gender equality, development and peace for the Twenty First Century"

Wamukonya, N., and Skutch, M. (2002) *Is there a gender angle to the climate change negotiations?* Energy and Environment **13**(1), 115-124

Wamukonya, N. (2002) *A critical look at gender and energy mainstreaming in Africa:* http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/forum-sustdev/Njeri-paper.pdf