USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

AGRILINKS
SPECIAL EVENT

YES, G-CAN! ENDORSING FOOD SECURITY WITH GENDER-RESPONSIVE AND CLIMATE-RESILIENT AGRICULTURE

Q&A AUDIO TRANSCRIPT

NOVEMBER 10, 2016

Presenters

Claudia Ringler, International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)

Elizabeth Bryan, International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)

Jessica Fanzo, Johns Hopkins University

Timothy Thomas, International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)

Meredith Soule, USAID Bureau for Food Security

Moderator

Julie MacCartee, USAID Bureau for Food Safety

Julie MacCartee: Thank you so much to all of our presenters. This is Julie MacCartee, and we're really excited to see the incredible comments and questions in the chat box. They will all be collected, shared with the presenters and the G-Can team for consideration as this framework is being developed and brought into its final form. And so we probably won't be able to get to all of the questions today, just based on time. We have about 20 minutes left. But we'll ask as many as we can.

And as a reminder, this webinar is being recorded, and you will get an email within a couple of weeks that has the recording, the transcript, any additional resources that the presenters would like to share with you, and we'll try and address any further questions in that email as well, so be on the lookout for that.

So I'll just kind of run down – we've been collecting your questions in a separate screen, and we're gonna run down as many of them as we can before we wrap up today. So I think I'll start kind of at the top of the question, for Claudia, from Indra Klein, who asked that given the data that have been collected and analyzed, how is it being strategically shared with governments, other community partners, ag producers, seed manufacturers, and anyone who has a stake in all of this data that's been collected, especially with regard to long-term thinking and action? Claudia, can you chime in on that?

Claudia Ringler: Yeah. Just very quickly, we couldn't share today with you our microsite, because it's currently under development. But at least under G-Can, we will have a data and analytics sub-site where all the research and data analysis that is being done under the project will be posted. I'll be preparing those sort of policy notes on countries in Feed the Future zones; and also specific analytical pieces; and, finally, also some review papers, for example, just on the state of knowledge and entry points for climate change and nutrition so for some areas where we really have very large gaps. But in general, US government and most governments have signed up to open data, policies, and standards. So actually, you can find a lot of data nowadays. The key really is to understand how to interpret that data.

Julie MacCartee: Great, thank you, Claudia. And next up we have a few questions that hearken back to Tim's presentation. And so I'll start with one from Rolf Klemm, who said that it seems that the various climate and crop models in the Zambia example that you shared generate highly variable predictions of yield. Have these models been applied retrospectively to assess their validity? Tim, can you chime in?

Timothy Thomas: Sure. Just briefly, on the climate model side of things, there have been works done, dissertations of various people, that tried to assess their historic reliability, and so we have some of those. But in terms of the crop model side of things, because I wasn't sure whether you were referring to the climate model or the crop model, on the crop model side, at the plot level even, there's ongoing work to assess the accuracy of the plot models in regard to the

weather we're seeing. So we have both measures of accuracy on the climate models and measures of accuracy on the crop models.

Julie MacCartee: Great, thank you. And another somewhat specific question from M. Omar Faruq: If you shift the date for planting for irrigated zones in Bangladesh, what happens for crops that are typically cultivated during rainy seasons? Would there be any overlapping of crops during harvest time?

Timothy Thomas: Well, thank you for that question. That was really a very good question, and at the conclusion of my research on this, because the funding and timing ran out, that was my ongoing point: that more research would need to be done, because once you shift one planting season, it affects every other planting season. But the simple idea, in addition to just doing some more research to understand how the overlap – whether there would be an overlap, that is – is that this could point to the need for more shorter-duration varieties of rice or other crops, or it may point to somehow mixing rice with another crop that is of shorter duration, although in the Bangladesh context, that probably wouldn't work.

Julie MacCartee: Excellent, thank you. Another question from – oh, well, first let me just mention that we have put our ending polls up on the screen, so if you wouldn't mind taking those as we continue through the remaining questions. These are just helpful for us to understand what you thought about the webinar, help plan additional webinars in the future. So please do answer the polls that you see on your screen. And it includes a box where, if you have specific requests for information or data from the G-Can team, you can elaborate in that bottom left question box and they will get back to you.

All right, so I think I'll jump to a question from Daniel Kangogo: If climate-smart agriculture at the farm level means introducing new technologies or breeds, what does this mean to household gender relations – workload for women, revenue for men, the pieces of land that were initially used to grow women-appropriate crops? He hypothesizes a situation where, in the face of climate change, people will use land to grow crops that are resilient, which may lead to specialization. They may be sold to buy a variety of foodstuffs, but whether that will actually happen is another issue. So given those comments, within your framework, are there potential mechanisms to control this?

Elizabeth Bryan: Thank you. Yeah, on that question, I would say the ways in which men and women are affected by new crop breeds or other kinds of technologies is so context-specific, it really depends on which crops are – what roles men and women have in a particular context. If there's a certain crop that's a women's crop, like groundnuts in Zambia and the new varieties developed for that, the impacts are very, very context-specific.

And so I think we need, for each project, to really think about these kinds of gender implications of different technologies or practices that are being rolled out, given the context that they're operating in, think through what are the different gender roles in this particular context, what are men's and women's

preferences and priorities, and how can we address the needs of both men and women through this project. And there are certainly risks, so if – let's say women are cultivating a certain crop, and that crop becomes much more profitable with a new breed or something along those lines, or a new production practice, is there a risk that men will take over that crop? What does that mean for their time in producing that crop and for their ability to prepare nutritious meals at home and those sorts of things?

So these are things that need to be thought through. There aren't really sort of general responses to that, but things that need to be thought through within the local context. And I strongly believe that researchers need to work very closely with project implementers so that these kinds of research questions are built into the interventions and that appropriate M&E is done to identify potential harm for men and women as these projects are being rolled out. And hopefully through this project and based on this framework, we'll be able to develop some tools and research approaches that can be used to examine these kinds of questions in the context of particular interventions.

Julie MacCartee: Excellent, thank you. Another question for Elizabeth from Fallys Masambuka-Kanchewa: What is the role of communities? Should there be a focus on advertising versus empowerment? I feel that there has been more focus on disseminating messages to communities and advertising at the expense of understanding views of the community and how the views can be incorporated to influence policy. It's kind of a broad question but something that would be worth addressing.

Elizabeth Bryan: I also saw some other related questions about sort of extension and how messages can reach men and women. I think it's important, again, for each project, given the local context in which they're operating in, to think about the ways in which women typically access information, what sources they depend on, and then think about what kinds of approaches can be used to reach women. So if the project is relying on giving out information on climate-smart practices or on the kinds of climate changes that are expected, through some sort of agricultural training that only men attend, then the women are not gonna be getting those messages.

If they understand that, hey, women really listen to the radio at this certain time, then maybe they can develop a broadcast to reach women through the radio. Or if women are involved in other kinds of groups within the community, maybe trying to insert some of those messages around climate change and climate-resilient approaches can be brought into those group settings that maybe have to do more with nutrition training or other kinds of trainings. So in each case, I think the answers are gonna be very specific to the local context, but there are different approaches that are available to reach both men and women. These just have to be considered.

And the other thing that has to be considered is what kinds of information do men and women need. So some research from Senegal showed that, for example, men wanted information about when the rainy seasons were starting,

because they plant first. The women, on the other hand, wanted to know when the rains were going to end, because they help their husbands plant on their plots first, and then they plant on their own plot, so they have a much sort of shorter season to deal with and they wanna know how much rainfall they're gonna actually get. So thinking about what different people within the community, what kinds of information they need, and then targeting that information to those specific groups is also something that needs to be done. And I'll turn it back over to Julie.

Julie MacCartee: Okay, thank you very much. A question came in from Laamari Abdelali about social experiments, suggesting that more effort is needed to evaluate the impacts of climate change and use of resources, including gender issues. What about using social experiments in specific communities and ecosystems? So maybe explain what is meant by social experiments and how they should be used. And that was targeted at Elizabeth.

Julie MacCartee: Oh, it's a question about social experiments: Can they be used in communities and ecosystems to kind of gather information about the impact of climate change and the use of resources, especially gendered social experiments?

Claudia Ringler: Claudia can maybe answer, because I guess the coordinator should speak once in a while. So yes, there are a lot of these – I mean, there's lotteries. There is dictator games. So there are a lot of social experiments to see who really has the decision-making power, and also those experiments are increasingly used to try to change behavior and to try to change norms so that, for example, men recognize the special needs of women on decision making beyond domestic issues. So there are a lot that are currently ongoing, but often the validity remains very local, very context-specific. So I think what's needed is maybe wait a little bit more time, another year or so, and then to actually try to draw lessons of larger messages that might be applicable to a larger context. So they're ongoing. I think some very interesting insights have been derived. But the challenge remains the contextuality of these experiments.

Julie MacCartee: Thank you, Claudia. And another question that I think you would be able to answer. There was a question from Laura Ostenso about heterogeneity. What exactly does that mean in the context of today's presentation?

Claudia Ringler: Right, very good point. I think several people have related to heterogeneity, starting with the climate change content presentations very heterogeneous impacts from a biophysical point of view, different climate patterns, and obviously responses with because of different soil and water availabilities. But we've also heard of heterogeneity in terms of socioeconomic conditions, ethnic groups, obviously gender heterogeneity.

So heterogeneity really affects everything, which is, again, why it's very important to do these context-specific studies, so you always have to go, obviously, beyond regional and global, and also beyond national to subnational, at a minimum, to better understand what adaptation and mitigation practices are most gender and nutrition sensitive. And it's basically a challenge, but it's

also an opportunity. And then, similar to the social experiments, the next step, again, has to be what could be learnings that then can be applied at a larger context, Because obviously we cannot do these very localized studies everywhere.

Julie MacCartee: Thank you, Claudia. Jessica, there was a question that came in during – or a comment that came in during your presentation that would be interesting to raise, which was from Claire van der Kleij, who said that working in Zambia herself, she sees that rural communities mostly produce their own food, and crops that have nutritious benefits are usually sold, since it earns them more money, rather than consuming it. They see more benefits in selling it than for their own health benefits, and there is a need for awareness about the balance of economic and health benefits at the household level. Do you see that – what level of kind of scrutiny and importance do you see of that issue, and how is it integrated into the framework?

Jessica Fanzo: Yeah, I mean, that's a great point from Claire. I think there's always been these tradeoffs between, when you're producing your own food, how much of it do you sell versus how much do you keep at home for the nutrition of your family? And there's been a lot of literature looking at cash crops and is there this shifting of cash crops where people, particularly nutritious cash crops, where people will sell them all. And often – it's termed the curse of the cash crop, because the income then generated doesn't go back into household health and nutrition.

But we know there's been a lot of work by Lisa Smith and Lawrence Haddad that if you put income in the hands of a woman, you're more likely to see improvements in health and nutrition outcomes of children at the household level. So there'd be a benefit of engaging women in cash-cropping systems. We know that there's an income pathway to improving nutrition and a market-based approach to improving nutrition. So I think it's not only production or only market-based; we have to think about both, so I think she brings up a great point.

And someone else had talked about – which is very nuanced, and you see this in different settings, depending on if you're in Ethiopia or Nepal. Sometimes there's women's crops and there's men's crops, and how do we get women more into what's considered the cash crops, and it'll become male dominated; this is a big issue.

So Claire brings up a really good point. It's this huge tradeoff. If any of you are nutritionists and you work in a field and you're talking to farmers, income always rules. So how do we ensure that the income generated is getting filtered back into the household, either indirectly or directly, to have health and nutrition benefits? And this is a contentious issue that people are trying to understand more and more, so she brings up a great point. Thank you for that.

Julie MacCartee: Thank you. And I think we have time for one more question that I'll ask to Tim in just a moment. I want to thank all of you for attending and remind everyone that this webinar is being recorded, and you'll get a link to the recording, lots of other resources, in a week or two. And of course, all of your comments and questions will be considered and collected, and we'll try and funnel as much information as we can in response to those questions and comments to you in our post-event email.

So one question came in from Rolf Klemm: Are there tools that help predict what happens to some parts of the value chain if you influence a link on the chain? So if you influence one part of the value chain, what happens to all the other parts of the value chain? Are there any tools that can help practitioners interpret that or predict what might happen?

Timothy Thomas: Well, that's a good question. We have a model at IFPRI that we've been using for more than 20 years now that keeps getting improved and refined, and what we do is we take in all of the climate responses, both through water and through agriculture, and then we look at what we think are projected productivity effects, income as it changes through time, population, and we do this for every country in the world, and every commodity, or at least 60 different commodities, and we look at how the whole system changes over time. And so what we can see is that changes in price of one commodity ultimately influence changes in price of another commodity, because supply and demand interact with each other globally.

And so one of the concerns, I think, that I saw in one of the questions, or maybe even implicit in this question, is that people will not be able to afford the more nutritional foods, and that's always an issue, of course. But also, with rising incomes, we find that while it is somewhat of a problem, it's not as big a problem in the future as you might expect. So I hope that answered the question.

Julie MacCartee: Wonderful. Thank you, Tim. All right, being conscious of time, I would like to go ahead and wrap up and send a sincere thank-you to our presenters for sharing this information today, and an even bigger thank-you to our audience. Without you, we wouldn't be holding these webinars, so we always really appreciate your participation, your attendance, and your comments for how we can improve Agrilinks webinars going forward. You're always welcome to email me, Julie MacCartee – my email is on the screen right now – with any further questions or comments. And I'll make sure that those are either sent to the presenters or incorporated into how we present future webinars.

On behalf of the Agrilinks team, I'd like thank you all for attending. Have a good rest of the day, and we'll see you at future events. Take care.

[End of Audio]