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About the Land Tenure Center: Established in 1962 at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, the Land Tenure Center (LTC) has evolved into the leading university-based institution on land policy in the world. The Center works in Africa, Asia, Eastern Europe, Latin America, and North America on issues of land tenure and land use, agrarian reform, land markets, legislative drafting, land registration and titling, institutional dimensions of rural development, and environmental/natural resource management. LTC emphasizes the needs of the country where work is undertaken, an interdisciplinary approach, and the importance of working with host-country institutions and individuals in policy analysis, research, training, and implementation.
Web Site: http://www.ies.wisc.edu/ltc/
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WELCOME

WELCOME TO DAY 1 OF THE GENDER AND NRM DISCUSSION FORUM
Post by: Smita Malpani, Discussion Host

First, let me welcome you to this three-day discussion on Gender and Natural Resource Management. We hope that these three days will give practitioners, policy makers, and those who are struggling with the realities of these issues, a chance to interact and learn from each other across regions, resources of expertise, and experiences. I hope you will contribute to these discussions whether you have years’ of experience in advocating for gender considerations in natural resource management, or you’re new to the field and have questions to which you hope to find some answers. Our participants possess a wealth of experience and diversity of backgrounds, and I am confident this will make for stimulating discussion. I’m pleased to welcome you to today’s discussion, focusing on access to natural resources. This discussion is particularly important, because often women use natural resources such as water and fuelwood to fulfill their families’ basic needs. In addition, productive resources such as land, and women’s lack of access to these resources, contributes to systematic vulnerability to poverty for women and women headed households. These questions of access are of fundamental importance to gender equality itself. We’re grateful to our expert for the day, Susanna Lastarria-Cornhiel of the Land Tenure Center housed at the University of Wisconsin, Madison for sharing her knowledge and expertise with us.

I also wanted to alert you to the publications and websites section of the FRAME website. The team has assembled a very good collection of resource materials that I’d encourage you to look at.

LAND RIGHTS AND LAND ACCESS

Legal rights may not always be sufficient in giving women access to land and other productive resources. When and how are women’s formal, legal rights effective in enabling women’s control over land or other resources? Are there non-legal means and systems that can be utilized to promote women’s access to resources? What about indigenous, cultural, or religious systems? Can cooperative or collective systems increase women’s access?

DAY 1 - SYSTEMS FOR ACCESS
Post by: Smita Malpani

Access to resources and control over its use are the basis for food and income production, and, more broadly, for household wellbeing. Systematic differences in access to land and other resources between men and women contribute to structural inequality and to poverty for women. This is generally the case whether access is through the market, community authorities, family or kinship relations, or the state.

There are two main topics that our expert for today, Susanna, has developed to help shape and promote our discussion. We hope these will be useful for you, but also please feel not to interpret these questions strictly, but instead respond with your thoughts and experiences.

RE: DAY 1 - SYSTEMS FOR ACCESS
Post by: Sue Telingator
International Resources Group (IRG)

I was very interested in the issue of legal land rights in graduate school and did a study looking specifically at South Africa and its legal attempts to help women in customary living arrangements gain access to land rights. At the time (2003), they had passed a law stating that if women in customary arrangements registered their marriages, they could gain legal access. When I further researched actual numbers of registered marriages, the result was less than 1%. There was a huge disconnect between the policymakers and those on the ground whose lives these policies affected. I know civil society plays a strong role in building these bridges. But, I also know that deeply ingrained cultural norms prevent change from occurring at the grassroots level unless and until these women whose lives are affected by a state’s laws take the first steps. Traditional leaders and informal and local courts need to take part, as well. Until then, I feel as if we’re just spinning the wheels.
RE: DAY 1 - SYSTEMS FOR ACCESS
Post by: Susana Lastarria-Cornhiel
Land Tenure Center

This South Africa example of legislation intended to improve women’s rights, but which is not utilized, is extremely common in many countries and regions. The solution (how to encourage use of the law by women) is probably a multi-pronged one: government must do more than just pass a law—the implementation of the law must be actively promoted by government with support at national, regional and local levels. Local authorities must get on board, courts & judges must be trained, women and their families need to learn about women’s rights and the implications of the law. Implementation on the ground may differ from place to place, accommodating local norms & practices. It would be good to hear about different experiences from our forum listeners & participants.

RE: DAY 1 - SYSTEMS FOR ACCESS
Post by: Sue Telingator

I wonder if anyone out there has had an experience whereby passing laws that provide property rights access to women has lead to women actually benefiting from these laws? If so, I would love to hear about it! Thanks for your comments.

RE: DAY 1 - SYSTEMS FOR ACCESS
Post by: Margie Huang
Winrock International

Women in Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan play an active role in agricultural production, yet only a small percentage actually own land or have access to agricultural inputs and services. While land legislations do not discriminate, local institutions, traditions, and customary laws reinforce traditional stereotypes of gender roles preventing women from realizing their full economic rights to land. Rural lands are typically registered under male (husbands, fathers, or sons) head-of-households. Often, women lack confidence to acquire land as they fear that owning and managing property is too difficult, or are incorrectly told they do not have this right. Yet, where female-head-of-households do exist and men are absent, women are forced to take on the double burden of performing both agricultural activities and household duties. Many of these women are the poorest in society as they do not own land.

It has been recommended that land laws need to take into consideration the specific needs of women to enable more of them to own and better manage their lands for profit. Educational campaigns are essential to raise general awareness among rural women, village administrators, village heads, members of the court of aksakals, ma(k)halla committees, jamaats, women’s councils, mullahs, schoolteachers, clan leaders, and judges of the formal procedures to registering, applying and claiming land rights, restructuring government farms, and taxation of lands, among other relevant issues. Increasing awareness among aksakal courts, aiyl okmotu, and women councils of the rights of women to equal access and compensation to land distribution can assist women to obtain land in the event of a divorce, death of a husband, and/or land disputes. Trainings are also needed to increase capacity on how
to raise the productivity of lands, obtain credits for agricultural inputs and services, and heighten marketing skills.

It is still too early to know if these approaches will successfully enable women to realize their full economic rights to land. I would like to hear from others whether this approach has been implemented successfully elsewhere.

**RE: DAY 1 - SYSTEMS FOR ACCESS**

Post by: Ruth Meinzen-Dick  
International Food Policy Research Institute

I’m sorry I wasn’t able to participate during Day 1, but I’ve read the contributions, and wanted to add a few thoughts.

- I do agree that there is an interaction between state law and a whole host of local cultural and religious norms, practices etc. Changing a state law does not change the latter overnight, but there is an interaction between the two.

- Any change in state law will have very little effect without a legal literacy campaign such as what Margie Huang described from Tajikistan. It might be useful to compile examples of those, and see what kinds of components they have. For example, the Zimbabwean film *Neria* some years ago provided a fictionalized account of a women going to court for her rights, which helped prompt discussion in communities.

- Another avenue that I’d like to see tried out: before when legislation or implementing regulations are passed, have someone (preferably someone high-up) literally walk through it with one (or more) poor rural women. For example, (even assuming she has heard about this), what does she have to do to convince her family to let her go to register her rights? How much does it cost to travel and to pay all the fees, and what is that relative to the money she has at her disposal (one poor widow said she would gladly sell her 3 goats, which were all the assets she had, to secure her land title in Kenya, but that would not begin to pay the cost of the registration). Then how long does she have to be away from home (for a woman, being away overnight is especially problematic.) When she gets to the government office, can she understand the paperwork? Is she treated with respect? Is she sent back home for a missing form or an extra signature, etc.? How many times will she have to go? I think that really going through the process with such a woman would do a great deal to reveal the impediments, make policymakers and implementers aware of the problems, and help to make the systems accessible to poor women.

- If formal titling or registration processes cannot be made accessible to women, then I think that there should be caution about whether proceeding gives elites and men an opportunity to capture the rights and erode the existing access of women to resources.

**ACCESS TO NRM SYSTEMS**

**RE: DAY 1 - SYSTEMS FOR ACCESS**

Post by: Raj Kumar Pandey  
MSc student from Nepal  
The University of Reading, UK

Women access is determined by many factors. It is historically and culturally constructed. Women access to natural resource management could be increased by:

- Formulating gender friendly legal framework by the state or government: for example, a required no of women presence in making decisions, women representatives and so forth.

- Proper translating the laws or policy into practice; Only the legal framework does not increase the access to women. The level of access is dependant how the law or policy is translated at the micro level. And also how the micro - macro levels are linked while formulating the policy.

- Enhancing knowledge and skills: The level of access is also determined by the level of knowledge and skills of the women and men. Development activities, if focused to promote the knowledge and skills of both women and men in an equitable way, could empower women to interact in the NRM domain; and also could increase the quality of access.

- Integration of modernization and liberation development approaches: Cultural context also critically determines the women access. In some cultures, women are not allowed to go for meeting, to share their ideas. Thus, integration of modernization and the liberation development approaches could be beneficial to address the issues related to women access.

- Participatory democracy: Based on my experience, the participatory democratic practice in some community forestry user groups in Nepal was found effective to increase women access to natural resource management. The participatory democracy asks for the common fora for sharing ideas, raising issues, interactions and making conclusions or decisions.
Incorporation of shared mental models in the NRM system: Access to women could also be increased by the incorporation of shared mental models in the natural resource management systems. When the vision of women is also incorporated with the vision of men in the NRM systems of a community, women access to natural resources management could be increased.

Recognition of interdependency: Overall, when men and women in a community recognize each other, understand their interdependency; women access to NRM systems could be obviously increased. More importantly, when men realize that empowerment of women could also make their (men’s) life more comfortable, easier and less stressful, women could be encouraged to have a sufficient level of access to play their roles not only in the NRM sector but also in the overall community development processes and interventions.

RE: DAY 1- SYSTEMS FOR ACCESS
Post by: Smita Malpani

Raj, you make a number of valid and comprehensive points. Your third point, increasing women’s capacity to act and influence decision-making interact in this arena? And can we make technology work to so that’s it’s easier for women to participate. I’m thinking specifically about participatory 3-D mapping, where GIS is used to generate a 3-D model for the community to discuss (particularly in hilly areas). I think it’s been shown to be better at involving women and other who may not be as literate. Does anyone have firsthand experience with this and have any thoughts?

RE: DAY 1- SYSTEMS FOR ACCESS
Post by: Raj Kumar

Smita,

Thank you for your interests! After we provided some training to women in some community forest user groups (CFUGs) on forest managements, sustainable harvesting techniques of forest products, the following changes were observed:

The committee of the CFUGs increased the number of women representatives in the committee which was previously dominated by men. In a CFUG system, the committee is one of the decision making fora.

In the committee meeting, women were found leading the decision making process related to the issues like forest management and harvesting of forest products.

At the time of the forest product harvesting, the women were monitoring who cut the forest products in what way?

This reveals that knowledge and skill is related to the access to resources. I believe that skills could provide women more public space to interact in the NRM arena.

I am sorry that I do not know about the implications of the participatory 3-D mapping.
RE: DAY 1- SYSTEMS FOR ACCESS
Post by: Carmen Griffiths
Construction Resource & Development Centre
Jamaica

Sorry for my late entrance!
However I would like to question Raj’s suggestions.
Firstly, he suggests that women should be given power through greater participation in decision making fora. However, the experience of reservation of setas for women in Panchayats (village level bodies for self governance) in West Bengal, a politically advanced State in India, shows otherwise. In most cases, the women nominated are the wives/relatives of earlier candidates. They are totally controlled by their husband.

Coming to the second point, Raj says:

2. Proper translating the laws or policy into practice; Only the legal framework does not increase the access to women. The level of access is dependent how the law or policy is translated at the micro level. And also how the micro -macro levels are linked while formulating the policy.

But this precisely is the problem—how to do it? How to persuade a male dominated structure from voluntarily yielding its power to a weaker and (what it considers to be) inferior section. Unless a concrete method or process can be identified such suggestions remain naive idealistic suggestions.

I would suggest that the question of access is so problematical because of the cyclical nature of the problem. Women are denied access to control resources because of her lack of education, lack of social recognition, etc. Again it is because of lack of social recognition, education, power, etc. that women lack access to resources.

Unless we can chalk out a concrete strategy to break this vicious circle, the problem will remain unresolved.

RE: DAY 1- SYSTEMS FOR ACCESS
Post by: Smita Malpani
Prime Minister’s High Level Committee

I would like to add to Raj and Zakir’s comments. I absolutely agree that there is a vicious cycle at work, but let’s have hope that it can be broken, if men see the benefit of women being empower and being able to contribute productively to their family and community.

Take the example of a World Bank-UNDP (ESMAP) project in Bangladesh, where women helped bring power and lighting to their community, earned income for their family, and also increased their status. This project was done through a women’s cooperative that was given the skills and technical training to deliver solar technologies to their island. Going back to Raj’s third point- I think there may be some hope in training and capacity building for women as well as women’s actions collectively.

There is a bit more information about this project at http://www.tve.org/ho/doc.cfm?aid=1677&lang=English

RE: RE: DAY 1- SYSTEMS FOR ACCESS
Post by: Raj Kumar

Dear Zakir,
Sorry for the late response! I could not participate in the second and third day discussions as I was hard pressed with my university works.

The issue you raised is quite reasonable. I agree with you. There are many similar cases in my country Nepal as well.

I believe that changing society is a very slow process. The cognitive maps framed by our cultural and other societal contexts are very strong and resistive but not permanent in nature, they are dynamic and can be changed with proper external interventions (e.g., ideas, skills, information and knowledge, interactions, debate, self monitoring of the outcomes, discourse, demonstrations,...). The external interventions are supportive to change the cognitive map of an individual, which leads to change his or her behavior.

It is an evolutionary process and takes a time. I fully agree with the note of Smita in this regards.

RE: RE: DAY 1- SYSTEMS FOR ACCESS
Post by: Patricia Howard
Wageningen University and University of Kent, Canterbury

Hello, I’m just coming in, but I’d like to put forth a few other ideas, although in a fairly scattered way. The first is that rights to natural resources are not the same as rights to land, and also that women depend on a lot of natural resources that are not found on private land. I think that there has been an over-emphasis on agricultural land tenure to the neglect of natural resource tenure and land not in agricultural production. Tree tenure provides a case in point, customary rights to plants another, as do rights to water, maritime resources, animals, and to forest areas and pasturelands, etc..
Some of the points made so far move in this direction, particularly in relation to conservation programmes that neglect women’s existing rights to use resources found, e.g., in communal or ‘wild’ areas.

Second, as some have already noted, women’s land rights are often informal and embedded in cosmologies and belief systems about appropriate behavior for men and women; e.g., even though women in Latin America generally have few rights to own land, they often have strong usufruct rights to use land, e.g., for homegardenning and small animal production, and also exercise rights to use communal and other land resources to exploit. I suggest that homegarden land is often the most fertile and most productive land that households access, and it is often managed by women (women make decisions around it, and they are female ‘spaces’)—but we tend to overlook this, and access to homegarden land hasn’t really been researched. In any case, rights to land may be valueless unless rights also exist to resources on that land such as trees, plants, and water. Usufruct or informal rights may be weak or strong, in part depending upon dynamics of change that are occurring in relation to the value of these resources in general. With commoditization we know that these rights regimes shift, but this does not mean automatically that women’s ploughing and problems with access to male labor, particularly among female headed households. Women’s access to wild plant resources has traditionally been strong but drought, deforestation and conservation measures sponsored by governments and development organizations that are rooted in local organizations in which they do not participate have broken down both their customary rights and resource availability. Women are not against these conservation measures because they see that they do lead to environmental improvement, but they lament the fact that they are not helping them to resolve their most pressing problems, for which women are paying dearly in terms of time investment to say the least. Men suffer as a result as well.

Finally, Roquas’s research in Honduras showed that women who own land most often do not want to farm it themselves since they consider it to be ‘unfeminine’—they hold it for sons or rent it out. Natural resource tenure is very much linked to concepts about social obligations and how different types of people gain social status; it is also related to the distribution of knowledge and skills. No wonder this doesn’t change overnight without some tremendous upheaval.

I can provide references and articles that cover the above for those who are interested, and am very interested in receiving references and literature from others as well.
What distinguishes gender /feminist research methodology from others is not only its strength in being multidisciplinary but also having a different approach to studying communities. It is encouraged for someone who is to study a community/society to not have a specific framework as his/her pair of eyeglasses beforehand but only armed with observational skills. The frameworks come later, during the analysis of the field study. This approach, I would like to argue, can help prevent placing “values” that is resulted from the researcher’s perspective on certain things in the community (the danger resides in the values placed by a researcher is that it can compound on/strengthen the certain values of certain people in the community). This will jeopardize the entire assessment work. However, this situation is not understood by donors, who when evaluating proposals, only prefer those who can be delivered and also produce result in a short time.

Though it seems impossible to change what has been in a society for thousands of years in a short period, it might not be so. I know a Bahai group of people who went to an African country (I will gladly supply the country’s name should anyone enquire) and change a community in that the men now understand that it’s not alright for them to hit women and women are allowed to go to literacy classes. This is a tremendous change. It is hard to change a society’s perspective where women are seen as 2nd class citizen and of inferior species. But I believe, there are many other groups that have done it. The only reason why their work are unknown is that they are not documented properly and circulated widely in the gender activists’ network.

It’s easy to say that women have to be empowered to take charge in changing their life and consequently their community. Nevertheless, empowerment is a complex process by itself. An extension worker can’t simply walk into a community and start telling the women that they are not being treated with equality and the men that they should lift the status of their women at par with them. It’ll be like being jolted with 500V electric shock! An Extension worker also has to think about the repercussion of future works of any NGO in that particular community as the result of the current work that she/he is doing. (For a good reference on empowerment, please refer to Women and Power by Jo Rowland etc)

In the CBFM (Community Based Fisheries Management) project led by The WorldFish Center, in one of the communities that was involved in the project, the extension worker who was involved in the project actually lived (i.e. local person) in the studied community even before the project start. The advantage of this was that this person had already acquired the “sameness” status in the community and this had made his job easier. A caution, though, is that if anything goes wrong in the project that give a negative impact on the community, he would be an easy target to blame and his social status is thus, jeopardized.
think what sticks out for me is your comments about entering a community and encouraging change. It brings up a larger issue of the whole approach to gender, “women’s rights” and other catch phrases that generally seek the same results. Unfortunately, I find there is a tension between marketing and labeling an approach and the practices necessary to achieve a desired outcome. If equity is what is ultimately needed (and by that I mean both women and men, and disenfranchised, etc.) then a holistic tactic is perhaps an effective means of attaining it. That means there needs to be a “men’s movement” and by that I specifically mean engaging, educating, involving and persuading the dominant half of the population of the benefits of sharing some of their power for the good of all. In the fieldwork I’ve done, specifically in North Africa, I found a great deal of effectiveness in avoiding these labels and simply describing approaches that would bring about equal benefits. I realize terms such as “gender” and “women’s rights” are wonderful for advocacy purposes and mobilizing civil society and I don’t think they are necessarily to be avoided. But maybe there needs to be a divide between development practitioners and how they approach these terms in the field and those who use these terms to promote different outcomes. In that case, I would advocate perhaps reevaluating the “women in development” label and sticking to something broader such as “development equity.”

**RE: DAY 1 - SYSTEMS FOR ACCESS**

*Post by: Regina Hansda*

Hi All! I know am joining in pretty late, But I still would like to add my two bits to the topics under discussion.

On the issue of access, in India for instance, wide range of socio-cultural practices and beliefs systems have constrained women over the years from accessing natural resources. For instance, under the concepts of purity and impurity women in the fishing communities in the Southern parts of India are prevented from entering the sea (well this concept can be seen practiced is our everyday homes, it falls within the domain of religion, and as we all know issues related to religion are sacrosanct in India, nobody even would want to touch upon it), also there have been cases in Bengal where tribal women have been prevented from participating in the culture of tussar cocoon (leading to the production of India’s best silk material) in the forests for fear their touch would kill the larvae). Every second second third day we get to read about witch hunting in some remote villages of India (a practice where women, to be precise a widowed women are branded as witches on the pretext of settling scores, family rivalry, or because powerful men want to punish her for spurning their sexual advances, sometimes to punish those who question social norms but more importantly to grab the little land/property she might own/possess). So here we get to see a case where commune level attempts restrict rightful access of women to their resources.

Strangely enough the recently proposed Scheduled Tribes (Recognition of Forest Rights) Bill, 2005 makes little mention of equity issues related to gender. It has preferred to keep quite on the gender-unequal codification of customary laws.

Also, traditionally, most extension services have been devoted to farmers who own land and who are willing and able to obtain credit and invest in inputs and technological innovations. Since women often lack access to land, or to other collateral with which to obtain credit, extension services, unintentionally, bypass women.

As rightly pointed out by Zakir we have seen the phenomenon of Sarpanchpati lately, where despite women being democratically elected, are directed by the male members of her house who in some way or the other manages to get their agenda into action and implemented as well. But we cannot negate the fact we have seen women being empowered through such policy level provisions of the government. We have states like Himachal Pradesh which has seen occupancy of full 45% of seats in Panchayats playing significant roles in all issues of governance.

Also, over the years institutional biases have been propounded, carried forward much to the disservice to the women community at large. Some we don’t even choose to question.

We have seen well-intentioned policies in place also but again because of lack of capacitated women being in the drivers seat of development we have seen little happening in real sense.
Privatization and Equity

What (if any) resources may be privatized without compromising access to resources by women and the poor? Can a rights-based framework for resource access co-exist with an approach that strives to maximize economic efficiency? Are social safety nets enough if tariffs are imposed for energy and water? If utilities and resources are privatized, does this free up government revenue that can be used for spending on programs like health and education?

RE: DAY 1- PRIVATIZATION AND EQUITY
Post by: Susana Lastarria-Cornhiel

Many resources (land, water, forests) are already privatized, at least in practice, in the sense that the state does not control them, but rather individuals and communities do. One problem with privatization is that when a resource becomes an asset (such as fertile cropland or irrigation water or peri-urban land), valuable enough that there is a market for it, persons without the means to buy them, such as low-income women, lose whatever rights they have had to these resources. One question we could address is: how can “valuable” resources remain in the private realm (controlled by either individuals or corporate groups such as communities) for use by low-income women and households? Is economic efficiency the only or most important criteria for resource allocation?

International Resources Group (IRG)

The value of resources is a complex concept—a specific resource may have a range of value depending on a range of factors. First, many resources can mean different things to different people in different contexts—I may see a forested hill as an important watershed, someone else sees it as a place for firewood and building material, another as an inconvenient overgrowth covering potential cropland, etc. All are “right,” but some uses exclude others.

Second, most resources are intertwined with a complex web of uses and interactions; clearing a swamp for agricultural land may reduce the availability of basket material, and of fish. Third, these systems are not static, but change seasonally and over time, again making “value” a slippery concept.

The trick then comes when one promotes new and improved natural resource management options, designed to empower communities and improve their sustainability. In many instances, the flow of revenue and of power within the household can change inexorably, and often based around gender differences. And in many instances the result may not be the positive impact that had been hoped, but rather increased inequity, or at least tension within families.

For instance, in Kenya several agroforestry programs found that they needed to define some woody plants grown for firewood as “bushes” and not trees, since trees, and their income, were defined culturally as something controlled by men. If crops such as sesbania were viewed as trees, ie as cash crops, often women would lose access.

A woman in Madagascar works with vanilla beans while keeping a watchful eye on her son.
Dear panelists,

I am sorry I could join you yesterday, because I was offline. I wanted to share some conclusions of my research in Cameroon, as a contribution to Day 1. I hope it is not too late if I do it now, though for me who stays in Africa we are already in Day 2.

Since the mid-90’s Cameroon has embarked on a process of forest management decentralization. At the occasion, powers and rights have been transferred to local actors, including the local communities, very dependent on the forest. Prior to this policy change, neither the traditional forest tenure nor the modern forest tenure were openly recognizing tangible property rights to women. The decentralization process has changed nothing in this situation, as shown by the following evidences:

- the management of community forests—one of the innovations brought by decentralization policy—is fully oriented towards timber exploitation, through the sawing of planks. Since the main activity of women in the exploitation of forest resources is the collection of non-timber forest products, the ‘timberisation’ of community forests has led an increase in their marginalization from forest management issue;
- to deal with decentralized management—that is the management of community forests and ecotaxes paid by timber companies to villages surrounding exploited forest concessions—management committees have been set up in rural Cameroon. Women are in the whole absent from this local representation infrastructure.
- women are not involved in local decision making concerning the management of community forests and revenue accruing therefrom. They are equally involved in decision making concerning the management of ecotaxes.
- when it happens to distribute revenue generated by forest exploitation, there is no gender-based distributional equity.

The main gender-based lesson learnt from our policy research in Cameroon is that policy change in forest management has worsened gender relations in access to rights over forest resources and access to financial resources derived from forest exploitation.

A central question is emerging from my short overview on gender-based relations in a context of NRM decentralization. Despite a dominating discourse, a rhetoric, many natural resource management policies in developing countries are not meaningfully taking into consideration gender relations.
DAY 2: MANAGEMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

WELCOME

DAY 2 - WELCOME (LET’S NOT CLOSE OUT DAY 1!)
Post by: Smita Malpani

We have had some very interesting postings from day one by students, practitioners, and researchers- on the effects of the decentralizing forests in Cameroon, on the distinction between usufruct and property rights, and also the recognition that formal, legal systems are not enough- that we need to consider capacity and culture as well. I have learned a lot, and I do hope that we will continue these discussions, as I think some important points have been raised and perhaps we can go further to flesh them out.

That having been said, I would like you to welcome you to Day 2 of the discussion, where we would like to add to the discussion the issue of management, and how best to promote women’s equal access to decision-making about natural resource management at various levels, individual, local, national, and international. I hope we can get into details of how we make policies trickle down into practice.

I’d like to welcome our expert for the day, Margie Huang of Winrock International. She will put forward some additional questions to guide the day’s discussions.

DAY 2 – THE EFFECT OF POLITICAL SYSTEMS ON GENDER MAINSTREAMING IN PRACTICE
Post by: Margie Huang

Hi all -
I am excited about this discussion forum and eager to hear people’s responses. I have three questions to start off Day 2 on gender and management of natural resources.

Here is the first question.

For the past decade, several high level, governmental meetings have highlighted the importance of integrating gender in various sectors of natural resource management. Despite this rhetoric, progress towards integrating gender within the water, land, forestry, energy, and other natural resource management sectors have been mixed.

In your experience, are there certain political systems, such as centralized versus decentralized, that are more or less conducive to transferring gender mainstreaming from the policy level down into practice? Or is addressing political systems irrelevant to the issue of conduciveness?

RE: DAY 2 - WELCOME (LET’S NOT CLOSE OUT DAY 1!)
Post by: Stephan Dohrn

Thank you Smita and Margie for opening the discussion on management and decision-making.

I do think that we need to understand these management systems not just in terms of policy mainstreaming. We will only be able to induce change in the decision-making systems at local level to become more gender equitable, if we also understand under what conditions a greater involvement in these processes increases the effectiveness of those groups and what people gain or lose from actively participating.

CAPRI (CGIAR Systemwide Program on Collective Action and Property Rights) organized a research workshop on Gender and Collective Action held last month that looked at the motivations of women and men for engaging in collective action, the implications of gender composition and gender roles for the effectiveness of collective action, as well as the impacts of collective action on gender relations.

I would like to invite all of you to have a look at the papers presented at the workshop: http://www.capri.cgiar.org/wks_gender_ca.asp. Any feedback is more than welcome.
Hi everyone -
Here’s the third topic area to lead off discussions today on gender and management of natural resources.

In your experiences, what is the entry point – national, regional, local level institutions – whereby access to decision-making results in benefits to women? Does managing resources through local governments (LGA) hinder women’s participation in NRM initiatives? Is it easier to promote gender through users associations? Does providing for women’s participation in users committees mean that gender considerations will be represented?

RE: DAY 2 DECISION-MAKING AT DIFFERENT INSTITUTIONAL LEVELS
Post by: Carolyn Brown

Hello! It seems that involvement of marginalized stakeholders in decision-making requires a multi-pronged approach at different levels. However, it may be easier for the entry to have the most immediate benefit at the local level.

As was shared yesterday on the discussion board, in the decentralization of forestry in Cameroon women have been marginalized. In some research I conducted there on the integration of women into management of non-wood forest products (NWFPs) in community forests I found that using a PAR approach to facilitate social learning helped to empower women. The research had also highlighted the capacity of women in management. I was able to use a future Scenarios tool to help stakeholders envision the future of management in separate workshops with the key stakeholders. Holding a separate workshop for women so that they could express their ideas freely appeared to validate their important role with these forest resources. It also resulted in other more powerful stakeholders acknowledging the capacity of the women. Although this was a small step in a process of changing ideas, the fact that it happened at the local level may mean that women will be empowered and refuse to ignore in future discussions at the community level about management of NWFPs in community forests in the future. However, we know that change is incremental and rhetoric of powerful stakeholders is often not followed up by reality. However, the role of a facilitator in such a social learning situation can be key in catalyzing a process.

DAY 2 DECISION-MAKING AT DIFFERENT INSTITUTIONAL LEVELS
Post by: Margie Huang

Hi! I would like to build on Carolyn’s comments.

In the set of articles that Stephan Dohrn recommended earlier, there is one on community forestry user groups in Nepal (http://www.capri.cgiar.org/pdf/Gen-CA_Acharya.pdf) that is particularly interesting. This study makes the point of the importance of distinguishing between CFUGs where the participation of women in key positions of users’ committee can be more effective in addressing equity of women and marginalized communities THAN the formation of women-only CFUGs who control only small land plots or are controlled by women of high wealth or caste. I think this is a very important distinction to make. The study goes on to argue that capacity building of elected and potential women leaders to enhance their knowledge, skills, courage and confidence is critical, as well as collective support of like-minded individuals to support these women in key positions. I couldn’t agree more. Winrock’s own study on emerging issues in community forestry in Nepal found that CFUGs still have a long way to go to capture the needs and priorities of the poor, women, and disadvantaged. The findings of the above study provide positive lessons demonstrating that building the enabling environment and capacity of women in key positions could be a promising way forward.

R: DAY 2 DECISION-MAKING AT DIFFERENT INSTITUTIONAL LEVELS
Post by: Monica Di Gregorio
PhD Candidate, LSE London

Hello! I have followed the discussion with interest. I agree that it is best to start at the local level to increase women’s participation and rights, also because local realities are so different, and different approaches are therefore needed.

I am a PhD student working in Indonesia which is a very diverse country. I work in two locations in Sumatra and East Kalimantan. I was very surprised to see the very big difference in women’s rights to participate in public life between Sumatra and East Kalimantan. In the first site, women are completely excluded from public life, they generally do not go further than the 2 or max 5th year of schooling, while many males continue their studies. Lack of primary education is an enormous hurdle for women. All this despite the fact that the area traditionally follows a matrilineal
inheritance system and men join the village of the wife when they marry.

In the other sites in East Kalimantan women have much more equal rights, many study and if they have the money some even go to university, they work in government offices etc. In one of the villages there is even a young female village head (democratically elected in the first direct elections of village heads in Indonesia).

The cultural differences are very big in a country like Indonesia, and these villages belong to very different geographic, historic, ethnic and cultural backgrounds. However, to me (and I am not a gender specialist), the difference in religion may play a very important role as well. In the Sumatra sites Islam is the main religion (the only one in these villages), in East Kalimantan the situation is more varied, the vast majority are Christians, but there are also some Muslims, and animists.

Is there a bit of a taboo to talk about the role of religion on women’s rights and participation or am I wrong?

RE: DAY 2 DECISION-MAKING AT DIFFERENT INSTITUTIONAL LEVELS
Post by: Ruth Meinzen-Dick

Hello Monica and all,

It’s interesting to hear about the findings from Sumatra and East Kalimantan. Usually matrilineal systems give women greater say, but you do raise an important point about the role of religion in shaping norms.

In the workshop on Gender and Collective Action that Stephan Dohrn mentioned this morning, there was a very interesting paper with comparative evidence from Muslim and Christian villages in Nigeria. While there is a similar finding of Muslim women being more constrained, the women were using Islamia schools as a way of increasing their mobility and interaction with other women. See Gender differences in mobilization for collective action: Case studies of villages in Northern Nigeria by Saratu Abdulwahid http://www.capri.cgiar.org/pdf/Gen-CA_Abdulwahid.pdf

RE: DAY 2 DECISION-MAKING AT DIFFERENT INSTITUTIONAL LEVELS
Post by: Margie Huang

Hi Monica –

I think your comment on the relevance of religion on women’s rights is completely valid. For instance, in Tajikistan as in many other parts of the world, religion dictates gender roles in society. Although civil code dictates that property is to be divided between a spouse, children, and parents of the deceased, customary laws in rural areas overrule and sons usually inherit the land. It is the village elders and mullahs/religious leaders that typically decide how household property is to be divided. In one interview, a mullah said that according to shari’a, property is
divided into shares of two to one to the deceased’s sons and daughters in favor of the former. However, in some villages, this rule is not even followed, and property goes all to the sons (even if there is a will that states otherwise). In addition, according to national law, daughters know they have the right to inherit their father’s property, but due to custom and tradition, they often do not. I would be interested in hearing of experiences where gender sensitivity programs have successfully worked with religious leaders to address misconceptions and misinterpretations that have oppressed women with regard to land tenure or related rights.

RE: DAY 2 DECISION-MAKING AT DIFFERENT INSTITUTIONAL LEVELS
Post by: Ash Hassan

In extrapolating some points in the discussion on religion playing a role in determining women’s rights, the one point that I can see is that it is NOT religion that’s playing the role but as the matter of fact, it’s CULTURE. I think those who have been working in various communities would be able to see that a specific religion is interpreted differently in many locations in this world. Take for example, Islam, while Monica’s experience with a Muslim community was where Muslims girls were not registered to higher level of education, just across the Strait of Malacca, hundreds of thousands of Muslim women in Malaysia are going to schools and university to the point that they outnumbered the males. In analyzing Margie Huang’s example, it is clear that the same shariah law was interpreted differently and carried out in a different manner in two different locations. One has to understand that culture is fluid; it can even manifest itself in one individual. One should not make a mistake defining culture as a norm of a community of people without specifying the kind of practice that is being commonly practice in that community. In this case, taking one or two examples of a group of people to carpet bomb the entire community of people of the same religious belief is an oversight and totally against the practice of social sciences research.

Just one comment on drawing women into the PRA workshop. Drawing from Ruth’s suggestion of a policy maker to walk the walk of those women in their journey in getting land tenure, I think practitioners should take into account any small details in planning the workshop since as we all know, in most societies, women are burdened with house chores that spending extra time to attend a workshop would add into their already energy-sucking life. One can only imagine how a woman with several children would be able to join or concentrate in a workshop. A workshop that is supposed to bring betterment to her life would end up as a nightmare! (One is welcomed to use one’s imagination as in what form this nightmare can be).

Do we honestly think that getting one or two women in a decision making panel would change a community practice of female subordination? What about educating those male decision makers about the possibility of a bird trying to fly with only one wing? What about educating all stakeholders? One danger that I foresee in pushing for a different sex involvement in a male dominated arena is that it can back fire in a way that women can be even more belittled. This whole thing about getting women to get a place in a decision making panel is as complex as trying to pull a string of hair from a bowl of flour, one has to make sure that the hair does not snap and the flour is not messed up. By educating those male decision makers, they can, as having the influence that got them there on the first place, change the attitude of their community. Then, only after women are able to enjoy the same privilege of those men and gain the same or even better set of skills and knowledge, that men are willing to let go some of their spaces to the women. This process could take time. But there’s no one to tell on how long or short it’s going to take. As practitioners in the developmental works, we should not be overambitious in looking at the world as a place where situation like subordination of women can be changed in its entirety. One method can work in one place and there is no assurance that it can work in another place. One should take one step at a time and be thankful that in taking the step, one doesn’t fall on one’s face.

RE: DAY 2 DECISION-MAKING AT DIFFERENT INSTITUTIONAL LEVELS
Post by: Smita Malpani

I want to appreciate Ash, Carolyn, Margie and everyone’s comments. I also agree that the local level is important for women to be integrated in decision-making processes. An important reason for this, in my opinion, is that the larger the scale of decision-making (i.e. national or regional), the more you will find women that are elite, well-educated, and perhaps even urban. It’s important to note that all women are not the same- that even within one village you can have variations of caste, religion, class- and that one or two women representatives don’t speak for women as a whole. That having been said- I think it is easier to be inclusive at the local level and hold women who are in decision-making posts more accountable to the needs and concerns of women at the grassroots level. At the national level, I think that simply to put women in decision-making posts doesn’t guarantee that the concerns of poor, rural women will be represented. In fact, I’ve seen cases where women will deliberately shy away from “gender” in an effort to make themselves more credible. So- I think it’s not just a question of numbers of
women, but mechanisms for accountability to ensure that the priorities of the women and underrepresented groups are heard.

**GENDER MAINSTREAMING FROM THE BOTTOM UP**

**DAY 2 – GENDER MAINSTREAMING FROM THE BOTTOM UP**

*Post by: Margie Huang*

Hi everyone -

Here’s the second question to lead off discussions today on gender and management of natural resources.

In your experience, where policies do not appear to support gender mainstreaming, what obstacles, challenges, and constraints are faced in introducing gender mainstreaming from the bottom up? Should more efforts be focused at the local level if there is evidence to support that women within a local environment are better at managing resources both individually and collectively? What are innovative ways to promote gender mainstreaming both in policy and in practice?

**RE: DAY 2 – GENDER MAINSTREAMING FROM THE BOTTOM UP**

*Post by: Mohamadou Issaka Magha [Translation of previous posting]*

Greetings,

The gender issue is of equal importance, no matter what the level of intervention is: local, national or regional. There must be a concomitant action at all levels in order to have sound progress in this area. We can clearly observe it within Rural Organizations. The fact is that women leadership is very weak in Rural Organizations. Women have limited access to management positions, especially within national unions and federations. As a result, they barely participate in debate on agricultural policies, and as a consequence, they could not expose their interests.

In order to reverse this tendency, the “Réseau des Organisations Paysannes et des Producteurs Agricoles de l’Afrique de l’Ouest (ROPPA)”, the West African Network for Rural Organizations and Agricultural Producers, of which the members and supporters are, in majority, from ECOWAS countries (13 out of 15), has created, in 2004, a consultation, exchange and reflection space so that women leaders of Rural Organizations can debate specific questions. At the present, efforts are less than considerable, but some progresses are visible. Rural women leaders are engaged in discussions on national politics, and ECOWAS agricultural policy. They promote their products, talk about their land tenures, and their position in family farming.

Some efforts still need to be done in terms of training in leadership, analysis of policies and their interests. But, in order for these efforts to be sustained and irreversible changes carriers, actions should have to be taken in Organizations at the base, that is, at the local communities and administrations level. The wider the base is the more efficient will be the protection of interests at the national and regional levels.
DAY 3: OPEN FORUM

DAY 3- OPEN FORUM
Post by: Smita Malpani

Dear all-
I have certainly learned a lot from all the thoughtful contributions made. I think it would be valuable to continue discussions from the first two days. Today, we would like to open up the discussion to allow for broader participation and experience sharing. We hope you will use this day to continue previous discussions from the first two days and open up new discussions.

• What are your experiences in the field, what are some best practices or research you can share?

• What frustrations have you faced while trying to integrate gender into a project that devotes limited (or no) resources to gender specifically?

• Has gender mainstreaming worked in NRM projects, or does it simply mean that resources don’t end up going towards gender?

• How has funding and thought changed over the years about gender and NRM?

• For those who are younger in the field, what difficulties have you faced in trying to establish yourself as a practitioner?

• What can we, as advocates for gender considerations do to be more effective working within NRM projects?

We sincerely hope that you will use this day to share your successes and experience, commiserate with colleagues for your challenges, and, most importantly, use this opportunity to interact with a (relatively small) community of practitioners that can understand and appreciate your work.

Looking forward to it!

RE: DAY 3- OPEN FORUM
Post by: Rebecca Pearl
PearlWood Consulting
pearlwoodconsulting@yahoo.com
1-917-755-7111

Dear all,
It's been a very enriching discussion to observe, I'm just joining in now.

I want to briefly share a model from which I have learned a great deal, and would appreciate any comments or insight. WOCAN – Women Organizing for Change in Agriculture and Natural Resources Management – is an organization based on a successful effort in Nepal to build relationships between rural women’s networks and women professionals in natural resource institutions. This partnership has opened critical spaces in NRM institutions and made these institutions more accountable to women and rural community needs. It has also had the effect of transforming men’s previous exclusion of women to proactive support of women’s participation and priorities.

We are now attempting to replicate the WOCAN model in several countries in Latin America with the collaboration of IUCN. In Latin America, as in other regions, there is a tremendous disconnect between rural women, poor women, indigenous women, and professional women in NRM institutions. The methodology of the Latin America project is based on participatory gender analysis, institutional assessment, and capacity-building to enhance women’s access to information, decision-making process, and resources.

But the heart of the initiative is to develop trust and a joint strategy between rural women’s networks and professional women in NRM institutions, specifically those who share a similar frustration and similar (or dissimilar) obstacles to ensuring that gender and/or women’s participation is a permanent cross-cutting theme. This partnership allows these two women’s groups to share critical information and potential strategies, and women in NRM institutions can serve as a leverage point for their outside partners.

The assumption is that making NRM institutions more accountable to rural/poor women is a long process of institutional change. Changing organizational structure or policies might provide some short-term gains, but deeper cultural change within the institution and with staff is necessary for sustaining the institution’s responsiveness to the community beyond the life of the project.

I am interested in hearing your thoughts about this approach, other similar examples, or if you have suggestions of places in Latin America where this idea could complement existing efforts. For those interested, there is more information about the WOCAN model at www.wocan.org.
THANK YOU AND CONGRATULATIONS ON FORMING THE BASIS FOR A RESOURCE GROUP FOR GENDER AND NRM
Post by: Smita Malpani

Dear all-

The three days of formal discussion on Gender and NRM are coming to a close. I want to thank our experts who have shared their expertise, Susanna Lastarria-Cornhiel of the Land Tenure Center and Margie Huang of Winrock International. Thank you also to all participants who have shared their research, information, and opinions. Also, thanks goes to the organizers of these three days, Anna Van der Heijden and Sue Telingator who gave us the opportunity to all meet in cyber space.

Although these three days of formal discussions are coming to a close, I wanted to let you know that this space will remain open for posting and as a resource for those who are interested to continue discussions. I know that I myself have learned a lot and will continue to rely FRAME as a as a resource.

We have covered some interesting ground in these three days, and see that there is still room for learning from each other and deepening nuances in our understanding of how culture, religion, and capacity all shape how women and men access and manage natural resources. Some points have emerged from discussions that may be useful:

- Women may require separate spaces for decision-making and consultation in order to elicit their participation and concerns
- There are many overlapping regimes for rights to access of property and usufruct rights, simply providing legal access is not enough when dealing with cultural constraints
- Women’s capacity itself may be a barrier to their participation in decision-making and control of natural resources, again- education and capacity building specifically for women is necessary
- Gender considerations in natural resource management may be most effective at the local level, but are necessary at all levels
- Collectively, women may achieve more progress than individually

Despite these points that were raised, there was some interesting discussion on the role of religion vs. culture and also the question of women’s representation, and whether women representatives can be effective in advocating for gender considerations, or whether other mechanisms are also necessary. There are still some discussions and points on which there is some debate, and I hope we can continue these.

Again, thanks to all of you. I hope to keep talking with you!

END OF DISCUSSION...WAYS TO CONTINUE YOUR INVOLVEMENT
Post by: Anna van der Heijden
avanderheijden@irgltd.com
International Resources Group (IRG)

Hi Everyone,
I’d like to add my thanks to those that Smita already expressed: Many thanks to our discussion host, Smita Malpani of dTS, and our experts on hand: Susanna Lastarria-Cornhiel of the Land Tenure Center and Margie Huang of Winrock International, and of course also many thanks to all of you participating in the forum for sharing your questions and expertise.

We will soon post a transcript of the event in PDF format, which should be a useful summation of the many ideas and resources shared in the last three days.

I am hoping you’ve enjoyed the discussion and would like to take this opportunity to point out a few ways you can continue to be engaged in this new community or otherwise take advantage of FRAME:

1) Continue visiting www.frameweb.org/gender. While the formal discussion is over, the discussion platform remains open for people to post further messages, post questions, announce events, etc. Given the interest in this discussion, we would encourage you to continue this dialogue.

If you are subscribed to the discussion and receive postings by e-mail: You can continue your subscription to also receive future messages by e-mail, or you can choose to unsubscribe from the forum. To do this, visit www.frameweb.org/gender, log in with your FRAME username and password, and select “un-subscribe from discussion forum” at the bottom of the forum. With any questions about unsubscribing, please e-mail me at avanderheijden@irgltd.com.

2) Use FRAME as a platform to initiate other discussions on topics of interest to you. If interested,
contact me at avanderheijden@irgltd.com.

3) Explore www.frameweb.org to access our vast library of documents related to natural resources management.

4) Sign up for the FRAMEgram, our monthly newsletter with information and links to news about NRM projects in the field, upcoming events, and funding opportunities. To sign up, e-mail me at avanderheijden@irgltd.com.

5) Stay tuned for future discussions. If you want to be sure not to miss any upcoming FRAME events, simply sign up for our FRAMEgram newsletter and we’ll keep you posted.

And finally, we welcome your feedback on this forum, any other thoughts you might have on the site, or your ideas for future discussion forums. Again, thanks for your active participation and I am looking forward to your continued involvement in this community.

RE: THANK YOU AND CONGRATULATIONS ON FORMING THE BASIS FOR A RESOURCE GROUP FOR GENDER AND NRM
Post by: Raj Kumar

Smita,
I am benefited from the e-discussions on Gender and NRM. There are many informations and issues raised by the participants, which I think requires to be integrated, deeply analysed/synthesised. I guess a good synthesized document/report based on the three day discussions could benefit to all of us, and more importantly, it could be one of the outputs of the discussions.

What do you think please?

RE: THANK YOU AND CONGRATULATIONS ON FORMING THE BASIS FOR A RESOURCE GROUP FOR GENDER AND NRM
Post by: Smita Malpani

Dear Raj-
I’m currently traveling in India, but would be happy to put something together on my arrival back in the States in January.

Till then, happy new year.

HOW TO CONTINUE THIS DISCUSSION: ONLINE RESOURCES
This FRAME Forum was hosted on www.frameweb.org/gender as part of the online community on gender and sustainable natural resource management. While the formal discussion is over, the discussion platform and community remain open for people to continue the dialogue and sharing of knowledge related to gender and NRM by posting messages and sharing documents and other resources.

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FRAME WEBSITE</th>
<th>HOST ORGANIZATIONS</th>
<th>LINKS FROM DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community forestry user groups in Nepal: (<a href="http://www.capri.cgiar.org/pdf/Gen-CA_Acharya.pdf">http://www.capri.cgiar.org/pdf/Gen-CA_Acharya.pdf</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gender differences in mobilization: <a href="http://www.wocan.org">www.wocan.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>