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## 1 Introduction

This reports documents the involvement of women in farmer-related activities of the N2Africa project - work that is guided by Activity 5 under Objective 4: 'Develop strategies for empowering women to benefit from the project products'. The sub-activities are:

> 4.5.1 Gender analysis in relation to specific legumes, labor, household and market preferences documented.
4.5.2. A report documenting the involvement of women in at least $50 \%$ of all farmer-related activities produced.
4.5.3 At least 2 special events on the role of legumes in household nutrition and value-added processing conducted per country.

The gender analysis in relation to specific legumes, labour, household and market preferences documented is covered by the consultancy report from Women Organizing for Change in Agriculture and Natural Resource Management (WOCAN), entitled "Enhancing Gender Responsiveness in Putting Nitrogen to Work for Smallholder Farmers in Africa" (WOCAN, 2011, 33 pp ). The report has been extensively discussed with the N2Africa project. Although the project has always been committed to reach women for the most sustainable impact of N2Africa interventions, the approach proposed in the report was not realistic; it consisted of 39 indicators, 23 tools, 18 means of verification and 82 recommendations. However, some recommendations from the report were of good use. In accordance with the detailed steps of the activity 4.5.1, all M\&E tools have been made gender sensitive; where relevant gender disaggregated data has been collected as well as additional data on e.g. particular activities targeted at women.

The current report is documenting on the target of the involvement of women in at least 50\% of all farmer-related activities. Note that this milestone specifically focuses on the involvement of women in farmer-related activities, not in all of the N2Africa project activities, such as engagement of staff, scholarships, etc.

Milestone 4.5.3 concerned the following activity: at least 2 special events on the role of legumes in household nutrition and value-added processing conducted per country. Although such events were usually targeted at women, this is not included in the present report, but is reported on in a separate milestone report.

The current report is the second report on Milestone 4.5.2. In the current report we attempt to consolidate and summarize gender related information from all countries in farmer-related activities (except for the activities under milestone 4.5.3). Therefore there is some overlap between this and the previous report on 4.5 . 2 (which was submitted in October 2011), with the current report providing the most comprehensive overview.

In the chapters hereafter the achievements per country are detailed focussing on farmers reached ${ }^{1}$, i.e. those receiving inputs from/via the N2Africa project, the composition of the group of Lead Farmers or Master Farmers engaged, trainings and participation in field days. These are the most relevant farmer-related N2Africa activities for which we aimed to collect systematically gender-disaggregated data through M\&E. The last chapter summarizes some conclusions.

[^0]
## 2 Ghana

### 2.1 Introduction

Although all M\&E tools facilitate gender-disaggregated data collection, the records from Ghana are not complete for all the seasons in which N2Africa was implemented in the country (2010, 2011, 2012 and some adjusted activities in 2013 for which no M\&E data was collected).

According to the baseline data, slightly fewer women participate full-time in farming activities in Ghana as compared to men ( $46 \%$ versus $62 \%$ ) while their seasonal involvement is larger than that of men (Table 1). This overall difference between male and female participation in farm activities is not such that it should have inhibited reaching the target of $50 \%$ female participation in N2Africa project activities in Ghana.

Table 1: Involvement of women and men in farm activities in Ghana (\% of household members)

|  | Full-time | Seasonal | Not at all |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 46.42 | 41.54 | 12.03 |
| Male | 62.17 | 29.51 | 8.32 |

Source: N2Africa baseline data.

### 2.2 Farmers Reached through Input Distribution

Of the first season in 2010 we know that $33 \%$ of the Lead Farmers were women, no data was available on the percentage of women in other activities such as trainings and field days nor among the other farmers who received inputs.

For the second season, in 2011, there are incomplete and inconsistent records of input distribution. Table 2 summarizes some of the data available. It is based on records of 3,461 farmers. Of these farmers registered, just over $40 \%$ were women (40.7\%) (see Appendix I for more details). While the differences between the various areas of operation is noteworthy, the differences within these areas are even larger. For example for Chereponi the percentage of female farmers receiving inputs varied from under 39\% to as high as over 67\%. In KassenaNankana East, where MoFA implemented N2Africa the percentage of women farmers varied from just over $14 \%$ to just over $54 \%$. In Bawku West, the percentage of women varied between about $20 \%$ to just under $60 \%$, in Nadowli between $22 \%$ up to over $56 \%$, Wa East $22 \%$ to over 40 \% (see Appendix I).

Table 2: Gender disaggregated information on some of the input distribution, 2011, Ghana

| Region | District | Partner | Total <br> (no.) | Male <br> (\%) | Female <br> (\%) | Blank <br> (\%) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Northern Region | Chereponi | ACDEP | 730 | 48.4 | 51.2 | 0.4 |
| Upper East | Kassena-Nankana East | MoFA | 644 | 62.6 | 37.4 | 0.0 |
| Upper East | Bawku West District | MoFA | 1329 | 59.4 | 40.3 | 0.2 |
| Upper West | Nadowli | MoFA | 59 | 52.5 | 47.5 | 0.0 |
| Upper West | Wa East | MoFA | 699 | 67.1 | 32.6 | 0.3 |
|  | Total |  | $\mathbf{3 4 6 1}$ | $\mathbf{5 9 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 2}$ |

In 2012, almost 42\% of the participants in N2Africa who received inputs were women (see Table 3). However, the percentage of women amongst the Lead Farmers is lower at less than $33 \%$ (see Table 3). As for the division between the legumes, the percentage of women as compared to men receiving soyabean and groundnut is slightly higher, but the differences between the genders are very small (data not presented here).

Table 3: Input distribution gender disaggregated, 2012, Ghana

| Total number of farmers | Gender | Number | Percentage |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Women | 6783 | 41.6 |
|  | Men | 9473 | 58.1 |
| Lead farmers | Unknown | 57 | 0.3 |
|  | Total: | $\mathbf{1 6 3 1 3}$ |  |
|  | Women | 216 | 32.6 |
|  | Men | 445 | 67.1 |
|  | Unknown | 2 | 0.3 |
|  | Total: |  | $\mathbf{6 6 3}$ |

### 2.3 Training participation

For the previous report on Milestone 4.5.2, little information on trainings was available from Ghana. From that little information, the participation of women in trainings proved to be very low in 2010 and 2011 at $15 \%$ and below, while one training had no female participation at all.
Updated information on the 2011 season is that there were records of a total number of participants in the trainings of 668 people. Of 280 participants, the gender is not known. This gives the following percentages: gender unknown 41.9\%, $42.2 \%$ male participants, and 15.9\% female participants.

For the 2012 season, we have records of 544 people participating in training in Ghana. Of these participants, almost $78 \%$ were farmers, $14 \%$ from government agricultural extension services, and almost $2 \%$ from NGOs (see Table 4). Of the farmers participating, just over $37 \%$ were women. Although this is slightly more than the percentage of women Lead Farmers, it is not quite close to the planned $50 \%$ women participation.

Table 4: Occupations of training participants, gender disaggregated, 2012, Ghana

| Occupations | Gender | Number | \% | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Farming | Women |  | 37.4 | 422 |
|  | Men | 264 | 62.6 | (77.6\%) |
| Agricultural Extension - Government | Women | 5 | 6.6 | 76 |
|  | Men | 71 | 93.4 | (14\%) |
| N2Africa | Men | 2 | 100 | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (0.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| NGO | Men | 9 | 100 | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ (1.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Other | Women | 15 | 42.9 | 35 |
|  | Men | 20 | 57.1 | (6.4\%) |
| Total | Women | 178 | 32.7 |  |
|  | Men | 366 | 67.3 |  |

### 2.4 Field days

In 2011, it was reported that in total 3204 people participated in field days in Ghana, including farmers, NGO staff, extensions staff and government officials. Of this total, 3012 were farmers, $53 \%$ of whom were men and $47 \%$ women. Of the 165 extension staff in attendance, 84 \% were men and 16\% women.
Overall, in 2012 of the participants in field days, $48.4 \%$ were women - close to the planned $50 \%$ of women participation (Table 5). However the difference between the different field days is large, ranging from around $20 \%$ to over $66 \%$ (see Appendix II for details).

Table 5: Gender disaggregated data on participation Field Days, 2012, Ghana

|  |  | No. | $\%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Men | 947 | 51.6 |  |
| Women | Total | $\mathbf{1 8 3 7}$ | 48.4 |
|  |  |  |  |

## 3 Nigeria

### 3.1 Introduction

The position and role of women in agriculture in Northern Nigeria differs quite a lot from the other N2Africa countries and even within the region the differences are significant as became apparent from the baseline survey. Table 6 shows the involvement of women and men in agricultural activities Kano and Kaduna in Nigeria.

Table 6: Involvement of women and men in farm activities in Kano and Kaduna, Nigeria (\% of household members)

|  |  | Full-time | Seasonal | Not at all |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kano State | Female | 11.2 | 20.8 | 68 |
|  | Male | 43.3 | 45 | 11.7 |
| Kaduna state (north) | Female | 2.6 | 23.5 | 73.8 |
|  | Male | 47 | 29.2 | 23.8 |
| Kaduna State (south) | Female | 93.6 | 4 | 2.4 |
|  | Male | 92.8 | 5.9 | 1.3 |

Source: N2Africa baseline data.
In Kano and northern Kaduna, generally men decide on the use of land and on the use of the harvest (Table 7). In southern Kaduna, where both men and women are most often full-time involved in farming, decisions on land use and harvest use are more frequently taken together by men and women (see Table 7).

Table 7: Control over land use and harvest by household members in Nigeria (\% of all fields)

|  | Kano State |  | Kaduna State (north) |  | Kaduna State (south) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Land use | Harvest | Land use | Harvest | Land use | Harvest |
| Wife | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.9 | 5.3 |
| Husband | 99.9 | 99.4 | 97.9 | 94.8 | 58.5 | 54.7 |
| Both | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.8 | 5.2 | 34.3 | 37.7 |
| Owner | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 2.3 |

Source: N2Africa baseline data.

Taking the above in consideration, it is not surprising that the average numbers of women participating in N2Africa farmer-related activities is limited. In 2010, on average only $6 \%$ of the Lead Farmers were women. Even at that time, the project recognized that it would not be feasible to reach the target figure of $50 \%$ women participation among Nigerian farmers. In the southern areas of Kaduna State it should be possible, but for the Northern part of Kaduna State and Kano State it was not be possible. It was acknowledged that there was need for specific interventions from the N2Africa project to ensure that women would be enabled to benefit from the project - even if they are not directly engaged in agricultural production activities.

### 3.2 Farmers Reached through Input Distribution

For 2011, in total there are records of 11,238 farmers who received inputs from N2Africa project in the states of Kaduna and Kano in North Nigeria. Considering the large numbers of farmers, the data entry of the input distribution records was of very high quality. The following tables summarize the input distribution. Of the Lead Farmers, less than $10 \%$ are women, of the other farmers, the percentage of women is $15 \%$ (Table 8 ).

Table 8: Female and male farmers who received inputs in 2011, Nigeria

|  | Female | Male | Gender <br> unknown* | Total | \% <br> Female | \% Male |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| KANO |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead Farmer | 27 | 191 | 1 | 219 | 12.33 | 87.21 |
| Other farmer | 694 | 3365 | 9 | 4068 | 17.06 | 82.72 |
| Total KANO | 721 | 3556 | 10 | 4287 | 16.82 | 82.95 |
| KADUNA |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead Farmer | 48 | 513 | 0 | 561 | 8.56 | 91.44 |
| Other farmer | 875 | 5508 | 5 | 6388 | 13.70 | 86.22 |
| Total KADUNA | 923 | 6021 | 5 | 6949 | 13.28 | 86.65 |
| KANO \& KADUNA |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead Farmer | 75 | 704 | 1 | 780 | 9.62 | 90.26 |
| Other farmer | 1569 | 8875 | 14 | 10458 | 15.00 | 84.86 |
| Grand Total | $\mathbf{1 6 4 4}$ | 9579 | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 2 3 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 . 6 3}$ | $\mathbf{8 5 . 2 4}$ |

* The numbers of farmers with unknown gender are very small; therefore the percentages of this are not presented in the table.

Although the population of Kano State is in its large majority Muslim and women are not as much engaged in agricultural production activities as women with different religious orientations, Table 8 shows that a slightly higher percentage of participants is women in Kano State as compared to Kaduna State.
In the subsequent season in 2012, we recorded the details of almost 20,000 farmers receiving inputs through N2Africa. The percentage of women is higher than in the 2011 season, on average over 16\%. In Kano state, the percentage of women is highest amongst the other farmers and Lead Farmers as compared to the other states of Kaduna and Niger (Table 9).

There was not much difference between the legumes received per gender; most receive soyabean (between $72 \%$ (men) and almost $75 \%$ (of the women)), roughly around $20 \%$ cowpea and just over 6\% groundnut - it is only for groundnuts that the percentage of women Lead Farmers is bit higher at almost $20 \%$, while for soyabean and cowpea it is between 12.5 to $13 \%$ ) (data not presented).

Table 9: Number and percentages of female and male farmers receiving inputs, per state, 2012, Nigeria

|  | Numbers |  |  |  | Percentage |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Female | Male | Gender unknown* | Total | Female | Male |
| KADP |  |  |  | 8432 |  |  |
| Other farmers | 1789 | 6302 | 2 | 8093 | 22.1 | 77.9 |
| Lead Farmers | 56 | 283 |  | 339 | 16.5 | 83.5 |
| KNARDA |  |  |  | 8263 |  |  |
| Other farmers | 915 | 6969 | 1 | 7885 | 11.6 | 88.4 |
| Lead Farmers | 40 | 338 |  | 378 | 10.6 | 89.4 |
| NSADP |  |  |  | 2482 |  |  |
| Other farmers | 330 | 2042 | 1 | 2373 | 13.9 | 86.1 |
| Lead Farmers | 15 | 94 |  | 109 | 13.8 | 86.2 |
| Grand Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other farmers | 3034 | 15313 | 4 | 18351 | 16.5 | 83.4 |
| Lead Farmers | 111 | 715 | 0 | 826 | 13.4 | 86.6 |
| All farmers | 3145 | 16028 | 4 | 19177 | 16.4 | 83.6 |

* The numbers of farmers with unknown gender are very small; therefore the percentages of this are not presented in the table.


### 3.3 Training

Table 10 present the participation in trainings in 2010 and 2011 in Nigeria. Unfortunately, no information on training was made available for the 2012 season. Probably even in 2013 some activities have taken place in terms of trainings, accessibility of inputs, etc. because Nigeria is a core country for the second phase of N2Africa.

Table 10: Male and female participation in Training-of-Trainers, 2010 and 2011, Nigeria

|  |  | Extension Agents and Lead Farmers |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Male |  | Female |  | Total LF \& EAs |
| 2010 |  | No. | \% | No. | \% | No. |
| Kano \& Kaduna |  | 57 | 77 | 17 | 23 | 74 |
|  | Extension | Male |  | Lead Farmers trained |  |  |
|  | Agents |  |  |  |  | Total |
| 2011 |  | No. | \% | No. | \% | No. |
| Kano | 59 | 241 | 96 | 10 | 4 | 251 |
| Kaduna | 24 | 85 | 89 | 11 | 11 | 96 |

To further encourage their participation in the project, modules in legume processing technologies were developed and trainings were held for over 282 women from eight communities during the 2011 season. This activity was to continue 2012 but no further reporting was given related to this.

### 3.4 Field days

As is shown in Table 11, in 2011 a total of 670 farmers reportedly participated in the field days. Obviously this number seems quite low considering the large numbers of farmers reached by the N2Africa project in the 2011 season. Although we have not managed to get
feedback on this finding from Nigeria, one reason for this seemingly low figure could be that the data collected on field days held in the 2011 season in Nigeria for the N2Africa project report of the larger field days only and does possibly not take account of the smaller field days. In addition, partners may have been organizing field days that were not initiated by N2Africa and failed to report on those through the N2Africa M\&E form. See Appendix III for more details on participation in field days in 2011 in Nigeria.

Table 11: Farmers' attendance field days, 2011, Nigeria

| Action site | Numbers |  |  | Percentage |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Total | \% male | \% female |
| Albasu LGA | 23 | 0 | 23 | 100 | 0 |
| Tudun Wada | 54 | 5 | 59 | 91.5 | 8.5 |
| Giwa LGA | 35 | 4 | 39 | 89.7 | 10.3 |
| Gaya | 60 | 11 | 71 | 84.5 | 15.5 |
| Bichi | 46 | 9 | 55 | 83.6 | 16.4 |
| Soba | 27 | 8 | 35 | 77.1 | 22.9 |
| Wudil | 53 | 17 | 70 | 75.7 | 24.3 |
| Igabi LGA | 70 | 26 | 96 | 72.9 | 27.1 |
| Garko | 87 | 45 | 132 | 65.9 | 34.1 |
| Zangon Kataf LGA | 32 | 20 | 52 | 61.5 | 38.5 |
| Kachia | 19 | 19 | 38 | 50 | 50 |
| Total | $\mathbf{5 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 4}$ | $\mathbf{6 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 . 5}$ |

There is no information available on field days in Nigeria in the 2012 season. Regrettably in absence of data, we can hardly conclude whether there has been some improvement in involving more women in farmer-related activities in N2Africa in Nigeria.

In the last year of the N2Africa project, a number of Focus Group Discussions were held in Nigeria to assess the impact of the project on women and gender relations. While this is not always evident whether it is truthfully the (N2Africa) project to which changes may be attributed, overall the assessment of the project was very positive.
In all LGAs except Kachia where ginger is grown as a cash crop, legumes were considered an income-generating crop. Legumes are particularly cultivated for food security and income; their nutritional benefits were only a third consideration.
Several groups indicated an increase in participation by women in agricultural activities and decision-making. Women have benefitted a lot from the training on processing and have come up with at least 25 different foods and recipes from soyabean alone. Targeting women for training in processing and value addition proofed worthwhile.

## 4 DR Congo

### 4.1 Introduction

The N2Africa baseline data from DRC showed that women are more involved in farm activities than men are in South Kivu where N2Africa started it activities (Table 12). The N2Africa team and the partner organisations in DRC have proven to be able to utilize this to achieve the goal to reach women farmers with their interventions. In the DRC, in the first year and a half of project implementation, about half of the farmers trained have been women farmers (Table 13). The participation of women in field days and exchange visits was even higher at $71 \%$ and $62 \%$ (Table 13). Out of twenty-four demonstration trials, seven demonstration trials were exclusively managed by women (see Appendix IV) for more detailed information from DRC).

Table 12: Involvement of women and men in farm activities in Eastern DRC (\% of household members)

|  |  | Full-time | Seasonal | Not at all |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age 17-35 | Female | 57.4 | 24.7 | 17.9 |
|  | Male | 26.3 | 37.6 | 36.1 |
| Age $>35$ | Female | 88.9 | 6.1 | 4.9 |
|  | Male | 66.3 | 17.8 | 15.9 |
| Total | Female | $\mathbf{7 3 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 . 4}$ |
|  | Male | $\mathbf{4 6 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 7 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 6}$ |

Source: N2Africa baseline data.

Table 13: Summary of participation of women farmers in diverse activities in DRC, 2010-11

|  | Women |  | Men |  | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. | $\%$ | No. | $\%$ | No. |
| Training of farmers | 291 | 50.3 | 288 | 49.7 | 579 |
| Exchange visits | 410 | 62.5 | 246 | 37.5 | 656 |
| Field days | 169 | 71.6 | 67 | 28.4 | 236 |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{8 7 0}$ | 59 | $\mathbf{6 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{4 1}$ |
| Workshop on gender and the role of <br> women in agriculture | $\mathbf{1 7}$ | 85 | 3 | 15 | 20 |

### 4.2 Farmers Reached through Input Distribution

While in Table 14, Table 15 and Table 16, more detailed information on the input distribution in DR Congo is presented, Table 17 summarizes the numbers of farmers reached since 2010B. As SARCAF is an organisation specifically targeting women, it is not surprising their percentages of women receiving inputs is very high (generally above 90\%, except in 2012B for other farmers). But it is noticeable that even the other partner organisations have a high percentage of women amongst their participants. This could be an indication of the highly feminized agriculture in South Kivu as was also apparent from the N2Africa baseline data, possibly resulting for the many years of on-going violence in the area.
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Table 14: Number of farmers who received inputs, per partner, Season 2011B, DRC

|  | Numbers of farmers |  |  |  | Percentages |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Female | Male | unknown | Total | \% female | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% } \\ \text { male } \end{gathered}$ | \% unknown |
| DIOBASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other farmers | 181 | 75 | 2 | 258 | 70.2 | 29.1 | 0.8 |
| Lead Farmers | 46 | 34 | 4 | 84 | 54.8 | 40.5 | 4.8 |
| DIOBASS Total |  |  |  | 342 |  |  |  |
| PAD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other farmers | 177 | 99 | 2 | 278 | 63.7 | 35.6 | 0.7 |
| Lead Farmers | 38 | 39 | 0 | 77 | 49.4 | 50.6 | 0.0 |
|  |  |  | PAD Total | 355 |  |  |  |
| SARCAF |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other farmers | 294 | 27 | 0 | 321 | 91.6 | 8.4 | 0.0 |
| Lead Farmers | 46 | 1 |  | 47 | 97.9 | 2.1 | 0.0 |
|  | SARCAF Total |  |  | 368 |  |  |  |
| Totals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other farmers | 652 | 201 | 4 | 857 | 76.1 | 23.5 | 0.5 |
| Lead Farmers | 130 | 74 | 4 | 208 | 62.5 | 35.6 | 1.9 |
| Grand total | 782 | 275 | 8 | 1065 | 73.4 | 25.8 | 0.8 |

Table 15: Number of farmers who received inputs, per partner, Season 2012A, DRC

|  | Numbers of farmers |  |  |  | Percentages |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Female | Male | unknown | Total | $\%$ <br> women | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { men } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { unknown } \end{gathered}$ |
| DIOBASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Farmers | 340 | 165 | 5 | 510 | 66.7 | 32.4 | 1.0 |
| Lead Farmers | 36 | 33 | 0 | 69 | 52.2 | 47.8 | 0.0 |
|  | DIOBASS Total |  |  | 579 |  |  |  |
| PAD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Farmers | 307 | 223 | 5 | 535 | 57.4 | 41.7 | 0.9 |
| Lead Farmers | 52 | 45 |  | 98 | 53.1 | 45.9 | 1.0 |
|  | PAD Total |  |  | 633 |  |  |  |
| SARCAF* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Farmers | 638 | 25 | 4 | 667 | 95.7 | 3.7 | 0.6 |
| Lead Farmers | 69 | 2 | 0 | 71 | 97.2 | 2.8 | 0.0 |
|  | SARCAF Total |  |  | 738 |  |  |  |
| Totals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Farmers | 1285 | 413 | 14 | 1712 | 75.1 | 24.1 | 0.8 |
| Lead Farmers | 157 | 80 | 1 | 238 | 66.0 | 33.6 | 0.4 |
| Grand total | 1442 | 493 | 15 | 1950 | 73.9 | 25.3 | 0.8 |

[^1]$\qquad$

Table 16: Number of farmers who received inputs, per partner, Season 2012B, DRC

|  | Numbers of farmers |  |  |  | Percentages |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Female | Male | unknown | Total | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { women } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { men } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% } \\ \text { unknown } \end{gathered}$ |
| DIOBASS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead Farmers | 60 | 26 | 0 | 86 | 69.8 | 30.2 | 0.0 |
| Other farmers | 27 | 10 | 0 | 37 | 73.0 | 27.0 | 0.0 |
| Unknown | 604 | 296 | 30 | 930 | 64.9 | 31.8 | 3.2 |
|  | DIOBASS Total |  |  | 1053 |  |  |  |
| PAD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead Farmers | 63 | 24 | 1 | 88 | 71.6 | 27.3 | 1.1 |
| Other farmers | 64 | 24 | 1 | 89 | 71.9 | 27.0 | 1.1 |
| Unknown | 413 | 164 | 5 | 582 | 71.0 | 28.2 | 0.9 |
|  | PAD Total |  |  | 759 |  |  |  |
| SARCAF |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead Farmers | 146 | 19 | 1 | 166 | 88.0 | 11.4 | 0.6 |
| Other farmers | 711 | 63 | 9 | 783 | 90.8 | 8.0 | 1.1 |
|  | SARCAF Total |  |  | 949 |  |  |  |
| Totals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead Farmers | 269 | 69 | 2 | 340 | 79.1 | 20.3 | 0.6 |
| Other farmers | 802 | 97 | 10 | 909 | 88.2 | 10.7 | 1.1 |
| Unknown | 1017 | 460 | 35 | 1512 | 67.3 | 30.4 | 2.3 |
| Grand Total | 2088 | 626 | 47 | 2761 | 75.6 | 22.7 | 1.7 |
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Table 17: Total numbers of farmers reached between 2010B to 2012B, DR Congo

|  | Numbers of farmers |  |  |  | Percentages |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Female | Male | unknown | Total | $\%$ <br> women | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { men } \end{gathered}$ | $\%$ <br> unknown |
| Totals 2010B |  |  | 537 | 537 |  |  | 100 |
| Totals 2011A |  |  | 1350 | 1350 |  |  | 100 |
| Totals 2011B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead Farmers | 130 | 74 | 4 | 208 | 62.5 | 35.6 | 1.9 |
| Other farmers | 652 | 201 | 4 | 857 | 76.1 | 23.5 | 0.5 |
| Grand total 2011B | 782 | 275 | 8 | 1065 | 73.4 | 25.8 | 0.8 |
| Totals 2012A* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead Farmers | 157 | 80 | 1 | 238 | 66.0 | 33.6 | 0.4 |
| Other Farmers | 1285 | 413 | 14 | 1712 | 75.1 | 24.1 | 0.8 |
| Grand total 2012A | 1442 | 493 | 15 | 1950 | 73.9 | 25.3 | 0.8 |
| Totals 2012B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead Farmers | 269 | 69 | 2 | 340 | 79.1 | 20.3 | 0.6 |
| Other farmers | 802 | 97 | 10 | 909 | 88.2 | 10.7 | 1.1 |
| Unknown | 1017 | 460 | 35 | 1512 | 67.3 | 30.4 | 2.3 |
| Grand Total 2012B | 2088 | 626 | 47 | 2761 | 75.6 | 22.7 | 1.7 |
| Totals 2011B, 2012A \& 2012B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead Farmers | 556 | 223 | 7 | 786 | 70.7 | 28.4 | 0.9 |
| Other farmers | 2739 | 711 | 28 | 3478 | 78.8 | 20.4 | 0.8 |
| Unknown | 1017 | 460 | 35 | 1512 | 67.3 | 30.4 | 2.3 |
| Grand Total | 4312 | 1394 | 70 | 5776 | 74.7 | 24.1 | 1.2 |
| Totals 2010B, 2011A, 2011B, 2012A \& 2012B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead Farmers | 556 | 223 | 7 | 786 | 70.7 | 28.4 | 0.9 |
| Other farmers | 2739 | 711 | 28 | 3478 | 78.8 | 20.4 | 0.8 |
| Unknown | 1017 | 460 | 1922 | 3399 | 29.9 | 13.5 | 56.5 |
| Grand Total | 4312 | 1394 | 1957 | 7663 | 56.3 | 18.2 | 25.5 |

* 81 double entries under SARCAF were removed

Apart from the information from the standardized M\&E data collection in DRC, there is some information from the 30-month and 42-month country report. The N2Africa country team and the partner organisations continued to stimulate participation of women in project activities. In these reports, it is reported that $65 \%$ of recruited households $(6,110)$ are women while $82 \%$ of farmers participated in exchange visits were women. Likewise, as indicated in Table 20, the majority of farmers participating in different training are women.
In the 2013A season the overall percentage of women farmers reached through input distribution in DR Congo is almost $60 \%$. As in the other seasons, the women organisation SARCAF reached almost 79\%, but even the other partner organisations attain close to $50 \%$ women participation (Table 18, see also Appendix V for more detailed information on input distribution in season 2013A).

Table 18: Beneficiaries summarized per partner, 2013A, DRC

|  |  | Women | Men | Unknown | Total |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIOBASS | no. | 776 | 708 | 16 | 1500 |
|  | $\%$ | 51.7 | 47.2 | 1.1 |  |
| PAD | no. | 794 | 797 | 10 | 1601 |
| SARCAF | $\%$ | 49.6 | 49.8 | 0.6 |  |
|  | no. | 1195 | 316 | 6 | 1517 |
|  | $\%$ | 78.8 | 20.8 | 0.4 |  |
|  | no. | $\mathbf{2 7 6 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{3 2}$ | $\mathbf{4 6 1 8}$ |
|  | $\%$ | $\mathbf{5 9 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 9 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 7}$ |  |

With regards to the different legumes received by men and women, overall in DR Congo we see that women tend to be engaged in bean cultivation, while men are more often recipients of soyabean inputs (see Table 19). Very generally speaking, soyabean is more often considered and treated as a cash crop although in DR Congo a lot of effort has been made to train women on household processing of soyabean to produce milk, tofu, and other recipes utilizing soyabean within their households and for petty trade within communities.

Table 19: Kind of legumes received by women en men farmers, 2013A, DRC

| Women | Number | Common bean | Soyabean | unknown | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1884 | 825 | 56 | 2765 |
|  | Percentage | $68.1 \%$ | $29.8 \%$ | $2 \%$ |  |
|  | Number | 1019 | 781 | 21 | 1821 |
|  | Unknown | Number | $56 \%$ | $42.9 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ |
| TOTALS | Number | 15 | 16 | 1 |  |
|  | Percentage | $46.9 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $3.1 \%$ |  |
|  | Percentage | $\mathbf{2 9 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{6 3 . 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{7 8}$ |
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### 4.3 Training

Table 20 provides details on the participation in various trainings in 2011B and 2012A in DR Congo. On average the percentage of female participants is quite high, towards $60 \%$ which is of course also to be attributed to SARCAF.

Table 20: Participation in various trainings, 2011B and 2012A, DRC

|  | Master Farmers |  |  | Facilitators |  |  | Households |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIOBASS | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |  |
| Numbers | 30 | 21 | 51 | 22 | 40 | 62 | 256 | 245 | 501 |  |
| Percentage | $58.8 \%$ | $41.2 \%$ |  | $35.5 \%$ | $64.5 \%$ |  | $51.1 \%$ | $48.9 \%$ |  |  |
| PAD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Numbers | 32 | 30 | 62 | 40 | 35 | 75 | 138 | 92 | 230 |  |
| Percentage | $51.6 \%$ | $48.4 \%$ |  | $53.3 \%$ | $46.7 \%$ |  | $60 \%$ | $40 \%$ |  |  |
| SARCAF |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Numbers | 9 | 40 | 49 | 17 | 45 | 62 | 37 | 272 | 309 |  |
| Percentage | $18.4 \%$ | $81.6 \%$ |  | $27.4 \%$ | $72.6 \%$ |  | $12 \%$ | $88 \%$ |  |  |
| SITES SATELLITES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Numbers | 25 | 41 | 66 | 30 | 32 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Percentage | $37.9 \%$ | $62.1 \%$ |  | $48.4 \%$ | $51.6 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Numbers | 96 | 132 | 228 | 109 | 152 | 261 | 431 | 609 | 1040 |  |
| Percentage | $42.1 \%$ | $57.9 \%$ |  | $41.8 \%$ | $58.2 \%$ |  | $41.4 \%$ | $58.6 \%$ |  |  |

Information from 30-month and 42-month country report, not based on M\&E data.

In the 2013A season, a total of 1529 people were trained. These trainings were mostly one day trainings, a few of the trainings lasted for two days. All trainers were men, of the trainees the average percentages of women was almost $60 \%$. SARCAF, the N2Africa partner organisation targeting women facilitated seven trainings which had the highest participation of women (see Table 21 for details).
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Table 21: Male and female participation in trainings, 2013A, DRC

| Organiser training | Numbers |  |  | Percentages |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Total | \% Men | \% Women |
| PAD | 39 | 21 | 60 | 65.0 | 35.0 |
| PAD | 25 | 15 | 40 | 62.5 | 37.5 |
| PAD | 13 | 8 | 21 | 61.9 | 38.1 |
| PAD | 32 | 20 | 52 | 61.5 | 38.5 |
| PAD | 23 | 15 | 38 | 60.5 | 39.5 |
| DIOBASS | 143 | 95 | 238 | 60.1 | 39.9 |
| PAD | 22 | 15 | 37 | 59.5 | 40.5 |
| DIOBASS | 13 | 10 | 23 | 56.5 | 43.5 |
| PAD | 22 | 21 | 43 | 51.2 | 48.8 |
| DIOBASS | 15 | 15 | 30 | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| PAD | 10 | 11 | 21 | 47.6 | 52.4 |
| DIOBASS | 122 | 141 | 263 | 46.4 | 53.6 |
| PAD | 10 | 12 | 22 | 45.5 | 54.5 |
| CIAT | 15 | 18 | 33 | 45.5 | 54.5 |
| CIAT | 19 | 23 | 42 | 45.2 | 54.8 |
| PAD | 14 | 19 | 33 | 42.4 | 57.6 |
| DIOBASS | 13 | 18 | 31 | 41.9 | 58.1 |
| CIAT | 21 | 32 | 53 | 39.6 | 60.4 |
| DIOBASS | 11 | 18 | 29 | 37.9 | 62.1 |
| SARCAF | 3 | 6 | 9 | 33.3 | 66.7 |
| SARCAF | 2 | 8 | 10 | 20.0 | 80.0 |
| SARCAF | 7 | 44 | 51 | 13.7 | 86.3 |
| SARCAF | 9 | 104 | 113 | 8.0 | 92.0 |
| SARCAF | 8 | 93 | 101 | 7.9 | 92.1 |
| SARCAF | 2 | 26 | 28 | 7.1 | 92.9 |
| SARCAF | 4 | 104 | 108 | 3.7 | 96.3 |
| Total | 617 | 912 | 1529 | 40.4 | 59.6 |

### 4.4 Field Days

For 2012, we have records of 32 field days, with a total of 1773 participants on record, $75.4 \%$ of them being women. There were four field days with women participation below $50 \%$, one of those one as low as $14 \%$ of the participants being women - strangely enough a field day organized by SARCAF. In ten of the recorded field days, more than $90 \%$ of the participants were women.

In addition to more commonly known field days, farmers in DR Congo have been organizing so-called 'porte ouverte'; farmers receiving other farmers from their surroundings in an informal setting. While these have not been recorded with standardized M\&E forms, it does
indicate the relevance of more open definition of so-called 'extension events' beyond field days only.

### 4.5 Reaching women through radio

The N2Africa team and its partners in South Kivu have been very pro-active in the engagement with the popular station 'Radio Maendeleo' based in Bukavu (Maendeleo means 'development'). Radio Maendeleo is the radio station that is most widely followed in the region; it can be received everywhere in South Kivu (except in Fizi), also in a larger part of North Kivu and even in Rwanda (Cyangungu) and in Burundi (Bujumbura and Cibitoke). And it is estimated that more than two million people listen to Radio Maendeleo.

In general, during the agricultural season one broadcast would be prepared by N2Africa which would then be broadcasted at different times during the week and often also in different local languages as well as sometimes in French.
While the emissions in French are considered not so suitable to reach women (since often women in rural areas do not master French so well), the emissions in Kiswahili and Mashi are very well suited to ensure reaching women as it is reported that women in general do have a habit of following radio broadcasts.
It was noted that women are much interested in nutrition and processing of legumes for consumption.

From interactions with listeners, farmers, and partner organisations, it has been observed that little by little the attention for these particular broadcasts is increasing within all different audiences who are already accustomed to following radio broadcasts.

In conclusion, N2Africa in DR Congo has achieved good participation of women in their activities. It is a little unfortunate that data collection was not done as systematically as would have been ideal. Even for the later seasons of 2011B, 2012A and 2012B compilation and analyses were challenging and more time consuming because of diversity in quality and formats used.

## 5 Rwanda

### 5.1 Introduction

According to the information from the N2Africa baseline, involvement of men and women is relatively balanced in Rwanda (Table 22). Although in the early stages of the N2Africa project it had been reported that in Rwanda there were no specific activities to enhance the participation of women farmers in the project's activities, $62 \%$ of the participating farmers in the first year were women (Table 23) which shows the pro-active engagement of N2Africa staff and partner organisations in Rwanda.

Table 22: Involvement of men and women in farm activities in Rwanda (\% of household members)

|  |  | Full-time | Seasonal | Not at all |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age 17-35 | Female | 77 | 10 | 14 |
|  | Male | 61 | 23 | 16 |
| Age $>35$ | Female | 98 | 0 | 1 |
|  | Male | 93 | 5 | 2 |
| Total | Female | $\mathbf{8 7 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{7 . 5}$ |
|  | Male | $\mathbf{7 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 4}$ | $\mathbf{9}$ |

Source: N2Africa baseline data.

Table 23: Participation of men and women in D\&D activities, Rwanda (season 2011A \& 2011B)

| Impact zone | Dissemination package | Size of plot | Men |  | Women |  | Total <br> No. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | No. | \% | No. | \% |  |
| Kamonyi | Cassava intercrop with bush bean | 10x6m | 72 | 28.8 | 178 | 71.2 | 250 |
|  | Soyabean in rotation with maize | 6x6m | 59 | 23.6 | 191 | 76.4 | 250 |
| Bugesera | Cassava intercrop with bush bean | 10x6m | 109 | 43.6 | 141 | 56.4 | 250 |
|  | Soyabean in rotation with maize | $6 \times 6 m$ | 112 | 44.8 | 138 | 55.2 | 250 |
| Kayonza | Cassava intercrop with bush bean | 10x6m | 111 | 44.2 | 140 | 55.8 | 251 |
|  | Soyabean in rotation with maize | $6 \times 6 m$ | 106 | 42.7 | 142 | 57.3 | 248 |
| Burera | Climbing bean in rotation with maize | $6 \times 6 m$ | 199 | 38.3 | 321 | 61.7 | 520 |
| Gakenke | Climbing bean in rotation with maize | 6x6m | 179 | 35.8 | 321 | 64.2 | 500 |
|  |  | Total | 947 | 37.6 | 1572 | 62.4 | 2519 |

In addition to reaching relatively larger numbers of female farmers, one of the N2Africa partners, COCOF, conducted training on land rights to sensitize the community on empowering women towards accessing land and participating in decision making on land use. Another partner, DRD, also trained women from their 4 action sites in gender related to household power relations. In May 2011, DRD also assisted a group of women

Umutimawurugo from Cyabingo action site to buy a piece of land of about $1 / 4$ ha for seed multiplication and demonstration.

### 5.2 Farmers Reached through Input Distribution

In the 2012A season, a total of 1069 farmers received inputs and all of them have reportedly planted. Overall the distribution between female and male farmers is quite balanced; the average being just over $54 \%$ women and over $45 \%$ men. Table 24 presents the details of the farmers reached in Rwanda in the 2012A season. Caritas-Rwanda engaged between 40 and almost $56 \%$ women in the different action sites. COCOF is reaching over $60 \%$ women, while DRD had the lowest and highest percentage of women with $22 \%$ and almost $82 \%$ in two different districts. Percentages of women engaged by EPR varied between almost $45 \%$ and almost 55\%.

Table 24: Farmers reached in 2012A season, Rwanda


* The numbers of farmers with unknown gender are very small; therefore the percentages of this are not presented in the table.

In the 2012B season a total of 4839 farmers received inputs and thus were reached by the N2Africa project (see Table 25); on average $52.5 \%$ women and over $47 \%$ men. The percentages of women engaged by Caritas is comparable between the 2012A and 2012B season, only in one place, Bugesera, Rilima the percentage is high at $73 \%$. COCOF is a little lower at over $51 \%$ (compared to over $60 \%$ in the 2012A season). DRD is much more average compared to the previous season with percentages between slightly less than $50 \%$ and just over $58 \%$. EPR is comparable to the previous season and this season between 43 and over 55\%.

While the overall percentages of women involved are commendable, it is noteworthy that was still true for the engagement of women as Master Farmers in these seasons. Often we can observe that women are well engaged at the level of input distribution while their participation decreases when looking at Master Farmers and for example trainings. Table 26 presents the details of Master Farmers and only in Bugesera, Juru the percentage is very low, but in the other places it is still ok. Table 27 presents the seeds and cassava distributed for cultivation in the $2012 B$ season - here no remarkable differences between men and women.
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Table 25: Inputs distributed per partner and per district, 2012B, Rwanda

|  | Numbers of farmers |  |  |  | Percentages |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Female | Male | unknown | Total | \% women | \% men |
| CARITAS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bugesera, Juru | 51 | 49 |  | 100 | 51 | 49 |
| Bugesera, Mareba | 104 | 96 |  | 200 | 52 | 48 |
| Bugesera, Musenyi | 99 | 85 |  | 184 | 53.8 | 46.2 |
| Bugesera, Nyamata | 78 | 111 | 1 | 190 | 41.1 | 58.4 |
| Bugesera, Nyarugenge | 44 | 66 |  | 110 | 40 | 60 |
| Bugesera, Rilima | 54 | 20 |  | 74 | 73 | 27 |
| Bugesera, Rweru | 57 | 72 |  | 129 | 44.2 | 55.8 |
| Total CARITAS | 487 | 499 | 1 | 987 | 49.3 | 50.6 |
| COCOF |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kamonyi | 477 | 450 | 1 | 928 | 51.4 | 48.5 |
| Total COCOF | 477 | 450 | 1 | 928 | 51.4 | 48.5 |
| DRD |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Burera | 379 | 380 |  | 759 | 49.9 | 50.1 |
| Gakenke | 288 | 211 | 1 | 500 | 57.6 | 42.2 |
| Musanze | 436 | 312 | 1 | 749 | 58.2 | 41.7 |
| Total DRD | 1103 | 903 | 2 | 2008 | 54.9 | 45.0 |
| EPR |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kabarondo | 66 | 83 |  | 149 | 44.3 | 55.7 |
| Nyamirama | 290 | 260 |  | 550 | 52.7 | 47.3 |
| Rukara | 66 | 55 |  | 121 | 54.5 | 45.5 |
| Rwinkwavu | 51 | 45 |  | 96 | 53.1 | 46.9 |
| Total EPR | 473 | 443 | 0 | 916 | 51.6 | 48.4 |
| Grand Total | 2540 | 2295 | 4 | 4839 | 52.5 | 47.4 |

* The numbers of farmers with unknown gender are very small; therefore the percentages of this are not presented in the table.

Table 26: Number and percentages of women and men amongst Master Farmers, 2012B, Rwanda

| Partner \& Action site* | Number |  |  | Percentage |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Women | Men | Total | \% women | \% men |
| Bugesera, Juru | 1 | 5 | 6 | 16.7 | 83.3 |
| Bugesera, Mareba | 9 | 5 | 14 | 64.3 | 35.7 |
| Bugesera, Musenyi | 7 | 7 | 14 | 50 | 50 |
| Bugesera, Nyamata | 7 | 6 | 13 | 53.8 | 46.2 |
| Bugesera, Nyarugenge | 4 | 6 | 10 | 40 | 60 |
| Bugesera, Rilima | 3 | 4 | 7 | 42.9 | 57.1 |
| Bugesera, Rweru | 4 | 6 | 10 | 40 | 60 |
| EPR |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kabarondo | 3 | 7 | 10 | 30 | 70 |
| Rwinkwavu | $\mathbf{4}$ | 5 | 9 | 44.4 | 55.6 |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{4 2}$ | $\mathbf{5 1}$ | $\mathbf{9 3}$ | $\mathbf{4 5 . 2}$ |

[^2]From the data on seeds and planting material distributed to farmers in 2012B we see that men are relatively better represented in soyabeans, the most obvious crop for commercialization while the other crops are most likely to be for household use in first instance (see also Table 27).

Table 27: Seeds and planting materials distributed, 2012B, Rwanda

|  | Numbers |  |  |  |  | Percentage |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Female | Male | unknown | Total | \%F | \%M |  |
| Climbing bean | 1103 | 903 | 2 | 2008 | 54.9 | 45.0 |  |
| Soyabean | 691 | 698 |  | 1389 | 49.7 | 50.3 |  |
| Bush bean | 664 | 639 | 1 | 1304 | 50.9 | 49.0 |  |
| Maize | 66 | 48 | 1 | 115 | 57.4 | 41.7 |  |
| Cassava | 11 | 4 |  | 15 | 73.3 | 26.7 |  |
| (blank) | 5 | 3 |  | 8 | 62.5 | 37.5 |  |
| Grand Total | $\mathbf{2 5 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 9 5}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{4 8 3 9}$ | $\mathbf{5 2 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{4 7 . 4}$ |  |

In the seasons 2013A and 2013B the percentage of women farmers reached continued to be high, with two partner organisations at well over the targeted $50 \%$, while one partner organisation reaches just below 44\% of women (Table 28).

Table 28: Farmers reached in 2013A and 2013B, Rwanda

| Partner <br> organisation | Number |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Women | Men | Total | Women | Men |
| Caritas | 309 | 240 | 549 | 56.3 | 43.7 |
| COCOF | 1207 | 849 | 2056 | 58.7 | 41.3 |
| EPR | 472 | 602 | 1074 | 43.9 | 56.1 |
| Grand Total | $\mathbf{1 9 8 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 9 1}$ | $\mathbf{3 6 7 9}$ | $\mathbf{5 4 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 6 . 0}$ |

The Lead Farmer assessment questionnaire was administrated in February-March 2012. More Lead Farmers were recruited in 2012B as the number of beneficiaries increased significantly. Half of all beneficiaries were recruited in 2012B-2013A (about 10,000). When the Lead Farmer survey was carried out in February-March 2012, it was just a month after they had been recruited, not much time had passed and the farmers had just received an introductory training on the dissemination packages; they were not yet trained on all the BNF modules like their fellow farmers who were recruited earlier on (see Table 29). 19 May 2014

Table 29: Female and male Master Farmers (recruited for 2012B and 2013A season), Rwanda

|  |  | Female |  | Male |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | No. | $\%$ | No. | $\%$ | Total |
| CARITAS | Bugesera | 22 | 45.8 | 26 | 54.2 | 48 |
| COCOF | Kamonyi | 65 | 60.2 | 43 | 39.8 | 108 |
| DRD | Burera | 27 | 48.2 | 29 | 51.8 | 56 |
|  | Gakenke | 9 | 36.0 | 16 | 64.0 | 25 |
|  | Musanze | 23 | 65.7 | 12 | 34.3 | 35 |
|  | Total DRD | 59 | 50.9 | 57 | 49.1 | 116 |
| EPR | Kayonza | 53 | 55.8 | 42 | 44.2 | 95 |
|  | Rukara | 1 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 |
|  | Total EPR | 54 | 56.3 | 42 | 43.8 | 96 |
|  | Grand total: | $\mathbf{2 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 4 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 8}$ | $\mathbf{4 5 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{3 6 8}$ |

### 5.3 Training

In total there were 1063 people participating in 37 trainings, almost $39 \%$ male, just over $61 \%$ female (M\&E records for 2012A, 2012B and 2013A, see Table 30).

There was one training in which women from all over Rwanda were gathered together for intensive processing training. One other reported training concerned an exchange visit of 26 farmers from Rwanda to Kenya. Most trainers were men.
For the seasons 2012A, 2012B and 2013A, we have records of 39 trainings. For two trainings we lack information on participation, the participation in the remaining 37 trainings is summarized in Table 30.
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Table 30: Trainings in season 2012A, 2012B and 2013A, Rwanda

| Action site(s) | Date of training | Numbers |  |  | Percentage |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Bugesera | Nov 2011 |  | 30 | 30 | 0 | 100 |
| Bugesera | May 2012 | 21 | 23 | 44 | 47.7 | 52.3 |
| Bugesera | July 2012 |  | 52 | 52 | 0 | 100 |
| Musambira | Mar 2012 | 11 | 13 | 24 | 45.8 | 54.2 |
| Musambira | Jun 2012 | 5 | 14 | 19 | 26.3 | 73.7 |
| Nyarubaka | Mar 2012 | 12 | 21 | 33 | 36.4 | 63.6 |
| Nyarubaka | Nov 2011 | 8 | 31 | 39 | 20.5 | 79.5 |
| Nyamiyaga | Jun 2012 | n/a |  |  |  |  |
| Nyamiyaga | April 2011 | 11 | 14 | 25 | 44 | 56 |
| Nyamiyaga | Jun 2012 | 11 | 11 | 22 | 50 | 50 |
| Nyamiyaga | Mar 2012 | 11 | 24 | 35 | 31.4 | 68.6 |
| Musambira | Mar 2012 | 8 | 28 | 36 | 22.2 | 77.8 |
| Kabarondo, Rukara, Nyamirama, Rwinkwavu | Apr-May $2012$ | 30 | 18 | 48 | 62.5 | 37.5 |
| Kinoni, Cyabingo, Kivuruga, Nemba | Nov 2011 | 26 | 31 | 57 | 45.6 | 54.4 |
| Kinoni \& Cyabingo | May 2012 |  | 26 | 26 |  | 100 |
| Cyuve, Muko, Rugarama, Cyanika, Kivuruga \& Nemba | May 2012 | 28 | 42 | 70 | 40 | 60 |
| Kinoni, Cyabingo, Kivuruga, Nemba | May 2012 | n/a |  |  |  |  |
| Kamonyi | Feb 2012 | 10 | 9 | 19 | 52.6 | 47.4 |
| Kayonza | Feb 2012 | 11 | 8 | 19 | 57.9 | 42.1 |
| Bugesera | Feb 2012 | 9 | 10 | 19 | 47.4 | 52.6 |
| Gakenke | Feb 2012 | 3 | 6 | 9 | 33.3 | 66.7 |
| Burera | Feb 2012 | 12 | 6 | 18 | 66.7 | 33.3 |
| Musanze | ? | 5 | 5 | 10 | 50 | 50 |
| All | Sept 2012 |  | 26 | 26 | 0 | 100 |
| ? | May 2012 | 10 | 3 | 13 | 76.9 | 23.1 |
| Musanze | Aug 2012 | 24 | 17 | 41 | 58.5 | 41.5 |
| Bugesera | Aug 2012 |  | 6 | 6 | 0 | 100 |
| Kamonyi | Sep 2012 | 13 | 6 | 19 | 68.4 | 31.6 |
| Gakenke | Sep 2012 | 12 | 16 | 28 | 42.9 | 57.1 |
| All | Nov 2011 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 40 | 60 |
| Kamonyi district | Nov 2011 | 14 | 30 | 44 | 31.8 | 68.2 |
| Kayonza district | Nov 2011 | 26 | 27 | 53 | 49.1 | 50.9 |
| Bugesera district | Nov 2011 | 24 | 17 | 41 | 58.5 | 41.5 |
| Kivuruga, Cyabingo, Kinoni | Oct 2011 | 32 | 37 | 69 | 46.4 | 53.6 |
| Nemba | Oct 2011 | 10 | 8 | 18 | 55.6 | 44.4 |
| Kamonyi district | Mar 2012 | 3 | 17 | 20 | 15 | 85 |
| Rwinkwavu | Mar 2012 | 4 | 9 | 13 | 30.8 | 69.2 |
| Nyamirama | Mar 2012 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 40 | 60 |
| Rukara | Mar 2012 | 5 | 3 | 8 | 62.5 | 37.5 |
| Total |  | 413 | 650 | 1063 | 38.9 | 61.1 |

### 5.4 Field Days

There are few records from Rwanda of field days. The few available concern field days in June-July 2012 and one in December 2011. None of the field days had any specific activities for youth or women. The seven field day records report of in total 232 participants, almost $48 \%$ men and over $52 \%$ women, although the highest percentage of women is over $84 \%$, lowest being just over 28\%. The field days are not large, between 20 to 50 participants.

## 6 Kenya

### 6.1 Introduction

Considering the information from the N2Africa baseline, in Western Kenya more women are fulltime involved in farming activities than men (Table 31). A survey of 1182 households participating in Year 1 dissemination activities revealed that $62 \%$ of those receiving BNF technology field packages were women, following the trend found in the baseline survey. Furthermore in Kenya, N2Africa made it a requirement that half of all trainers and workshop participants are women. However, in some cases participants are sent by other organisations who - for diverse reasons - do not always send the required number of women. Also due to the very limited information provide through the standardized M\&E forms, it can not be verified whether this requirement was met. It was reported that at the Grain Legume Processing Workshop in May 2011, two-thirds of the trainers and $84 \%$ of the participants were women. In 2011, 44\% of the trained Master Farmers were women farmers and half of the node leaders were women.

Table 31: Involvement of women and men in farm activities in western Kenya (\% of household members)

|  | Full-time | Seasonal | Not at all |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 70.5 | 23.4 | 6.1 |
| Male | 56.6 | 33.8 | 9.7 |

Source: N2Africa baseline data.

### 6.2 Farmers Reached through Input Distribution

For the 2010 Long Rains and Short Rains season, information was provided through country reporting. Table 32 gives information on a sub-sample; an average of almost $62 \%$ of participants in input distribution are women.

Table 32: Sub-sample of farmers, presenting the gender division, west Kenya, 2010 LR \& SR

|  | 2010 LR |  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ SR |  |  <br> Short rains |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. | \% | No. | $\%$ | No. | \% |
| Female | 352 | 63.8 | 397 | 60.1 | 731 | 61.8 |
| Male | 200 | 36.2 | 264 | 39.9 | 451 | 38.2 |
| Grand Total | $\mathbf{5 5 2}$ |  | $\mathbf{6 6 1}$ |  | $\mathbf{1 1 8 2}^{*}$ |  |

* Note: only unique farmer names, 31 farmers received inputs both in $L R$ \& $S R$

For the 2011 Short rain season, we have more detailed information on the input distribution in west Kenya. From that data, if we look at the overall figures, we can notice that almost $56 \%$ of the recipients of input packages were women (see Table 33).
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Table 33: Input distribution according to gender, Kenya, season 2011 short rains

|  | Total <br> Number | $\%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 1355 | 55.7 |
| Male | 1071 | 44 |
| Unknown gender | 6 | 0.3 |
| Grand Total | $\mathbf{2 4 3 2}$ |  |

From Table 34 it is clear that there are no great differences between the different nodes with regards to percentages of women included as participants. The northern node has the highest at almost $62 \%$, the soya bean cluster (SB Cluster) relatively the lowest: slightly below $50 \%$. However, if we look in more detail we can see a bigger difference between men and women participation amongst Master Farmers. Although the differences between the nodes are similar (except for Southern node, but total number of Master Farmers there is only 3 so difficult to compare realistically), the ratio of Master farmers versus other farmers is strikingly different (see Table 34).

Table 34: Gender division input distribution per Node \& type of farmer, Kenya, season 2012A

| Action sites: | Numbers |  |  |  | Percentage |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Female | Male | unknown | Total | Female | Male |
| Northern Node |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other farmers | 264 | 162 |  | 426 | 62 | 38 |
| Master Farmers | 2 | 4 |  | 6 | 33.3 | 66.7 |
| Central Node |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other farmers | 577 | 439 | 3 | 1019 | 56.6 | 43.1 |
| Master Farmers | 4 | 7 | 11 | 22 | 18.2 | 31.8 |
| Soyabean Cluster |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other farmers | 293 | 281 |  | 574 | 51 | 49 |
| Master Farmers | 29 | 49 |  | 78 | 37.2 | 62.8 |
| Southern Node |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other farmers | 186 | 127 | 2 | 315 | 59 | 40.3 |
| Master Farmers | 2 | 1 |  | 3 | 66.7 | 33.3 |
| Grand total |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other farmers | 1320 | 1009 | 5 | 2334 | 56.6 | 43.2 |
| Master Farmers | 37 | 61 | 11 | 109 | 33.9 | 56 |
| All farmers | 1357 | 1070 | 16 | 2443 | 55.5 | 43.8 |

The data collected with the Master Farmer Assessment tool was entered in somewhat different manner which made cleaning and analyses slightly more laborious. On the other hand, there were only 32 Master Farmers who filled the form. While the quite large numbers of farmers involved with N2Africa in West Kenya, it is rather questionable how representative the sample is of all Master Farmers in West Kenya. Table 35 shows that just over 34\% of the Master Farmers sampled were women; they are younger than their male counterparts. These women Master Farmers are more often not head of household as compared to the male Master Farmers (see Table 35). The highest education received by Master Farmers differed slightly between men and women, with a higher percentage of women having only primary
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schooling and a higher percentage of the male Master Farmers having been to College (data not presented). It remains relevant to keep the small sample size in mind here.

Table 35: Some characteristics Master Farmers, 2012A, Kenya

| Master Farmers | Female | Male | (blank) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | 11 | 19 | 2 |
| $\%$ | 34.4 | 59.4 | 6.3 |
| Average age | 38 | 45 | 51 |
| Master Farmer is head of household | 6 | 15 | 1 |

For the 2012 Long Rains season, average female participation in input distribution was high at almost $58 \%$, with the Central Node being even higher at over $67 \%$ (see Table 36).

Table 36: Input distribution, 2012 LR, Kenya

| Action Site | Numbers |  |  |  | Percentage |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Female | Male | Group | Total | \% female | \% male |
| Central Node | 1580 | 770 | 1 | 2351 | 67.2 | 32.8 |
| Northern node | 1736 | 1452 | 8 | 3196 | 54.3 | 45.4 |
| SB Cluster | 612 | 500 |  | 1112 | 55.0 | 45.0 |
| Southern node | 217 | 309 |  | 526 | 41.3 | 58.7 |
| Total: | $\mathbf{4 1 4 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 3 1}$ | $\mathbf{9}$ | $\mathbf{7 1 8 5}$ | $\mathbf{5 7 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{4 2 . 2}$ |

### 6.3 Training

Little data was made available from Kenya through the standardized M\&E tools. It was reported that at the Grain Legume Processing Workshop in May 2011, two-thirds of the trainers and $84 \%$ of the participants were women. In 2011, $44 \%$ of the trained Master Farmers were women farmers and half of the node leaders were women.

M\&E records for training in the 2012 Long Rains season are presented in Table 37; a couple of trainings have a below $50 \%$ female participation, but overall women participation is good.

Table 37: Participation in training, 2012 LR, Kenya*

| Target Group | Duration <br> (in days) | Numbers |  |  | Percentage |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Male | Female | Total | \% male | \% female |
| Master farmers | 2 | 13 | 8 | 21 | 61.9 | 38.1 |
| Master farmers | 2 | 16 | 13 | 29 | 55.2 | 44.8 |
| Master farmers | 2 | 11 | 10 | 21 | 52.4 | 47.6 |
| Master farmers | 2 | 10 | 13 | 23 | 43.5 | 56.5 |
| Nutrition Workshop | 2 | 2 | 20 | 22 | 9.1 | 90.9 |
| Data Collectors for M\&E | 1 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 50.0 | 50.0 |
|  | Total: | $\mathbf{6 2}$ | $\mathbf{7 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 6}$ | $\mathbf{4 5 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{5 4 . 4}$ |

* All trainings took place in June and July 2012


### 6.4 Field Days

The records of field days show that there have been 23 field days in Kenya in the second half of 2011. In total 2443 people participated in these field days ( 2197 farmers and 246 others, i.e. Government extension staff, other government officials, NGO staff, Private sector, Others). Overall, almost $50 \%$ of these participants were women (49.8\%). Of the farmers, the percentage of women participants was slightly higher at $51.3 \%$ (see Appendix VI for more detailed information).

Sixteen field days had something specifically targeting women: value addition (8), cooking contest (4), legume utilisation (1), and exhibit on legumes (1). The Odiado Tumanini Women group presented a drama on how soyabean farming business has improved their incomes and living standards.

For the 2012 Long Rains there are records of 22 field days, on average almost $50 \%$ of the participants in these field days were women (Table 38).

Table 38: Attendance of field days, 2012 LR, Kenya

| Action site: | Numbers |  |  | Percentage |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Female | Male | Total | \% women | \% men |
| Central Node | 389 | 266 | 655 | 59.4 | 40.6 |
| Northern Node | 521 | 583 | 1104 | 47.2 | 52.8 |
| SB CLUSTER | 244 | 286 | 530 | 46.0 | 54.0 |
| Southern Node | 99 | 144 | 243 | 40.7 | 59.3 |
| Grand Total | $\mathbf{1 2 5 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 7 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 3 2}$ | $\mathbf{4 9 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{5 0 . 5}$ |

## 7 Malawi

### 7.1 Introduction

From the N2Africa baseline survey, it is known that the involvement of men and women in farming activities in Malawi is quite balanced. Surely the younger women are more often fulltime engaged than men, but after the age of 35 , involvement of women and men is almost equal (see Table 39).

Table 39: Involvement of women and men in farm activities in Malawi (\% of household members)

|  |  | Full-time | Seasonal | Not at all |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age 17-35 | Female | 77.3 | 21.3 | 1.4 |
|  | Male | 63.2 | 31.4 | 5.4 |
| Age $>35$ | Female | 93.6 | 4.8 | 1.6 |
|  | Male | 92.9 | 4.6 | 2.5 |
| Total | Female | $\mathbf{8 5 . 4 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 . 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 5}$ |
|  | Male | $\mathbf{7 8 . 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 8}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 9 5}$ |

Source: N2Africa baseline data.

### 7.2 Farmers Reached through Input Distribution

The involvement of men and women in farming in Malawi is reflected in the participation of women and men in N2Africa activities. Slightly over half (51.2\%) of the participating farmers in the 2010-11 season were women (see Table 40) and in that season $49 \%$ of the Lead Farmers in Malawi were women.

Table 40: Gender disaggregated data on farmers participating in N2Africa, season 2010-11, Malawi

| District | Partner | No. | Men |  |  | Women |  | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | No. | $\%$ | No. |  |  |  |  |
| Dedza | DAES | 304 | 46.2 | 354 | 53.8 | 658 |  |  |
| Lilongwe | DARS, N2Africa | 222 | 41.8 | 309 | 58.2 | 531 |  |  |
| Mchinji | CDI | 424 | 59.7 | 286 | 40.3 | 710 |  |  |
| Ntcheu | CU | 163 | 60.6 | 106 | 39.4 | 269 |  |  |
| Dowa | WVM |  | 273 | 41.3 | 388 | 58.7 |  |  |
| Salima | DAES |  | 288 | 47.8 | 315 | 52.2 |  |  |
|  |  | Total | $\mathbf{1 6 7 4}$ | $\mathbf{4 8 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 5 8}$ | $\mathbf{5 1 . 2}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3432 |  |  |  |

* Based on country report, not on M\&E records.

For the second season in Malawi, 2011-12, the M\&E data on input distribution that is generally used to assess for example reach of the N2Africa project was inconsistent. There were quite some discrepancies between the M\&E records and for example partner reports. This is not unique to Malawi, but does show the need for rigorous M\&E data collection to be able to provide reliable information on the performance of the project. In addition, clarifying such discrepancies takes a lot of (unnecessary) time and effort.

Table 41 gives an overview of the input distribution in Malawi according to districts and divided by men and women participants in the N2Africa project. Overall, just over $53 \%$ of the
recipients of inputs were women, with Kasungu having the lowest percentage at just under $52 \%{ }^{2}$, while Lilongwe district had the highest percentage of women at $61.5 \%$.
Table 41: Input distribution per district, 2011-12 season, Malawi

|  |  | Female | Male | Unknown <br> gender | Grand <br> Total |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kasungu | Total No. | 1187 | 1097 | 7 | 2291 |
|  | $\%$ | 51.8 | 47.9 | 0.3 |  |
| Lilongwe | Total No. | 123 | 77 | 0 | 200 |
|  | $\%$ | 61.5 | 38.5 | 0 |  |
| Ntcheu | Total No. | 238 | 206 | 7 | 451 |
|  | $\%$ | 52.8 | 45.7 | 1.6 |  |
| Dowa | Total No. | 629 | 745 | 9 | 1383 |
|  | $\%$ | 45.5 | 53.9 | 0.7 |  |
| Salima | Total No. | 526 | 359 | 4 | 889 |
|  | $\%$ | 59.2 | 40.4 | 0.4 |  |
| Mchinji | Total No. | 509 | 375 | 4 | 888 |
|  | $\%$ | 57.3 | 42.2 | 0.5 |  |
| Dedza | Total No. | 548 | 391 | 9 | 948 |
|  | \% | 57.8 | 41.2 | 0.9 |  |
| TOTAL | Total No. | $\mathbf{3 7 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 2 5 0}$ | 40 | $\mathbf{7 0 5 0}$ |
|  | \% | 53.3 | $\mathbf{4 6 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 6}$ |  |

After correcting, the total number of farmers reached in the 2011-12 season came up to 10,061 farmers of which $48 \%$ were women (instead of $53 \%$ ). The representation of women is strongest in groundnut cultivation and lowest in soyabean production. The differences between the locations at the level of Extension Planning Areas (EPAs) in Malawi is noteworthy; the highest percentage of female participants being at $67.5 \%$ and the lowest at $33.6 \%$, of the farmers benefitting from N2Africa input distribution. The team in Malawi hypothesized that this is most likely due to the presence of the farm input subsidy program in some areas, where women are targeted as vulnerable and in greater need of assistance. Extension officers and local leaders discourage N2Africa partners from giving additional inputs to these women, so men are selected instead. The exception is Dedza District where the (female) District Agricultural Development Officer reasons that recipients of subsidies are the poorest farmers who should also benefit from N2Africa.

Overall, women are well represented at over $53 \%$ of the participants being women (based on the M\&E data). It is however of interest to also take account of the gender division amongst Lead Farmers as compared to the division between other farmers as is shown in Table 42. Looking at Lead Farmers only, only $40 \%$ of the participants are women. Data from the various training events confirms this finding. Most training is targeted at Lead Farmers and we will see that the percentage of women participating is often even lower than $40 \%$ except for the training on nutrition and processing and the training sessions held in Kasungu (see also Table 43).

[^3]Table 42: Percentages of women and men amongst Lead Farmers and other farmers, 201112 season, Malawi

|  |  | No. | \% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Other farmers total | 6663 |  |
| Female |  | 3603 | $54.1 \%$ |
| Male | 3017 | $45.3 \%$ |  |
| Unknown gender |  | 43 | $0.6 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| Female |  | 387 | $40.6 \%$ |
| Male |  | 157 | $59.2 \%$ |
| Unknown gender |  | 229 | $0.3 \%$ |
|  |  | 1 |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Female |  | 7050 | $53.3 \%$ |
| Male |  | 3760 | $46 \%$ |
| Unknown gender |  | 3246 | $0.6 \%$ |

### 7.3 Training

Although Table 44 gives a total number of participants in trainings of almost 3,000 people, these are of course not all unique individuals. For example a similar group of Lead Farmers might be trained on different subject at different points in time.

From the input distribution records, we know that $40.6 \%$ of the Lead Farmers were women. Yet, if we look at overall participation in N2Africa training, the percentage of women is $51 \%$. From the Table below (Table 43), it is clear that is this higher number is caused by just a few of the trainings. Two of the trainings on nutrition and processing had high percentages of women participation (no. $16 \& 17$ both at almost $65 \%$ ). Additionally, the two trainings from CRS in Kasungu had large numbers of participants, the majority of which were women (19 and 20). This is probably attributable to the work of CRS in Savings and Internal Loans Committees (SILCs). The target CRS sets is that a minimum $60 \%$ of SILC members must be women, and this past season about 90-95\% of the CRS N2Africa farmers were members of SILCs. Hence, higher participation of women than men in trainings conducted in Kasungu. Another factor could be that fact that in case a Lead Farmer cannot participate in a training he/she might send another farmer from the group, this could influence the percentages of men and women participants.
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Table 43: Overview training events in Malawi, season 2011-12

| Action site(s) involved | Duration <br> (in days) | Target Group | Participation |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Numbers |  |  | Percentage |  |
|  |  |  | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Lilongwe \& Mchinji NASFAM | 2 | Lead Farmers | 22 | 1 | 23 | 95.7 | 4.3 |
| Lilongwe, Mchinji, Dedza, Dowa and Salima | 2 | Agro-dealers | 5 | 3 | 8 | 62.5 | 37.5 |
| Dowa World Vision | 4 | Lead Farmers | 54 | 24 | 78 | 69.2 | 30.8 |
| Mchinji World Vision | 2 | Lead Farmers | 24 | 23 | 47 | 51.1 | 48.9 |
| Salima DAES - <br>  <br> Chinguluwe EPA | 4 | Lead Farmers | 40 | 16 | 56 | 71.4 | 28.6 |
| Lilongwe World Vision | 2 | Lead Farmers | 31 | 20 | 51 | 60.8 | 39.2 |
| Lilongwe DAES | 2 | Lead Farmers | 10 | 8 | 18 | 55.6 | 44.4 |
| Dedza World Vision | 2 | Lead Farmers | 33 | 13 | 46 | 71.7 | 28.3 |
| Ntcheu Concern Universal | 2 | Lead Farmers | 29 | 11 | 40 | 72.5 | 27.5 |
| Kasungu Catholic Relief Services | 2 | Extension Officers | 11 | 5 | 16 | 68.8 | 31.3 |
| Salima DAES - <br>  <br> Chinguluwe EPA | 4 | Lead Farmers | 41 | 14 | 55 | 74.5 | 25.5 |
| Kasungu Catholic Relief Services | 2 | Lead Farmers | 51 | 25 | 76 | 67.1 | 32.9 |
| Dowa World Vision | 4 | Lead Farmers | 54 | 24 | 78 | 69.2 | 30.8 |
| Dedza DAES | 1 | Farmers | 10 | 3 | 13 | 76.9 | 23.1 |
| Ntcheu Concern Universal | 1 | Farmers | 9 | 2 | 11 | 81.8 | 18.2 |
| Mngwangwa EPA | 2 | Farmers | 25 | 46 | 71 | 35.2 | 64.8 |
| Mkanda NASFAM | 2 | Farmers | 6 | 11 | 17 | 35.3 | 64.7 |
| Mchinji Mlonyeni World Vision | 2 | Farmers | 18 | 11 | 29 | 62.1 | 37.9 |
| Kasungu Catholic Relief Services | 2 | Lead Farmers \& Farmers | 426 | 526 | 952 | 44.7 | 55.3 |
| Kasungu Catholic Relief Services | ? | Farmers | 556 | 731 | 1287 | 43.2 | 56.8 |
|  |  | Total: | 1455 | 1517 | 2972 | 49 | 51 |

*All trainings took place between September 2011 and July 2012.

### 7.4 Field Days

In total sixty-three of the 132 field days in the 2011-12 season had $50 \%$ or more female participation. Table 44 shows the average percentages of women farmers as percentage of all farmer participants in field days in Malawi. The lowest and highest percentages are also given to illustrate the wide range, from $11.7 \%$ to $75.5 \%$ (see Table 45). On three of the field days there was legume cooking as activity specifically targeted at women.

N2Africa
Involvement of women in at least 50\% of all farmer-related activities 19 May 2014

Table 44: Participation in field days, season 2011-12, Malawi ${ }^{3}$

|  | Farmers |  | Other participants |  | Total |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | $\%$ | Number | $\%$ | Number | $\%$ |
| Female | 7006 | 47.7 | 256 | 34.4 | 7262 | 47.1 |
| Male | 7668 | 52.3 | 488 | 65.6 | 8156 | 52.9 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 4 6 7 4}$ |  | $\mathbf{7 4 4}$ |  | $\mathbf{1 4 9 3 3}$ |  |

Table 45: Female farmers as percentage of all farmers participation, field days, Malawi, season 2011-12

|  | Average \% of participants <br> female farmers | Lowest <br> percentage | Highest <br> percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AISAM | 24.2 | 11.7 | 36.8 |
| Madisi EPA | 34.6 |  |  |
| Chinguluwe EPA | 35.0 | 21.8 | 60.5 |
| Makande EPA | 35.5 | 25.9 | 51.4 |
| Mngwangwa EPA | 39.5 | 28.8 | 56 |
| Tchesa ADP | 40.7 | 18 | 75.5 |
| Concern Universal | 47.1 | 22.9 | 67 |
| World Vision | 48.7 | 25 | 73.2 |
| Linthipe EPA | 53.1 | 31.6 | 77 |
| Catholic Relief Services | 53.8 | 24.1 | 81.3 |
| NASFAM | 55.8 | 39.5 | 67.5 |

For the season 2012-13, no M\&E data has been made available. There is one country report in which it is stated that N2Africa had been encouraging participation of women in its activities. In the district of Kasungu, N2Africa cooperated with Catholic Relief Services (CRS). CRS linked the N2Africa activities to local savings and loan schemes that had been set-up and that had over $50 \%$ women members.

While it is reported that the nutrition and legume crop processing activities would target mostly women farmers for better household nutrition and income generation, what is reported on other trainings shows a decrease in the percentage of participants being women (see Table 46).

[^4]
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Table 46: Attendance of N2Africa trainings, 2012-13, Malawi*

|  |  | Male | Female | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lead Farmers | No. | 377 | 215 | 592 |
| Extension Staff | $\%$ | $64 \%$ | $36 \%$ |  |
|  | No. | 67 | 14 | 81 |
| Total | $\%$ | $83 \%$ | $17 \%$ |  |
|  | No. | $\mathbf{4 4 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 7 3}$ |

[^5]
## 8 Mozambique

### 8.1 Introduction

From the N2Africa baseline conducted in Mozambique we have learned that over $80 \%$ of women are fulltime involvement in farming activities in the areas surveyed (Table 47).

Table 47: Involvement of women and men in farm activities in Mozambique (\% of household members)

|  | Full-time | Seasonal | Not at all |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 81.3 | 2.8 | 15.9 |
| Male | 64.4 | 2.6 | 32.8 |

Source: N2Africa baseline data.

### 8.2 Farmers Reached through Input Distribution

A total of 68 soyabean demonstrations were established across the Manica, Tete and Zambesia provinces during the 2010-11 growing season. The project reached a total 8687 farmers of which 1499 were females (17\%) (see Table 48).

Table 48: Male and female participation in dissemination trials, seasons 2010-11, Mozambique

| Province | District | Male |  | Female |  | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | No. | $\%$ | No. | $\%$ | No. |
| Manica | Sussundenga | 887 | 90.1 | 98 | 9.9 | 985 |
|  | Angonia | 1164 | 73.9 | 411 | 26.1 | 1575 |
| Tete | Macanga | 1115 | 80.6 | 269 | 19.4 | 1384 |
|  | Tsangano | 586 | 66.4 | 296 | 33.6 | 882 |
|  | Gurue | 3436 | 89 | 425 | 11 | 3861 |
|  |  | Total | $\mathbf{7 1 8 8}$ | $\mathbf{8 2 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 9 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 . 3}$ |

In the 2011-12 season, it is reported that IITA established 134 demonstrations on farmers' fields; $29 \%$ of these farmers were women. IKURU established 11 groundnut demonstrations on farmers' fields; 10 were female farmers. Technoserve established 93 soyabean demonstrations plots but the number of females with demonstration plots is not known. In addition, the project reached 7,455 soyabean farmers ( $28 \%$ females) and 1350 groundnut farmers ( 851 females $=$ equivalent to $63 \%$ ) during the $2011-12$ growing season through demonstration and dissemination activities across project communities (Source: 30-month report).

Also for the 2012-13 season, the data from Mozambique is not complete. It is reported that inputs were distributed to 516 farmers in Tete, we have no information on the gender of these farmers. Then there is separate information on other areas and partners (Mogovolas Manica Zambiazia Nampula, Muriaze Mogovolas Nametil and IKURU); inputs distributed to 184 farmers, $48.4 \%$ of them being women. Table 49 presents information on input distribution provided by CLUSA; for Tete the female participation is up to over $40 \%$, in the areas of Manica and Zambezia is much lower around 20\%.

Table 49: Input distribution, 2011-12, Mozambique

| Partner: | Other farmers |  |  | Lead Farmers |  |  | Grand total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Female | Male | Total | Female | Male | Total |  |
| CLUSA | 5 | 40 | 45 | 6 | 50 | 56 | 101 |
| IITA | 11 | 16 | 27 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 32 |
| IKURU | 10 |  | 10 | 1 |  | 1 | 11 |
| Grand Total Number \% | $\begin{gathered} 26 \\ 31.7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 56 \\ 68.3 \end{gathered}$ | 82 | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ 12.9 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 54 \\ 87.1 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 62 | 144 |

Table 50: Input distribution N2Africa partner organisation CLUSA, 2012-13, Mozambique*

| Province | Number |  |  | Percentage |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Total | \% male | \% female |
| Tete | 4855 | 3292 | 8147 | 59.6 | 40.4 |
| Manica | 1628 | 391 | 2019 | 80.6 | 19.4 |
| Zambezia | 6020 | 1535 | 7555 | 79.7 | 20.3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 2 5 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{5 2 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 7 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{7 0 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 9 . 4}$ |
| ${ }^{*}$ Baseryyyyyy |  |  |  |  |  |

* Based on data provided by CLUSA, not through N2Africa M\&E data collection tool.

The low percentage of women reached in the first season's trials and the trainings can perhaps be attributed to lack of awareness on the part of the partnering organizations of N2Africa's goal of at least 50\% female participation in all farmer-related activities. The partner organisations and N2Africa technicians were made aware and strongly encouraged to include as many women farmers as possible, for example by linking up with existing women's organizations.

### 8.3 Training

Tables Table 51 and Table 52 present some information on trainings in the 2010-11 season. The percentage of women participants in the N2Africa training is rather low, on average below $15 \%$. As to be expected, for the training-of-Trainers on home processing of legumes it is much higher, on average just below $80 \%$.
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Table 51: Male and female participation in N2Africa trainings conducted, season 2010-11, Mozambique*

| Date** | Location | Subject | Male |  |  | Female |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | No. | $\%$ | No. | $\%$ | No. |  |
| Nov. <br> 2010 | Gurue | Field preparation, variety selection, <br> weed control, seed treatment, demo <br> plots and production cost | 44 | 88 | 6 | 12 | 50 |
| Nov. <br> 2010 | Chimoio | Field preparation, variety selection, <br> weed control, seed treatment, demo <br> plots and production cost | 40 | 88.9 | 5 | 11.1 | 45 |
| Febr. <br> 2011 | Gurue | Crop protection, scouting, crop <br> management, harvesting and storage | 23 | 76.7 | $\mathbf{7}$ | 23.3 | 30 |
| Febr. <br> 2011 | Chimoio | Crop protection, scouting, crop <br> management, harvesting and storage | 21 | 84 | 4 | 16.0 | 25 |
|  |  | Total | $\mathbf{1 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{8 5 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 0}$ |

* Based on M\&E records.
** All trainings were two-day trainings.

Table 52: Participation in ToT on home processing, 2011-12, Mozambique*

|  | Number |  |  | Percentage |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Female | Male | Total | \% women | \% men |
| Gurue | 770 | 209 | 979 | 79 | 21 |
| Lioma | 209 | 123 | 332 | 63 | 37 |
| Ruace | 239 | 26 | 265 | 90 | 10 |
| Tete | 322 | 60 | 382 | 84 | 16 |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{1 5 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 5 8}$ | $\mathbf{7 9}$ |

* Information from 30-month country report.

There is another report that focuses on the nutrition trainings in July - August 2012; in total there were 99 trainings wit 1891 participants. On average almost $65 \%$ of the participants in these trainings were women, with a low of $33 \%$ and three trainings with only women.
There are M\&E records of trainings in the 2012-13 season. According to these records, there were 2304 participants, with an average of $44.8 \%$ of the participants being women (lowest at $7.1 \%$, highest at $67.7 \%$, see Appendix VII for more details). While information is given for trainings that were planned by N2Africa partner organisation Technoserve in Mozambique, no M\&E forms filled and no other information on women participation was provided.

### 8.4 Field Days

We have M\&E records of 7 field days in 2012: that in itself seems a number too low for a season and in addition, the seven records are rather incomplete. In total these field days were attended by 236 people (just over 70\% male and below 30\% female) (see Table 53).

Table 53: Field day attendance, March and April 2012, Mozambique

| Action site | Date | Number |  |  | Percentage |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Male | Female | Total | \% male | \% female |
| Nampula |  | 8 | 12 | 20 | 40 | 60 |
| Nampula | $16 / 4 / 2012$ | 17 | 4 | 21 | 81 | 19 |
| Nampula | $28 / 3 / 2012$ | 42 | 31 | 73 | 57.5 | 42.5 |
| Angonia | $6 / 3 / 2012$ | 18 | 7 | 25 | 72 | 28 |
| Angonia | $3 / 3 / 2012$ | 29 | 6 | 35 | 83 | 17 |
| Tsangano | $16 / 3 / 2012$ | 21 | 4 | 25 | 84 | 16 |
| Macanga | $13 / 3 / 2012$ | 31 | 6 | 37 | 84 | 16 |
|  | Grand total | $\mathbf{1 6 6}$ | $\mathbf{7 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 6}$ | $\mathbf{7 0 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 9 . 7}$ |

In conclusion, the M\&E records for Mozambique are incomplete, other information sources are not always clear on the period or season concerned and are at time inconsistent in the figures provided, it is therefore difficult to get a comprehensive understanding of women participation in farmer-related N2Africa activities in Mozambique. It does seem that overall women participation is not very high in N2Africa activities in Mozambique.

## 9 Zimbabwe

### 9.1 Introduction

The N2Africa baseline conducted in Zimbabwe, finds a slightly higher proportion of women full-time involved in farming activities as compared to men (see Table 54).

Table 54: Involvement of women and men in farm activities in Zimbabwe (\% of household members)

|  | Full-time | Seasonal | Not at all |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 64.4 | 26.2 | 9.4 |
| Male | 55.2 | 36.4 | 8.4 |

Source: N2Africa baseline data.

### 9.2 Reaching women in the first season

In the first season 2010-11 the full set of standardized M\&E tools was not yet deployed, but information was gathered from partner organizations as presented below. Although the participation of women was slightly below $50 \%$ at $44 \%$ in the training-of-trainers in Zimbabwe in the first season, the proportion of women benefitting from N2Africa interventions reaches beyond the target of $50 \%$ as just over half of the Lead Farmers are women and almost $65 \%$ of the other farmers are women (see Table 55 and Appendix VIII for details). In trainings and field days organised by partner organisations the female participation was respectively $57 \%$ and $62 \%$ (see Table 55).

Table 55: Participation by men and women in farmer-related activities, 2010-11, Zimbabwe

|  | Male | Female | Unknown | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Training-of-Trainers (Staff \& farmers) |  |  |  |  |
| Number | 139 | 101 |  | 240 |
| Percentage | $56 \%$ | $44 \%$ |  | $100 \%$ |
| Trainings |  |  | 255 | 6588 |
| Number | 2583 | 3750 | $3.9 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Percentage | $39.2 \%$ | $56.9 \%$ |  | 4161 |
| Field days (total 18 field days) |  |  | $100 \%$ |  |
| Number | 1571 | 2590 |  | 138 |
| Percentage | $37.8 \%$ | $62.2 \%$ |  | $100 \%$ |
| Lead Farmers | 67 | 71 |  |  |
| Number | $48.5 \%$ | $51.5 \%$ |  | 2215 |
| Percentage |  |  |  | $100 \%$ |
| Farmers | 787 | 1428 | $64.5 \%$ |  |
| Number | $35.5 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Percentage |  |  |  |  |

Additionally, in different districts a range of activities have been undertaken to engage women farmers. In Mhondoro, Makoni and Hwedza women farmers engage in peanut butter making for sale in town. Also in Hwedza there is a female farmer who was trained on processing of soya into different products in 2004 (processing of scones, coffee, soya milk and sausages from soya bean). Assisted by Agritex, she is cascading the trainings to other farmers in the area. Furthermore, in Hwedza, soya bean is being ground into flour and the flour is used for bread baking.
One of the NGO partners, CADS, is implementing a lot of activities with women who are in the N2Africa project, such as cooking demonstrations where women are trained to prepare meals using legume crops and then they can enter into cooking competitions. Women are also trained on how to process soya beans and groundnuts to produce milk, cakes and other food products. CADS has also organised and participated in several food fairs, where women showcase their different products processed from legume crops.

With ZAPAD-CLUSA each demo plot was led by a lead farmer who was deputised by two contact farmers; more than $60 \%$ of these posts were occupied by women. On average, in Guruve district, two thirds of the farmers at each demo plot were women.

### 9.3 Farmers Reached through Input Distribution

In the second season, 2011-12, the full set of M\&E tools has been implemented in Zimbabwe. The overall figure for the farmers reached is over 6,000 with a percentage of women quite close to the percentage reached in the season before, 2010-11; about 64.5\% in the 2010-11 season decreased to almost 62\% in 2011-12 season (see Table 56). However, the percentage of female Lead Farmers is up from $51.4 \%$ in the $2010-11$ season, to $53.4 \%$ in the 2011-12 season (see Table 58). With the more structured and elaborate data collection, we are able to analyse the involvement of women in the N2Africa project activities in more detail. If we just look at the percentage of women farmers receiving inputs, $62 \%$ in the 2011-12 season, this seems fulfilling the project objective of engagement of women in project activities with at least $50 \%$ of participants being women. However in other project activities, the participation of women is quite a bit lower - see for example the following chapter on training. Also the data allows for more detailed analyses and comparison between areas and D\&D partner organisations (see below).

Table 56: Summarised numbers of farmers reached in 2011-12, Zimbabwe

|  | Female | Male | (blank) | Grand Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | 3822 | 2383 | 4 | 6209 |
| $\%$ | 61.6 | 38.4 |  |  |

If we look at the gender division in the summarized figures per partner organisation, other than the high percentage with CADS and the rather low percentage achieved by LGDA it is clear that all partners achieve at least $50 \%$ women participation in input distribution (Table 57).

However, if we look at the figures in more detail (Table 58), per district and divided between all farmers and Lead Farmers, CADS has no longer the highest percentage of women receiving inputs, instead AGRITEX Makoni reaches more than $74 \%$ women. And AGRITEX Mudzi is even lower than LGDA in Guruve. For all districts, the percentage women amongst Lead Farmers is lower than for all farmers. This sparked vivid discussion at the partner meeting in Harare in June 2012; partners started to exchange their experiences and challenges in reaching out to women farmers.

Looking at the division of the four different legumes between male and female farmers there are no striking observations (data not presented).
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Table 57: Number of farmers who received inputs, per partner, 2011-12, Zimbabwe

| N2Africa <br> dissemination <br> partner | Female | Male | Total* | \% women | \% men |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AGRITEX | 1848 | 1158 | 3006 | 61.4 | 38.5 |
| CADS | 652 | 294 | 946 | 68.9 | 31.1 |
| CTDT | 838 | 434 | 1272 | 65.9 | 34.1 |
| LGDA | 484 | 497 | 981 | 49.3 | 50.7 |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{3 8 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 8 3}$ | $\mathbf{6 2 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 . 6}$ |

* Of 4 farmers the gender was not known, as these represent less than $0.1 \%$ of all N2Africa farmers, these 4 are left out of analyses.

Table 58: Farmers reached, gender, district, 2011-12 season, Zimbabwe

|  |  | Numbers of farmers |  |  | Percentage |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All farmers | Female | Male | Total $^{*}$ | \% women | \% men |  |
| CTDT | Chegutu | 390 | 200 | 590 | 66.1 | 33.9 |
| CTDT | Murehwa | 448 | 234 | 682 | 65.7 | 34.3 |
| CADS | Goromonzi | 652 | 294 | 946 | 68.9 | 31.1 |
| LGDA | Guruve | 484 | 497 | 981 | 49.3 | 50.7 |
| AGRITEX | Hwedza | 620 | 374 | 994 | 62.4 | 37.6 |
| AGRITEX | Makoni | 742 | 254 | 1000 | 74.2 | 25.4 |
| AGRITEX | Mudzi | 486 | 530 | 1016 | 47.8 | 52.2 |
|  | Total |  | $\mathbf{3 8 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 8 3}$ | $\mathbf{6 2 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 . 6}$ |
|  | Numbers of farmers |  | Percentage |  |  |  |
| Lead Farmers | Female | Male | Total | \% women | \% men |  |
| CTDT | Chegutu | 16 | 15 | 31 | 51.6 | 48.4 |
| CTDT | Murehwa | 21 | 14 | 35 | 60 | 40 |
| CADS | Goromonzi | 27 | 22 | 49 | 55.1 | 44.9 |
| LGDA | Guruve | 15 | 33 | 48 | 31.3 | 68.8 |
| AGRITEX | Hwedza | 22 | 27 | 49 | 44.9 | 55.1 |
| AGRITEX | Makoni | 32 | 18 | 50 | 64 | 36 |
| AGRITEX | Mudzi | 16 | 42 | 58 | 27.6 | 72.4 |
|  |  | Total | $\mathbf{1 4 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 1}$ | $\mathbf{3 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 6 . 6}$ |

* Of 4 farmers the gender was not known, as these represent less than $0.1 \%$ of all N2Africa farmers in the 2011-12 season, these 4 are left out of analyses.

For the 2012-13 season M\&E input distribution records were not complete; possibly due to time-pressure over 1600 farmers were left out of the database. The country team tracked the causes of the shortage in records and re-confirmed the total number of farmers reached in the 2012-13 season in Zimbabwe $(16,100)$, yet the analyses presented here are based on the M\&E records only.
Although the 2012-13 season was not the strongest in terms of reach women farmers overall, the percentage of Lead Farmers being women is quite good for that season at more than 52\%.
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Table 59: Gender disaggregated data on input distribution, season 2012-13, Zimbabwe

| Partner | Action site |  | Number |  |  | Percentage |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Women | Men | Total | Women | Men |
| CTDO | Chegutu | Other farmers | 1215 | 695 | 1910 | 63.6 | 36.4 |
|  |  | Lead Farmers | 58 | 47 | 105 | 55.2 | 44.8 |
| CADS | Goromonzi | Other farmers | 1345 | 565 | 1910 | 70.4 | 29.6 |
|  |  | Lead Farmers | 67 | 34 | 101 | 66.3 | 33.7 |
| LGDA | Guruve | Other farmers | 779 | 627 | 1406 | 55.4 | 44.6 |
|  |  | Lead Farmers | 32 | 42 | 74 | 43.2 | 56.8 |
| AGRITEX | Hwedza | Other farmers | 1302 | 789 | 2091 | 62.3 | 37.7 |
|  |  | Lead Farmers | 61 | 49 | 110 | 55.5 | 44.5 |
| AGRITEX | Makoni | Other farmers | 1588 | 599 | 2187 | 72.6 | 27.4 |
|  |  | Lead Farmers | 73 | 42 | 115 | 63.5 | 36.5 |
| LGDA | Mbire | Other farmers | 26 | 73 | 99 | 26.3 | 73.7 |
|  |  | Lead Farmers | 3 | 3 | 6 | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| AGRITEX | Mudzi | Other farmers | 1196 | 1024 | 2220 | 53.9 | 46.1 |
|  |  | Lead Farmers | 37 | 80 | 117 | 31.6 | 68.4 |
| CTDO | Murehwa | Other farmers | 1148 | 750 | 1898 | 60.5 | 39.5 |
|  |  | Lead Farmers | 50 | 49 | 99 | 50.5 | 49.5 |
| Grand Total |  | Other farmers | 8599 | 5122 | 13721 | 62.7 | 37.3 |
|  |  | Lead Farmers | 381 | 346 | 727 | 52.4 | 47.6 |
|  |  | All farmers | 8980 | 5468 | 14448 | 62.2 | 37.8 |

### 9.4 Training

From the records available for 2011-12, there was a total of 433 participants of trainings, $49 \%$ women on average. High=67\%, one training low at $12 \%$ in Mudzi, while the other training in Mudzi did have an attendance of $52 \%$ women.

In Zimbabwe, N2Africa collaborated with the IFAD funded project that organised and facilitated training on the following:

- Linking farmers to markets
- Collective marketing
- Farming as a Business

In some instances the N2Africa M\&E forms were used, but not consistently and therefore we are only reporting on the number of participants and their gender (see Table 60). Smaller numbers of people were targeted as these trainings were quite intensive. In principle, the same group of farmers was trained on the different subjects (Table 60). For the first training on 'Linking farmers to markets', the following percentages of participants were women: Goromonzi 57.5\%, Guruve 18.4\%, Hwedza 46\% and Mudzi 20\%.
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Table 60: Summary of 'Collective Marketing' and 'Farming as a Business' trainings, 2012, Zimbabwe (IFAD funded)

|  | Month | District | No. of farmers |  |  | No. of extension trained | Grand Total | \% farmers |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Female | Male | Total |  |  | Female | Male |
|  | April | Hwedza | 34 | 29 | 63 | 6 | 69 | 54 | 46 |
|  | May | Guruve | 7 | 31 | 38 | 3 | 41 | 18 | 82 |
|  | May | Mudzi | 8 | 32 | 40 | 5 | 45 | 20 | 80 |
|  | May | Goromonzi | 23 | 17 | 40 | 3 | 43 | 58 | 43 |
| $\sigma$ | August | Hwedza | 33 | 46 | 79 | 6 | 85 | 42 | 58 |
|  | September | Guruve | 45 | 39 | 84 | 3 | 87 | 54 | 46 |
| En | September | Mudzi | 32 | 44 | 76 | 6 | 82 | 42 | 58 |
| セّ | October | Goromonzi | 47 | 31 | 78 | 4 | 82 | 60 | 40 |

The Zimbabwean NGO CADS integrated value addition training and marketing with other activities, according to CADS to enable beneficiaries to prepare nutritious and balanced meals that are a prerequisite for good health and engage farmers in marketing activities. In the 2011-12 season, a total of 1090 participants attended the trainings on food processing and preparation of the different legume crops ( 467 men (almost $43 \%$ ) and 623 women (just over $57 \%$ )). Subsequently, farmers showcased processed products from the crops they had grown at the ward field days held in March 2012. Also a district food and products fair was held in Goromonzi on 25 June 2012 to promote information dissemination sharing of experiences. Farmers formed commodity associations for marketing their products.

In September 2012, N2Africa organized several trainings for agro-dealers; at least one training in each of the districts where N2Africa is being implemented, targeting agro-dealers in the proximity of specific Wards in the districts, those interested in improved legume cultivation and capable of taking-up the promotion of the fertilizers, improved seeds and inoculants. Some of the AGRITEX extension workers also participated in the trainings. In total there were 133 participants; of these 38 were women (almost $29 \%$ ) and 95 were men (over 71\%).

Training for farmers in the season 2012-13 is summarized in Table 61 - this excludes data on agro-dealer training. These trainings were targeting Lead Farmers, more trainings were one days, about a quarter of the trainings was two days. In the table the 27 trainings are summarized per district, i.e. Action Site; while difference can be noted between districts, the actual lowest female participation is at $16 \%$, while the highest is almost $80 \%$.
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Table 61: Summarized participation in Lead Farmer trainings, season 2012-13, Zimbabwe

| Action site* | Number |  |  | Percentage |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Total | Male \% | Female \% |
| Chegutu | 54 | 128 | 182 | 29.7 | 70.3 |
| Goromonzi | 93 | 151 | 244 | 38.1 | 61.9 |
| Guruve | 193 | 188 | 381 | 50.7 | 49.3 |
| Hwedza | 54 | 56 | 110 | 49.1 | 50.9 |
| Makoni | 40 | 62 | 102 | 39.2 | 60.8 |
| Mbire | 11 | 6 | 17 | 64.7 | 35.3 |
| Mudzi | 60 | 43 | 103 | 58.3 | 41.7 |
|  | Total $^{* *}$ | $\mathbf{5 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{6 3 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 3 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 4 . 3}$ |

* These are records of 27 trainings, summarized per Action Site.
** These trainings could be done more than once per season and therefore target the same Lead Farmers - the total number could include double counting.


### 9.5 Field Days

In total, we have records of 17 field days that were organized in the 2011-12 season and the total number of people who attended these field days was 3,546 ( $58 \%$ of the attendees were women, see also Table 62 and Appendix IX for more details). In the 2012-13 season the women participation at field days was close to $64 \%$ (see Table 63).

Table 62: N2Africa field days and attendance, season 2011-12, Zimbabwe*

| Action <br> site | Main <br> organizer <br> field day | No. of <br> field <br> days |  | No. of participants |  |  | Percentage |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |  |  |  |
| Goromonzi | CADS | 3 | 288 | 354 | 642 | 44.9 | 55.1 |  |
| Guruve | LGDA | 6 | 391 | 473 | 864 | 45.3 | 54.7 |  |
| Hwedza | AGRITEX | 3 | 193 | 319 | 512 | 37.7 | 62.3 |  |
| Makoni | AGRITEX | 3 | 289 | 525 | 814 | 35.5 | 64.5 |  |
| Mudzi | AGRITEX | 2 | 206 | 157 | 363 | 56.7 | 43.3 |  |
| Murewa | CTDT | 2 | 122 | 221 | 343 | 35.6 | 64.4 |  |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 8 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 5 3 8}$ | $\mathbf{4 2 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{5 7 . 9}$ |  |

* All these field days were held in March 2012
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Table 63: Field day attendance, 2012-13, Zimbabwe

| Partner <br> Organisation | District | No. of <br> field <br> days |  | Number |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Male | Female | Total | Percentage <br> male | \% <br> female |  |
| LGDA | Guruve | 6 | 246 | 274 | 520 | 47 | 53 |
|  | Mbire | 3 | 162 | 136 | 298 | 54 | 46 |
| CTDO | Chegutu | 3 | 98 | 203 | 301 | 33 | 67 |
| Agritex | Murehwa | 5 | 255 | 527 | 782 | 33 | 67 |
| Agritex | Makoni | 3 | 144 | 218 | 362 | 40 | 60 |
| Agritex | Hwedza | 3 | 160 | 220 | 380 | 42 | 58 |
| CADS | Mudzi | 3 | 99 | 201 | 300 | 33 | 67 |
|  | Goromonzi | 11 | 1295 | 2555 | 3850 | 34 | 66 |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{3 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 5 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 3 3 4}$ | $\mathbf{6 7 9 3}$ | $\mathbf{3 6 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{6 3 . 8}$ |

## Exchange visits

As part of the collaboration between N2Africa and the IFAD-funded project, exchange visits for farmers in Hwedza and Makoni districts were arranged. The purpose of the exchange visits was to accord farmers from the two districts an opportunity to learn and share their experiences about the legume production and marketing in their respective districts. For the exchange visits, we targeted the main ward field day in each of the two districts. The farmers who participated in the exchange visits were selected by their resident agricultural extension officers.
The first exchange visit was held on the $13^{\text {th }}$ of March 2012 in Chigondo ward (ward 8) in Hwedza district. On this day, 10 lead farmers ( 6 males and 4 females) and three AGRITEX officers ( 2 females and 1 male) from Makoni district attended the field day in Chigondo ward.

The second exchange visit was held in Makoni district on 28 March, where 12 ( 6 males and 6 females) farmers and four AGRITEX officers (3 males and 1 female) from Hwedza district attended a field day in Makoni District. Afterwards, the farmers said they had learnt a lot from the field day since they saw that the farmers in Makoni were more organised and the design of the N2Africa plot was up to standard.

The farmers from the two districts had an opportunity to share experiences in legume production and they learnt farmers from each district grew their crops and marketed their crops and the opportunities that existed for farmers to increase legume production.

## Dry shows

In addition to field days during the growing season, it is common for AGRITEX and other dissemination partners to organise what is called 'dry shows'; field days taking place in the dry season focusing on harvested produce.
Farmers showcase their produce among themselves; products are displayed by the farmers who are exhibitors and they invite judges who come and judge different crop produce based on the size, colour, varietal purity and other grain qualities. During the shows the farmers advertise the products that they have for sale to invited guests. As such, Dry Shows are viewed as a platform where farmers bring their harvested produce for other farmers to see.

Different varieties of crops are displayed and farmers will be taught about marketing opportunities, what buyers look for, storage of their harvest, and possibly some valueaddition. Farmers can also share information on how to process their products for value addition and also how to look for markets that give them high yield. Dry shows are usually
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organised at ward level, provincial and nationally where they are incorporated into an annual agricultural show.

Often the best farmers are awarded with some prices. Table 64 presents Dry Shows and their attendance, this is under-reported as not all partners used the Field Day form for providing information on their Dry Shows.

Table 64: Dry shows and attendance, 2011-12 season, Zimbabwe

| Date <br> 2012 | District | Nard | No. of participants | Percentage |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Male | Female | Total | men | women |
| 3 July | Goromonzi |  | 64 | 121 | 185 | 34.6 | 65.4 |
| 5 July | Goromonzi | 10 | 58 | 109 | 167 | 34.7 | 65.3 |
| 10 July | Goromonzi | 5 | 69 | 134 | 203 | 34.0 | 66.0 |
| 12 July | Goromonzi | 18 | 72 | 127 | 199 | 36.2 | 63.8 |
| 17 July | Goromonzi | 12 | 61 | 112 | 173 | 35.3 | 64.7 |
| 19 July | Goromonzi | 11 | 70 | 98 | 168 | 41.7 | 58.3 |
| 06 July | Hwedza | 9 | 60 | 222 | 282 | 21.3 | 78.7 |
| 20 July | Hwedza | 8 | 87 | 293 | 380 | 22.9 | 77.1 |
| 13 Sept. | Chegutu | 10 | 96 | 204 | 300 | 32.0 | 68.0 |
| 06 July | Chegutu | 27 | 73 | 180 | 253 | 28.9 | 71.1 |
| 19 Sept. | Chegutu, district show | 152 | 207 | 359 | 42.3 | 57.7 |  |
|  |  | Total | $\mathbf{8 6 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 6 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 2 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{6 7 . 7}$ |

Overall the female participation in farmer-related activities in Zimbabwe has been quite good; the percentages of all farmers receiving inputs has been above $60 \%$ at $64.5 \%$ in 2010-11, $61.6 \%$ in 2011-12 and $62.2 \%$ in the 2012-13 season. It is also noteworthy that the percentage of women Lead Farmers in the final season has been over $50 \%$.

Table 65: Number and percentages of female and male farmers reached in three subsequent seasons, Zimbabwe

|  | 2010-11 |  | 2011-12* |  | 2012-13 |  | Total |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. | \% | No. | \% | No. | \% | No. | \% |
|  | 1428 | 64.5 | 3822 | 61.6 | 8980 | 62.2 | 14230 | 62.2 |
| Female | 787 | 35.5 | 2383 | 38.4 | 5468 | 37.8 | 8638 | 37.8 |
| Male | Grand Total | $\mathbf{2 2 1 5}$ |  | $\mathbf{6 2 0 5}$ |  | $\mathbf{1 4 4 4 8}^{* *}$ |  | $\mathbf{2 2 8 6 8}$ |

${ }^{*} M \& E$ input distribution data has a limited number of records for which the gender is not known.
** This is the total number of farmers on record with detailed information, there were an additional 1652 farmers reached in this season in Zimbabwe.

## 10 Conclusion

In general, the N2Africa project has achieved the objective of reaching women by having 50\% of participants in farmer-related activities being women - including input distribution. Overall, female participation was largest at field days, followed by input distribution. For training it proved most difficult to ensure at least $50 \%$ female participation. This has to do with the fact that, even if inputs were distributed to many women, fewer women farmers were Lead Farmers or Master Farmers, and many trainings were targeted at Lead Farmers. It has not been investigated what the precise reasons in the different country contexts are for the lower percentages of female Lead Farmers as compared to the percentages of other farmers receiving inputs. While in a more detailed study on Lead Farmers in Zimbabwe, it became clear that other farmers are generally more content with female Lead Farmers as compared to male Lead Farmers, the reasons for the lower percentages of female Lead Farmers were not detailed. It is common practice for men to take up positions associated with leadership or any sort of public status. Possibly people thought there might be some more benefits for Lead Farmers and therefore men were eager to take up these roles.

Therefore it would be worthwhile to gain an understanding of the performance of female Lead Farmers also in comparison with their male counterparts and to understand why it fewer women were recruited as Lead Farmers as compared to male Lead Farmers.
One of the best ways to convince women of the benefits of cultivating legumes and teaching them the best possible practices is through example and participation. As the second phase of N2Africa moves towards more empowerment of women rather than mere participation of women in project activities, such an understanding will be essential.

For trainings it is often more difficult for women to attend in case a training lasts more than one day or if because of for example distance it requires the woman to be away from home for one or more nights.
The current report shows the great diversity in female participation among countries and within countries. Ghana and Mozambique have not achieved the targeted $50 \%$ women participation. We have not gained much insight into the reasons why this has been the case in both countries. Also in most areas in Nigeria, womens' participation was low, yet it proved to be much higher than expected given the baseline and our understanding of the cultural environment. Rwanda and DR Congo have done very well in women's participation. While the N2Africa teams in these countries have undoubtedly played an important role in this, it might also be because in both countries agriculture is more feminized after violent conflicts. In DR Congo, one of the partner organisation was a NGO targeting only women. While the other partner organisations in DR Congo also did well in terms of achieving women, the womenfocused NGO contributed greatly to the overall high percentages of women participation in DR Congo. Working through women's support groups or NGOs specifically targeting women is an effective way to achieve better women participation. Women's participation in Kenya seems to have been around or above $50 \%$ but the M\&E records from Kenya have been somewhat limited. Malawi and Zimbabwe have both done well in including women in farmerrelated activities.

Within countries the differences between regions and partner organisations are noteworthy. This should have generated discussion and learning within countries, among organisations and people involved. As with other learning with N2Africa this might have taken place, but has not been recorded centrally. There is only one review and planning meeting on record in Zimbabwe where discussions took place and people exchange experiences after the incountry diversity of female participation was presented to them.

It is important to design activities for women, for example related to household nutrition, processing, labour saving techniques, etc. At the same time to achieve empowerment of women, there is need to go beyond such specific activities and be conscious in targeting legumes. To empower women, opportunities could be created to make more commercially interesting legumes appealing to women. Sometimes legumes with more commercial value were proportionally distributed more to male farmers than to female farmers. If empowerment
of women is an objective, it would be worthwhile to distribute more commercial legumes to women and focus efforts on assisting women to commercialize their legume cultivation, gain access to markets, financial services, etc.
In quite a few cases, there were discrepancies between the M\&E records and partner reports or more general country reporting. This highlights the necessity for rigorous M\&E data collection to be able to provide reliable information on the performance of the project. Clarifying such discrepancies takes a lot of unnecessary time and effort.
Having established that N2Africa largely achieved its targets for reaching women it is essential to improve our understanding of the mechanisms behind the involvement of women and the consequences in order to better target project activities to achieve empowerment of women.

## Appendix I: Overview of inputs distributed to male and female farmers, Ghana, 20114

| Region | District | Partner | Village/Operational area | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Male } \\ & \text { (no.) } \end{aligned}$ | Female (no.) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Blank } \\ \text { (no.) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Total (no.) | Male (\%) | Female <br> (\%) | Blank (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Northern Region | Chereponi | ACDEP | Achuma | 159 | 143 | 2 | 304 | 52.3 | 47.0 | 0.7 |
| Northern Region | Chereponi | ACDEP | Adonyamanu | 81 | 62 | 0 | 143 | 56.6 | 43.4 | 0.0 |
| Northern Region | Chereponi | ACDEP | Adari | 68 | 140 | 0 | 208 | 32.7 | 67.3 | 0.0 |
| Northern Region | Chereponi | ACDEP | Jakpa | 45 | 29 | 1 | 75 | 60.0 | 38.7 | 1.3 |
|  |  |  | Chereponi Total | 353 | 374 | 3 | 730 | 48.4 | 51.2 | 0.4 |
| Upper East | Kassena-Nankana East | MoFA | Doba Kandinga Junction | 114 | 111 | 0 | 225 | 50.7 | 49.3 | 0.0 |
| Upper East | Kassena-Nankana East | MoFA | Kupela (in Manyoro) | 54 | 9 | 0 | 63 | 85.7 | 14.3 | 0.0 |
| Upper East | Kassena-Nankana East | MoFA | Pungu North | 54 | 26 | 0 | 80 | 67.5 | 32.5 | 0.0 |
| Upper East | Kassena-Nankana East | MoFA | Punyoro | 149 | 57 | 0 | 206 | 72.3 | 27.7 | 0.0 |
| Upper East | Kassena-Nankana East | MoFA | Naaga | 32 | 38 | 0 | 70 | 45.7 | 54.3 | 0.0 |
|  |  |  | Kassena-Nankana East Total | 403 | 241 | 0 | 644 | 62.6 | 37.4 | 0.0 |
| Upper East | Bawku West District | MoFA | Apotdabogo, Zongoyiri | 255 | 65 | 3 | 323 | 78.9 | 20.1 | 0.9 |
| Upper East | Bawku West District | MoFA | Kobore | 153 | 117 | 0 | 270 | 56.7 | 43.3 | 0.0 |
| Upper East | Bawku West District | MoFA | Sapelliga | 128 | 114 | 0 | 242 | 52.9 | 47.1 | 0.0 |
| Upper East | Bawku West District | MoFA | Tanga | 102 | 144 | 0 | 246 | 41.5 | 58.5 | 0.0 |
| Upper East | Bawku West District | MoFA | Tilli / Azupupang | 152 | 96 | 0 | 248 | 61.3 | 38.7 | 0.0 |
|  |  |  | Bawku West District Total | 790 | 536 | 3 | 1329 | 59.4 | 40.3 | 0.2 |

[^6]| Upper West | Nadowli | MoFA | Nadowli Serekpere-Goli | 7 | 4 | 0 | 11 | 63.6 | 36.4 | 0.0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Upper West | Nadowli | MoFA | Serekpere | 17 | 22 | 0 | 39 | 43.6 | 56.4 | 0.0 |
| Upper West | Nadowli | MoFA | Goriyiri | 7 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 77.8 | 22.2 | 0.0 |
|  |  |  | Nadowli Total | 31 | 28 | 0 | 59 | 52.5 | 47.5 | 0.0 |
| Upper West | Wa East | MoFA | Loggu | 224 | 64 | 0 | 288 | 77.8 | 22.2 | 0.0 |
| Upper West | Wa East | MoFA | Kpalworgu | 68 | 42 | 0 | 110 | 61.8 | 38.2 | 0.0 |
| Upper West | Wa East | MoFA | Kpalinye | 177 | 122 | 2 | 301 | 58.8 | 40.5 | 0.7 |
|  |  |  | Wa East Total | 469 | 228 | 2 | 699 | 67.1 | 32.6 | 0.3 |
|  |  |  | Total | 2046 | 1407 | 8 | 3461 | 59.1 | 40.7 | 0.2 |

## Appendix II: Participation of men and women in field days, Nov.-Dec. 2012, Ghana

| No. | Action Site | Organizer(s) | Number |  | Percentage |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  | Men | Women | Men | Women |
| 1 | Bawku West | CSIR-SARI/MOFA | 23 | 6 | 79.3 | 20.7 |
| 2 | Nadowli | MoFA | 41 | 18 | 69.5 | 30.5 |
| 3 | Nadowli | MoFA | 46 | 23 | 66.7 | 33.3 |
| 4 | Nadowli | MoFA | 45 | 23 | 66.2 | 33.8 |
| 5 | Nadowli | MoFA | 40 | 21 | 65.6 | 34.4 |
| 6 | Bawku West | CSIR-SARI/MOFA | 98 | 61 | 61.6 | 38.4 |
| 7 | Nadowli | MoFA | 12 | 8 | 60.0 | 40.0 |
| 8 | Bawku West | CSIR-SARI/MOFA | 38 | 28 | 57.6 | 42.4 |
| 9 | Nadowli | MoFA | 82 | 61 | 57.3 | 42.7 |
| 10 | Nadowli | MoFA | 21 | 17 | 55.3 | 44.7 |
| 11 | Bawku West | CSIR-SARI/MOFA | 17 | 14 | 54.8 | 45.2 |
| 12 | Bawku West | CSIR-SARI/MOFA | 31 | 26 | 54.4 | 45.6 |
| 13 | Nadowli | MoFA | 36 | 31 | 53.7 | 46.3 |
| 14 | Bawku West | CSIR-SARI/MOFA | 24 | 21 | 53.3 | 46.7 |
| 15 | Kassena-Nankana Municipal | MoFA-N2Africa | 33 | 29 | 53.2 | 46.8 |
| 16 | Bawku West | CSIR-SARI/MOFA | 22 | 22 | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| 17 | Kassena-Nankana East | MoFA | 31 | 32 | 49.2 | 50.8 |
| 18 | Bawku West | CSIR-SARI/MOFA | 23 | 26 | 46.9 | 53.1 |
| 19 | Bawku West | CSIR-SARI/MOFA | 21 | 24 | 46.7 | 53.3 |
| 20 | Kassena Nankana Municipal | MoFA | 25 | 30 | 45.5 | 54.5 |
| 21 | Kassena-Nankana East | SARI/MoFA | 26 | 32 | 44.8 | 55.2 |
| 22 | Bawku West | CSIR-SARI/MOFA | 24 | 30 | 44.4 | 55.6 |
| 23 | Bawku West | CSIR-SARI/MOFA | 25 | 32 | 43.9 | 56.1 |
| 24 | Bawku West | CSIR-SARI/MOFA | 17 | 23 | 42.5 | 57.5 |
| 25 | Kassena Nankana Municipal | SARI/MoFA | 25 | 34 | 42.4 | 57.6 |
| 26 | $?$ | MoFA | 20 | 29 | 40.8 | 59.2 |
| 27 | Nadowli | MoFA | 17 | 28 | 37.8 | 62.2 |
| 28 | Bawku West | CSIR-SARI/MOFA | 16 | 28 | 36.4 | 63.6 |
| 29 | Bawku West | CSIR-SARI/MOFA | 15 | 29 | 34.1 | 65.9 |
| 30 | Bundunia | MoFA | 18 | 35 | 34.0 | 66.0 |
| 31 | Kodema | SARI/MoFA | 20 | 39 | 33.9 | 66.1 |
| 32 | Kassena-Nankana East | MoFA | 15 | 30 | 33.3 | 66.7 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Appendix III: Detailed information Field day participation, 2011, Nigeria

| Action site | Farmers |  | Government extension staff |  | Govern ment officials <br> All male | NGO staff |  | Private sector <br> All male | Other <br> All male | Total numbers |  |  | Total \% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female |  | Male | Female |  |  | Male | Female | Grand total | \% male | \% female |
| Albasu LGA | 23 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 40 | 0 | 40 | 100 | 0 |
| Gaya | 60 | 11 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 72 | 11 | 83 | 86.7 | 13.3 |
| Bichi | 46 | 9 | 14 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 34 | 104 | 9 | 113 | 92.0 | 8.0 |
| Garko | 87 | 45 | 8 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 23 | 128 | 46 | 174 | 73.6 | 26.4 |
| Tudun Wada | 54 | 5 | 14 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 86 | 5 | 91 | 94.5 | 5.5 |
| Wudil | 53 | 17 | 13 | 0 | 14 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 65 | 150 | 17 | 167 | 89.8 | 10.2 |
| Giwa LGA | 35 | 4 | 9 | 1 | 7* |  |  | 0 | 0 | 51 | 5 | 56 | 91.1 | 8.9 |
| Igabi LGA | 70 | 26 | 4 | 0 | 2 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 76 | 26 | 102 | 74.5 | 25.5 |
| Zangon Kataf LGA | 32 | 20 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 59 | 22 | 81 | 72.8 | 27.2 |
| Kachia | 19 | 19 | 4 | 1 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 23 | 20 | 43 | 53.5 | 46.5 |
| Soba | 27 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 53 | 8 | 61 | 86.9 | 13.1 |
| Total: | 506 | 164 | 86 | 4 | 48 | 21 | 1 | 11 | 170 | 842 | 169 | 1011 | 83.3 | 16.7 |

* One female government official included in this number.


## Appendix IV: Detailed information from DRC

Table 66: Number of Master Farmers trained, 2010-2011, DRC

| Partner | Site | Male |  | Female |  | Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | No. | \% | No. | \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PAD | Mulamba | 22 | 45.8 | 26 | 54.2 | 48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Walungu | 30 | 62.5 | 18 | 37.5 | 48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Birava | 33 | 68.8 | 15 | 31.3 | 48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Murhesa | 20 | 41.7 | 28 | 58.3 | 48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Kalehe | 24 | 50 | 24 | 50 | 48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SARCAF | Mumosho | 0 | 0 | 15 | 100 | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Ikoma | 0 | 0 | 16 | 100 | 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Bwirembe | 1 | 8.3 | 11 | 91.7 | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Cagombe | 0 | 0 | 14 | 100 | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DIOBASS | Bugorhe | 55 | 64.7 | 30 | 35.3 | 85 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Nyangezi | 12 | 40.0 | 18 | 60 | 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Mushinga | 50 | 55.6 | 40 | 44.4 | 90 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Burhinyi | 41 | 53.2 | 36 | 46.8 | 77 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{2 8 8}$ | $\mathbf{4 9 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 9 1}$ | $\mathbf{5 0 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{5 7 9}$ |

Table 67: Female and male participation in exchange visits in DRC (up to May 2011)

| Partner | Participating sites | No. of exchange visits | Men |  | Women |  | Total <br> No. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | No. | \% | No. | \% |  |
| DIOBASS | Bugorhe Burhinyi | 2 | 59 | 45.4 | 71 | 54.6 | 130 |
|  | Burhinyi Mushinga | 1 | 15 | 68.2 | 7 | 31.8 | 22 |
|  | Bugorhe Nyangezi | 1 | 20 | 62.5 | 12 | 37.5 | 32 |
|  | Total | 4 | 94 | 51.1 | 90 | 48.9 | 184 |
| PAD | Mulamba - Birava <br> - Kalehe | 2 | 60 | 33.3 | 120 | 66.7 | 180 |
|  | Murhesa -Birava <br> - Kalehe | 1 | 57 | 44.9 | 70 | 55.1 | 127 |
|  | Total | 3 | 117 | 38.1 | 190 | 61.9 | 307 |
| SARCAF | Interpartenaires | 1 | 24 | 36.9 | 41 | 63.1 | 65 |
|  | Ikoma -Mumosho -Bwirembe | 2 | 6 | 10.3 | 52 | 89.7 | 58 |
|  | Ikoma - Mumosho | 1 | 5 | 11.9 | 37 | 88.1 | 42 |
|  | Total | 4 | 35 | 21.2 | 130 | 78.8 | 165 |
|  | Total | 11 | 246 | 37.5 | 410 | 62.5 | 656 |
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Table 68: Female and male participation in field days organized by partners, 2010-11, DRC

| Partner | No. of field <br> days | Participation |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Men | Nomber | Total | Men | Women |  |
| DIOBASS | 1 | 42 | 37 | 79 | 53.2 | 46.8 |
| PAD | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| SARCAF | 1 | 25 | 132 | 157 | 15.9 | 84.1 |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{6 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{7 1 . 6}$ |

Appendix V: N2Africa input distribution, gender disaggregated, 2013A, DR Congo

| Partner | Action site | Numbers |  |  |  | Percentage |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Women | Men | Unknown | Total | Women | Men | Unknown |
| DIOBASS | Nyangezi | 132 | 210 | 8 | 350 | 37.7 | 60.0 | 2.3 |
| PAD | Birava | 144 | 230 | 2 | 376 | 38.3 | 61.2 | 0.5 |
| DIOBASS | Bugorhe | 240 | 294 | 6 | 540 | 44.4 | 54.4 | 1.1 |
| PAD | Kalehe | 123 | 147 | 1 | 271 | 45.4 | 54.2 | 0.4 |
| PAD | Walungu | 157 | 184 |  | 341 | 46.0 | 54.0 | 0.0 |
| PAD | Murhesa | 135 | 135 | 2 | 272 | 49.6 | 49.6 | 0.7 |
| DIOBASS | Mushinga | 262 | 139 | 1 | 402 | 65.2 | 34.6 | 0.2 |
| DIOBASS | Burhinyi | 142 | 65 | 1 | 208 | 68.3 | 31.3 | 0.5 |
| PAD | Mulamba | 235 | 101 | 5 | 341 | 68.9 | 29.6 | 1.5 |
| SARCAF | Cagombe | 208 | 89 | 3 | 300 | 69.3 | 29.7 | 1.0 |
| SARCAF | Ikoma | 289 | 110 | 1 | 400 | 72.3 | 27.5 | 0.3 |
| SARCAF | Bwirembe | 196 | 46 | 1 | 243 | 80.7 | 18.9 | 0.4 |
| SARCAF | Mumosho | 122 | 28 |  | 150 | 81.3 | 18.7 | 0.0 |
| SARCAF | Miti | 102 | 21 | 1 | 124 | 82.3 | 16.9 | 0.8 |
| SARCAF | Kamisimbi | 278 | 22 |  | 300 | 92.7 | 7.3 | 0.0 |
|  | Total | 2765 | 1821 | 32 | 4618 | 59.9 | 39.4 | 0.7 |

## Appendix VI: Attendance Field Days, Kenya, season 2012A

|  | Farmers |  |  |  |  | Others (Government extension staff, other government officials, NGO staff, Private sector, Others) |  |  |  |  | All participants |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Numbers |  |  | Percentage |  | Numbers |  |  | Percentage |  | Numbers |  |  | Percentage |  |
| Farmers' Group/ Association | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Male | Female | Grand Total | Male | Female |
| Central Node |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| KENFAP | 50 | 44 | 94 | 53.2 | 46.8 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 50 | 50 | 55 | 49 | 104 | 52.9 | 47.1 |
| SCC-VI Agroforestry | 41 | 59 | 100 | 41 | 59 | 15 | 6 | 21 | 71.4 | 28.6 | 56 | 65 | 121 | 46.3 | 53.7 |
| Avene | 23 | 27 | 50 | 46 | 54 | 5 | 3 | 8 | 62.5 | 37.5 | 28 | 30 | 58 | 48.3 | 51.7 |
| MFAGRO | 54 | 42 | 96 | 56.3 | 43.8 | 11 | 6 | 17 | 64.7 | 35.3 | 65 | 48 | 113 | 57.5 | 42.5 |
| RPK | 39 | 46 | 85 | 45.9 | 54.1 | 18 | 6 | 24 | 75 | 25 | 57 | 52 | 109 | 52.3 | 47.7 |
| Mutaho F | 34 | 27 | 61 | 55.7 | 44.3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 100 | 34 | 28 | 62 | 54.8 | 45.2 |
| Maseno Univ. Outreach | 17 | 12 | 29 | 58.6 | 41.4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 100 | 0 | 18 | 12 | 30 | 60.0 | 40.0 |
| Hagonglo | 75 | 68 | 143 | 52.4 | 47.6 | 3 | 8 | 11 | 27.3 | 72.7 | 78 | 76 | 154 | 50.6 | 49.4 |
| SB Cluster |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BUSCO | 44 | 70 | 114 | 38.6 | 61.4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 44 | 70 | 114 | 38.6 | 61.4 |
| MUDIFESO | 174 | 92 | 266 | 65.4 | 34.6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 174 | 92 | 266 | 65.4 | 34.6 |
| KHG | 40 | 40 | 80 | 50 | 50 | 10 | 8 | 18 | 55.6 | 44.4 | 50 | 48 | 98 | 51.0 | 49.0 |
| Northern Node |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CABE | 39 | 82 | 121 | 32.2 | 67.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 39 | 82 | 121 | 32.2 | 67.8 |
| OWDF | 13 | 21 | 34 | 38.2 | 61.8 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 100 | 0 | 18 | 21 | 39 | 46.2 | 53.8 |
| BUFFSAN | 52 | 86 | 138 | 37.7 | 62.3 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 100 | 0 | 59 | 86 | 145 | 40.7 | 59.3 |
| BUSSFFO | 25 | 9 | 34 | 73.5 | 26.5 | 15 | 14 | 29 | 51.7 | 48.3 | 40 | 23 | 63 | 63.5 | 36.5 |
| Kesofa Bungoma North | 60 | 36 | 96 | 62.5 | 37.5 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 100 | 0 | 62 | 36 | 98 | 63.3 | 36.7 |


|  |  | Farmers |  |  |  |  | Others (Government extension staff, other government officials, NGO staff, Private sector, Others) |  |  |  |  | All participants |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| UCRC |  | 31 | 65 | 96 | 32.3 | 67.7 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 60 | 40 | 34 | 67 | 101 | 33.7 | 66.3 |
| SCODP |  | 27 | 31 | 58 | 46.6 | 53.4 | 8 | 3 | 11 | 72.7 | 27.3 | 35 | 34 | 69 | 50.7 | 49.3 |
| MDG |  | 20 | 60 | 80 | 25 | 75 | 12 | 2 | 14 | 85.7 | 14.3 | 32 | 62 | 94 | 34.0 | 66.0 |
| ARDAP |  | 94 | 118 | 212 | 44.3 | 55.7 | 13 | 8 | 21 | 61.9 | 38.1 | 107 | 126 | 233 | 45.9 | 54.1 |
| Atapara |  | 51 | 45 | 96 | 53.1 | 46.9 | 7 | 3 | 10 | 70 | 30 | 58 | 48 | 106 | 54.7 | 45.3 |
| Southern Node |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NDACODOR |  | 54 | 25 | 79 | 68.4 | 31.6 | 7 | 2 | 9 | 77.8 | 22.2 | 61 | 27 | 88 | 69.3 | 30.7 |
| KESOFA |  | 14 | 21 | 35 | 40 | 60 | 8 | 14 | 22 | 36.4 | 63.6 | 22 | 35 | 57 | 38.6 | 61.4 |
|  | Totals | 1071 | 1126 | 2197 | 48.7 | 51.3 | 155 | 91 | 246 | 63.0 | 37.0 | 1226 | 1217 | 2443 | 50.2 | 49.8 |

## Appendix VII: Detailed information Training 2012-13 season, Mozambique

| No. | Action site | Date of training | Duration (in days) | Target Group | Female | Male | Total | \% female | \% male |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Zambezia | 1/11/2012 | 2 | Farmers | 65 | 75 | 140 | 46.4 | 53.6 |
| 2 | Zambezia | 17/12/2012 | 1 | Farmers | 35 | 58 | 93 | 37.6 | 62.4 |
| 3 | Zambezia | 18/12/2012 | 1 | Farmers | 10 | 19 | 29 | 34.5 | 65.5 |
| 4 | Angonia | 19/12/2012 | 2 | Smallholder farmers | 21 | 10 | 31 | 67.7 | 32.3 |
| 5 | Sussundenga | 21/12/2012 | 1 | Smallholder farmers | 83 | 97 | 180 | 46.1 | 53.9 |
| 6 | Gondola | 22/12/2012 | 2 | Smallholder farmers | 33 | 39 | 72 | 45.8 | 54.2 |
| 7 | Angonia | 23/12/2012 | 2 | Smallholder farmers | 10 | 6 | 16 | 62.5 | 37.5 |
| 8 | Angonia | 27/12/2012 | 2 | Smallholder farmers | 21 | 15 | 36 | 58.3 | 41.7 |
| 9 | Angonia | 29/12/2012 | 2 | Smallholder farmers | 68 | 79 | 147 | 46.3 | 53.7 |
| 10 | Angonia | 23/1/2013 | 1 | Smallholder farmers | 29 | 34 | 63 | 46.0 | 54.0 |
| 11 | Angonia | 24/1/2013 | 1 | Smallholder farmers | 45 | 35 | 80 | 56.3 | 43.8 |
| 12 | Angonia | 27/1/2013 | 1 | Smallholder farmers | 19 | 18 | 37 | 51.4 | 48.6 |
| 13 | Sussundenga | 28/1/2013 | 1 | Smallholder farmers | 75 | 81 | 156 | 48.1 | 51.9 |
| 14 | Angonia | 28/1/2013 | 1 | Smallholder farmers | 22 | 31 | 53 | 41.5 | 58.5 |
| 15 | Nampula | 30/1/2013 | 1 | Farmers | 45 | 35 | 80 | 56.3 | 43.8 |
| 16 | Nampula | 1/2/2013 | 1 | Farmers | 11 | 22 | 33 | 33.3 | 66.7 |
| 17 | Nampula | 1/2/2013 | 1 | Farmers | 57 | 63 | 120 | 47.5 | 52.5 |

Ne

| 18 | Nampula | 4/2/2013 | 1 | Primary School students | 37 | 43 | 80 | 46.3 | 53.8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19 | Nampula | 5/2/2013 | 1 | Primary School students | 45 | 35 | 80 | 56.3 | 43.8 |
| 20 | Nampula | 6/2/2013 | 1 | Primary School students | 10 | 21 | 31 | 32.3 | 67.7 |
| 21 | Angonia | 13/2/2013 | 1 | Smallholder farmers | 43 | 50 | 93 | 46.2 | 53.8 |
| 22 | Angonia | 14/2/2013 | 1 | Smallholder farmers | 33 | 40 | 73 | 45.2 | 54.8 |
| 23 | Angonia | 16/2/2013 | 1 | Smallholder farmers | 11 | 12 | 23 | 47.8 | 52.2 |
| 24 | Angonia | 17/2/2013 | 1 | Smallholder farmers | 3 | 39 | 42 | 7.1 | 92.9 |
| 25 | Angonia | 22/2/2013 | 1 | Smallholder farmers | 61 | 80 | 141 | 43.3 | 56.7 |
| 26 | Sussundenga | 27/2/2013 | 1 | Smallholder farmers | 21 | 52 | 73 | 28.8 | 71.2 |
| 27 | Angonia | 27/2/2013 | 1 | Smallholder farmers | 13 | 21 | 34 | 38.2 | 61.8 |
| 28 | Gondola | 2/3/2013 | 2 | Smallholder farmers | 45 | 71 | 116 | 38.8 | 61.2 |
| 29 | Nampula | 2/3/2013 | 1 | Farmers | 28 | 52 | 80 | 35.0 | 65.0 |
| 30 | Chimoio | 4/3/2013 | 2 | Technicians | 10 | 6 | 16 | 62.5 | 37.5 |
| 31 | Angonia | 21/3/2013 | 1 | Smallholder farmers | 11 | 12 | 23 | 47.8 | 52.2 |
| 32 | Angonia | 28/3/2013 | 1 | Smallholder farmers | 5 | 6 | 11 | 45.5 | 54.5 |
| 33 | Nampula | 28/3/2013 | 1 | Farmers | 5 | 7 | 12 | 41.7 | 58.3 |
| 34 | Zambezia | 29/3/2013 | 1 | Farmers | 3 | 7 | 10 | 30.0 | 70.0 |
|  |  |  |  | Grand Total: | 1033 | 1271 | 2304 | 44.8 | 55.2 |

## Appendix VIII: Participation in trainings, season 201213, Zimbabwe*

| Action site |  | Number |  |  | Percentage |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Male | Female | Total | Male \% | Female \% |
| Guruve |  | 32 | 6 | 38 | 84.2 | 15.8 |
| Guruve |  | 13 | 6 | 19 | 68.4 | 31.6 |
| Mbire |  | 11 | 6 | 17 | 64.7 | 35.3 |
| Guruve |  | 8 | 5 | 13 | 61.5 | 38.5 |
| Hwedza |  | 15 | 10 | 25 | 60.0 | 40.0 |
| Hwedza |  | 3 | 2 | 5 | 60.0 | 40.0 |
| Mudzi |  | 27 | 18 | 45 | 60.0 | 40.0 |
| Mudzi |  | 33 | 25 | 58 | 56.9 | 43.1 |
| Guruve |  | 21 | 16 | 37 | 56.8 | 43.2 |
| Hwedza |  | 28 | 23 | 51 | 54.9 | 45.1 |
| Guruve |  | 42 | 37 | 79 | 53.2 | 46.8 |
| Guruve |  | 27 | 24 | 51 | 52.9 | 47.1 |
| Makoni |  | 21 | 23 | 44 | 47.7 | 52.3 |
| Chegutu |  | 11 | 13 | 24 | 45.8 | 54.2 |
| Chegutu |  | 13 | 16 | 29 | 44.8 | 55.2 |
| Goromonzi |  | 22 | 30 | 52 | 42.3 | 57.7 |
| Goromonzi |  | 24 | 34 | 58 | 41.4 | 58.6 |
| Chegutu |  | 6 | 9 | 15 | 40.0 | 60.0 |
| Goromonzi |  | 16 | 26 | 42 | 38.1 | 61.9 |
| Goromonzi |  | 16 | 27 | 43 | 37.2 | 62.8 |
| Guruve |  | 33 | 56 | 89 | 37.1 | 62.9 |
| Goromonzi |  | 5 | 9 | 14 | 35.7 | 64.3 |
| Makoni |  | 19 | 39 | 58 | 32.8 | 67.2 |
| Guruve |  | 17 | 38 | 55 | 30.9 | 69.1 |
| Goromonzi |  | 10 | 25 | 35 | 28.6 | 71.4 |
| Hwedza |  | 8 | 21 | 29 | 27.6 | 72.4 |
| Chegutu |  | 24 | 90 | 114 | 21.1 | 78.9 |
|  | Total** | 505 | 634 | 1139 | 44.3 | 55.7 |

* Excluding the agro-dealer trainings
** These trainings could be done more than once per season and therefore target the same Lead Farmers - the total number could include double counting


## Appendix IX: N2Africa field days and attendance, season 2011-12, Zimbabwe

| No. | Action site | Village | Main organizer field day | Total no. of participants |  |  | Percentage |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Male | Female | Total | male | female |
| 1 | Makoni | Rukweza | AGRITEX | 38 | 188 | 226 | 17 \% | 83 \% |
| 2 | Goromonzi | Marimo | CADS | 102 | 106 | 208 | 49 \% | 51 \% |
| 3 | Murewa | Chanetsa | CTDT | 68 | 137 | 205 | 33 \% | 67 \% |
| 4 | Hwedza | Chiswa | AGRITEX | 42 | 83 | 125 | 34 \% | 66 \% |
| 5 | Hwedza | Chinyanyiwa | AGRITEX | 72 | 104 | 176 | 41 \% | 59 \% |
| 6 | Mudzi | Chimwara | AGRITEX | 138 | 95 | 233 | 59 \% | 41 \% |
| 7 | Makoni | Chamunorwa | AGRITEX | 79 | 118 | 197 | 40 \% | 60 \% |
| 8 | Goromonzi | Chimani | CADS | 80 | 108 | 188 | 43 \% | 57 \% |
| 9 | Mudzi | Kanyoka 1 | AGRITEX | 68 | 62 | 130 | 52 \% | 48 \% |
| 10 | Murewa | Muziwi | CTDT | 54 | 84 | 138 | 39 \% | 61 \% |
| 11 | Hwedza | Nyahungwa | AGRITEX | 79 | 132 | 211 | 37 \% | 63 \% |
| 12 | Goromonzi | Kamwendo | CADS | 106 | 140 | 246 | 43 \% | 57 \% |
| 13 | Guruve | Wachenuka | LGDA | 57 | 81 | 138 | 41 \% | 59 \% |
| 14 | Guruve | Karambwe | LGDA | 59 | 87 | 146 | $40 \%$ | 60 \% |
| 15 | Guruve | Chihwe Village2 | LGDA | 37 | 73 | 110 | $34 \%$ | 66 \% |
| 16 | Makoni | Mutungwazi | AGRITEX | 172 | 219 | 391 | 44 \% | 56 \% |
| 17 | Guruve | Chomugwada | LGDA | 74 | 101 | 175 | 42 \% | 58 \% |
| 18 | Guruve | Mukwenya | LGDA | 85 | 77 | 162 | 52 \% | 48 \% |
| 19 | Guruve | Chouwa | LGDA | 79 | 54 | 133 | 59 \% | 41 \% |
|  |  |  | Total | 1489 | 2049 | 3538 | 42 \% | 58 \% |

[^7]
## List of project reports

1. N2Africa Steering Committee Terms of Reference
2. Policy on advanced training grants
3. Rhizobia Strain Isolation and Characterisation Protocol
4. Detailed country-by-country access plan for $P$ and other agro-minerals
5. Workshop Report: Training of Master Trainers on Legume and Inoculant Technologies (Kisumu Hotel, Kisumu, Kenya-24-28 May 2010)
6. Plans for interaction with the Tropical Legumes II project (TLII) and for seed increase on a country-by-country basis
7. Implementation Plan for collaboration between N2Africa and the Soil Health and Market Access Programs of the Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA) plan
8. General approaches and country specific dissemination plans
9. Selected soyabeans, common beans, cowpeas and groundnuts varieties with proven high BNF potential and sufficient seed availability in target impact zones of N2Africa Project
10. Project launch and workshop report
11. Advancing technical skills in rhizobiology: training report
12. Characterisation of the impact zones and mandate areas in the N2Africa project
13. Production and use of Rhizobial inoculants in Africa
14. Adaptive research in N2Africa impact zones: Principles, guidelines and implemented research campaigns
15. Quality assurance (QA) protocols based on African capacities and international existing standards developed
16. Collection and maintenance of elite rhizobial strains
17. MSc and PhD status report
18. Production of seed for local distribution by farming communities engaged in the project
19. A report documenting the involvement of women in at least $50 \%$ of all farmer-related activities
20. Participatory development of indicators for monitoring and evaluating progress with project activities and their impact
21. Suitable multi-purpose forage and tree legumes for intensive smallholder meat and dairy industries in East and Central Africa N2Africa mandate areas
22. A revised manual for rhizobium methods and standard protocols available on the project website
23. Update on Inoculant production by cooperating laboratories
24. Legume Seed Acquired for Dissemination in the Project Impact Zones
25. Advanced technical skills in rhizobiology: East and Central African, West African and South African Hub
26. Memoranda of Understanding are formalized with key partners along the legume value chains in the impact zones
27. Existing rhizobiology laboratories upgraded
28. N2Africa Baseline report
29. N2Africa Annual country reports 2011
30. Facilitating large-scale dissemination of Biological Nitrogen Fixation
31. Dissemination tools produced
32. Linking legume farmers to markets
33. The role of AGRA and other partners in the project defined and co-funding/financing options for scale-up of inoculum (banks, AGRA, industry) identified
34. Progress Towards Achieving the Vision of Success of N2Africa
35. Quantifying the impact of the N2Africa project on Biological Nitrogen Fixation
36. Training agro-dealers in accessing, managing and distributing information on inoculant use
37. Opportunities for N2Africa in Ethiopia
38. N2Africa Project Progress Report Month 30
39. Review \& Planning meeting Zimbabwe
40. Howard G. Buffett Foundation - N2Africa June 2012 Interim Report
41. Number of Extension Events Organized per Season per Country
42. N2Africa narrative reports Month 30
43. Background information on agronomy, farming systems and ongoing projects on grain legumes in Uganda
44. Opportunities for N2Africa in Tanzania
45. Background information on agronomy, farming systems and ongoing projects on grain legumes in Ethiopia
46. Special Events on the Role of Legumes in Household Nutrition and Value-Added Processing
47. Value chain analyses of grain legumes in N2Africa: Kenya, Rwanda, eastern DRC, Ghana, Nigeria, Mozambique, Malawi and Zimbabwe
48. Background information on agronomy, farming systems and ongoing projects on grain legumes in Tanzania
49. Nutritional benefits of legume consumption at household level in rural sub-Saharan Africa: Literature study
50. N2Africa Project Progress Report Month 42
51. Market Analysis of Inoculant Production and Use
52. Grain legumes and fodder legume materials with high Biological Nitrogen Fixation Potential identified in N2Africa impact zones
53. A N2Africa universal logo representing inoculant quality assurance
54. M\&E Workstream report
55. Improving legume inoculants and developing strategic alliances for their advancement
56. Rhizobium collection, testing and the identification of candidate elite strains
57. Evaluation of the progress made towards achieving the Vision of Success in N2Africa
58. Policy recommendation related to inoculant regulation and cross border trade
59. Satellite sites and activities in the impact zones of the N2Africa project
60. Linking communities to legume processing initiatives
61. Special events on the role of legumes in household nutrition and value-added processing
62. Media Events in the N2Africa project
63. Launch N2Africa Phase II - Report Uganda
64. Review of conditioning factors and constraints to legume adoption and their management in Phase II of N2Africa
65. Report on the milestones in the Supplementary N2Africa grant
66. N2Africa Phase II Launch in Tanzania
67. N2Africa Phase II 6 months report
68. Involvement of women in at least $50 \%$ of all farmer related activities

## Partners involved in the N2Africa project
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Definition of Reach: use of two N2Africa components. Use of such 'improved legume cultivation' on a minimum surface of 100 m 2 .

[^1]:    * 81 double entries under SARCAF were removed

[^2]:    * From COCOF and DRD there is insufficient information on Master Farmers to present in this table.

[^3]:    ${ }^{2}$ This a somewhat curious as Kasungu is mentioned for the 2012-13 season as guaranteed good participation of women resulting from the collaboration with the Savings and Internal Loans Committees (SILCs) set-up by CRS which have a mandatory $60 \%$ women participation.

[^4]:    ${ }^{3}$ In the adjusted data supplied, previously provided data was also changed, in total 243 additional participants were reported. These are not included in this table as it would have required complete rerun of analyses.

[^5]:    * According to Malawi country report, not based on M\&E data.

[^6]:    ${ }^{4}$ The numbers in this table are derived from the registers from the input distribution in Ghana, excluding the people who have not received inputs. The numbers differ from what has been reported in the 24 month report from Ghana. Clarification has been sought in order to reconcile the information. In addition, there are numerous farmers who received input in 2010 and in 2011. These farmers should not be counted twice. At present we are looking into ways to exclude these farmers from the database.

[^7]:    * All these field days were held in March 2012

