1.0 Purpose of the Trip

The trip provided opportunity for three undertakings:

1. Attendance and participation in the IPM-CRSP (now known as IPM-Innovation Lab) SEA Annual Regional Planning meeting. The planning meeting provided the Gender Global Theme members opportunity to share lessons and give updates on the progress of country activities (July 1, 2013).


3. Field site observations in Rurukan where a field study on strawberries under the organic agriculture practice was visited, and another field visit in tomato farms and other vegetable farms with pest problems.

2.0 General Impressions

July 1, 2013: Gender Global Theme Planning Meeting

1. The Gender Global Theme is composed of members from Indonesia (Alifah Sri Lestari, Gender Team – Coordinator) and Herien Puspitawati, from the Philippines (Maria Helen Dayo) and Cambodia (Mam Sitha).

2. The team met on July 1 as part of the preparation for the IPM Annual meeting.

The GGT members conducted a workshop to review country activities to ensure that in all country reports, gender mainstreaming in IPM research is present.

3. During the said meeting, each country had to focus their gendered research on certain activities, as follows:

   • Indonesia: Gender roles in home garden and kitchen space
   • Philippines: Gender role participation in IPM technology (willingness to participate via the new HH survey-perception study)
   • Cambodia: Strengthening gender mainstreaming to support IPM farmers in production and application of Trichoderma
July 2, 2013: Annual IPM Regional Meeting

1. The session formally started with Welcome Remarks from Dr. Mike Hammig, Principal Investigator, IPM Innovation Lab in South East Asia and Dr. Donald A. Rumokoy, Rector of Sam Ratulangi University, the host institution. Team Innovation Lab representatives also presented IPM Innovation Lab Success Stories from South East Asia. USAID/Indonesia was represented by Dr. Donald Tambunan and Toni Djogho. A short commemorative presentation was made in honor of Dr. Hermie Rapusas of the Philippine Rice Research Institute (PhilRice). Dr. Rapusas was a long-term partner of IPM-CRSP since its conceptualization in the 1990’s.

2. The formal meeting and program for the annual planning proceeded with the presentation of country reports. Interesting exchange of experiences ensued.

3. On July 3, the GGT Coordinator (Alifah Lestari) presented a comprehensive report of all country-members. The Report covered gender mainstreaming in IPM Training, field visits and field monitoring and consultation with IPM technical team partners, among others.

4. Led by Dr. Maria Elisa Christie, the IPM CRSP Gender Team introduced the Gender Checklist and agreed that henceforth, the IPM CRSP Gender Team shall consolidate the Gender Checklist from IPM country research-partners. (See Attachment 1)

5. The Annual Planning meeting closed with the presentation of the “Future of the IPM Innovation Lab as presented by Dr. John Bowman, USAID. New insights and prospects came into understanding

July 4-7, 2013: International Symposium on Biodiversity and IPM.

1. The Symposium on Biodiversity and IPM presented technical and scientific papers that cover various topics on the interaction of ecology, pest and crops. As an anthropologist, the topic that excites me most was a topic presented by Dr. Jan van Tol of the Netherlands Naturalis Biodiversity Center about the discovery(?) of Wallace line (Named after Alfred Russel Wallace, a British Naturalist). Another important paper was that of K.L.Heong on rice plant hopper population in South East Asia that for me brought the fusion of science and economics. Thus, at the personal level, coming from the perspective of a social science, what appeared to be a “new” knowledge lent me a fresh perspective of what I can do in the conduct of agricultural research.

2. Sharing and exchange of knowledge among experts from different institutions (both private business and academics) forged new partnerships in IPM and biodiversity.

3. Field visits:
a) Rurukan: There were several farms visited during field visit. Had a great
time of interaction with farmers and farmers’ cooperative (?) that
demonstrated pest problems in the field. In most instances, scientists and
farmers had the opportunity to exchange information on specific topics that
ranged from vegetable production to pest management and problems
encountered. Field visit in a tomato farm (coop managed(?). I had a limited
opportunity to ask about women’s participation in the farms we visited.

From my own understanding, Rurukan, an agricultural community where IPM
research sites were demonstrated, this agricultural site practiced cool high
elevation agriculture system where strawberries (and also crucifers) can be
grown. I was surprised to see strawberries (organic) grown in plastic bags with
appropriate production technique that minimizes pest occurrence. Accordingly,
organic strawberries offers competitive price.

_July 7-8, 2013 Homeward bound_

Maria Helen F. Dayo and Nenita Opina departed from Manado to the Philippines
WOMEN’S PARTICIPATION CHECKLIST
FOR IPM CRSP ACTIVITIES

Dear IPM CRSP PIs, Co-PIs and students,

As you are aware, USAID guidelines on gender require that all IPM CRSP activities work with both women and men. The purpose of this checklist is to provide a more systematic approach to targeting women and reporting the achievements and progress in our annual reports. The checklist will be used during the upcoming year and will be completed for each project activity. We will ask you to submit these for the mid-year reporting and final report. Please note that each activity should only be reported once; select one team member to complete the form.

Section A: Sex disaggregated information about the research activity

DATE OF ACTIVITY: _____________________

1. Name of researcher/technician/trainer implementing activity: ____________________________

2. Gender of the researcher: Male: ____ Female: ____

3. Location of the research (Country, district, sub-county): ____________________________

4. Project title: ____________________________

5. IPM tactic/technology and crop: ____________________________

6. Nature of research activity (Circle all that apply):
   Lab research  Field/on farm trials
   Farmer workshops  Other
   (specify): ____________________________
7. Total number of participants in each of the research activities listed in (6) above:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of activity</th>
<th>Number of researchers who participated</th>
<th>Number of farmers who participated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field/on farm trials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section B: Barriers to women’s participation in IPM CRSP activities

In this section we list common barriers to women’s participation in agricultural research. **Check** those which limit women’s participation in this IPM CRSP activity.

- [ ] Heavy workload which leaves no time to participate in agricultural research and training activities
- [ ] Timing of the activity is not suited to women
- [ ] Location of the activity is not convenient to women
- [ ] Information about activity does not reach the women
- [ ] Husbands (or culture) restrict women’s movement
- [ ] Husbands (or culture) restrict women’s interaction with male researchers
- [ ] Women lack confidence to speak in public especially in mixed sex groups
- [ ] Language and level of information is not suitable to women of low education levels
- [ ] The IPM technology does not address women’s needs (e.g. it is on a crop women don’t grow)
- [ ] Other (specify):

____________________________________________________________________________________________

Indicate the source of information used to complete this section:

- [ ] Focus group discussion with women farmers
- [ ] Informal interviews or conversations with key informants (e.g. women leaders, extension workers, local council leaders, etc.)
- [ ] Survey
- [ ] Other (specify)

____________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________
Section C: Strategies for targeting women

In this section we list some of the tested strategies to overcome barriers to women’s participation in agricultural research and training activities. We encourage you to use these in your research site. **Check** those which you have used in the activity reported here.

- We specifically invited women to participate in the activity.
- We specifically invited/encouraged women to lead the activity.
- We worked with women’s organizations to reach women.
- We worked with female extension agents.
- We asked women what time they were available to meet.
- We changed the time of the activity according to women’s availability.
- We asked women what location would be convenient for them to meet.
- We changed the location of the activity according to women’s needs.
- We held separate groups (men-only and women-only) in the activity.
- We ensured that the language, format, and level of information in the activity were suitable for women.
- Women actively participated (spoke, asked questions, etc.) in the activity.
- When conducting interviews, we interviewed both males and females in each household.
- We collected sex-disaggregated data.
- We analyzed the sex-disaggregated data.
- We specifically made sure field trials included women farmers.
- Other strategy adopted to target women (please specify):


Section D: Challenges, lessons, successes

Briefly share experiences and lessons in using the various strategies to target women. Specify the strategy and indicate whether it was effective in increasing women’s participation, what worked/didn’t work, and what challenges were encountered.
**Attachment 2. List of Contacts Made:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title/Organization</th>
<th>Contact Info (address, phone, email)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wiske Rotinsulu</td>
<td>UNSRAT</td>
<td>62 813 5671 17164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Tambunan</td>
<td>Project Management Specialist USAID/Indonesia</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dtambunan@usaid.gov">dtambunan@usaid.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norielyn Abalos,</td>
<td>University of San Carlos, Philippines</td>
<td><a href="mailto:novrie_enigma@yahoo.ca">novrie_enigma@yahoo.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ainara Penalver Cruz</td>
<td>IRRI Philippines</td>
<td><a href="mailto:a.penalvercruz@irri.org">a.penalvercruz@irri.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miriam Rich/Mary white</td>
<td>Virginia Tech (IPM)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mrich@vt.edu">mrich@vt.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>