Country Visited: Uganda

Dates of Travel: July 6-12, 2014

Travelers Names and Affiliations: Maria Elisa Christie, Gender Global Theme PI, Virginia Tech

Purpose of Trip: Participate in IPM IL annual meeting including presentation of research results. Also, meet with Margaret Mangheni, Gender Global Theme Coordinator for East Africa project.

IPM INNOVATION LAB PROGRAM-WIDE MEETING:
“Twenty Years of the IPM CRSP/Innovation Lab”

Sites Visited: Venue: Imperial Botanical Hotel, Entebbe, Uganda

Description of Activities/Observations:
I arrived at Entebbe near midnight on July 7.

The next day served to prepare for meetings with Gender Global Theme East Africa Coordinator.

July 9-11 I attended the IPM IL program-wide meeting. The meeting was attended by 14 men in program capacities, including two USAID officials, three female PIs or Co-PIs, and two female communications staff from Virginia Tech. Two female PIs on the agenda (Sue Tolin and Sally Miller) were not in attendance but were represented by two male PIs. I presented results of my research with gender and Trichoderma in Bangladesh on July 10. Below are some highlights from the meeting relevant to the Gender Global Theme.

In George Norton’s presentation about the first 11 years of IPM he gave the following anecdote about farmers’ perceptions related to pesticide use in the Philippines: George asked a farmer why he was mixing up such toxic stuff for his pest control—terrible pesticides. The man said “Because at the end of the day I feel woozy.” “So why use it then?” asked George. “Imagine what it’s doing the insects,” the farmer replied.

Also in George Norton’s presentation he said IPM CRSP found in a Uganda impact assessment that working with groundnuts would bring in $33-36M income, but USAID wanted to know impact on poverty so had to go back to see who got the income. This would
necessarily require looking at gender in the household. (How did they measure poverty and
distribution of income?)

Mark Erbaugh pointed out that participatory research is very important but is expensive
and takes a lot of researcher time (and funding students).

The gender and participatory methods regional workshops were not included in the list of
IPM IL workshops. I added these to my presentation.

Eric Benson and Jerry Carner, representing Mike Hammig for the SE Asia reported that
UPLB introduced IPM to home gardens (through a government housing project?)

My presentation was very well received, primarily because it was gender research directly
applied to IPM technology. It was a good opportunity for me to explain a feminist approach
and the need for theory to frame my research, and the challenge of fitting into a journal
that is between development or IPM and gender academic research. Ed Rajotte is very
excited about the research and offers to support in any way he can to conclude the data
gathering, which is moving very slowly. There is discussion in the group about next phase
(if we get it) having controlled experiments looking into this, and also work with MCC in
other parts of country. We discuss the possibility of talking about this with MCC’s director
at headquarters which is in Pennsylvania. Matt Kleinhenz, of Ohio State University,
recommends focusing on grafting due to its benefits to women and women’s participation---
due to dexterity and other factors. This was indeed a topic originally targeted by my
research. Women are in low paid positions and getting a small proportion of the benefits. To
address this issue, a program would need to support the development of women
entrepreneurs who own the nurseries and train the workers directly.

In closing discussions the final day, my contribution is as follows:

**One: what is biggest gap?**

- Integration of gender specialists in RP with IPM researchers in RP
- Take gender findings into account in project cycle (implementation, evaluation,
  planning)
- “Genderization” (Training and implementation of gender-sensitive
  approaches/strategies) of IPM researchers and field staff (gender checklist; workshops—ex.
  Indonesia)
- Cross-regional interaction and between gender researchers (possibility would have
  been Indonesia-Bangladesh on Trichoderma)
Many of above are prerequisites for better integration of Global Themes with RPs

Lack of gender specialists in collaborating institutions (ex. IDS Nepal, INIAP, Guatemala, Tajikistan)

- Need ongoing pressure from international donors and training

**Two: What do you see as biggest success of IPM IL?**

- Gender integration into technical projects (certain degree of)

- Network of gender professionals working with IPM projects facing similar challenges and sharing experiences (building on each other’s expertise)

**Three: What are the lessons that we learned over the years of IPM CRSP/IL to carry forward?**

- Follow-up training is required to reinforce what was learned, correct what was mis-learned, and allow space for questions after testing and practicing new skills

- Mark says: “Gender and impact assessment need to be a part of every work plan.”

On my last day I met with Margaret Mangheni of Makerere University to discuss two potential publications resulting from Gender Global Theme research in Uganda during this phase. The most recent draft of the papers were emailed to me that morning; I printed and read them, made comments, and then met with her to discuss these in detail. We also discussed follow-up and authorship on the three papers we aim to publish. I left near midnight, and found extreme security measures at the Entebbe airport due to warnings about terrorists targeting it.

In all, it was a short but intense and successful trip.