



# REPORT

## **Pathways to Improving Impact: Funding Women's Leadership and Food Security in Africa**

**April 13, 2015**

Philanthropy New York, 79 Fifth Avenue, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor, New York, New York

### **CO-HOSTED AND SPONSORED BY:**

Global Fund for Women  
New Field Foundation

Africa Grantmakers' Affinity Group  
Foundation for a Just Society  
Tides Foundation



## Contents

- I. Meeting Objectives
- II. Welcome Remarks and Introductions
- III. Presentation of Evaluation Results
  - a. Evaluation of the Women Striding Forward Initiative, 2011-2013  
*Presented by Muadi Mukenge, Global Fund for Women*
  - b. Evaluation of the Rural Women Creating Change Program  
Casamance Focus Area, 2006-2013  
*Presented by Sarah Hobson, New Field Foundation*
- IV. Discussion of Evaluation Results
- V. Funder Strategies and Learnings
- VI. Opportunities for Collaboration
- VII. Closing Remarks and Next Steps
- VIII. Appendix: Participant List

*Report prepared by Sethu Nair and Dani Gelardi*

## **I. Meeting Objectives**

The *Pathways to Funding Women's Leadership and Food Security in Africa* funders' dialogue, held on April 13, 2015 in New York City brought together foundations, NGOs and inter-governmental agencies that prioritize gender justice, the right to food, access to land, and agro-ecology, and promote women's rights in the face of climate change. The dialogue aimed to generate new ideas and strategies that would increase the quantity and quality of financial and other resources reaching women and their organizations across Africa. The event provided a platform for the presentation of two recent evaluations in this field, as well as for a discussion among stakeholders about strategies and potential opportunities for collaboration.

## **II. Welcome Remarks and Introductions**

**Jane Sloane of Global Fund for Women** opened the event by acknowledging the diversity of funders, NGOs, and non-profits represented. Jane celebrated the session as an opportunity to share reflections on and commitments to women's leadership, particularly as it relates to sustainable livelihoods and food security in Africa. The meeting was timely, reflecting the African Union's 2014 Year of Agriculture & Food Security and 2015 Year of Women's Empowerment, along with the 20 year review of the Beijing Platform for Action – particularly as the women's movement is thinking about how best to attract significant funds to support grassroots women's movements for change. Jane acknowledged the conference co-hosts, Global Fund for Women and New Field Foundation, and co-sponsors, Africa Grantmakers' Affinity Group, Foundation for a Just Society, and Tides Foundation.

Andrea Lynch of the Foundation for a Just Society made introductory remarks on supporting women's rights in Africa, and Kimberly Middleton of Tides Foundation invited each participant to introduce themselves and the work of their organization as it relates to women's leadership and food security in Africa. Please see Section VIII for list of participants.

## **III. Presentation of Evaluation Results**

### **A. Evaluation of Global Fund for Women's Women Striding Forward Initiative, 2011-2013 <sup>1</sup>** Presented by Muadi Mukenge, Program Director for Sub-Saharan Africa and Lead for GFW's Sustainable Livelihoods Initiative

#### **Context**

Over 50% of Global Fund for Women's (GFW) annual grant making in Sub-Saharan Africa is allocated to rural women's organizations. GFW awards 90-100 grants each year to groups in

---

<sup>1</sup> [www.globalfundforwomen.org/storage/documents/annual\\_reports/gfw\\_rural\\_women\\_striding\\_forward.pdf](http://www.globalfundforwomen.org/storage/documents/annual_reports/gfw_rural_women_striding_forward.pdf)

Sub-Saharan Africa with the goal of supporting initiatives that are led by and target the needs of women. Over the last six years, GFW has examined the organizing capacity of women's groups and worked to link rural women to mainstream processes and crucial policy arenas. Launched in 2011, GFW's Rural Women Striding Forward is a key initiative with the goal of moving the conversation away from bio-technology as the main solution to Food Security and poverty alleviation. GFW does this work by highlighting initiatives led by local rural women.

Muadi noted that the initiative is funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF) and that GFW had extensive discussions with BMGF during proposal development to ensure that GFW retained its philosophy of how to work with women's groups. GFW therefore had autonomy in choices regarding grantmaking, training methods, and relationship building.

Grounded in the philosophy that women's movements need flexible support to advance movements as they see fit, the initiative developed a research framework to collect evidence of the work that is already happening in women's groups as well as the views of rural women regarding growing food in healthy and environmentally sustainable ways. It also supported women to learn about agricultural policies and opportunities to join local and sub-regional agricultural platforms.

Phase I of the initiative has ended. Through Phase II (2014-2015), GFW hopes to disseminate learnings and elicit interest in collaborative work to support rural women's food security in Africa.

### **Methodology and Approach (Phase I)**

To select grantee partners, GFW began with its existing network of African women's groups. Sixty percent of the grantees in the initiative are existing partners and the remaining 40% came through recommendations from grantee partners on the ground. Through the initiative, GFW awarded grants to 22 grantee partners in 3 countries: Burkina Faso, Kenya and Uganda, via core support grants for a total of \$400,000 with an average grant size of \$18,000.

GFW developed the following criteria for selecting grantees:

- The groups must already work at the intersection of food security and women's empowerment
- The groups must be conducting agricultural projects
- The groups must be established (The grant recipients average founding date is 13.6 years prior)
- The groups must operate with a women's rights' lens
- The groups must focus on local solutions and sustainable agriculture rather than mechanized agriculture or agri-business

**The project hypothesis** centered on the conviction that providing core support strengthens the ability of women's groups to provide information, tools, income sources, and networks to rural

women, which collectively contributes to the promotion of human rights, poverty alleviation, and agricultural productivity.

Grantee partners used the funds for the following activities:

- Agricultural inputs
- Agricultural training to enhance women's knowledge
- Operating costs and research activities that were led and executed by the grantee groups themselves
- Food security dialogues
- Advocacy at the local and national level

The project undertook a participatory approach to evaluation, including the use of three tools at baseline and impact stages:

- Organizational survey of the individual grantee partner organization
- Survey of grantees' beneficiaries
- Focus group discussions with beneficiaries

The research tools investigated five main research questions:

- What are good strategies for agricultural productivity?
- Which strategies most effectively lead to poverty reduction?
- What is the value of core support?
- What is the value of convening?
- What is the value of technical assistance?

Convenings were held at least once per year, with a multi-prong aim of developing shared understanding of the initiative's goals; clarifying research procedures for the initiative; providing training in research methodology, and; deepening grantees' understanding of agricultural policy. Grantee partners also had the opportunity to meet with representatives from the Ministry of Agriculture to question and discuss national food security policies. Grantee partners provided critical feedback on whether the policies reflect what happens on the ground and had the opportunity to educate policy makers on their experiences.

### **Key Results and Impact**

The project had over 30,000 beneficiaries as well as other qualitative outcomes. Some of the outcomes in Burkina Faso, Kenya and Uganda included:

1. Restoration of land that had been dried up by the negative impacts of climate change;
2. Establishment of revolving funds and training centers to foster the use of compost and improve business practices
3. Establishment of literacy and empowerment programs
4. Increased agricultural income for women
5. Increased consumption of indigenous crops such as millet and sorghum that had previously been abandoned as part of governments priorities. (Per country, there was a 50 – 90% increase in the consumption of non-staple, healthier foods, increased

negotiation power for women, and an increase in the shared responsibility of agricultural and household duties between women and men.)

Quantitative outcomes include:

1. 5,251 rural women received agricultural trainings
2. More than 10,000 rural women and men attended community awareness trainings
3. Grassroots women farmers acquired over 100 acres of land

Other overall improvements in the work of grantee partners include; strengthened organizational capacity - with partners being trained in and leading monitoring, evaluation, and data collection processes - enhanced peer-to-peer learning among women farmers, direct linkages to technical support, commitment to enhance future women's rights work, and a trend towards the frequent use of local resources (manure, and more).

### **Additional Lessons, Challenges, and Recommendations**

There were ongoing structural and cultural inequalities that women face: lack of access to water and affordable farm inputs, issues around women's inheritance rights, and the need for increased women's advocacy.

The most frequently requested trainings included those on the use of organic fertilizer, new planting methods, water management and new varieties of crops. Least requested trainings included those on the use of chemical fertilizers and the integration of energy saving stoves.

Among the recommendations from our grantee partners is a request to donors to consider flexible funding so that local groups can design their own need-specific initiatives. There were also requests to fund the research capacity of women's groups, as well as movement building and advocacy initiatives.

## **B. Evaluation of New Field Foundation's Rural Women Creating Change Program<sup>2</sup>**

Presented by Sarah Hobson, Executive Director, New Field Foundation

### **New Field Foundation Work and Context**

Based in San Francisco, with offices in Dakar, Senegal, and Burkina Faso, New Field Foundation was a supporting organization of Tides Foundation for 10 years and is now a private foundation. Since 2004, New Field has focused all its resources on rural women, their families and communities in Sub-Saharan Africa, with a particular focus over the last eight years in post-conflict zones and French-speaking West Africa. New Field has chosen to focus on these otherwise underfunded areas because of the dire food security issues facing women in conflict

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.newfieldfound.org/pdfs/PathwaysPresentation22OCT14.pdf>

zones and the great need to concentrate efforts on women who are the primary producers and processors of food.

New Field supports local food systems and women's rights, but recognizes that there are many terms currently in use for issues of hunger and food in Africa, including "food sovereignty", "food justice", "food rights", as well as "food security". An interesting and provocative example that reflects the complexity and insufficiency of a term like food security is the experience of the prison population in the United States, which is very food secure but has little agency over food or consumption choices.

New Field focuses its funding on women's organizations as a strategic priority, given their significance and scale in West Africa. In Senegal, for example, more than 16,000 women's organizations are registered with the Ministry of Family, an official figure that represents about a third of all those that are operational in Senegal.

### **Evaluation Methodology and Approach**

In 2012, New Field's Rural Women's Creating Change Program supported community grant-making to ensure funds directly reached rural women's groups. Grants ranged from \$3,000 to \$10,000 a year, renewable for 2–3 years. More than 200 groups were funded in Burkina Faso, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Mali, Senegal, and Sierra Leone.

In 2013, New Field carried out a participatory evaluation in Senegal to assess the impact on 116 rural women's groups that received community grants for a total of \$1.4 million over seven years. The evaluation focused on identifying the changes, impact, and unintended consequences New Field funds had on rural women, families, organizations, and communities, and the extent to which women's groups had control over their activities and resources.

The evaluation was conducted using two methodologies:

- i. **Rapid Rural Evaluation:** Independent evaluators interviewed 1,843 people in 63 focus groups and presented their findings to the participants and funders;
- ii. **Participatory Assessment:** 24 rural women were trained and carried out surveys with 32 rural women's groups; 15 of them received further training as reporters, then interviewed 79 rural women, created 30 written reports, and broadcast 41 radio programs in local languages in collaboration with five community radio stations.

Challenges to conducting the study included:

- The post-conflict environment and loss of infrastructure
- Limited written information and data
- The large number of community grantees
- The devalued status of women in their rural communities
- A lack of direct funding to rural women's organizations

## **Key Results and Impact**

The evaluation culminated in the following reports ([www.newfieldfound.org/publications](http://www.newfieldfound.org/publications)):

- Changes in Asset Management
- Changes in Rural Women's Leadership
- Changes in Education and Family Health

### **Notable Successes in Women's Leadership and Income**

- Of the 379 women interviewed, 120 women ran for local elections and 65 were elected.
- 45 of those 65 women became members of advisory committees on regional development programs that discuss funding for agricultural development.
- 100% of women who received financial management and leadership development trainings said they are now better able to express themselves during meetings.
- All women's groups improved their democratic processes to determine the use of funds.
- The majority of groups chose to invest in irrigation systems, fencing, and gardening equipment that reduced labor while improving the quality and quantity of produce.
- As a result of investments, members of the groups saw increased income from the sale of food. Higher income led to increased agency and autonomy for women, who used the revenues from grant-supported activities to improve family nutrition.
- Women individually reported significant changes in household decision-making processes as their husbands began to perceive them as active agents of household income and welfare.

Rural women reported that their absolute priority is to have more and higher quality food for family consumption. It is only after meeting family needs that they choose to sell food in the market. This report, like many others, shows that when women have agency and autonomy, there are significant increases in family and community wellbeing.

### **Additional Notable Findings**

- When solutions were found to reduce labor and increase quality and quantity of food, it meant less work in the fields and greater health changes for women and families.
- 72% of women surveyed said they were better able to respond to their families' health needs. Women reported greater access to maternal reproductive health and preventive health practices and a reduction in the practices of female genital mutilation.
- 73% of women said they were better able to support their children's school attendance. 53% of women said that the ability to purchase bicycles supported their children to travel to secondary schools.

In order to better understand rural women's organizations and the funds they receive, New Field is carrying out a survey with rural women leaders across Africa to identify how they currently receive funds and what will enable them to increase funding in the future. The results of this survey are meant to encourage further dialogue between rural women leaders and donors, with the long term goal of increasing the quantity and quality of the funds that reach rural women's organizations in Africa.



#### **IV. Discussion of Evaluation Results**

##### ***How receptive was the Gates Foundation to GFW's philosophy and methodology?***

When GFW initially applied for funding, many questions were asked about GFW's process, use of funding, the types of farmers GFW worked with, and more. The Gates Foundation expressed openness to working in partnership while acknowledging that this initiative did not match their existing grant portfolio and models. GFW has had a transparent working relationship regarding the data gathered and the progress of the project. GFW also had numerous internal discussions prior to accepting funding regarding the consequences of receiving funding, and perceptions by partner organizations. GFW's final decision to work with the Gates Foundation was grounded in the agreement that no direction would be given to grantees on how they do their work.

##### ***How did the shrinking civil society and land rights work shape programming? What kind of challenges did grantees face in their effort to shift status quo and move towards agro-ecology?***

GFW commented that the grantee experiences and use of agro-ecological methods were varied. Some groups supported by GFW were not using agro-ecological methods, so for those groups GFW provided information to build awareness. Other grantees chose to incorporate agro-ecological practices in their existing work. In Burkina Faso, some of the organizations were advocating to ensure that Millennium Challenge Corporation allocations also reached women, with women farmers as trainers. The infrastructure was already in place, with model farmers, and some mechanisms set up for peer exchange and learning. It was clear that there was a wealth of knowledge in the community, and that outside expertise was not needed very much. GFW worked with the intention of amplifying that model.

New Field commented that the decentralization process in West Africa over the last 8-10 years has provided rural women and their organizations with the political and economic space to advance their activities and address the growing pressure on land and water resources. In regards to the shift towards agro-ecology, there is already a strong food sovereignty movement in West Africa that is linked to other parts of Africa. Of note are the agro-ecology schools in Guinea Bissau, Mali, Mozambique, Zimbabwe and other countries.

##### ***Was there a control group in the evaluation for the Women Striving Forward Initiative?***

GFW's greatest goal with this initiative was learning. Due to the shortage in funding, the program design did not include a control group. Despite this, the findings are grounded in the experiences of grassroots groups and are very compelling.

##### ***The Women Striving Forward report indicates that much of the money was spent on agricultural training. What was the logic behind this allocation?***

The funding portion allocated as "agricultural training" includes the purchase of inputs like equipment, tools, fertilizers, and seeds, which is why that allocation looks large. Most grantees provided multiple trainings to their target groups to expand the knowledge and skills of rural farmers and promote crop diversification, adoption of organic farming, and planting of

indigenous varieties. The training money also went to building management capacity, with some technical support. Some funds were allocated to women's federations in West Africa which then provided funds to specific, smaller groups with which they worked within their communities. All of GFW's money was intentionally spent in integrated ways to ensure that the different needs of diverse groups on the ground were met.

***The strength and network of the food sovereignty movements across Africa differ. Some regions are more scattered than others, and in West Africa, the food sovereignty movement is stronger than in East and Southern Africa. Did the geographical context affect the strategies used and impact of the work?***

GFW responded that there were differences that had to do with geography. For example in Burkina Faso groups had a greater understanding of food sovereignty principles and were familiar with larger movements. The groups thus explored the opportunities to engage in movement building and advocacy. GFW provided information about the African Union's Year of Agriculture & Food Security and changes in agricultural policy. The groups then decided independently how they wanted to mobilize. In Kenya, the African Biodiversity Network was invited to present on pending seed patent laws. The grantees were learning this information for the first time and, stunned by the negative consequences that would follow. The silence reflected a moment of awareness about how shifting laws would impact the daily lives of farmers. This awareness generated a lot of energy and action among groups to develop advocacy strategies and to take action.

New Field responded that, in its experience, place-based funding focusing on rural women's groups led to the emergence of cooperatives and federations. This was partly due to the time that rural women leaders spent together in trainings with the opportunity to brainstorm and build connections. In Sierra Leone, for example, 34 rural women's groups registered as two rural women's cooperatives – the first in the country – with a total membership of nearly 7,000 members. In Casamance, 26 women's groups came together to form an association to increase their political clout and build on their advocacy work. New Field has been mindful of creating rivalry among groups through its funding, but over and over again, it has become apparent that successful groups serve as a beacon of hope to smaller groups of women, who are inspired by and learn from them.

***What were the gender consequences of funding rural women's groups? How did community and household dynamics change between men and women?***

GFW responded that it has not seen a backlash from men. This was most likely due to the time and effort local organizations invested in building community awareness about the programs. They included trainings and opportunities for everyone, including men, to be educated on various issues. They showed that communities were benefitting from the investments, everyone in the family was eating better, and household incomes were changing.

New Field had been very concerned about this issue and also found no evidence of backlash. In fact, it was the opposite, as women gained greater respect in their families and communities for

securing and managing funding. There was evidence of a resulting decrease in domestic violence and an increase in men taking on domestic responsibilities so that their wives could attend meetings and carry out their collective work.

## **V. Funder Strategies and Learnings**

The following suggestions emerged during a brainstorm of possible strategies and actions to raise the profile and status of rural women's groups:

1. Capture indigenous women's knowledge through a survey and disseminate results
2. Leverage the richness of rural women's collective experience as curriculum, captured and offered by rural women themselves rather than academics
3. Support grassroots approaches rather than Western-derived solutions
4. Engage in collective resource mobilization and campaigning in order to make the case for greater resource commitment to grassroots women's groups, women's funds, and women's movements
5. Expand spaces for women's groups to organize
6. Unify messaging on women's issues with language that is relevant and resonant
7. Increase influence by sharing results of respective evaluations
8. Identify key donor and policy forums and enable grantee participation. Examples include:
  - Council of Foundations National Conference
  - International Human Rights Funders Group Conference
  - 2016 Women Deliver Conference in Denmark
  - 2016 AWID Conference in Brazil
  - Environmental Funders Network Conference
  - African Union Commission Summit meetings
  - G8 Meeting in 2015 and 2016
  - NEPAD meetings
  - International Conferences on Environment and Climate Change
9. Create a listserv through which resources are shared, including calls-to-action that direct advocacy, resources, and attention where it is most needed
10. Mobilize core funding for rural women's agency in regards to local food systems, access to land and agro-ecology, and women's self-determination
11. Organize a shared convening for movement-building (eg: International Network of Women's Funds and the Greengrants Alliance of Funds hosted a Summit on Women and Climate Change in 2014 funded by the Ford Foundation. This convening highlighted innovative and creative solutions by grassroots women's organizations)
12. Collectively identify and mobilize key advocates from grassroots organizations that could join other funders at key regional and global forums to make the case for gender-specific climate financing mechanisms

Discussion shifted to possible opportunities for strategic advocacy, grassroots work, and collaborations.

## **VI. Opportunities for Collaboration**

Participants agreed that it is a critical time for women's and other civil society groups to gather and strategize around food sovereignty and food rights in Africa, particularly with the rise of the G8's New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition (G8 Alliance).

Conversations about strategies and opportunities were guided by the following questions:

- *What can we do as a group to uphold work that is grounded in the needs of women and communities?*
- *In what ways can we collaborate?*
- *What lessons and experiences do we have that we can gather and leverage?*

### **Responding to and working with shifting global trends**

A participant noted that the fundamental battle is between public and private investment in agriculture and development, pointing out that negotiations taking place between governments and corporations through the new G8 Alliance are very secretive and inaccessible. This lack of transparency makes it difficult for groups to organize against the G8 Alliance or to identify entry points for response and action.

### **Working with and beyond governments**

The point was highlighted that up to 70% of agricultural labor in Africa is performed by women. A population this large should be considered a significant economic player by governments, agencies, and companies. In the case of women and indigenous communities this has not been the case. A call was made to leverage the wealth of research and data that funders already have to showcase women as highly productive and valuable investments, not only in terms of empowerment but as adding value to the overall economic health of a nation state.

It was also pointed out that governments have a significant role to play. Over the last 10 years the African Union has made commitments to national governments and allocated 10% of their budgets to agricultural development. It was recommended that funders target national governments in Africa, the African Union Commission, and NEPAD to advocate for how governments can invest a greater portion of that 10% to women's groups and agricultural development led by women.

Discussion then shifted towards the power of networks to mobilize and influence local and national governments. An example was given in which a number of leaders from East African countries gathered and discussed the confusion about what the Trans-Atlantic Trade

Agreement might mean for African markets. These conversations led to collaborative action to engage and inform government officials on this issue.

### **Commercialization and profitable markets**

Concern was raised about the enormous emphasis placed on entrepreneurial investment for increased commercial production, which can be detrimental to women farmers, as it excludes large numbers of them from conversations and resource pathways. This focus on commercialization can also prompt women to work as part of larger systems that devalue environmental interests and work against existing bio-diverse systems.

One participant highlighted the reality that women's food production rarely results in surplus; the gender dynamic often means men take over when crops become more commercial and profitable. Shifting gender norms means work that has to be ongoing so that women can maintain their autonomy in market-driven economies.

Another participant called into question whether it is truly possible for industrial and small scale food systems to co-exist, noting the onslaught of money and political power that could lead Africa on a path in which food systems based on agro-ecological principles die because short-term political gain is more important than long term agricultural development.

### **Media and advocacy solutions**

A call was made for funders to hold themselves accountable for supporting the large-scale advocacy needs of indigenous and women's groups. This includes working to close the gap between social movements across Africa.

Another suggestion was made to invest in a broad media and television campaign to promote the ways women farm and the global value of this work.

Attention was drawn to the traps of language when terms are co-opted by those supporting the Green Revolution. For example, the G8 Alliance has begun to use the term "climate smart agriculture" which is being equated with "agro-ecology." Careful attention needs to be given to how such terms are used and interchanged.

There was general consensus that DFID and USAID should be called out publicly for their collusion with global alliances that cause harm to grassroots movements and agro-ecology in the name of food security.

### **Opportunities for engagement**

Participants discussed the timeliness of the day's gathering in light of the African Union's Year of Agriculture & Food Security (2014), Year of Women's Empowerment (2016), and Year of African Human Rights (2016) with a focus on women's rights in particular. The following suggestions were made so that funders could capitalize on this critical momentum:

- Target local private sectors by engaging local companies in conversations about agri-business in order to facilitate market access for women
- Unify messaging and language to frame women as significant agricultural actors and call state attention to how important women are in agricultural action and dialogue
- Craft narratives to inform national development agendas, highlighting the key priorities for rural organizations and communities
- Amplify the voices of local women by featuring them in climate dialogues (eg, fund travel for rural African women to attend Paris climate talks as a way to shape the debate through the experience of women's networks)
- Develop short-term communications strategies and campaigns that can take hold of opportune moments such as World Food Day in October

### **Movement building**

There was consensus among the group to continue to invest in movement building efforts as a strategy to counter the work of the G8 Alliance and other top-down development initiatives. One participant highlighted the derailment of the WTO by grassroots and advocacy groups as an example of what is possible for the Global South to accomplish. The Women and Climate Change Summit was also named as an important initiative for grassroots women's organizations to gather and discuss innovative ways to respond to climate change challenges. In response to the gender blind analysis typical of larger climate convenings, participants advocated for funders to brainstorm strategies to address this data gap.

The recommendation was made that funds be allocated to design programs that shift gender norms over a span of 10 or more years, so that long-term work can demonstrate impact. The Global Gender and Climate Alliance, a self-organized network that leads its own advocacy campaigns, has successfully raised gender issues in various international contexts, using negotiation tactics to increase the visibility of gender in the larger conversation. Its ability to bring organizations together to develop collaborative campaigns is one that funders with an interest in this issue area can draw on.

## **VII. Closing Remarks**

In closing, Jane Sloane summarized the key points and lessons from the presentations and discussions of the day, which affirmed that supporting rural women's groups results in enormous benefits at the individual and community level. These benefits can be seen through:

- An increase in women's asset management
- An increase in women's agency and autonomy
- An increase in women's health and wellbeing, and that of their families
- Greater women's political and civic engagement
- Greater women's participation in agro-ecology and nutrition movements
- More food and higher quality food for women and their families
- More money for women and their communities

- A reduction in violence against women
- An increase in men's domestic responsibilities
- Greater gender equality within the household and community

There is a clear urgency to channel more funds to women's agro-ecology initiatives to mitigate such threats as corporate land grabs, patented seeds, and pro-GMO policies and practices that are promoted by the G8 Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition. There is the need to collectively support rural women as leaders to speak in as many influential spaces as possible to discuss their stories, strategies and solutions as well as present their broader vision for change.

**For more information, contact:**

Muadi Mukenge of Global Fund for Women: [mmukenge@globalfundforwomen.org](mailto:mmukenge@globalfundforwomen.org)

Sarah Hobson of New Field Foundation: [sarah@newfieldfound.org](mailto:sarah@newfieldfound.org)

Notes and Report: Sethu Nair, Communications Consultant | [nairsethu@gmail.com](mailto:nairsethu@gmail.com)

## **VIII. Appendix: Participant List**

### **Foundation for a Just Society (co-sponsor)**

Andrea Lynch, Program Officer

### **Global Fund for Women (co-sponsor)**

Sadaf Hasan, Grant Writer

Eva Kolodner, Director of Major Gifts, Eastern Region

Muadi Mukenge, Program Director, Sub-Saharan Africa

Jane Sloane, Vice President of Programs

Marissa Wesely, Board Member

### **New Field Foundation (co-sponsor)**

Sarah Hobson, Executive Director

Tabara Ndiaye, Program Consultant (by Skype)

### **Tides (co-sponsor)**

Kimberly Middleton, Senior Client Specialist

### **ActionAid**

Marie Brill, Executive Director

### **African Women's Development Fund**

Sarah Mukasa, Director of Programmes

### **CARE USA**

Charu Goyle, Senior Director, Strategic Partnerships

### **Femmes Africa Solidarité**

Harriet Williams Bright, Advocacy Director

### **GRAIN**

Henk Hobbelink, Coordinator

### **Grassroots International**

Chung-Wha Hong, Executive Director

### **GROOTS International**

Sandra Schilen, Global Facilitator

### **Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy**

Juliette Majot, President



**International Development Exchange**

Rajasvini Bhansali, Executive Director

Trishala Deb, Regional Director, Asia

**International Food Policy Research Institute**

Agnes Quisumbing, Senior Research Fellow

**MADRE, Inc.**

Yifat Susskind, Executive Director

**MDG Health Alliance**

Leith Greenslade, Co-Chair of Child Health

**New York University**

Samrawit Assefa, Masters Student, Public Administration

**One Acre Fund**

Diana McNiff, Senior Associate, Business Development

**Root Capital**

Debra Shapira, Senior Manager, Institutional Relations

**United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) GEF Small Grants Programme**

Ana Maria Currea, Communications and Knowledge Management Specialist

**UN Office of the Special Adviser on Africa (OSAA)**

Ecoma Alaga, Program Officer

**UN Women**

Tunay Firat, Partnership Development Specialist

**Virginia Gildersleeve International Fund**

Elisabet Eklind, Executive Director