



Gender, IFIs and Food Insecurity Case Study: Haiti



Haiti, the poorest nation in the Western Hemisphere, suffers from chronic food insecurity (World Food Program, 2010). One third of the population is food insecure, the most vulnerable of whom are women and children. International Financial Institutions (IFIs), including the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank (WB) and the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), have severely undermined Haiti's ability to improve food security and reduce hunger and malnutrition among Haiti's poor. Beginning in the 1980s, IFI structural adjustment strategies imposed sweeping trade liberalization measures on Haiti (McGowen, 1997), including substantial reductions in Haiti's import tariffs. United States and other developed country food imports "flooded into the country" (FAO, 2001), undermining the livelihoods of rural farmers. Moreover, the WB and IDB, among Haiti's largest donors and most influential policy advisors (Gender Action, 2010), have failed to adequately address gender issues in agricultural and rural development sector investments. Doing so would contribute to improving Haiti's food security and reducing rural poverty.

Destructive IFI agricultural policies have taken the greatest toll on Haitian women, who alone head almost half of the nation's households and constitute the majority of Haiti's subsistence farmers. Since Haiti's devastating earthquake in January 2010, the burden on poor women has only increased. Gender Action's monitoring shows that most of the 13 WB and 80 IDB post-earthquake commitments to Haiti, totaling over US\$950 million as of fall 2011, "neither focus on agriculture and rural development, nor on the role of women." Contrary to WB and IDB gender policy recommendations, "few WB and IDB post-earthquake grants to Haiti are explicitly gender sensitive" (Gender Action, 2010).

Gender Analysis Methodology and Findings

Since IFIs address food security primarily through agriculture and rural development operations, this case study applies "Gender Action's Essential Gender Checklist" to assess the quality of gender integration in WB and IDB agriculture and rural development investments in Haiti.* The Checklist is part of Gender Action's [Gender Toolkit for International Finance Watchers](#), a user-friendly toolkit for helping civil society groups to incorporate gender perspectives into their work on IFIs and other projects. This case study demonstrates that IFI agriculture investments in Haiti lack a human rights perspective and pay little attention to gender inequalities that could hinder women and girls' ability to participate in and benefit from project activities. Since none of the projects mandate the collection of sex-disaggregated data, IFIs cannot determine their investments' differential impacts on men and women, boys and girls.

*This case study includes all active WB projects that are categorized primarily under the WB's "agriculture, fishing and forestry" sector. This case study only includes three approved IDB agriculture projects, as documentation for the nine other approved IDB agriculture projects was not retrievable through the IDB website: www.iadb.org. These cases are presented chronologically.

The IDB's Agricultural Intensification Project, 2003/2010 (US\$41.94 million)

In 2003, the IDB allocated US\$41.94 million in loans (0.006 percent of the IDB's 2003 budget) for the Agricultural Intensification Project in Haiti. Following the devastating earthquake in 2010, the IDB approved an additional US\$5.9 million grant to conduct follow-up activities and maintain the irrigation system, which did not have to be repaid.

The project aims to increase "the efficiency and sustainability of water used for irrigation" in order to improve rice production. The 2003 loan proposal claims that the project will thereby decrease Haiti's reliance on imports, make Haiti less susceptible to volatile global food price fluctuations, and over time, increase food security and lead to higher incomes for Haitian farmers.

The project fails to consider agriculture from a women's or human rights perspective. Instead, the loan proposal focuses solely on the economic benefits of "increasing the efficiency and sustainability of water used for irrigation." The project also fails to acknowledge gender inequality in Haitian agriculture, including women's unequal access to land and lack of decision-making and leadership roles within Haiti's farmer associations.

Rather than explicitly promote equal opportunities and outcomes for men and women, the loan proposal actually reinforces gender inequality by stating that project benefits may not "remain available to all segments of the community, most notably women." The loan proposal also fails to indicate whether female "beneficiaries" have participated in any stages of the project cycle, including preparation, implementation, completion and reporting. Although the loan proposal promises that the project's social impacts will be "measured by the effect of the project on the income of particular sets of households, with special reference to impacts on women and children," it is impossible to determine the project's differential impacts on women and men, boys and girls, given the lack of gender-specific indicators and sex-disaggregated data (IDB, 2003).

Applying Gender Action's Essential Gender Analysis Checklist:

Human Rights: The loan proposal does not approach agricultural intensification from a human rights perspective.

Gender In/equality: The loan proposal neither acknowledges gender inequality, nor explicitly promotes gender equality.

Gender Data: The loan proposal neither provides nor analyzes sex-disaggregated data. It also fails to mandate the collection of sex-disaggregated data in its monitoring framework.

Gender in Context: The loan proposal does not include a social, economic or political context in which to understand gender relations in regard to land management and agriculture in Haiti.

Gender Access: The project does not promote equal access to project benefits for men and women; the project actually creates barriers for poor women, who are primarily responsible for collecting water, since it "require[s] that producers invest their time and income paying for water."

Gender Input: The loan proposal does not indicate whether women and girls were able to participate throughout the project cycle.

Gender Output: The loan proposal does not explicitly promote project outputs and outcomes that equally benefit women and men.

Gender Impact: The loan proposal does not examine differential impacts on women and men, boys and girls.

Underlying Causes of Food Insecurity in Rural Haiti

- Limited food production capacity
- Food import dependency
- Lack of basic social services
- Natural disasters
- Socio-political instability
- Widespread poverty

—WFP, 2008

UNICEF: Haiti Malnutrition and Food Security Indicators (2009)

Population	10,033,000
Life expectancy at birth for ages 15-59 (2008)	60(m)/63(f)
Percent of population living below \$1 per day	54
Percent of infants with low birth weight	25
Percent households that consume iodized salt	3
Percent children <5 years who are underweight	18
Percent children < 5 years who are stunted	29
Percent children < 5 years who are wasting	10
Percent children who receive early breastfeeding	44
Percent children who are exclusively breastfed (< 6 months)	41

The IDB's Ennery-Quinte Agricultural Intensification Project, 2005/2010 (US\$27.1 million)

In 2005, the IDB provided a five-year, US\$27.1 million loan (0.4 percent of its 2005 budget) for Haiti's national Agricultural Intensification Plan, which aims to rehabilitate irrigation systems, improve crop yields, increase farmers' access to export markets, and thereby raise incomes and enhance food security for over 10,000 rural Haitian farmers. Following the earthquake in 2010, the IDB approved an additional US\$15.7 million grant to support follow-up activities and maintenance.

The 2005 loan proposal, which lacks a human rights perspective, fails to acknowledge entrenched gender inequalities that could impact women's ability to participate in project activities and access project benefits. The loan proposal promises that "pro-active measures will be taken to assure broad participation...with particular regard to the full participation of women," and recommends that "monitoring criteria should include criteria for assessing the effectiveness of community outreach in reaching women" (IDB, 2005). However, Gender Action's analysis reveals that the project's monitoring and evaluation framework lacks gender-specific indicators and does not mandate the collection of sex-disaggregated data. It is therefore impossible to determine the degree to which female "beneficiaries" actually engage in and benefit from project activities.

Gender Action's IFI Gender Advocacy in Post-Earthquake Haiti

Gender Action has actively monitored post-earthquake IFI investments and reconstruction, and worked alongside Haitian and international organizations as part of the Haiti Advocacy Working Group to demand effective and just reconstruction and long-term development. Recent publications include:

- [World Bank and Inter-American Development Bank: Haiti Post-Earthquake Track Record on Gender, Agriculture and Rural Development](#): At the time of writing, this publication presented Gender Action's analysis of 44 IDB approved grants and 7 World Bank grants for Haiti after the earthquake. Gender Action analyzed these grants to assess the extent and quality of their rural and gender content and found that "the vast majority of World Bank and IDB post-earthquake grants to Haiti neither focus on agriculture and rural development, nor on the role of women" (Gender Action, 2010).
- [The Haiti Gender Shadow Report](#): This report, edited by Gender Action, provides the crucial gender content that is missing from the Haitian government's WB-led Post Disaster Needs Assessment, the operative blueprint for Haiti's recovery (Haiti Equality Collective, 2010).

Applying Gender Action's Essential Gender Analysis Checklist:

Human Rights: The project loan proposal does not assume a human rights perspective.

Gender In/equality: The loan proposal fails to acknowledge and address gender inequalities between men and women, boys and girls.

Gender Data: The monitoring and evaluation framework does not include any gender indicators, nor does it mandate the collection of sex-disaggregated data.

Gender in Context: The loan proposal does not analyze gender relations or inequalities in a broader context.

Gender Access: The project fails to promote equal access to project activities for men and women, boys and girls.

Gender Input: Although the loan proposal claims to support "the full participation of women," it has no indicators to measure women's participation.

Gender Output: Although the Environmental and Social Management Report provides recommendations to ensure that women are able to benefit from the project, these recommendations are not mandated or enforced.

Gender Impact: The loan proposal mentions women in the monitoring plan, but does not include specific targets and indicators to measure the differential impact on women and men, boys and girls.

The 2010 Earthquake's Impact on Food Security

- Increased food insecurity
- Worse sanitary conditions
- Increased acute malnutrition
- Intensified micronutrient deficiencies
- Even less government capacity to address the nutrition crisis than before the earthquake

—World Bank, 2010

The WB's Rural Community Driven Development Project, 2005/2010 (US\$53 million)

The WB granted US\$38 million for its Rural Community Driven Development Project in 2005, which aims to “enhance access to basic and economic infrastructure” (i.e. irrigation systems, feeder roads, schools, vocational training centers, health posts) and fund income-generating activities in rural and peri-urban areas (WB, 2005). Although the project appraisal document (PAD) does not mention women in its promise to ensure that poor and marginalized communities have “unimpeded access to project benefits” (WB, 2005), a 2009 WB gender assessment found that the project enhanced women’s community participation, leadership capability and women’s social status (WB, 2010b). In 2010, the WB approved an additional US\$15 million grant to address the needs of up to 1.2 million Haitians who relocated to rural areas from the earthquake-ravaged Port-au-Prince. The additional financing, which is detailed in the WB’s 2010 Project Paper, intends to “scal[e] up community sub-project investments” and provide additional capacity building (WB, 2010b).

Commendably, the WB included a “dedicated gender strategy” to support “gender sensitization programs, training for female leaders and development of women’s networks” (WB, 2010b) under the additional financing’s US\$2.1 million “Capacity Building and Technical Assistance” component. However, although the 2005 PAD acknowledges Haitian women’s inability to engage in decision-making in Haiti’s hierarchical society (WB, 2005), the 2010 Project Paper aims for women to hold only 30 percent of Community Development Council positions. While WB claims that this indicator is sufficient to “track project progress from a gender perspective” (WB, 2010b), none of the project’s other indicators are sex-disaggregated. It is therefore impossible to determine whether women and men equally participated in the project’s design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, benefited from capacity building activities, or experienced different project impacts.



Applying Gender Action’s Essential Gender Analysis Checklist:

Human Rights: The project does not approach community development from a human rights perspective.

Gender In/equality: The PAD acknowledges women’s lack of influence in decision making processes, but does not aim to fully redress this gender inequality. The Project Paper claims that the initial phase improved women’s “well being” and social status, but does not fully address gender inequality beyond women’s Community Development Council membership.

Gender Data: The project only includes one indicator to monitor women’s project participation, which the WB considers sufficient to “track project progress from a gender perspective.” None of the other project indicators are sex-disaggregated.

Gender in Context: The PAD offers minimal context in which to understand gender relations and rural community development. The Project Paper does not offer any context at all.

Gender Access: The project explicitly promotes women’s participation, but does not require women’s equal project participation with men.

Gender Input: The PAD does not indicate that women were consulted and allowed to offer input throughout the project cycle.

Gender Output: The project does not explicitly promote equal outputs for women and men, boys and girls.

Gender Impact: The project’s lack of sex disaggregated data and insufficient indicators make it impossible to determine the project’s differential impacts on men and women, boys and girls.

The WB's Strengthening the Management of Agriculture Public Services Project, 2009 (US\$5 million)

Although the WB invested only US\$5 million, or 0.01 percent of its 2009 budget, in a grant to strengthen Haiti's Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Rural Development (MARNDR) and improve agricultural services, the "Strengthening Agriculture Public Services" project provides a relatively positive example of gender integration in IFI food security investments. Despite the project's lack of a human rights perspective, Gender Action's analysis shows that project documents acknowledge and seek to redress several gender inequalities. At the MARNDR level, the project appraisal document notes that there are few female professional and managerial staff and "minimal mainstreaming of social aspects, particularly regarding gender" in MARNDR agriculture investments; it states the project will try to "better mainstream these [gender] issues" (WB, 2009).



Applying Gender Action's Essential Gender Analysis Checklist:

Human Rights: The project does not include a human rights perspective.

Gender In/equality: The project acknowledges and tries to redress several gender inequalities.

Gender Data: The project does not collect or analyze sex-disaggregated data or mandate gender indicators.

Gender in Context: The project's consultation with women provides a social and cultural context in which to understand gender relations in regard to the agricultural sector.

Gender Access: The project does not promote equal access to project activities and benefits for men and women, boys and girls.

Gender Input: Although the project included women-only consultations, the monitoring framework does not measure whether the WB responded to women's requests for literacy and numeracy trainings.

Gender Output: The appraisal document does not promote equal outputs for men and women, boys and girls.

Gender Impact: The project does not examine its differential impact on women and men, boys and girls.

At the community level, WB consultations with women farmers revealed that "women were largely absent from leadership roles in mixed productive organizations as a result of pervasive illiteracy among women producers, women's time constraints because of their domestic responsibilities which limit the frequent travel and meeting attendance leadership roles entail, as well as men's resistance to women occupying higher profile positions in such groups." The project appraisal states that consultation process findings "inform[ed] project design and implementation plans for the activities financed under the loan" (WB, 2009). These activities include technical training, literacy and numeracy programs, which would put women on more equal footing with men and help them challenge their "husbands' and other men's resistance to women occupying higher profile positions" in agricultural organizations. Although the WB claims that the project includes "the development of a basic financial literacy program for women" (Nedelman, 2010), the latest Implementation Status and Results Report (WB, 2011b) fails to measure progress on this activity.

The project does not mandate the use of gender-specific indicators and collection of sex-disaggregated data. The "inclusion of gender indicators" is a "suggested action," along with "the creation of conditions for facilitating youth and women's access to basic agricultural training and extension services, and the design of gender-sensitive training programs in pilot areas" (WB, 2009). Without the mandatory inclusion of gender indicators and sex-disaggregated data, the WB cannot measure women's participation, access to project activities, and the project's differential impact of the project on men and women.

The IDB's Mango as an Opportunity for Long-Term Economic Growth Project, 2010 (US\$7.6 million)

The IDB's Mango as an Opportunity for Long-Term Economic Growth project provides a positive example of gender integration insofar as it explicitly promotes equal project participation for women and men. The project "donors memorandum" promises that "the project will ensure that women producers are empowered through [Producer Business Groups (PBGs)]," and that women's access to PBGs "will be closely monitored to ensure that it equals participation by men." It also promises to train women's groups in "leadership and group dynamics" (IDB, 2010). The project includes several gender-specific indicators to measure these outcomes, which hold the IDB accountable for ensuring that "at least 50 percent of employees at processing plant are women and women have senior roles; 50 percent of PBGs undertake actions aimed at women's participation" and "90 percent of PBG meetings [are] conducive to women's participation" (IDB, 2010). This gender-sensitive content responds to Gender Action's critique of the IDB's earlier project document (Gender Action, 2010).

Although the project explicitly promotes women's participation, however, the flawed project itself is hardly gender-sensitive. The project aims to improve the Haitian mango industry's "ability to add value locally and diversify its products offering while improving the lives of the mango farmers" (IDB, 2010) by shifting mango production from traditional cooperatives to privatized, commercial business structures. This project not only weakens Haiti's traditional small producer model. It also undermines women's ability to participate in agricultural activities and earn income, as cooperatives have traditionally provided essential social programs, like daycare, for poor and vulnerable groups (Gender Action, 2010). As Gender Action has previously documented, such IFI privatization ventures deepen poverty for poor women and men while enriching corporations and local elites (Gender Action, 2006).

The Coca Cola Company, which invests 60 percent of total project funding through selling "Haiti Hope" promotional drinks in the United States, stands to benefit as "there is strong potential for [Coca Cola]...to be able to purchase a portion of the mango fruit juice produced by the small farmers in this project" (IDB, 2010). The Coca Cola Company also sits on the project Steering Committee alongside the IDB to provide general guidance, advise project management on strategy, policy issues and new industry developments, and "build support for the project among key stakeholders and regulators" in Haiti's mango industry (IDB, 2010). The Steering Committee fails to include any representatives of the Haitian "beneficiaries" themselves.

Given its focus on agribusiness, it is hardly surprising that the project lacks a human rights perspective. The project also fails to acknowledge gender inequalities that may hinder women's participation and access to project benefits. Haitian women are often discouraged from participating in agricultural organizations when men are present (WB, 2009), and may have difficulty engaging in activities due to competing domestic and childcare responsibilities. The project also ignores the fact that only ten percent of women farmers own their own land (Social Institutions & Gender Index, 2009), which would severely limit their potential to benefit from the IDB's investment. It falls short of explicitly promoting outcomes that equally enhance the livelihoods of women and men, including new jobs and higher incomes for farmers.

Applying Gender Action's Essential Gender Analysis Checklist:

Human Rights: The donors memorandum does not include a human rights perspective.

Gender In/equality: The donors memorandum does not acknowledge or try to redress gender inequalities.

Gender Data: The donors memorandum includes several gender-specific indicators to measure women's project participation, but none measure the project's gender outputs and impacts.

Gender in Context: The donors memorandum does not provide any context in which to understand gender relations in Haiti.

Gender Access: The project explicitly promotes equal access to project activities for men and women.

Gender Input: There is no indication in the donors memorandum that women 'beneficiaries' will participate throughout the project cycle.

Gender Output: The project promotes women's equal participation in project activities, but does not explicitly promote equal outcomes for men and women.

Gender Impact: The donors memorandum fails to examine the potential harmful impacts that may result from undermining traditional rural cooperatives and their social programs, which support women. It also lacks indicators to measure the project's differential impact on women and men.

Gender Action Recommendations

Civil Society Organizations Can:

- ✓ Use Gender Action resources to advocate for IFIs to increase food security investments that directly benefit women and girls
- ✓ Pressure IFIs to strengthen and fully implement their gender policies with regard to food security projects
- ✓ Help those who are negatively impacted by IFI food security projects to bring gender discrimination cases to IFI accountability mechanisms; help them gather information about IFI policies and procedures

IFIs Must:

- ✓ Consistently approach food security investments from a human rights perspective
- ✓ Avoid undermining developing countries' local agricultural markets, which harms the livelihoods of poor women, men, girls and boys
- ✓ End harmful conditionalities, such as requiring that developing countries privatize agriculture and rural development activities and remove or reduce subsidies and tariffs while developed countries maintain their subsidies and tariffs
- ✓ Live up to repeated promises to collect sex disaggregated data to enable measuring differential project impacts on women, men, girls and boys
- ✓ Explicitly promote gender integration throughout food security project cycles and promote outcomes that increase food security, especially for women and girls, who comprise the majority of the poor

GENDER ACTION

1875 Connecticut Avenue Suite 500

Washington DC 20009

Tel: 202-949-5463

Web: www.genderaction.org

Email: info@genderaction.org

Web: www.genderaction.org

Gender Action's mission is to promote women's rights and gender equality and ensure women and men equally participate in and benefit from International Financial Institution (IFI) investments in developing countries.



References

- FAO, 2001. 'The State of Food and Agriculture: Latin America and Caribbean.' <http://www.fao.org/docrep/003/x9800e/x9800e10.htm>
- FAO, 2010. 'Web-based information tool for food security in Haiti.' www.fao.org/news/story/pt/item/40042/icode/en
- Gender Action, 2006. 'Gender Guide to World Bank and IMF Policy-Based Lending.' <http://genderaction.org/images/Gender%20Guide%20032007.pdf>
- Gender Action, 2010. 'World Bank and Inter-American Development Bank: Haiti Post-Earthquake Track Record on Gender, Agriculture and Rural Development.' www.genderaction.org/publications/2010/haiti_ifi_ag.pdf
- Gender Action, 2011. 'Gender Toolkit for International Finance Watchers.' http://genderaction.org/publications/IFI-Watcher_Toolkit.pdf
- Haiti Equality Collective, 2010. 'Haiti Gender Shadow Report.' <http://www.genderaction.org/publications/2010/gsr.pdf>
- IDB, 2003. 'Agricultural Intensification Project.' <http://idbdocs.iadb.org/wsdocs/getdocument.aspx?docnum=416109>
- IDB, 2005. 'Ennery-Quinte Agricultural Intensification Project.' <http://idbdocs.iadb.org/wsdocs/getdocument.aspx?docnum=575053>
- IDB, 2010. 'Donors Memorandum: Mango as a Long-Term Economic Growth Opportunity.' <http://idbdocs.iadb.org/wsdocs/getdocument.aspx?docnum=35191701>
- McGowan, L. 1997. 'Haiti.' Washington, DC: Foreign Policy In Focus. <http://www.fpif.org/reports/haiti>
- Nadelman, 2010. 'A Small But Bright Light in a Terrible Year for Haiti.' <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTGEN-DER/0,,contentMDK:22836958~pagePK:210058~piPK:210062~theSitePK:336868,00.html>
- Social Institutions & Gender Index, 2009. <http://genderindex.org/country/haiti>
- UNDP Human Development Report, 2009. http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/HDR_2009_EN_Complete.pdf
- UNICEF, 2010. 'At a Glance: Haiti.' http://www.unicef.org/infobycountry/haiti_statistics.html#80
- UNIFEM, 2010. 'At a Glance: Women in Haiti.' http://www.unifem.org/news_events/story_detail.php?StoryID=1146
- WB, 2005. 'PAD: Community Driven Development Project.' http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2005/07/12/000090341_20050712153850/Rendered/PDF/32634a.pdf
- WB, 2009. PAD: 'Strengthening Agriculture Public Services.' http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/main?pagePK=64193027&piPK=64187937&theSitePK=523679&menuPK=64187510&searchMenuPK=51351213&theSitePK=40941&entityID=000333037_20090623233008&searchMenuPK=51351213&theSitePK=40941
- WB, 2010. 'Nutrition Security in Haiti: Pre-and Post-earthquake Conditions and the Way Forward.' http://sitesources.worldbank.org/INT/LAC/Resources/2578031269390034020/EnBreve_157_English_Web.pdf
- WB, 2010b. 'Project Paper: Community Driven Development Project.' http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2010/05/21/000334955_20100521021951/Rendered/PDF/530730PJP090101OfficialUseOnly1.pdf
- WB, 2011a. 'Haiti: Fostering Economic Empowerment for Female Agricultural Producers.' <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/NEWS/0,,print:Y~isCURL:Y~contentMDK:22746256~menuPK:141310~pagePK:34370~piPK:34424~theSitePK:4607,0.html>
- WB, 2011b. 'Implementation Status & Results Report: Haiti Strengthening the Management of Agriculture Public Services.' http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/LCR/2011/01/24/C49F544571DBDAAE852578220073AEF4/1_0/Rendered/PDF/P1136230ISR0D012420111295903014726.pdf
- World Food Program, 2008. 'Executive Brief: Haiti.' <http://home.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/ena/wfp197128.pdf>
- World Food Program, 2010. 'Haiti Overview.' <http://www.wfp.org/countries/Haiti/Overview>