

# Gender Equality and Equity in Irrigation Scheme Management: The Gender in Irrigation Learning and Improvement Tool

---

Deborah Rubin,<sup>1</sup> Nicole Lefore<sup>2</sup> and Elizabeth Weight<sup>3</sup>

## *Overview of tool*

The Gender in Irrigation Learning and Improvement Tool (GILIT) looks at the aspects of gender equity that can be influenced by the policies and operations of formal irrigation schemes. The intention is that the tool can help to facilitate learning and improve gender equitability by supporting the scheme to consider gender equitable standards in relation to men's and women's involvement, needs and benefits. In addition, the GILIT tool seeks to clarify specific actions that scheme management can take to address inequities that are highlighted through application of the tool. The assumption of the tool is that the scheme's gender-related goals are to aim for equality of access and benefits. In such projects, the scheme's role is to ensure that the governance systems and service provision systems do not formally or informally discriminate against or discourage women, and to provide women with supplementary support if needed. The questions also direct managers and researchers to consider what women may already be doing to manage the resources available to them through informal patterns of behavior and cooperation, and to consider how the scheme could better support them.

## *Who is the Tool Designed For?*

The GILIT has been designed to be directly relevant, useful, and easily applicable to irrigation schemes or projects. The GILIT is intended to be used by:

- **Irrigation scheme managers, project managers and other interested stakeholders** can benefit by using this tool for collaboratively learning and improving.
- **Donors** can use this tool to support improvements in irrigation schemes, for example, by providing support to highly "equitable" schemes to document and share with other schemes what they are doing. It might also suggest where more investment is needed for inequitable schemes to become equitable.
- **Scheme stakeholders** can use the tool to hold registered organizations and associations and scheme management accountable to national legislation and policies related to gender equality.
- **Project or scheme evaluators** can use the tool to identify measures taken throughout scheme development and implementation to support equitable outcomes.
- **Researchers** may also find the tool useful for comparing gender performance across types of irrigation schemes, varying governance configurations, and geographical areas and regions.

## *Measurement for learning and improving*

Three areas of measurement are chosen in relation to men's and women's: i) access to scheme resources (including information, such as in the design phase; land, water, and other inputs); ii) participation in scheme membership, leadership, and decision-making; and iii) access to scheme benefits, including access to market information, packaging, and payments from product sales or processing, depending on the location and crop. In each of these three categories (access to scheme

---

<sup>1</sup> Cultural Practice, LLC

<sup>2</sup> IWMI

<sup>3</sup> IWMI

resources, access to decision-making, and access to benefits), a series of statements are suggested that describe conditions that would result from the implementation of gender-equitable policies and practices. The framing of each statement acknowledges men's and women's different initial enabling conditions with respect to the assets needed to fully participate and/or benefit from the scheme. Scores are suggested for different levels of performance on the gender-equitable statements. However, the tool is not intended to penalize low scores, but to indicate where further support is needed in specific areas for improvement.

### *Data for GILIT*

Data for responding to and scoring sections on a scheme or project with this learning tool may come from various sources. The national policy context and existing overall situation may be understood through policy documents on natural resources, water, gender and local government, as well as organizational structures and budgets that provide insight into human and financial resource allocation and investment into gender. The more specific project or scheme context may be understood through project goals, objectives and expected outcomes, as well as processes and activities; useful documents include project designs, monitoring and evaluation data and reports, and internal and external evaluations or impact assessments. These documents may be available from government ministries and agencies, donors, universities, NGOs and consultants. A general understanding of how the local context fits within (or is anomalous to) national patterns and statistics is important to identifying the potential and opportunities for improving gender equitability. The majority of the questions in the document should be answered by women and men participants in the irrigation scheme across different levels. It is important to score the scheme activities and results across the range of users related to the project or scheme to ensure all perspectives are considered, from scheme planning level, to scheme managers and local officers implementing the project, to users of irrigated water services within the scheme.

### *How to use and score the GILIT*

#### **Statement scores**

To apply the tool, the user will read a series of statements that describe an optimal condition, state or outcome for women involved in the irrigation scheme. The user will rank each **statement** on a scale of 1 to 3, where "1" indicates that the scheme does not or rarely matches the optimal condition, state or outcome and "3" indicates that the scheme often or always matches the optimal condition, state or outcome.

To assist in scoring the statements, each statement is followed by **a series of questions**. These questions provide a guide for users to rank the situation in relation to the optimal outcome statement. For example, if most responses to the questions are negative, the scoring of the statement will be low. These questions can and should be adapted to the local context to recognize that each context differs according to local practices and national policies and priorities. If the GILIT is used by NGOs or donors, the questions could also be adapted to reflect the requirements or expectations of that organization. For schemes (or investors) that seek more quantitative assessment and data, the supporting questions could be used to collect detailed data.

Each statement receives a score reflecting the response to the various questions. The supporting questions are not scored individually, but instead are intended to reveal the gender dimensions of scheme operations in relation to the statements that represent the optimal condition. The supporting questions thus act as a guide to inform those using the tool about men's and women's different needs, preferences, and capabilities. If all the answers to the questions are positive, then the scheme receives

the highest possible score of 3. If most of the answers are negative, it receives a score of 1. If it is not possible to answer the questions because no information is available, the scheme receives a score of 0.

### Overall project/scheme score

A scoring table is provided with the tool. Currently, the scales are different for the three sections of the GILIT in order to reflect the level of effort and investment required to achieve gender equity. Higher scores are required for “Section A: Access to scheme resources” because it is easier for scheme management to include both men and women in discussions about the scheme and its organization, plot locations, and benefits prior to construction, and to give both men and women an equal opportunity to become scheme members, including gaining supplementary services or considerations to make that possible. “Section B: Access to scheme membership, leadership opportunities and decision-making” and “Section C: Access to scheme benefits” represent more complex processes of establishing equitable governance of irrigation projects. This requires more investment, effort and engagement with committees or other bodies. Establishing equitable policies (i.e., by-laws and other regulations) is important at this level, yet not sufficient to ensure equitable implementation of those policies. Equitable access to scheme benefits, because it can be deeply embedded in household and community-level gender relations, is probably the most difficult to structure and to implement.

The scoring scales therefore reflect the different levels of investment, engagement and effort to achieve optimal gender outcomes. The emphasis of the tool is not necessary the scores. The discussion around each statement enables scheme participants, managers and investors to reflect on performance and to identify ways to improve gender equitability. The tool is useful for reporting purposes and for assessing improvement in cases where the tool is implemented at different project phases. The table is not intended to be fixed or universal across all contexts; instead, it should be adjusted to account for the degree of difficulty to achieve gender equitability in each local context.

Table: Scoring Scales for the GILIT

Scoring	
Section A: 0-13 Section B: 0-8 Section C: 0-5 Total: 0-26	Women are underrepresented as scheme participants and are formally disadvantaged in scheme participation. Women face gender-based constraints to participation in the scheme, in scheme management, and/or in access to scheme services. Women are disadvantaged in service delivery. Women do not participate equally in scheme management.
Section A: 14-24 Section B: 9-16 Section C: 6-12 Total: 29-52	Women are underrepresented as scheme participants and face some informal disadvantages to participation and/or access to benefits.
Section A: 25-33 Section B: 17-24 Section C: 13-21 Total: 55-78	Men and women participate in scheme management and leadership as needed to benefit. Women and men access scheme services and benefit equally from the scheme.

### Additional Questions if Scores are Low

If scores are low, the implementer of the tool asks respondents to answer the additional questions in the far right column. These additional questions are important because these represent learning from the assessment process based on participant feedback. Recommendations for improvement should focus on actions that are implementable and within the scope of the scheme or project. The responses to these questions should be documented carefully. The responses to the questions should be reported

and are the basis for recommendations for improvements. The scheme managers may use the responses and related recommendations to change or adapt scheme/project activities to improve gender performance. The recommendation may also suggest areas in which it may be important to work with other levels of authority beyond scheme management to achieve the goals of full and equitable participation. In addition, an analysis of responses and recommendations across a range of schemes in different geographic locations will enable broader lessons and learning to be synthesized.

### **Context statements and questions that are not scored**

The first section of the GILIT, titled “Context Questions”, is intended to provide an understanding of the broader national and sub-national regulatory and enabling environment within which each irrigation scheme or project operates. Responses to these questions will not be scored because the national and sub-national regulatory environment is outside of the control of the scheme management. The section of the GILIT provides a basis for assessing the performance of the scheme in relation to the overall national or regional context and in relation to the goals of the scheme. This section should be compared to the overall score of the scheme or project to identify if the scheme aligns with national policies or scheme/project development goals. A positive national policy context that prioritizes and promotes gender equitable outcomes from irrigation investments should be reflected in the scheme/project plans and implementation activities and therefore in the overall scores.

# Instructions for Implementation of the Gender in Irrigation Learning and Improvement Tool<sup>4</sup>

---

This short guide will assist water user association leaders and irrigation scheme managers to promote equal opportunities and equal participation of all its members, men and women, in accessing the benefits from and meeting the obligations of association and scheme membership. The listed questions below are intended to measure whether men and women have equitable i) access to scheme resources; ii) participation in association and scheme management; and iii) access to scheme benefits. The tool can be used by WUA leaders, irrigation scheme managers, or members, or it could be implemented by M & E specialists, researchers, and external consultants.

It is recommended that the interviews be complemented with a document review. Documents that should be compiled and reviewed include laws, regulations, policies, and scheme plans and documented consultations (for example, documentation of community consultations). This will provide another source of input in addition to interviews with community members. It is also recommended that interviews are scheduled at a time and a location that is convenient for women.

## **Guidance in selecting interviewees:**

1. Ensure that interviewees include women and men of different ethnic, religious or social groups that are represented in the scheme
2. Ensure that interviewees include different economic groups
3. Ensure that interviewees include a significant number of women who are not members of the scheme management

## **Guidance in asking interview questions:**

1. Try to determine if meetings and participation of both men and women was meaningful or simply included women to meet a quota or other requirements.
2. Try to determine whether women in different ethnic and economic groups were consulted and whether their views were included in decisions. For example, were poorer women included in consultations? Were there specific needs addressed in the scheme management decisions?

## **Guidance in Scoring:**

Context questions: The questions on the national and local policy and regulatory environment are not scored. The information collected for that section of the questionnaire is intended to provide the basis to assess whether or not the scheme is in line with and performing adequately in relation to national policies and regulations, as well as with the goals and objectives set out by the scheme.

Individual Statement Score: Each bolded **Statement** describes a gender-equitable situation. A score is given for performance on that Statement. High scores reflect greater equality of opportunity between men and women; low scores suggest that inequality or discrimination may be present. **Scoring Guidance** describes a situation related to the statement representing three levels of equity. The Guidance that best describes the situation in the scheme is chosen with a corresponding score.

Scoring guidance 1 describes a situation that is not gender equitable, so receives the lowest score of 1.

Scoring guidance 2 describes a situation that is somewhat, partly or at times gender equitable, so receives a moderate score of 2.

Scoring guidance 3 describes a situation that is gender equitable, so receives the highest score of 3.

Discussion Questions: The tool provides discussion questions next to each Statement to clarify the level of gender equity and to assist in creating a score in cases where/when the level of gender equity related to the

---

<sup>4</sup> The tool has been through multiple versions following expert input, peer review and piloting. Version 1 was developed by Deborah Rubin. Version 2 was developed by Elizabeth Weight. Version 3 was developed by Elizabeth Weight and Nicole Lefore.

statement is unclear. The discussion questions are *not* scored individually, but suggest how the scheme is performing and can be rated on the Statement.

**Low scores:** The tool supports learning to improve in situations of low equity. For statements receiving a low score, the interviewer should facilitate a discussion among respondent(s) to propose specific ways to improve the scheme that are within the scope of control of scheme managers. Discussion points are suggested in the column for “Feedback for suggested actions if scores are low”.

**No information:** If it is not possible to answer the questions because no information is available and the respondents have no information, the score is 0. This suggests the scheme has not considered the issue, is not directly addressing any potential constraints, and/or does not support a gender equitable approach.

**Not applicable to scheme or project:** If the statement does not apply to the scheme or project, the score is N/A and it is not considered in the overall scoring.

Individual statement score guide	
N/A	Not applicable
0	Insufficient information
1	No; not at all; rarely (situation is not gender equitable)
2	Moderately; some of the time (situation is somewhat, partly or at times gender equitable)
3	Yes; nearly all; comprehensively (situation is gender equitable)

**Section and Overall Score Guide:** Individual scores should be totaled for each section and compared to the point scale below. This is done by section, because the statements for equality in some sections are harder to achieve than other sections.

**N/A statements scoring:** In cases in which statements receive a N/A and therefore no score, for each N/A response the total section score available must decrease.

Section Score Guide	
Section A: 0-10 Section B: 0-8 Section C: 0-6 Total: 0-24	<b>Scheme approach to gender equity show little or no sensitivity; requires attention and redress.</b> Women are underrepresented as scheme participants and are formally disadvantaged in participation. Women face gender-based constraints to participation, scheme management, and/or access to scheme services that result in lack of equal access to benefits.
Section A: 11-17 Section B: 9-15 Section C: 7-13 Total: 27-45	<b>Scheme approach to gender equity shows some sensitivity. Statements will low scores require attention and adjustment to related activities.</b> Women are underrepresented as scheme participants and face some informal disadvantages to participation and/or access to benefits.
Section A: 18-24 Section B: 16-24 Section C: 14-21 Total: 48-69	<b>Scheme approach ensures that men and women participate in scheme management and leadership and can access scheme benefits. Monitoring is suggested to ensure continued gender equity on scheme.</b> Women and men access scheme services and benefit equally from the scheme.

## General Information for each respondent group or interview

Date of interview:	
Conducted by:	
Type of group interviewed (farmer/WUA, or scheme management, etc.)	
Interviewees names, position in scheme (member and/or leadership) and contact information:	

### About the Irrigation Scheme

Name of Irrigation Scheme:	
Irrigation Scheme Location (Geographic location; GPS coordinates if available)	
Irrigation Scheme Description (size of area, water source, water lifting and distribution method, major crop in the scheme):	
Irrigation Scheme Contact Information:	

### About the Project

(If the GILIT tool is implemented for a Project working with or supporting an Irrigation Scheme, complete the questions below)

Name of Project:	
Project Implementers (Government agency, NGO and/or donor agency):	
Project Donor or funding agency:	
Lead Project Implementer Contact Information:	
Start and end dates of Project activities in this Irrigation Scheme:	

# The GILIT Questionnaire

## Section: Context Questions

**Section Score: This section is not scored**

**Purpose of section:** This section of the tool is intended to provide an understanding of the broader national and sub-national regulatory context within which each irrigation scheme or project operates. Responses to these questions are not scored because the policy and regulatory environment is outside of the control of the scheme management. The purpose of questions is to provide the basis for assessing the performance of the scheme in relation to the overall national or regional context and in relation to the goals of the scheme. This section should be compared to the overall score of the scheme or project to identify if the scheme's mission or goals and its operations align with national policies and development goals. A positive national policy context that prioritizes and promotes gender equitable outcomes from irrigation investments should be reflected in the scheme/project plans and implementation activities and therefore in the overall scores.

Statement	Guiding Questions
<p><b>Women and men are aware of and knowledgeable about national policies, acts, regulations and goals that prioritize equitable access to resources, participation and benefits between men and women.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are national policies or regulatory frameworks already in place that clearly state that women and men should have equal access to natural resources?</li> <li>• Do national policy documents state that women should have increasing and/or equal benefits as men?</li> <li>• Are local institutions mandated to provide opportunities to both men and women to access and benefit equally from water and land resources?</li> <li>• Are local institutions resourced financially and with adequate staff to support both men and women to access and benefit equally from water and land resources?</li> <li>• Are women represented as appointed or elected officials at local level in the scheme area?</li> <li>• In the local history, did both women and men historically have equal access to land and water resources? If not, is there a clear trend of that changing to become more equitable?</li> <li>• Are there national laws that prohibit sex discrimination in association membership? Does the national law or regulation on WUAs address gender equity and/or participation of women in decision-making of WUAs?</li> </ul>
<p><b>The purpose of the scheme/project is to ensure equal benefits for both men and women from access to water.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the project design state goals and/or objectives related to gender equity with regard to access and shared benefits between women and men?</li> <li>• Does the project design include specific activities targeting women?</li> <li>• Does the project monitoring and evaluation framework include any indicators related to increased access to water and access to scheme/project benefits for women?</li> <li>• Was the scheme or project intended for irrigation only? Were non-irrigation uses of water considered at any point during the feasibility or planning stages? Were plans put in place outside of the project to ensure water sources for non-irrigation purposes?</li> <li>• Did the scheme design change the sources of water for non-irrigation uses? Did the scheme change the amount of effort, time and/or expense for women to access the water?</li> </ul>



## Section A: Access to Scheme Resources

## Section Score Total:

**Purpose of section:** This section reviews whether association and scheme by-laws and other regulations give men and women equal access to resources such as land, water, labor, and technology. Men and women often have different initial levels of attributes, resources, and capacity and are not always equally able to meet association or scheme membership criteria, but the process of establishing the water users association and the irrigation scheme should be inclusive and not discriminate on the basis of sex. Sometimes, there may be a need to provide special services to underrepresented or underserved groups, whether men or women, to achieve goals on equality.

Statement	Score	Scoring Guidance	Discussion Questions for Scoring	Feedback for Suggested Actions if Scores are Low
<b>Scheme planners met with various stakeholders, including women's groups and potential women participants and clearly explained scheme goals, objectives, and eligibility and potential costs and benefits</b>	n/a <input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Scheme planners met with no women stakeholders</li> <li>2. Scheme planners met with men and a few women in the community</li> <li>3. Scheme planners met with a sufficient number of women (including poorer and less poor women) and women and men were well informed about costs and benefits</li> </ol>	<p><i>Did project planners or scheme implementers meet with existing women's groups or meet with groups of women farmers in the area?</i></p> <p><i>Did women understand the costs and benefits of the scheme to their satisfaction?</i></p>	<p>If scheme planners met with few or no women, did that negatively affect women?</p> <p>If women were not well-informed of the scheme costs and/or benefits, did that lack of information negatively affect them?</p> <p>If this lack of information negatively affect women, do they have suggestions for addressing this issue now?</p>
<b>Both men and women were included in discussions of options for site location, design and proposed technologies</b>	n/a <input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Only leaders were involved in discussions; all or nearly all were men.</li> <li>2. Most men in the community were involved in discussions; some women were included.</li> <li>3. Most men and women ((including poorer and less poor women) in the community were actively involved in discussions.</li> </ol>	<p><i>Did scheme planners or implementers meet with women's groups to discuss site location, design and proposed technologies?</i></p> <p><i>Were a fair number of women's groups contacted compared to the total number that exist?</i></p>	<p>If women were not actively involved in discussions of scheme options, did their lack of input negatively affect women?</p> <p>If the lack of women's input negatively affected women, do they have suggestions for addressing this issue now?</p>
<b>Both men and women were given opportunities to comment and provide alternative suggestions relating to site location, design and proposed technologies</b>	n/a <input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No suggestions from women were sought in site location, design or technologies.</li> <li>2. Some women's and men's suggestions were considered in site location, design and technologies.</li> <li>3. Women's and men's suggestions were used in site location, design and technologies.</li> </ol>	<p><i>Were women specifically asked to share their views in meetings composed of both men and women?</i></p> <p><i>Were women's suggestions and/or objections discussed and noted, for further consideration?</i></p>	<p>If women's suggestions were not used in site location, design and/or technologies, did that negatively affect women?</p> <p>If women were negatively affected by site location, design</p>

				or technologies, do they have suggestions for addressing these issues now?
<b>Both men and women were or are now given opportunities to discuss and provide suggestions that are considered to ensure equal access to irrigated plots of land.</b>	n/a <input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Only men or no community members were included in discussions of land availability or land allocation.</li> <li>2. Some women were included in discussions of land availability and land allocation.</li> <li>3. Both women and men were included in discussions of land availability of land allocation and their suggestions considered or used.</li> </ol>	<p><i>Are women satisfied that they are included in discussions about land or plot allocation?</i></p> <p><i>If concerns have been or are now raised by women about land or plot allocation, are women satisfied that actions are taken to address their concerns on secure land access?</i></p>	<p>Do women believe that they were negatively impacted by not being included in discussions of land availability and/or land allocation?</p> <p>If women were negatively impacted because their concerns were not address, do they have suggestions for addressing this issue now?</p>
<b>During the scheme or system design process, or during later interaction with members, information was collected and considered on men's and women's different water needs for domestic/household use.</b>	n/a <input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Information was gathered only from men or from no community members regarding domestic water needs.</li> <li>2. Information was gathered from a few men and a few women regarding domestic water needs, but was not considered in scheme planning or management.</li> <li>3. Information was gathered from both women and men regarding domestic water needs. Gender-based preferences are considered in scheme water management for domestic or household uses and production activities.<sup>5</sup></li> </ol>	<p><i>Can water from the scheme or system be used for both domestic and agricultural uses?</i></p> <p><i>If no, are there dedicated sources for domestic uses nearby?</i></p> <p><i>Are women satisfied with access for both domestic and agricultural water sources in the area and the scheme?</i></p> <p><i>Are there tensions over using the scheme's resources for different purposes? If yes, are these tensions related to different uses by men and women?</i></p>	<p>If information was not gathered from women regarding their different uses of water (including domestic or household water use), how were women affected?</p> <p>If women were negatively impacted because their household and domestic water needs were not addressed, do women have suggestions for addressing this issue now?</p>
<b>During the scheme or system design process, or in the current scheme operations, men's and women's choices on crops and the different water needs for agricultural production were/are considered.</b>	n/a <input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Information was gathered only from men regarding water needs for agricultural production.</li> <li>2. Information was gathered from a few men and a few women regarding water needs for agricultural production. Little or no consideration was/is given to gendered</li> </ol>	<p><i>Were/are the different crop and production activities and needs by both men and women considered in the project design and management?</i></p> <p><i>Do both men and women contribute to decisions on the crops grown on the</i></p>	<p>If information was not gathered from women regarding their water needs for agricultural production, how were women affected?</p> <p>If women were negatively impacted because their water</p>

<sup>5</sup> The statements about information collection actual use in scheme plans and/or management are grouped together to emphasize that collecting sex-disaggregated data without analyzing or using it is not sufficient to result in gender equity.

		<p>preferences or needs.</p> <p>3. Information was gathered from both women and men regarding water needs for agricultural production. Gender-based preferences are considered in scheme water management for crops and production activities.<sup>6</sup></p>	<p><i>scheme? Are women satisfied that their suggestions on crops in the scheme are considered?</i></p> <p><i>Are there tensions over using the scheme's resources for different crops? If yes, are these tensions related to different crop preferences of men and women?</i></p>	<p>needs for agriculture production were not considered, do women have suggestions for addressing this issue now?</p>
<p><b>Both men and women were included in discussions of proposed obligations for site operation and maintenance and comments and alternative suggestions were/are incorporated into maintenance and operations plans.</b></p>	<p>n/a <input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>1. Women community members were not involved in discussions regarding site operation and maintenance.</p> <p>2. Some men and women community members were consulted regarding site operation and maintenance and some suggestions considered.</p> <p>3. Both women (including poorer) and men were consulted regarding site maintenance and suggestions informed site operation and maintenance.</p>	<p><i>Were women's groups and prospective women members met with to discuss proposed operation and maintenance obligations specific for women?</i></p> <p><i>Did women make suggestions and/or objections? Were specific actions taken based on the suggestions made?</i></p> <p><i>Are women satisfied with their roles in operation and maintenance?</i></p>	<p>If women were not involved in discussions regarding site operation and maintenance, how were women affected?</p> <p>If women were negatively affected because they were not involved in decision making on site operation or maintenance, do they have suggestions for addressing this issue now?</p>
<p><b>Scheme management provides supplementary support to men and women to overcome agricultural production and marketing constraints.</b></p> <p>Note: If scheme provides no such support or services, then the response to the statement is N/A.</p>	<p>n/a <input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>1. Scheme management does not provide any supplementary support to women to overcome production and/or marketing constraints.</p> <p>2. Scheme management provides some supplementary support to overcome production and/or marketing constraints, but women find it challenging to access or effectively use these support services.</p> <p>3. Scheme management provides both women and men adequate support to overcome production and/or marketing constraints.</p>	<p><i>Does the scheme offer inputs on credit to both men and women? If yes, does the scheme offer credit based on non-land assets for women to access, such as purchase contracts<sup>7</sup>?</i></p> <p><i>Does the scheme offer risk insurance to both men and women plot managers?</i></p> <p><i>Does the scheme offer equal access to both men and women for land leveling, plowing, and other services that use large equipment?</i></p> <p><i>Are women and men satisfied with the level of support to women to access</i></p>	<p>If scheme management does not provide support to women to overcome production and/or marketing constraints, how has that affected women?</p> <p>If women are negatively affected by lack of support to overcome production/marketing constraints, do women have suggestions for addressing this issue now?</p>

<sup>6</sup> The statements about data collection and gender analysis are grouped together to emphasize that collecting sex-disaggregated data without analyzing it is not sufficient.

<sup>7</sup> Women often have more difficulty securing loans if land is required as collateral. If scheme management provides credit, they can consider non-land assets as collateral.

			scheme inputs and services?	
--	--	--	-----------------------------	--

<b>Section B: Access to scheme membership, leadership opportunities and decision-making</b>	<b>Section Score Total:</b>
---	-----------------------------

***Purpose of section:** This section addresses men’s and women’s opportunities to participate meaningfully in scheme governance, e.g., to join a scheme, to become members of a scheme’s user association, and to hold positions of leadership within those associations.*

Statement	Score	Scoring Guidance	Discussion Questions for Scoring	Feedback for Suggested Actions if Scores are Low
<p><b>Scheme/association membership is open to both men and women.</b></p>	n/a <input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scheme or association by-laws have specific requirements (for example, membership is open only to heads of households, plot owners, or positions held primarily by men) that result in few women members.</li> <li>Scheme or association by-laws explicitly state that both men and women are eligible for membership and some women are members.</li> <li>Scheme or association by-laws explicitly note that both men and women are eligible for membership and women form at least a significant minority of members in their own right.</li> </ol>	<p><i>What proportion of the scheme members are men? What proportion of the scheme members are women?</i></p> <p><i>How do new members join the scheme, e.g., through inheritance, purchase, etc.?</i></p> <p><i>Questions only for contexts where literacy rates are low, particularly for women:</i></p> <p><i>Is school-based education, literacy or numeracy a prerequisite for scheme membership<sup>8</sup>? If so, on what grounds? Can this requirement be appealed?</i></p>	<p>If scheme membership rules has limited women’s membership, do women want to become members? Do women have suggestions for addressing this issue now?</p>
<p><b>Women and men contributed to writing the scheme by-laws.</b></p> <p><i>If by-laws are written by a government authority and applied uniformly to all schemes with no opportunity for input by men or women to adapt to the local context or scheme, the response on this</i></p>	n/a <input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Women did not contribute to writing the scheme by-laws.</li> <li>Some women contributed and their opinions were addressed in some scheme by-laws.</li> <li>A significant proportion of women contributed ideas and those ideas were incorporated in most scheme by-laws.</li> </ol>	<p><i>Are women satisfied that their concerns and preferences are reflected in the by-laws?</i></p>	<p>If women did not contribute to writing the scheme by-laws, were they negatively affected by that? Can the bylaws be amended or changed now to address those issues?</p>

<sup>8</sup> In many parts of the world, women have lower levels of literacy and numeracy. Making these skills a requirement of membership can be discriminatory.

<i>statement is N/A. This should be noted in the context information on the project and national level regulatory/policy environment.</i>				
<b>Association and/or scheme by-laws are available to and known by all members.</b>	n/a <input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There are no by-laws (or other group regulations)</li> <li>2. By-laws are written and posted.</li> <li>3. By-laws are written, posted, and known by leaders and both women and men members.</li> </ol>	<i>Do both men and women have access to, awareness of, and understanding of the by-laws?</i>	If there are no by-laws or if scheme members do not know the by-laws, has this affected women involved in the scheme? What actions can be taken now to address this issue?
<b>Scheme by-laws permit both plot owners and plot managers to be association members.<sup>9</sup></b>	n/a <input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Local customs and/or scheme by-laws restrict membership to plot owners. Most women manage a plot but do not own a plot, so most scheme members are not women.</li> <li>2. Scheme by-laws do not restrict membership to plot owners, but customs tend to favor plot owners. Some women own a plot, so some women are scheme members.</li> <li>3. Both scheme by-laws and customs support participation of plot owners and plot managers. Most women who manage but do not own a plot are scheme members.</li> </ol>	<p><i>What proportion of plot owners are men? Are women?</i></p> <p><i>What proportion of plot managers are men? Are women?</i></p> <p><i>Are there local regulations, including customary rules, that restrict women from being plot owners or managers? Are these regulations consistent with national legislation on land and on gender?</i></p>	If most scheme members are men, how has that affected women plot managers? What actions can be taken now to address this issue?
<b>Scheme by-laws allow equal voting rights for men and women and ensure that scheme elections are organized to allow for both men and women to participate.</b>	n/a <input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Scheme by-laws do not have equal voting rights <u>and</u> elections are organized in ways that create challenges for women or men to participate.</li> <li>2. Scheme by-laws state that women and men have equal voting rights <u>but</u> elections are organized in ways that create challenges for women or men to</li> </ol>	<p><i>Are men and women members aware of their eligibility to vote on scheme issues and leadership?</i></p> <p><i>Did both men and women vote in the most recent elections?</i></p> <p><i>Do any factors limit voting for women?</i></p>	If it is challenging for women to vote in elections, have women been negatively affected? How can this issue be addressed now?

<sup>9</sup> This is a complex point that needs some further exploration. In some cases, a woman may manage (or be the primary person responsible for decisions and labor on) a plot owned by her spouse, but is not recognized as a member because rules only recognize plot ‘owners’. For this tool, an owner is the one formally or informally recognized as having primary user rights to the plot. A manager is the person that takes primary responsibility for inputs and labor on the plot. In some cases, the formal owner is for example, a customary/clan leader or a government entity. People may be given user rights to access during certain seasons, but are never considered ‘owners’. In such cases, membership to a scheme may be given to the person recognized by the customary leader as the rightful ‘user’ because of clan/lineage/custom.

		<p>participate.</p> <p>3. Scheme by-laws state that women and men have equal voting rights <u>and</u> elections are organized in ways support participation of women and men.</p>	<p><i>For example, scheduling of elections, literacy, familiarity with the process or the candidates, other?</i></p>	
<p><b>Scheme by-laws and/or scheme organization and management support women and men to hold positions as association leaders.</b></p>	<p>n/a <input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>1. Scheme by-laws permit both women and men to hold leadership positions but women face numerous challenges to stand for election.</p> <p>2. Scheme by-laws permit both women and men to hold leadership positions but women face some challenges to stand for election.</p> <p>3. Scheme by-laws permit both women and men to hold leadership positions and women are supported in multiple ways to stand for election.</p>	<p><i>Did both men and women stand for leadership positions in the most recent election?</i></p> <p><i>Do both men and women hold leadership positions: President; Vice President; Treasurer; Secretary?</i></p> <p><i>Are women primarily in secretarial roles or do they have decision-making roles?</i></p> <p><i>Does the scheme have requirements for leadership positions that women find challenging to meet? For example, payment of fees or transport costs.</i></p> <p><i>Have women taken an increasing role in scheme leadership over the duration of the scheme?</i></p> <p><i>Are women satisfied with their roles? Would women stand for leadership positions if given equitable opportunity?</i></p>	<p>If women want to stand for elections but face challenges, what actions can be taken to address this issue?</p>
<p><b>The scheme (or supporting institutions/organizations) provides training that enables women and men members to serve effectively in scheme management.</b></p>	<p>n/a <input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>1. The scheme does not provide any training or information to women scheme members.</p> <p>2. The scheme provides some training, but the training is provided primarily to men and/or the training is not seen as useful for women to serve effectively in scheme management.</p> <p>3. The scheme provides training that supports both women and men to serve in scheme management and to effectively represent constituents' needs.</p>	<p><i>Does the scheme provide instruction on scheme management (responsibility, roles) to both men and women?</i></p> <p><i>Does the scheme provide or explain where it is possible to receive training in association leadership?</i></p> <p><i>Have women/men received gender-awareness training to better understand and represent their constituents' needs?</i></p>	<p>What training do women need to serve effectively in scheme management? How can this best be provided by the scheme?</p>

<p><b>Both women and men report feeling that their opinions are respected in scheme association or similar meetings.</b></p>	<p>n/a <input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Women do not feel comfortable stating their opinions at meetings.</li> <li>2. Women and men feel comfortable stating their opinions at meetings, but women feel that their opinions are not respected or acted upon.</li> <li>3. Women and men feel comfortable stating their opinions at meetings and their opinions are acted upon.</li> </ol>	<p><i>Do women and men both state their opinions in group meetings?</i></p> <p><i>Do women prefer to have ways to meet and provide opinions outside of public scheme meetings? For example, women's groups, smaller group or individual meetings with scheme leaders, in writing.</i></p>	<p>What actions can be taken to ensure that women are comfortable stating their opinions and to ensure that their opinions are heard in decisions?</p>
--	---	--	---	--

<b>Section C: Access to scheme benefits</b>	<b>Section Score Total:</b>
---	-----------------------------

*Purpose of section: This section contains statements and associated questions to address how well (or poorly) irrigation scheme management and/or an associated farmer/producer association offers to both men and women equally: payments, marketing support, extension services, and other forms of assistance*

Statement	Scoring	Scoring Guidance	Discussion Questions for Scoring	Feedback for Suggested Actions if Scores are Low
<p><b>Both women and men are able to receive the amount of water they need.</b></p>	<p>n/a <input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Women do not receive adequate water on the scheme.</li> <li>2. Men receive adequate water but women do not receive adequate water in some months of the year.</li> <li>3. Women and men receive adequate water throughout the year.</li> </ol>	<p><i>Are decisions about water allocations made based on women's uses of water?</i></p> <p><i>If water delivery is inadequate throughout the year (or during some months of the year), are men and women affected equally or are women disproportionately affected by the decrease in water?</i></p> <p><i>Are women-owned or managed plots placed to receive water as easily and regularly as those of men?</i></p>	<p>What do women and men recommend as specific solutions that will enable them to receive adequate quantities of water throughout the year?</p>
<p><b>When water restrictions are put into place, decisions are made in ways that do not discriminate against women's or men's needs.</b></p>	<p>n/a <input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Water restrictions negatively affect women more than men.</li> <li>2. Water restrictions are based on specific criteria (for example, crop type, plot size) that have unintended negative impacts on women.</li> <li>3. Decisions regarding water restrictions do</li> </ol>	<p><i>When water needs to be rationed, are water reductions the same for everyone or do water reductions take into account the type and seasonality of crops being grown and/or the plot size?</i></p>	<p>Are women are negatively affected by the criteria used to allocate water? What can be done to change the criteria now?</p>

		not discriminate (intentionally or unintentionally) against women or men.		
<b>Both women and men receive water on a schedule that is acceptable to them.</b>	n/a <input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Women are not involved in discussions on water allocation scheduling and do not receive water on a schedule that is acceptable to them.</li> <li>2. Women and men are involved in discussions on water allocation scheduling <u>but</u> do not receive water on a schedule that is acceptable to them.</li> <li>3. Women and men are involved in discussions on water allocation scheduling <u>and</u> receive water on a schedule that is acceptable to them.</li> </ol>	<p><i>Have men and women been involved in discussions about the water allocation schedule?</i></p> <p><i>Are women satisfied with the schedule for water allocation on their plots? Is water allocated in the evening, at night or other times when it is difficult for them to use or manage?</i></p>	If women do not receive water on an acceptable schedule, what schedule do they suggest is suitable to them? What solutions can improve the water scheduling?
<b>Extension advice and price information, among other types of information, are available to both men and women via their preferred communication channels.</b>	n/a <input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Important information needed to understand markets, crop and water management, etc. is <u>not</u> available to women via their preferred communication channels.</li> <li>2. Important information needed to understand markets, crop and water management, etc. is available to men but not women (including poorer women) via their preferred communication channels.</li> <li>4. Important information needed to understand markets, crop and water management, etc. is available to both women and men (even poorest and poorer farmers) via their preferred communication channels.</li> </ol>	<p><i>Do fewer women compared to men have access to newspapers, mobile phones, radios, computers, and other information channels?</i></p> <p><i>Do fewer women compared to men have regular face to face exchanges with agents/community knowledge workers that meet their information needs? Do fewer women participate in farmer field days and demonstration days than men in the scheme?</i></p> <p><i>Are there social restrictions on women's interactions with other men and women related to agricultural activities?</i></p> <p><i>Are women satisfied with their ability to access information?</i></p>	What is the best way to communicate important information to women and men when they need it?
<b>Trainings related to scheme services and agricultural productions are held at convenient times and in convenient locations to enable both men and women to participate easily.</b>	n/a <input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Women are not provided with information on trainings and/or trainings are not held at convenient times and/or not held at convenient locations for women to participate.</li> </ol>	<i>Are trainings publicly announced to all members so that all are aware of both regularly scheduled and unscheduled (or emergency) sessions?</i>	What do women suggest as improvements to the training schedules, locations, etc? What types of support from the scheme would enable them to



		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Men and only a few women are provided with information on trainings and/or trainings are not held at convenient times and/or not held at convenient locations for women to participate.</li> <li>Trainings are announced and held at convenient times and are held at convenient locations for both men and women (including poorer and poorest) to participate fully.</li> </ol>	<p><i>Are training held at times when both men and women are able to attend?</i></p> <p><i>Does scheme management provide services to enable women to fully participate in trainings and meetings? For example, help to arrange for child care, transport, and food when trainings are held.</i></p>	<p>participate to their full satisfaction?</p>
<p><b>Product marketing support (including collection points for bulking, sorting, grading, and cooperative selling) organized and/or supported by the scheme is open to women and men.</b></p> <p>If no support services are provided through the scheme related to product collection, sorting or marketing, then the response is N/A.</p>	<p>n/a <input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access to marketing support services and/or infrastructure is restricted in some way that creates challenges for women scheme members to access markets.</li> <li>Marketing support services and/or infrastructure presents a few restrictions that may create challenges for some women scheme members to access markets (particularly smaller producers and poorer or poorest women).</li> <li>Marketing support services and/or infrastructure have no restrictions that negatively affect women and men scheme members.</li> </ol>	<p><i>Does the scheme have criteria to access marketing benefits (product collection, bulking, sorting and grading) related to plot size, volume of produce, produced type or produce value?</i></p> <p><i>Are there social restrictions on women's participation in marketing activities? Are women satisfied with their role in marketing and ability to access markets for produce from the scheme?</i></p>	<p>If product collection rules limit women's access to markets, what solutions can improve women's access to markets?</p>
<p><b>The scheme management contracts services for the scheme, and seeks out women-owned businesses, women's groups, and other women entrepreneurs to provide services, such as input suppliers, processors, packagers, transporters, and exporters.</b></p> <p>If the scheme does not contract out any services, then the response to the statement is N/A.</p>	<p>n/a <input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scheme management does not seek to work with women-owned businesses in the value chain.</li> <li>Scheme management wants to work with women-owned businesses in the value chain but there are few or the efforts have not be successful.</li> <li>Scheme management works successfully with women-owned businesses in the value chain.</li> </ol>	<p><i>Are there women-owned businesses that could provide services to the scheme?</i></p> <p><i>Does the scheme seek to work with and support women in the scheme area who are not producers? For example, to participate as actors in agricultural value chains for irrigated crops as marketers, processors, or transporters.</i></p>	<p>Are there women-owned businesses that the scheme can work more closely with? What can the scheme do to facilitate that cooperation?</p>



## GILIT Score for Scheme and Planned Actions for Improvement

Section	Section Total Score	Key Issues and Lessons for Statements with Low Scores in Each Section	Feedback for Suggested Actions for Low Score Statements in Each Section	Planned Actions to Improve Gender Performance Based on Scores and Feedback
Section A: Access to scheme resources				
Section B: Access to scheme membership, leadership and decision-making				
Section C: Access to scheme benefits				

Section Score Guide	
Section A: 0-10 Section B: 0-8 Section C: 0-6 Total: 0-24	<p><b>Scheme approach to gender equity show little or no sensitivity; requires attention and redress.</b>                      Women are underrepresented as scheme participants and are formally disadvantaged in participation. Women face gender-based constraints to participation, scheme management, and/or access to scheme services that result in lack of equal access to benefits.</p>
Section A: 11-17 Section B: 9-15 Section C: 7-13 Total: 27-45	<p><b>Scheme approach to gender equity shows some sensitivity. Statements will low scores require attention and adjustment to related activities.</b>                      Women are underrepresented as scheme participants and face some informal disadvantages to participation and/or access to benefits.</p>
Section A: 18-24 Section B: 16-24 Section C: 14-21 Total: 48-69	<p><b>Scheme approach ensures that men and women participate in scheme management and leadership and can access scheme benefits. Monitoring is suggested to ensure continued gender equity on scheme.</b>                      Women and men access scheme services and benefit equally from the scheme.</p>