



RIEL

Research Institute for  
the Environment and  
Livelihoods

# An evaluation of recent initiatives on women, gender and livelihoods in small-scale fisheries in Indonesia

Natasha Stacey<sup>1</sup>, Emily Gibson,<sup>1</sup> Neil Loneragan,<sup>2,3</sup> Carol  
Warren,<sup>2</sup> Budy Wiryawan,<sup>4</sup> Dedi Adhuri<sup>5</sup>, Ria Fitriana<sup>1</sup>

1 Charles Darwin University, Darwin, NT, Australia

2 School of Veterinary and Life Sciences, Murdoch University

3 Asia Research Centre, Murdoch University, Perth, WA, Australia

4 Faculty of Fisheries and Marine Sciences, Bogor Agricultural University, Indonesia

5 Research Centre for Society and Culture, Indonesian Institute of Sciences, Indonesia

# Research Project Aims

1. Review evidence of effectiveness in initiatives for enhancing coastal livelihoods in Indonesia, the incorporation of a gender approach, the degree of involvement of women and lessons learned.
2. Document knowledge gaps and future research needs.



# Approach and Methods

- Qualitative, desk top study, 3 components, 2015 -2017
- **Literature Review** - women's roles in SSF activities in Indonesia, gender and development theory, effectiveness of sustainable livelihoods programs.
- **Workshops (3) with project team (10)** to discuss methodologies and approaches, identify livelihood project case studies, review project summaries and conduct analysis.
- **Evaluation of 20 past & current coastal livelihood enhancement projects**
  - Review of documents, information summarized into a template
  - **Analysis in excel**
    - 1) project characteristics;
    - 2) project results - change in livelihood outcomes, gender approaches and activities/components, capacity building and/or institutional development, and sustainability of project activities;
    - 3) lessons learned, including achievements, enabling factors, challenges, constraints and recommendations.

# Temple for Livelihood Evaluations (adapted from IMM 2008, SLA Framework)

<b>Title of project</b>	<b>Corporate title of project being implemented</b>
<b>Funder of project</b>	Source of funding
<b>Implementer /partners</b>	Implementer(s), regional and local partner(s)
<b>Investment</b>	Total funding, including portion of livelihood component
<b>Date/period of project</b>	Date or period of project implementation
<b>Location(s)</b>	Place implemented
<b>Goal of livelihood activity</b>	Livelihood issue being addressed and desired livelihood outcome(s), including targeted participants and how identified
<b>Approach</b>	Theoretical basis or driving narrative of intervention design; eg. poverty alleviation, value chain, co-management, SLA, conservation, community-based, adaptation and mitigation, food security, vulnerability
<b>Targeted beneficiaries</b>	What were the characteristics of the targeted beneficiaries and did project reach these beneficiaries?
<b>Gender component and women</b>	Whether there was a clear gender approach in project planning, design & implementation? Did project design include gender analysis, and did women benefit directly or indirectly from project activities?
<b>Description of livelihood activity</b>	What was carried out and what livelihood enhancement is being done (which assets are being built?)
<b>Activities implemented</b>	Describe the key activities or actions undertaken
<b>Successes and benefits for livelihood outcomes?</b>	How did the activity impact on livelihood outcomes (eg income, diversification, sustainable natural resource use, improved capacity, quality of life, wellbeing, reduced marginalisation and vulnerability, improved assets etc) Direct and indirect?- Ecological, Social, Economic, Institutional
<b>Challenges/constraints/ livelihood sustainability</b>	These could be governance, economic, social, cultural, market etc.
<b>Evaluation of project</b>	How was project evaluated? What evidence-based indicators/criteria were used?
<b>Lessons/learnings</b>	
<b>Opportunities</b>	
<b>Sources of information</b>	References



# Approach and Methods

## Project selection criteria to encompass diversity

- Livelihood improvements or enhancements across a spectrum of SSF and aquaculture -related livelihood activities
- Underlying intervention objective driving the type of project – e.g. fisheries management, conservation, capacity building, market-based approaches, community development
- Project scale – regional, national, district, village level
- Value of project – Multi-million dollar investment to tens of thousands of dollars
- Scope and breadth – Bilateral & International development programs , large regional initiatives, International NGOs, community-based NGOs and government programs
- Geographical coverage across Indonesian archipelago
- Research team knowledge and access to information



## 20 Projects evaluated with various characteristics

- Four Projects (Government of Indonesia or ACIAR from Australia)
- Eight projects (International) (ABD, World Bank, EU, GEF, World Fish, IFAD, USAID)
- Eight Projects (NGO) (TNC, Conservation International, MDPI, LMMA)
- 1998-2017, 1 to 5 years
- Value of project – Multi-million dollar investment to tens of thousands of dollars
- Multi- partner/funders or single organisation
- Beneficiaries – individuals, families, ‘communities’ to specific groups – fishers, farmers, households



# Government of Indonesia or Australia #4

Project title	Time frame	Scale	Funding	Main focus of activities	Beneficiaries
<b>Government of Indonesia or Australia</b>					
<b>#1: Alternative Livelihoods Project for Fishers on Rote and in Kupang Bay (AUSAID/ANU)</b>	2004 - 2006	District (Rote and Kupang Bay, NTT)	AU\$241,000	Development (trial of mariculture) and livelihoods	60 families
<b>#2: Arafura and Timor Seas Ecosystem Action Program – Coastal Livelihoods Demonstration Project (ATSEA I) (UNDP/GEF)</b>	2010 – 2014	Regional (Indonesia: Aru, Tanimbar)	US\$2.5 million with US\$200,000 for national demonstration project	Environment (ecosystem management)	Coastal communities (150 direct and 3,520 indirect beneficiaries)
<b>#3: Diversification of Smallholder Coastal Aquaculture in Indonesia (AG/ACIAR)</b>	2010 – 2015	District (South Sulawesi and Aceh)	AU \$1,813,000	Development (trial of mariculture)	134 farmers
<b>#4: Economic and Welfare Movement of Coastal Communities, West Sumatra (Provincial GoI)</b>	2012-2016	Province (West Sumatra)	US \$2,205,000	Livelihoods	At least 1,784 households

# International #8

Project title	Time frame	Scale	Funding	Main focus of activities	Beneficiaries
<b>International</b>					
<b>#5: Coastal Community Development and Fisheries Resources Management (ADB/MMAF)</b>	1998 - 2005	Village (at least 35 villages in 5 districts in 4 provinces (Bengkalis, Tegal City, Trenggalek, Banyuwangi, East Lombok))	US \$41 million (incl. loan)	Fisheries and livelihoods	Households with fisheries-based livelihoods
<b>#6: Sustainable Aquaculture Development for Food Security and Poverty Reduction Project (ADB/MMAF)</b>	2007 – 2013	District (5 districts in 4 provinces (Lankgat, Ogan Komering Ilir, Kawawang, Sumedang, Boton))	US \$44.6 million (incl. loan)	Livelihoods	Coastal fishers and farmers  (at least 14,585 households)
<b>#7: Coral Reef Rehabilitation and Management Project (COREMAP – Phase II) (World Bank/GEF/MMAF)</b>	2005 – 2011	National (selected villages in 7 districts (Selayar, Pangkep, Sikka, Buton, Wakatobi, Biak, Raja Ampat))	US \$53.3 million	Environment (coral reef protection)	357 communities
<b>#8: Implementing an Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EAF) in Small-Scale Tropical Marine Fisheries (EC/WorldFish/MMAF)</b>	2011 – 2014	Regional (Indonesia: government to village (2 villages in NTB))	EU \$330,000	Fisheries and livelihoods	Fishers and multi-level government stakeholders



# International #8

Project title	Time frame	Scale	Funding	Main focus of activities	Beneficiaries
<b>International</b>					
<b>#9: Regional Fisheries Livelihoods Programs for South and Southeast Asia (Kingdom of Spain/FAO/MMAF)</b>	2009 – 2013	Regional  (Indonesia: 4 districts in NTT)	US \$2.02 million	Fisheries and livelihoods	Households with fisheries-based livelihoods and multi-level government stakeholders
<b>#10: Coastal Community Development Project (IFAD/MMAF)</b>	2012 – 2017	National  (selected villages in provinces of Papua, Maluku, North Maluku, North Sulawesi, Gorontalo, South Sulawesi, NTB, NTT, West Kalimantan)	US \$43.2 million  (incl. loan)	Development and livelihoods	9,900 households
<b>#11: Indonesia Marine and Climate Support (IMACS) Project (USAID/MMAF/WWF/TNC/WCS)</b>	2010 – 2014	District  (10 in Southeast Sulawesi and NTB)	US \$31.9 million with US \$1.4 million Small Grants Programme	Fisheries	100 villages, 26 recipients of small grants (village to private company)
<b>#12: Coastal Marine Planning and Livelihood Development in Rote-Ndao District, NTT (AG/TNC)</b>	2013 – 2015	District  (Rote Ndao, NTT)	AU \$981,000	Development	Not clearly identifiable

## NGO #8

Project title	Time frame	Scale	Funding	Main focus of activities	Beneficiaries
<b>Non-government organization</b>					
<b>#13: Coastal Field Schools component, Restoring Coastal Livelihoods – Building Social and Ecological Resilience in the Mangrove Ecosystem of South Sulawesi (CIDA/OXFAM/Blue Forests)</b>	2010 – 2015	Regional  (Indonesia: 4 districts in South Sulawesi)	CA \$248, 653	Environment and livelihoods	1,476 participants
<b>#14: Up-scaling Community-based Fisheries Management in Biak and Supiori Regencies, Papua (Packard/MacArthur/National Fish and Wildlife Foundations/CI, I-LMMA)</b>	2015 – present	Village  (8 sub-districts)	AU \$80,000 over five years for Biak program / AU \$250,000 over five years for expansion program	Environment and livelihoods	Coastal communities
<b>#15: Sustainable Aquarium Fishery and Aquaculture Project, Les, Bali (Yayasan LINI and various funders)</b>	2008 – present	Village  (northern Bali)	N/A	Environment (coral reef restoration) and livelihoods	Community members
<b>#16: Sustainable Mangroves and Coastal Livelihoods – Small Grant Facility (MMF/Gol – National Coordinating Body)</b>	2010 – present	Regional  (Indonesia – villages in South Sulawesi, North Sulawesi, Gorontalo, Central Java, East Java, West Java, North Jakarta, Yogyakarta)	US \$800,000  (Small grants programme)	Environment (mangrove restoration) and livelihoods	Community members

## NGO #8

Project title	Time frame	Scale	Funding	Main focus of activities	Beneficiaries
<b>Non-government organization</b>					
<b>#17: Fair Trade Seafood Project (Fairtrade USA, MDPI and various funders)</b>	2015 – present	National (Maluku, West Papua, NTB, NTT, Sulawesi)	N/A	Fisheries and livelihoods	Small-scale fishers and their communities
<b>#18: Women’s Mud-crab Fishery Improvement Project (CI/MDPI)</b>	2015 – present	District (Arguni Bay, West Papua)	N/A	Fisheries and environment	140 women mud-crab fishers
<b>#19: Lovina Dolphin Watching Nature-based Tourism (JCU PhD)</b>	2008 – present	Village (northern Bali)	N/A	Sustainable eco-tourism and livelihood	Village boatmen and local tourist industry
<b>#20: Kurma Asih Sea Turtle Conservation (WWF &amp; various private and government donations)</b>	1998 - present	Village (West Bali)	N/A	Sea turtle conservation and alternative livelihoods	Turtle conservation group (6 members)

# Assessment of Gender aspects of Projects

Gender was considered as a variable for assessment across the different types of project.

Categorised the 20 projects by type according to

- a) how women were involved in the project activities (e.g. livelihood activities) and the purported impacts and outcomes of this involvement.
- b) the apparent gender approach - '*none*', '*gender accommodating*', or '*gender transformative*' as evidenced in documented project cycle planning, design, implementation and evaluation activities.





# Results A. Livelihood Projects for or involving women or relating to gender

A. Project activities for or involving women, or relating to gender		Project type			
		Government	International	Non-government	Overall
Livelihood training	Alternative livelihoods	4/4 - 100%	7/8 – 87.5%	5/8 – 62.5%	<b>16/20 – 75%</b>
	Enhancement to existing livelihood activities	2/4 – 50%	8/8 – 100%	4/8 – 50%	<b>14/20 - 70%</b>
Livelihood activity assets		2/4 – 50%	4/8 – 50%	3/8 – 37.5%	<b>9/20 – 45%</b>
Community groups	Women’s	0/4 – 0%	1/8 – 12.5%	2/8 – 25%	<b>3/20 – 15%</b>
	Conservation	1/4 - 25%	1/8 – 12.5%	0/8 – 0%	<b>2/20 – 10%</b>
	Livelihood	1/4 - 25%	5/8 – 62.5%	3/8 – 37.5%	<b>9/20 – 45%</b>
	Infrastructure	0/4 – 0%	1/8 – 12.5%	0.8 – 0%	<b>1/20 – 5%</b>
Community infrastructure		0/4 – 0%	3/8 – 37.5%	2/8 – 25%	<b>5/20 – 25%</b>
Environmental activities		1/4 - 25%	3/8 – 37.5%	4/8 – 50%	<b>8/20 – 40%</b>
Gender awareness training	Program level	0/4 – 0%	2/8 – 25%	1/8 – 12.5%	<b>3/20 – 15%</b>
	Community level	0/4 – 0%	0/8 – 0%	1/8 – 12.5%	<b>1/20 – 5%</b>

*Note: Proportion and percentage relates to the number of projects within the specified project category, and the total number of projects.*

## Results B - Gender approach apparent in the review of available project documentation

B. Gender approach	Project type			Overall
	Government	International	Non-government	
a) None	2/4 – 50%	3/8 – 37.5%	3/8 – 37.5%	<b>8/20 - 40%</b>
a) Gender accommodating	2/4 – 50%	4/8 – 50%	4/8 – 50%	<b>10/20 - 50%</b>
a) Gender transformative	0/4 – 0 %	1/8 – 12.5%	1/8 – 12.5%	<b>2/20 - 10%</b>

*Note: Proportion and percentage relates to the number of projects within the specified project category, and the total number of projects.*

- No clear approach to gender in 8/20 projects, unclear in project documentation whether activities were targeted specifically at women or whether women were merely included as part of a fisher household
- The gender approach in 10 projects could be described as ‘gender accommodating’
- Only 2 projects could be considered as pursuing a ‘gender transformative approach’

# Results C: Gender lessons and recommendations

Majority of projects did not document any gender specific lessons but there were 3 recommendations noted



- Need for gender strategies for regional programs to be contextualised at the local level (#8)(*EU/World Fish*)
- Deliver gender awareness training with communities prior to project implementation to increase community awareness of gender roles with the aim of increasing women's access to resources and participation in governance and decision-making (#14)(*LMMA*)
- The need for thorough value chain and gender analyses prior to project commencement (#10)(*IFAD*)

# Discussion



- Unsurprisingly in our assessment of 20 initiatives, gender was largely conflated with women
- Very few projects sought to address institutional or socio-cultural factors contributing to inequalities in women's access to livelihood resources and governance processes
- Appeared to be little consideration of the impact(s) of engaging women in additional productive activities implemented in projects beyond their existing roles
- Only one project sought to draw attention to problem of seeking to increase women's participation in community-level governance processes without first challenging existing social norms (#14NGO)



# Discussion



- A ‘women in development’ or ‘gender accommodation’ approach was the main approach to projects reviewed
- We did not find any clear association between gender approach applied in project and the overarching gender policy or strategy of the implementing agency – i.e. whether certain organisations did gender better due to better policies etc.
- It seems that funders/implementers of these projects had more of a focus on ‘women’ rather than ‘gender’ despite many funders having gender strategies and policies.
- Often gender was included in project design and planning, but not followed through in implementation where focus on delivering activities or distributing resources within required timeframes.
- Little evaluation of gender outcomes.

# Discussion



- Overall documentation is poor, limited to quantitative reporting (such as # male/female participants etc), analysis of gender indicators and evidence of gender approaches is limited.
- With a few exceptions, projects have been gender blind or at best gender neutral with a failure to document and learn from past projects which contributes to reinforcing gender inequalities (FAO 2019).
- This seems to be consistent with findings in other areas of agriculture (e.g. Cole et al 2014)
- All implementers at all categories (international, government and NGO) need to improve the application of gender approaches at all stages of projects (Cole et al 2014).



# Livelihoods and Gender

- Reviewing coastal livelihoods diversification literature, itself quite limited and lacking evidence of best practice approaches, gender is generally overlooked
- Considerable scope for improving the linkages between gender aware approaches, and best practices for gendered coastal livelihood projects in Indonesia.



*(e.g. de Haan and Zoomers 2003; Ireland 2004; Brugere et al. 2008; ; IMM Ltd 2008; Bennet 2010; Pomeroy 2013; Roe et al. 2015; Wright et al. 2015).*



# Lessons for Improving Practice



- Emerging lessons from the gender - agriculture literature and best practices
- Njuki (2016) identifies entry points to guide research organizations or programs for a systematic process for gender integration.
  - The focus of the research and expected outcomes, **needs and aspirations**, gender analysis;
  - **Gender sensitive research** and gender equity opportunities throughout the research process/program cycle;
  - **Capacity building** to undertake gender integration & research (gender awareness, gender integration skills, gender research methods and training in gender transformation for **program staff**);
  - **Accountability of organisations/staff** for gender outcomes through monitoring and evaluation to achieve gender goals.

Could be well applied to fisheries and aquaculture initiatives



# Conclusion

- Over last 20 years a gender aware approach in coastal livelihood and fisheries programs in Indonesia is largely lacking.
- But there is progress from a women in development to gender accommodating approach in fisheries and aquaculture research and supporting international policies
- Yet to be fully realised in Indonesia
- Need for more applied, gender aware, action driven research for development in Indonesia (with supporting materials, training, monitoring, evaluation), building on what is happening in other countries and sectors.
- Gender integration as a core element in project design, implementation and monitoring to support the transformation needed for sustainable livelihoods in Indonesia.

## SRA Small-scale fisheries in Indonesia: benefits to households, the roles of women, and opportunities for improving livelihoods - FINAL REPORT



<https://www.aciar.gov.au/publication/Small-scale-fisheries-Indonesia>

Final report: SRA Small-scale fisheries in Indonesia: benefits to households, the roles of women, and opportunities for improving livelihoods



Australian Government  
Australian Centre for  
International Agricultural Research

### Final report

project	SRA Small-scale fisheries in Indonesia: benefits to households, the roles of women, and opportunities for improving livelihoods
project number	FIS/2014/104
date published	11 May 2018
prepared by	Professor Neil Lourenço, School of Veterinary and Life Sciences, Murdoch University and Associate Professor Natasha Stacey, Research Institute of Environment and Livelihoods, Charles Darwin University <u>Project Partner Country Collaborators:</u> Dr Budi Wuryawan, Department of Marine Fisheries, Bogor Agricultural University Dr Deok Adhuni, Research Center for Society and Culture, LIPI Assoc. <u>Project Contributors:</u> Associate Professor Carol Warren, Murdoch University Dr Rin Fitriana, RIEL/Charles Darwin University Ms Emily Gibson, RIEL/Charles Darwin University Dr Dirk Steenbergen, ANCORS/University of Wollongong (Adjunct to RIEL/Charles Darwin University) Dr Puh Liza Kusuma Murtika ('Icha'), James Cook University Dr Vasevas Juteh, Murdoch University Ms Ratna Fadilah, Blue Forests, Makassar, Indonesia
approved by	Dr Chris Barlow, Fisheries Program Manager
final report number	FR 2018/02
ISBN	978-1-925746-19-8
published by	ACIAR GPO Box 1571 Canberra ACT 2601 Australia