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Appraisal of GEP Projects for Women’s Economic Empowerment

Karin Astrid Siegmann

1. Introduction

1.1 Challenges for women’s economic empowerment

Women’s economic empowerment can be defined as access to and control over productive resources. There are legal obstacles to it, e.g. in the form of gender-biased inheritance and labour laws, policy problems, such as in the form of trade and investment policies that ignore the gender-differentiated economic roles of women and men, as well as cultural impediments. In the Pakistani context, females’ constrained mobility is one of the crucial obstacles. Women’s constrained mobility disadvantages them not only in terms of access to paid employment but also regarding their economic bargaining power. Their seclusion from the public sphere and their involvement in reproductive tasks leads to an inability to organise themselves for enhanced bargaining power in the economic field. An example is the fact that exploitation of home-based workers (HBWs) through middlemen is facilitated by their constrained mobility. To them, no knowledge about market prices and margins is available.

Female labour market participation is as low as 28% (Federal Bureau of Statistics, 2004), productive resources such as land, machinery, as well as cash are commonly in the hands of men, and the gender gap in education is huge, with less than a third of all women accessing formal education as compared to half of all men (Federal Bureau of Statistics, 2004). Compounded by women’s lack of free movement, this implies that women’s access to entrepreneurial skills, technical as well as managerial, necessary for successful productive involvement is hampered. Over and above, both women and men lack of awareness regarding the structural injustice in gendered access to resources.

In such an environment, the achievement of women’s economic empowerment remains a great challenge for the Pakistani society.

The macro-economic environment has not been conducive either. Growth rates slowly decreased since the 1980s from around 6% to a low of about 2% until 2001 and then picked up again to reach a level of 8% in 2004/2005 (Federal Bureau of Statistics, 2005). Whereas politicians keep praising the recent growth performance, it is questionable whether this has translated into more economic opportunities for women. Female labour force participation has somewhat increased and unemployment rates have declined slightly between 2001-2002 and 2003-2004 (Federal Bureau of Statistics, 2005 and 2003). More importantly, public spending on health and education has dropped significantly both in absolute terms and as budgetary shares since the end of the 1980s, the start of structural adjustment programmes in Pakistan. It is likely that this has a more direct effect in particular on women’s access to resources, given the preference given to boys’ schooling and women’s constrained mobility hampering access to health facilities. Ultimately, poor schooling and health implies poor bargaining power and less access to paid employment.
1.2 Objective and approach of the evaluation

GEP’s project funding aimed at contributing to narrow the gap in economic indicators between women and men in Pakistan through enhancing women’s opportunities for economic decision-making. In order to achieve this goal, it provided funding to 13 projects of a diverse range of organisations, from small non-governmental organisations, via a bank and an advocacy network to university institutes. The objective of this report is to map footprints of these grants and analyse their effect and impact regarding women’s economic empowerment.

For this assessment, the strategy of triangulation has been applied, i.e. the combination of various data sources. In particular, the project documents provided by GEP have been analysed based on GEP’s logframe (for a complete list of documents see Annex 1). In addition to that, two workshops have been conducted with project partners in the area of women’s economic empowerment (for a list of organisations represented, see Annex 2). During the workshop, semi-structured group discussions were conducted focusing on the innovativeness of and obstacles faced in the project, its contribution to organisational strengthening of the implementing partner as well as its impact on beneficiaries, the collaboration with the government and GEP itself, and finally its interface with the macro-economic and political environment (for a list of the items for the group discussions, see Annex 3).

The triangulation of the written documentation and interaction during the workshops was useful to fill information gaps caused by incomplete project documentation as well as to reach at more robust conclusions regarding GEP’s footprint in the partner organisations and -ultimately - regarding women’s economic empowerment.

The next sections introduce the projects (section 2) with some of their unique features, their effects on the partner organisations and their beneficiaries (section 3), as well as the multiple environments in which the partners are operating (section 4). Section 5 critically discusses the effectiveness of GEP’s project funding and section 6 outlines future lessons for strategies to enhance women’s economic agency in a hostile environment.

2. The projects

2.1 Issues

HomeNet!!! All in all, thirteen of the 52 projects funded by GEP since 2001 specifically addressed issues of women’s economic empowerment. They did so in a very diverse manner. A couple of organisations, such as Bint-e-Malakand (Bathkela), Grass Root Development Programme (GRDP, Khushab), Indus Resource Center (IRC, Khairpur Mir’s), Roots for Equity (Karachi), Sawera (DI Khan), Sarhad Rural Support Programme (SRSP) (Peshawar), and HAWWA associates (Islamabad) provided entrepreneurial training for women to address their lack of technical, managerial, and marketing skills. Many of these projects linked the training to traditional skills, such as tailoring and embroidery, food production and processing, but some included modern skills. IRC, for example offered computer short courses. The National University of Science and Technology (NUST, Rawalpindi) addressed the same issues, but for women in national and international organisations through a seminar on women’s changing role in management. GRDP set up a grain bank for women in Soon Valley in order to address the appropriation of financial resources in cash by male household members.
Apart from such direct interventions, a couple of research-based projects were funded. Some of them linked these studies to their organisations’ interventions. Holistic Understanding for Justified Action and Research (HUJRA, Saidu Sharif), for example, conducted research to map gendered activities in Swat as well as to identify training needs of women and men in the area, the SME Bank (Islamabad) evaluated a credit scheme for rural women. Other studies were mainly intended to generate new knowledge about the economic roles and challenges faced by women such as the research on globalisation’s impact on peasant women by the South Asia Partnership – Pakistan (SAP-PK, Lahore) or a study on the bangle industry in Hyderabad by the Institute of Women Development Studies (IWDS) at the University of Sindh (Jamshoro).

Apart from the abovementioned focus of many projects on enhancing women’s entrepreneurial skills, some of the partners addressed broader constraints for women’s economic empowerment. The objective to strengthen women’s control over income and savings is particularly pronounced in IRC’s concept of a grain bank. Roots for Equity explicitly mentions and operationalises awareness raising on gender (in-)equality issues as one of the project components. There are limits, however, to what extent small organisations can contribute to changing cultural patterns that are biased against women’s access to resources. One young man working in Roots for Equity’s shop gave a clear account of his own raised awareness regarding matters of gender equality. However, his father would still not allow his sisters to go to school.

Women’s freer movement is targeted, and - as anecdotal evidence illustrates – achieved in many cases, such as Sawera, SRSP, Roots for Equity, and Bint-e-Malakand. One workshop participant reported that she used the back problems she suffered from as an excuse to overcome mobility constraints she usually faces. Walking to meetings of Bint-e-Malakand was presented as a measure for health improvement to her family members. Now, she would travel all the way from Swat to Lahore.

There are two broad categories of entrepreneurial skills the projects addressed. One is more technical know-how of appropriate production techniques and design. HAWWA and IRC stress these aspects in the trainings they provided. Another is the skill to run a business successfully, including leadership skills and marketing. SRSP reports the case of Naheed Bibi who was getting small embroidery orders from her own village with little profit. Through the SRSP’s training she identified new markets with higher purchasing power. Now, she regularly goes to Rawalpindi and Abottabad for orders and sourcing. It is reported that her monthly income increased fivefold, she has set up a small business community in her own village.

The funding provided covered between one month in case of the seminar organised by NUST and two years for SRSP. SRSP also obtained the largest grant with more than PKR 9 million. The majority of projects received PKR 2-5 million, research-related projects around half a million.

2.2 Partners’ features

Regarding the size and experience of the partners, about a third of the projects funded were implemented by small partners, i.e. with up to ten employees, such as Bint-e-Malakand, GRDP, HAWWA, and Sawera. HomeNet definitely qualifies as a nascent partner as its establishment was funded by GEP.
The project locations are mostly rural. HAWWA aims to cooperate with artisans from remote areas, such as Swat, Kohat, and Sawera has its office in a rural area of DI Khan. GRDP’s grain bank is located in rural Southern Punjab. NUST, in contrast, explicitly targeted an urban area. The target groups of Roots for Equity, HomeNet, and IWDS might not be located in remote areas but they belong to marginalized groups in society, such as squatter settlers, and HBWs.

The partners’ understanding of women’s economic empowerment is a diverse as the organisations supported. Two broad strands can be distinguished. A few projects perceive women’s economic empowerment as instrumental in reaching other societal goals such as poverty alleviation (GRDP), or girl’s access to education (HAWWA). This is in line with the understanding expressed in GEP’s strategy paper. Most partners, however, see women’s enhanced economic decision-making as an important step to reaching women’s broader empowerment in terms of intra-household bargaining power, freer movement, enhanced self-esteem and social status, as well as understanding of patriarchy. Once women earn cash income, it is less easy to ignore their contribution and marginalize them in the household as well as in the broader society.

2.3 Innovations

Whereas strengthening women’s entrepreneurial skills is an novelty as such in conservative areas, where, overall, women’s agency is severely curtailed, economic partnerships between women and men aimed at and implemented by several of the projects is a timely step to address economic gender inequalities. They are able to deal with the resistance of male household members against women’s involvement in income-generating activities because of fear of loosing bargaining or financial power. Awareness raising is a first and necessary step, e.g. addressed by the mixed trainings for female and male entrepreneurs arranged by SRSP, or by including men and youth in trainings and exposure visits on the impact of patriarchy on women’s work (Roots for Equity). It is worthwhile to mention that Roots for Equity took into consideration the possible domination of the project by male participants and therefore restricted their participation quantitatively.

Apart from this cautiously inclusive approach, circumventing men’s economic power, e.g. through GRDP’s in kind bank, through strengthening women’s marketing skills to overcome middlemen’s power, or through cooperative access to productive resources such as sewing machines, are alternative routes to avoid a women-centred approach that does not take into account gender relations.

SAP-PK’s investigation into the linkages between the macro-economy and women’s environment also is a timely undertaking. As shown below (section 4), so far, there is little awareness of the impact of the macro-environment on efforts to strengthen women’s economic agency.

2.4 Obstacles

However, Roots for Equity identifies political forces, in particular the resistance of feudals, as an important obstacle for the project’s performance. Other problems faced mirror the abovementioned constraints for women’s economic empowerment, i.e. women’s lack of mobility and decision-making power, illiteracy in the community and/or amongst
beneficiaries, the difficulty to find the right marketing channels and to deal with competitors have more market power.

2.5 Future

The projects’ future plans and challenges ahead are equally related to the hurdles for economic empowerment that women in Pakistan encounter, such as the identification of new markets and the acquisition leadership skills. On a more positive note, they reflect the achievements of the project. IDWS mentions the distribution of its research findings into the curriculum, HUJRA the catering to identified training needs for women in Swat. For example, with increasing migration of male household members, Swati women get more involved in farming and livestock management. Hence, the females of remittances earners need training in these areas. Livestock training to women herders is one of HUJRA’s potential future initiative so that they could own and properly look after their own animals and start a wool processing initiative in the area.

For Sawera as probably for other partners, scaling-up their efforts is seen as the challenge now.

3. The footprints

3.1 Partners’ capacity building

One of the objectives of GEP’s funding support is capacity building in NGOs and private sector institutions to promote women’s economic empowerment.

Staff size is one of the indicators to assess whether the capacity of the partner organisations has been increased. Several organisations, in particular smaller ones such as Bint-e-Malakand, GRDP, and Sawera, report employment generation through the GEP funded project. It is difficult and probably too early to assess whether this enhanced staff size will last beyond the project duration. HUJRA sees the field researchers involved in the empirical research as potential field workers for future interventions. The research components also of more intervention-related projects, such as Bint-e-Malakand and GRDP, were assumed to increase organisational knowledge and capacity for targeted intervention. As part of the IRC project to set up an outlet for women and youth, the organisation acquired a building, which enhances the future organisational capacity of the centre.

Despite the anticipation that the study conducted with GEP funding would develop faculty for carrying out similar research quite independently, and with using in-house human capacities in future, the IWDS representative at the workshop was rather sober about whether such capacity building had actually taken place.

3.2 Beneficiaries’ benefits

A simple indicator of benefits for the project beneficiaries are, for example, whether the number of people targeted and reached is congruent.

Although information about this is aspect incomplete and in some cases its validity is questionable, the overall impression from the analysed project documents is that partners
tended to overestimate what can be reached within a relatively short project duration. For example, Sawera targeted at training 900 girls during one year. So far, they reached 40.

As mentioned above, effects on women’s income is another, crucial indicator. Although income increase is a stated objective for a number of the partner organisations, few explicitly assess this dimension of their project’s impact. Those few are likely to be the successful ones: Roots for Equity, e.g., reports overachievement in income enhancement of its cooperative members. Workshop participants trained by SRSP from Kohat reported the change in profits they make through a change in colour combinations used for their products. In other cases, entrepreneurial training allowed the identification of cheaper sourcing, new technology, and good business practices for the beneficiaries business. One such instance is the case of a female entrepreneur from Peshawar, trained through the project. Her whole family is engaged in nimko production and packaging. When the family got an order from Lahore, the brother was supposed to deliver, but fell ill, and was unable to send the products on time. Before leaving for Lahore upon his recovery, his sister suggested to call the vendor as she had learned through trainings. That way, they found out that the items had already been purchased from another source.

As it is disputable whether increases in income flows can be achieved during a project duration of mostly less than two years, one can shift the analytical focus towards the changes in stocks of organisational resources as an important stepping stone towards economic empowerment especially for women. For example, one of SRSP’s beneficiaries established an enterprise platform for female and male enterprise activists as a hub for entrepreneurs multiplication of training through local enterprise activists and media. Roots for Equity added membership to its cooperatives. Access to productive resources, such as sewing-machines, was established by SRSP beneficiaries on a cooperative basis. Trainings for entrepreneur activists and trainers pursued by a number of organisations (Bint-e-Malakand, SRSP) is another way of guaranteeing benefits for women’s economic empowerment beyond the project duration.

In case of research-oriented projects, advocacy tools to disseminate findings to stakeholders may support policy effectiveness of new knowledge. They were used both by IWDS and SME and planned by SAP-PK. It is difficult to assess their effectiveness, however, based on the present documentation.

4 The multiple environments
4.1 Collaboration with the government

Strengthening the government’s capacity for implementing policies to narrow the gender gap in access to and control over economic resources and to strengthen women’s economic empowerment is an important objective of GEP. As most of the partner organisations are NGOs, the question is whether their projects partnered with and potentially influenced the various government agencies’ awareness and policies regarding women’s economic empowerment.

In the projects’ written documentation, the government is virtually invisible. In case of SAP-PK, collaboration with, awareness-raising, and capacity building in government bodies are explicitly mentioned as objectives of their project. Asked about their experience with the government at various levels, delegates at the workshops reported appreciation and support for their efforts by local government representatives. Government representatives were
invited for project launching and were targeted for the projects’ outreach. One organisation reported that they were given technical assistance and training by the forest department in their tree plantation projects and Social Welfare Department in furthering community development work. However, no feedback loops are apparent in terms of increased awareness and better policies regarding women’s economic empowerment.

Executive agents of the government such as the police were mentioned as obstacles in the partners’ work. Roots for Equity, who markets handicraft with the help of a vehicle, experienced problems with the police in Karachi who constantly directed them to move from their respective sales locations.

### 4.2 Partnering with GEP

As it is unlikely that project documentation provides a critical assessment of the co-operation with the funding agency, this question was addressed during the workshops conducted. The smaller organisations, in particular, appreciated GEP’s support in building capacity in the organisations’ generic skills. Constructive and extensive feedback regarding their respective proposals was mentioned, advice in media strategies, as well as support in networking or the identification of required personnel. In financial matters, both positive feedback and criticism was reported. Whereas Roots for Equity appreciated the flexibility to accommodate unforeseen expenses, IWDS criticised GEP’s inflexibility in a similar situation. The institute also emphasised the importance of feedback by the right members of the GEP team in the planning stage. The accountant sent, for example, was not perceived as the right person to assess the suitability of IWDS’ research design. In the author’s opinion, a critical appraisal of the IWDS questionnaire would have brought to the fore that it cannot serve as a tool to answer the research questions.

### 4.3 Synergies between partners

Apart from aiming at making a difference as a donor, GEP intended to create and strengthen national and international networks of organisations working for women’s economic empowerment. Supporting linkages between partners was seen as one important step to reach this broader objective.

For a number of organisations, links to other GEP partners existed before that receiving funding from GEP. However, further networking was obviously stimulated. IRC, for example, planned to use the GEP network’s resources to develop advocacy tools. In a number of cases, other GEP partners were involved in the project in some way or the other. HAWWA got logistical support from Bint-e-Malakand, financial assistance from SRSP in terms of micro-finance, and, reversely, served as a marketing outlet for SRSP’s products. Meetings with projects working in similar areas at fairs or exposure visits were seen as an inspiring learning experience and very much appreciated. Such meetings, however, were mainly restricted to the intervention-oriented projects. During the workshop, HUJRA and IWDS delegates regretted the lack of interaction between them so far.

### 4.4 Macro-politics and -economy

As mentioned above, depending on their gender biases or gender-sensitivity, regulation and policies may be both hurdles and catalysts for women’s economic empowerment. However, macro-political or –economic dimensions do not loom large in the projects’ documents. This
issue and its potential effects on project’s progress or failure was discussed during the workshop, but participants could hardly relate to it.

Roots for Equity was an exception in this respect, putting informalisation and marginalisation of women’s work in the context of a neo-liberal macro-economic agenda that focuses on export promotion.

IWDS noted the impact of technological change on the validity of its findings. After completion of their study, an increase in imports of Chinese bangles without joints was observed that might change the structure of the industry in the mid-term. SRSP mentioned government regulation as an obstacle for women entrepreneurs businesses, e.g. if organisations used more than 5 kilo grams of the mazri plant, or produced a mat of more than one hundred square feet with it, then they would need a permit from the government or face paying a fine.

In an environment of poverty, skill enhancement itself becomes an economic choice, as Sawera’s progress report underlines. In Sawera’s area of intervention, it was vital to point out that the organization would provide equipment for skill learning. Due to poverty, women would not be able to two meals a day, let alone working tools.

During the workshop, it was controversially debated in how far the rise to power of the religious alliance of the Muttahida Majlis-e-Amal (MMA) in NWFP in 2002 has reinforced a rigid interpretation and implementation of gender norms in the province and thus negatively impacted on the respective project’s successes. Whereas delegates from Bint-e-Malakand reported government officials’ interest in and support for their work for women’s economic empowerment, a lady representing SAWERA saw this as a way of infiltrating progressive organisations.

5. A critical appraisal

Has GEP reached its objective to strengthen capacity for women’s economic empowerment in Pakistan?

Regarding the choice of partners, it has made efforts to reach out to small and nascent NGOs or CBOs, as intended. About one third of the partners can be considered small or nascent organisations. Their operations mainly target rural, remote or marginalized groups of the population.

One can question why donor-funding was necessary for the for-profit sector, such as the SME Bank. However, the results of the study conducted by the bank go beyond a simple feasibility study with continuation or discontinuation of the loan scheme as the binary results. The assessment of SME bank’s credit scheme for women entrepreneurs suggested playing a proactive, but more targeted role in women entrepreneur development in terms of loan schemes, but also in terms of training and education.

Diversity in terms of the partners and their approaches to women’s economic empowerment can be seen as strength of GEP’s approach. Whereas larger organisation might be able to scale up their pilots in a later stage, smaller organisations might be able to reach out to new target groups and develop locally adapted innovations.
Obviously, apart from public universities, the Government has not been reached by GEP’s funding. As mentioned above, even an indirect effect via the civil society partners is hard to perceive. Here, GEP has clearly missed its target. The question is, on the one hand, whether the volume and duration of the grants would have been attractive for the government directly. On the other hand, any influence on an informal basis is unlikely given the nature of the players. In case of most GEP’s partners, relatively small NGO’s would have been hardly in a position to influence slow-moving bureaucracies. Usurpation would have been more likely. In most cases, the relationship with GEP was too short term to leave a significant footprint on partners and beneficiaries. It is questionable whether increases in staff size will be sustainable beyond the project duration. With the type of grants offered, one would expect an effect on the partners’ capacity building rather than a direct impact on beneficiaries. Apparently, this is what happened with smaller partners. Generic skills of staff members and the organisation as a whole could be strengthened. One can say that this is one of GEP’s strengths that was used – and will indirectly become useful for women’s economic empowerment.

The discussion above shows that learning through networking is a powerful tool for capacity building, particularly if the relationship with the donor is relatively short-term. Such synergies have partially been encouraged by GEP.

The projects’ approaches address strategic skills for women’s economic empowerment at the micro-level, such as free movement, enhanced decision-making, access to and control over financial and other, for example organisational resources, as well as entrepreneurial including marketing skills. While these issues are innovative given the hostile environment the projects take place in, in particular the approaches addressing men’s resistance to women’s economic empowerment and strengthening female-male partnerships can be highlighted as very timely. Strategic skills, such as marketing, and business development, appear to be more important for a sustainable effect on the beneficiaries than purely technical training regarding new products and designs. It is questionable whether the latter contributes to enhanced understanding of women’s economic constraints.

However, in all cases of interventions it would be helpful if monitoring and evaluation systems would be an integral part of the project design. They allow for self-assessments of the projects effectiveness and, if necessary, to identify corrective measures.

In a political and cultural environment, where it is far from being accepted that women contribute economically, more research that makes women’s economic role and contribution to the economy and broader society visible is necessary. However, in two of the studies conducted with GEP support (IWDS, SAP), it is questionable whether the questions posed have been answered with the help of the research. Apart from that, it remains unclear whether the studies translate into information available to a broader audience, in particular to policy-makers. Research funding for women’s economic empowerment appears to be more useful if the studies conducted provide support for intervention, like in the cases of Hujra, Bint-e-Malakand, and GRDP or are combined with media/advocacy strategies.

6. The way forward

Some of the lessons learned from GEP’s experience in supporting women’s economic empowerment are the following. Especially for short-term, limited volume grants it is crucial that:
• Synergies between partner organisations are created. Partners do not meet as competitors and thus learning from each others experience, successes, and failures is possible. Fairs and exposure visits are examples. They can even lead to the establishment of business relationships;
• Potential for replication and outreach of the projects are conceptualised at the planning stage. Positive examples of how women’s economic space can be widened can thus be communicated to a wider target audience and replicated;
• Similarly, targeted trainings for the partner organisation as part of the donor’s coaching can enhance organisational capacity and sustainability beyond the project duration;
• The potential to cooperate with the government needs to be critically assessed. Particularly, if the bargaining power of the government body and the partner is very unequal, it is likely that an agenda for women’s economic empowerment gets diluted in poor governance;
• The issue of macro-micro linkages needs to be addressed in project design. Increasing knowledge about the macro changes in the economy and politics and their bearing on grassroots level efforts to support women’s productive involvement and decisionmaking might be an important step towards gender mainstreaming in economic policy-making.
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List of organisations represented during the workshops

**Day 1 (August 16, 2005):**
- Bint-e-Malakand
- GRDP
- Hawwa
- IRC
- Roots for Equity
- Sawera
- SRSP

**Day 2 (August 17, 2005):**
- Hujra
- IWDS
- (SME, left early)
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List of workshop items

Session 1
- What was unique or different about the project you implemented with GEP support?
- What obstacles do you continue to face in the implementation of this project or addressing the issue?
- How do you want to take the issue forward?

Session 2a
- Has the project changed your organisation’s capacity (e.g. knowledge, management, efficiency etc.)?
- Has the project changed your organisation’s orientation (e.g. topical focus, methods used)?

Session 2b
- What difference have you observed in your organisation/in your personal life through the project?
- What are you now doing about the issues addressed by the GEP project in your own capacity?
  - Have you taken initiatives on your own?
- Do you feel the issue can be approached in a different way?

Session 3
- If you collaborate with the government, what kind of experience did you have in this cooperation?
- What kind of relationship do you have with DFID/GEP (also compare with other funding sources)?
- Is there synergy between and among GEP partners? Have any opportunities been provided by GEP to create such synergy?

Session 4
- What policies have changed in the last few years?
- Identify instances where conducive environment or changes in policies supported the issue and implementation of your project.
- What needs to change further?