

Minutes

APGEST Regional Workshop

Quality Hotel, Yogyakarta, Indonesia
5-7 April 2001

Objectives:

- *To visit projects that promote economic empowerment of poor women through S&T;*
- *To discuss and assess the first draft of the country reports of the National Focal Points;*
- *To discuss the recommendations on specific policies and programs arising from the country reports and its implication to national and regional work in S & T*

Contents:

	<i>Page</i>
Minutes of the meeting	1 – 20

ANNEXES

1. Welcome remarks from Gusti Kanjeng Ratu Hemas
2. The development of Traditional Herb business in the framework of optimizing women's empowerment, establishing science based home industry and herbs conservation in Yogyakarta – Dr Nahiyah Jaidi Faraz
3. Gender Best Practices in Improved Cookstove Programme and Biomass Fuel Use in Asia and SODIS – Dra Christina Ariyanti
4. Power point Korea – Dr Young-Ok Kim
5. Power point Mongolia – Dr Amarsanaa Luvsandorj
6. Power point China – Dr Cheng Donghong
7. Handouts Fiji –Ms Ruth Lechte
8. Handouts Samoa – Ms Lumaava Sooaemalelagi
9. Handouts Kiribati – Dr Peggy Fairbairn-Dunlop
10. Power point Nepal – Mr. Sudhindra Sharma
11. Power point India - Sudha Nair
12. Handouts Vietnam– Dr Tran Xuan Dinh
13. Power point Philippines – Dr Maruja Lorica
14. Summary of recommendations and synthesis of workshop - Ms Caroline Matammu Lampaoug
15. Newspaper cutting from local newspaper
16. Photos



UNESCO OFFICE, Jakarta

DAY ONE – 5 APRIL 2001, Thursday

The workshop commenced with a visit to Yogyakarta Palace. Participants were welcomed by Her Majesty Ratu Hemas, who has great influence on gender advancement in Yogyakarta.

WELCOME AND OPENING OF SESSIONS - Dr Minella C Alarcon and Caroline Matammu Lampaoug

Ms Matammu Lampaoug welcomed the participants and talked through the programme. She said that there are some exhibitions in the lobby of the hotel of potential best practice projects from Indonesia. Originally it was planned that the participants will visit the potential best practice project sites, however, due to time constraints and to maximize interaction, the projects were invited to the venue. Dr Minella Alarcon introduced the resource persons on water, renewable energy, biotechnology and green health.

CASE PRESENTATION OF POTENTIAL BEST PRACTICE PROJECTS FROM INDONESIA

I. THE DEVELOPMENT OF TRADITIONAL HERB BUSINESS IN THE FRAMEWORK OF OPTIMIZING WOMEN'S EMPOWERMENT, ESTABLISHING SCIENCE BASED HOME INDUSTRY AND HERB CONSERVATION - Dr Nahiyah Jaidi Faraz of Center for Women Studies, the Research Institute, Yogyakarta State University

Dr Faraz leads a group of researchers working to improve hygiene, technology, and marketing of herbal medicine (Jamu) and conservation of herbal plants. The project is undertaken in Bantul District, Yogyakarta province. A group of traditional medicine sellers were approached and trained. Credits were provided to buy treatment machines, dryers, milling machines, grating machines. The goals were to establish Jamu business based on science; develop market for traditional medicine and create job opportunities for women. A mentoring programme runs informal sessions which brings to the vendors' the importance of entrepreneurship; fosters business spirit; stresses the importance of hygiene in Jamu making; and provides tips on business development. The team works together with PKK (Family Welfare Education for Women association), functionaries at the local Trade and Industry department, the Institution of Herb Examination, and local village leaders. A VCD of the project was also shown.

II. ENERGY EFFICIENT COOK STOVE PROGRAMME AND BIOMASS FUEL USE IN ASIA AND SOLAR WATER DISINFECTION PROJECTS - Christina Ariyanti of Yayasan Dian Desa

Christina Ariyanti stated that the stove project is gender sensitive because women play an important part in food preparation, the potters are women, and it is women who collect fuel. The stove is made of clay, use biomass fuel such as rice husks, and the design is site specific. The stove programme benefits women by improving health conditions, saving time and energy, reducing drudgery and improving their self-esteem and confidence. An additional impact of this



programme is for the environment. The programme helps to reduce tree cutting, results in less agriculture waste, and less CO₂ going into the air.

Ms Ariyanti also made a presentation on SODIS, a technology for water disinfection. She mentioned the context of SODIS implementation in relation to gender because again women are the primary providers of drinking water for the family. It is a custom in many countries that women collect water and boil it. With SODIS, they do not have to boil the water, and this helps in cutting time and fuel costs. The SODIS technology needs sunshine, open space, transparent plastic/glass containers, black paint and brush, and clear water. The technology helps women to save time and energy, improves the health of the family and saves fuel and environment. It should be noted that SODIS's technical application varies in different places, according to climatic conditions

COMMENTS

- ♣ **Dr Lilia Ramos** suggest possible exchange of experiences and lessons learned with Dr Faraz. She said that APGEN has a similar project and in Philippine there is a food safety network which Dr Faraz's team could join. She would like to visit the venue.
- ♣ **Dr Maggy Thenawidjaja Suhartono** suggested that Dr Faraz's group analyze the microorganism content of the Jamu after processing because it might be contaminated. This is important to increase the marketability of the product and also open up opportunities for wider range of users.
- ♣ **Dr Young-Ock Kim** inquired about the technology used for the Jamu project. Dr Faraz said that drying treatment is one of the technologies introduced. The project is funded by the government through the science, technology and poverty alleviation sector.
- ♣ **Suhindra Sharma** asked regarding the efficiency of the cook stove. Ms Ariyanti said that the efficiency measured in the field and in the lab is different. In the lab the range is between 8 to 20 %, which is very high. In the field, from monitoring with the users, they said that they use 50% less biomass fuel.
- ♣ **Dr. Kimbuong Kipgen** asked about evaluation of the projects. Ms Ariyanti said that monitoring showed success stories in Sri Lanka and Bangladesh, but not much in other countries. Participatory monitoring and evaluation programme is being implemented to improve the programme by ensuring the voice of women is heard in defining their needs and aspiration

PRESENTATION OF COUNTRY REPORT FROM INDONESIA – Wati Hemawati

Wati Hemawati explained the country scanning activities, which started in November 2000. Interviews and focused group discussions with key persons were conducted by the team. Secondary data was collected from government documents, resolutions, mandates, reports, etc. Due to limited time and funds available, the assessment only covered completed or on-going programs/projects/services touching the five technology areas within years 1995 to 2000. The data gathering was focused on institutions/organizations in Jakarta, West Java, Central Java, East Java, Bali, Nusa Tenggara Barat and Nusa Tenggara Timur. These are the provinces identified



as having benefited most from projects in the five areas. Ten GOs, 7 Women Study Centers at Public Universities and 24 NGOs were selected to be the source of information. Ms Hermawati ended her presentation with a discussion about potential best practice projects for Indonesia.

COMMENTS

- ♣ **Dr Amelia Ancog** queried whether efforts have been made to enhance the report to select best practice projects. Dr Ancog asked NFPs to provide more information and to refer to the project document. She said that from the report it is hard to know the impact of this technology for men and women, the number of men and women participating in this project, technology transfer processes, etc.
- ♣ **Dr Amelia Guevara** questioned one of the conclusions, which said that women are benefiting most from the program. She asked how this conclusion was reached. Dr Guevara suggested having a format e.g. criteria, to measure success for such project, technology introduced, situation before and after, gender sensitiveness etc. so it would be easier to judge the program.
- ♣ **Dr Sudha Nair** asked whether there is a guideline for RAG members on what to comment on. She added that on the project scanning document, there is a set questionnaire to define best practice projects. She later added that besides documenting best practice projects, APGEST also looks for gaps in GS&T which in itself is a major step forward. In the area of water and renewable energy maybe it is not too difficult to look for best practice projects. However, in green health and biotechnology very little is documented about the involvement of women, and this is a major problem.
- ♣ **Dr Annie Dugdale** said that the participants need to be careful on how to comment on best practice. Dr Dugdale added that the idea of having best practice was to have learning and teaching materials, ideas, and concrete lessons learned that could be used in spreading gender analysis in G S&T.
- ♣ **Wati Hermawati** said that guidelines for choosing and presenting best practice projects have been provided in the scanning document. However, Ms Hermawati added two more components: sustainability of the project; and whether the project answered not only practical need but also strategic needs e.g. empowerment of women, fulfillment of basic need of human being. In the water project chosen, not only it empowered women, but also the project beneficiaries have more spare time to sell snacks and grow vegetables.
- ♣ **Caroline Matammu Lampaoug** said that the minimum requirements for best practice project are that they need to have components of poverty reduction, science and technology, and gender equality. It is true that the best practice in one place might not be best practice in other countries and the technology might not be applicable/appreciated in another place etc.
- ♣ **Dr Minella Alarcon** emphasized again the basic criteria of gender equality, science and technology and poverty alleviation, which need to be taken into consideration. Three questions that will help to assess the project are what technology is being used?; how are the women involved in the utilization/design of the project?; how do women profit from the project in terms of improving their economic status?; and the convergent of these three aspects.



DAY TWO – 6 April 2001, Friday

CLEARING THE AIR

Dr Anni Dugdale chaired the first session, which was specially added to the second day's agenda because there was an intense atmosphere at the end of day one. She invited all participants to say what ever they wanted, to clear the air and avoid misunderstanding.

1. **Caroline Matammu Lampaoug** who attended both RAG meeting 5 April night and NFPs meeting 6 April morning reported the following:
RAG and Resource Persons met last night, the following were agreed:
 - It would be good if we all are open and less defensive to the comments given
 - the experts have not been given a copy of scanning document. Caroline will make enough copies of the scanning document and will distribute them to the experts today.
 - NFPs to indicate specific comments they want from experts and RAG members. This is an opportunity where the experts and NFPs to meet one to one [formal and informal meeting could be arranged during the whole workshop]

The NFPs met this morning and the results were:

- a worry on the extent of the revision that are expected from them, due to limitation of time they may not really fulfill this expectation
 - they welcome feedback from the experts
 - Expert should throw in all the comments to be noted by the documentor
 - There should be written comments from the experts. Experts should arrange one to one meetings with the national focal points. The comments should be compiled by the RC
2. **Dr Amelia Ancog** queried whether the comments should be limited only to the report and/or on the methodology.
 3. **Dr Sudha Nair** said that there should be suggestions on how to move forward in term of country report presentation. She reminded the audience that the persons who are present at the meeting are not necessary the ones who collected the data, therefore they might not know the answer to every question.
 4. **Annie Seranno** said that UNDP facilitated the APGEST process as a small step to move the S&T agenda forward. At the end of the day NFPs need to decide what best to put in the country report because they will be the ones who will use this report for advocacy and policy with their own government. Do not think that the report should be written only for UNDP/UNESCO.
 5. **Dr Lilia Ramos**, who said that she is a practitioner, said that this exercise is very useful and she wants to see how this report could be translated to the field.
 6. **Dr Anni Dugdale** said that RAG members and NFPs need to put their head together to move this project forward; looking to the future and future opportunities; and try to network with each other to make it happen.
 7. **Dr Peggy Fairbairn Dunlop** said that the greater priority is how the information could be used at the national level. So it would be a result of building bases, building networks, and



awareness raising at the national level. She said that the country report should be 'a forward looking document'.

8. Everybody agreed that questions should be pooled at the end of each presentation. Experts should give written comments even though oral comments are also welcome. Everybody should be free to give comments.

PRESENTATION OF COUNTRY REPORT FROM KOREA - Dr. Young-Ock Kim

Dr Young-Ock Kim started her presentation with a list of government policy to advance women in science and technology, especially in information technology i.e. computer education for 2 million housewives; assistance to computer education programs for women; job training for unemployed women household heads etc. Ministry of Gender Equality was established in January 2001, expanding the Presidential Commission on Women's Affairs (PCWA), which was formed in February 1998. Dr Kim reported that the survey questionnaire was pilot tested and sent out to 72 institutions and 43 experts. Field visits were made to project sites, including to Konggi Women's Development Center. In-depth interviews were conducted with the experts in charge of projects. Potential best practice projects were chose with poverty alleviation, gender perspective and science and technology in mind. Amongst the potential best practices are Women's Incubation Center for SOHO Enterprise; Women as Professionals in IT; Women as Tele-marketers, Income generation project for rural women on bean sprouts production in Kimpo and rice bud oil production. Dr Kim said that it has been a bit difficult to identify best practices in 4 other areas of technology.

COMMENTS

- ♣ **Dr Maggy Thenawidjaja Suhartono** commented on the definition of Biotechnology, used by UNESCO and commonly mentioned in various publications, which involved fermentation technology, bio industry, bio pesticide, bio remediation, tissue culture, and recombinant DNA technology. There are many topics that could be related to the goal of this project, because they are close to development of women and technology. As per annex 2 on Korea country report there are institutes which already do work related to this project e.g. bean sprout, cheese, and rice.
- ♣ **Dr Amelia Ancog** congratulated Dr Kim on the good presentation. Dr Ancog asked about career development and competitiveness of women scientists and whether there are any criteria for choosing the women scientists who received grants? Dr Kim said that the project has been implemented since last year. It is a grant, not a loan, given to women scientists which does not have to be paid back as long as they produced research outputs. The areas for research for getting this grant are where women are under represented e.g. food processing engineering and nuclear technology.
- ♣ **Dr Lilia Ramos** questioned why there is only one paragraph about water in the report. Does this suggest that there is no problem about water in Korea? Dr Kim said that clean water is still an issue, not many people can drink water from the tap and in the north of the country people still drink water from the river. Dr Ramos suggested that Dr Kim include the information in the report.



- ♣ **Dr Kim Kimboun** checked the Korean government policy on renewable energy. Dr Kim said that government has implemented many initiatives such as solar energy but most of them did not work. Some environmental NGOs have pushed the government to implement more renewable energy projects. Unfortunately the scanning team could not highlight many successful projects.
- ♣ **Dr Minella Alarcon** said that there is confusion about green health and biotech. Green health, as defined by the Chennai meeting, are projects in medicinal plant use, e.g. ginseng project. NFPs collected many projects on green health but many of them are not sustainable, lack a marketing strategy and lack processing procedure information. Most of these projects stop working as soon as the government stops the funding. Dr Alarcon reminded the NFPs that for APGEST best practice projects, sustainability of the project is important.

PRESENTATION OF COUNTRY REPORT FROM MONGOLIA – Dr Amarsana Luvsandorj

Dr Luvsandorj showed a video presentation on best practices in Mongolia. Mongolia developed its policies from 1992. The National Program for Action for the Advancement of Women was established in 1996. Implementing bodies for the programs are Department of Youth, Family and Women's Affairs (1997), National Council on Women's issues (1998), and National Committee on Gender Equality (2001). The latter is headed by the Deputy Chief, Cabinet Secretariat of Government. Scanning questionnaires were distributed to 64 organizations including GOs, NGOs, international agencies, and research institutions. However, only 38 organizations responded. The summary so far is: policy framework for G S&T exists, the policy on S & T is well defined; women's literacy rate is high; programs/projects towards poverty alleviation exist. The weaknesses are that some of the institutional machinery is not properly functional and government financing in S & T is scarce.

COMMENTS

- ♣ *Dr Lilia Ramos inquired about one of the schemes of the Mongolian government on poverty alleviation i.e. restocking of animal for poor herders who are nomadic. Dr Ramos questioned whether government supplies clean water which is also essential for their life. Dr Luvsandorj said that there is a national problem on water, but they have a national committee that is dealing with this problem. The National Committee is responsible for running the national irrigation project and water sub-centers. Herders usually move at least 4 times a year, season to season. In summer they move close to a river, in winter they drink melted ice. Dr Ramos informed Dr Luvsandorj that in 1995 APPROTECH Asia with Mongolian Women for Progress organized a National Women's Conference on Science and Technology for assessment of resources in Mongolia. One of the results was forming an association of women scientists and technologists in Mongolia. Secondly in terms of information technology, the International Development Research Center has a big project in Mongolia [Pan Asia Networking] which provides infrastructure, hardware and training. In the area of biotechnology, APPROTECH sponsored a women scientist to come to the Philippines to learn about agricultural biotechnology. Dr Ramos suggested this information be included in the report.*



- ♣ **Suhindra Sharma** asked about privatization. Dr Luvsandorj said that even though the herds become privatized the land is state owned, and herders can move from place to place freely.
- ♣ **Dr Amelia Ancog** asked regarding key figures who could help with gender advocacy work. Dr Luvsandorj said that there is possible candidate i.e. Head of National Committee on Gender Equality who is already familiar with the APGEST project
- ♣ **Dr Amelia Guevara** asked whether medicinal herbs are extensively used in Mongolia or not. Dr Luvsandorj said that lot of herbs grows wild. There are companies who specially grow it and sell it to the market, but involvement of individual/families are new because there is no history of medicinal plants. The common activities for individual/families are milk-related products.
- ♣ **Dr Tran Xuan Dinh** asked about the high literacy rate and reasons for it. Dr Luvsandorj said that about 98% of women are literate. There is a common perception that if parents were given choices, they will send their daughter to school instead of their son, because they believe that women need education in order to get a job and be independent while men could do any jobs.
- ♣ **Dr Anni Dugdale** inquired about entrepreneurial education that was provided by the Monenzyme. Dr Luvsandorj said that training in marketing is very much needed by the community to help them market their products better. Lack of information is another serious problem for rural people because they do not have any access to any means of communication i.e. telephone, TV. Unfortunately, these are usually provided only if there are projects on the ground.
- ♣ **Dr Minella Alarcon** said that she appreciated the report especially the video because it gives a feel of what it is like in Mongolia. She asked whether there is a Ministry of Science and Technology because she is looking for a rational why there is not much activity in traditional medicine activities. Dr Luvsandorj said that they have Ministry on Science, Health and Education. She added that many medicines are imported.

PRESENTATION OF COUNTRY REPORT FROM CHINA - Dr. Cheng Donghong

Dr Donghong said that the China team was formally set up in February 2001. They translated the questionnaire, planned the whole activities, and formed Advisory Committee for APGEST national scanning. They sent questionnaires and interviewed GOs, NGOs, Science&Technology institutions, collected secondary data from the websites, libraries, and held workshops and consultation meetings. Potential best practices are comprehensive water gathering project - for water, how women learn to cultivate edible mushroom - for biotechnology, community program on Iodine Disorder Deficiency protection - for green health. She asked for inputs from the participants on selecting best practices. Dr Donghong presented a video on the water project.

COMMENTS

- ♣ **Dr Sudha Nair** said that the water project is a good candidate for best practice because the project works at micro level and national level. The ones on biotechnology and green health might not be appropriate.
- ♣ **Ruth Lechte** agreed with Dr Nair that the IDD project is not green technology unless there is some additional research intervention done on iodine production.



- ♣ **Dr Minella Alarcon** informed Dr Donghong that there is a lot of research in the area of green technology which has been done by the Institute of Botany, UNESCO partner in Beijing. Dr Donghong replied that much research in biotech is for pharmaceutical companies and has neither gender nor poverty alleviation components. Herbal medicine in China is done more and more as business. China does not have community projects like Jamu in Indonesia.
- ♣ **Wati Hermawati** added one of the threats for Jamu is traditional medicine from China. They are very popular in Indonesia. Many companies in Indonesia imitate China in packaging the herbs in capsules.
- ♣ **Dr Lilia Ramos** suggested the Water Cellar for poor mothers project should be selected as the best practice for water, because of its national scope, its potential for replication, and the participation of poor mothers. Dr Ramos added that if this project is being presented as best practice for water, there are events where it could be strategically presented: first is at the Rainwater Catchment Tank Conference in September in Stuttgart. Second is at the 3rd Water Forum in Kyoto. This project could make a good poster/case study presentation.
- ♣ **Dr Anni Dugdale** said that a good green health project could be simple, for example, any project that encourage women to plant herbs at home for their own use. Dr Dugdale added that she is interested in the negotiation process between the designer and the people on the water project. The women's input of the design in water tank and the maintenance of the project should be brought into the report.
- ♣ **Dr Peggy Fairbairn-Dunlop** said that best practice should vary from small to large scale, from individual to institute etc. For green health we should look for wider range not only traditional medicine.

PRESENTATION OF COUNTRY REPORT FROM FIJI – Ruth Lechte

Ms Lechte said that in small island states one never works in isolation. They work collectively in group such as WAINIMATE, Women in Fisheries, ECOWOMAN, the Fiji Association of Women Graduates and the Institute of Applied Science at the University of the South Pacific. The Fiji team did some interviews, produced list of experts, country institutions, and summary of potential best practice projects. The line between government and NGOs is blurred because most of them work for both. Ms Lechte discussed the potential best practice projects proposed for Fiji. Ms Lechte said that it has been difficult to find best practice for water and information technology. Photos from the APGEST Pacific workshop were shown. Analysis and findings are not completed because they would like to get input from this meeting. Copies of potential best practice projects were distributed.

COMMENT

- ♣ **Dr Sudha Nair** asked about products made from water hyacinth. Ms Lechte said they produce crafts such as hats and bags, but the main objective of the project is to clean the river from water hyacinth.
- ♣ **Dr Amelia Guevara** queried the timetable for medicine safety and advocacy work and also reasons for publication of medicinal books. Ms Lechte said that there is no timetable for medicine safety and advocacy work, they are still working on it. For the book, Ms Lechte



said that the women requested a book so they could have common understanding on the use/function of medicinal plants.

- ♣ **Dr Maggy Thenawidjaja Suhartono** suggested again the term of biotechnology should be clarified to “*biotechnology and related areas*” and UNESCO could define the ‘related areas’. This is because even though the term biotechnology as mentioned in various publications covers large areas, there is also narrow definition of biotechnology which is “using living cells/microorganism to produce products useful for human that have commercial value”. If UNESCO uses the term “biotechnology’ only, people will associate it with certain projects only, so projects like floriculture from Fiji could not be included. Dr Alarcon replied that the biotechnology definition is not UNESCO definition but Chennai definition. However, she suggested that in the floriculture project, it might be possible to highlight the botany in the project e.g. propagation.
- ♣ **Dr Sudha Nair** said that the Chennai meeting took Biotechnology as the umbrella for agricultural biotechnology, food biotechnology, and medical biotechnology. Dr Nair said that it is a myth that biotechnology is only recombinant DNA. By-and-large the definition of biotechnology includes food, medical and agricultural biotechnology. She thinks that there is no problem with the definition because bio is the base for all of these.
- ♣ **Dr. Maruja V. Lorica** queried whether conventional breeding, varietal improvement, horticultural production are part of biotechnology. **Dr Maggy Thenawidjaja Suhartono** replied that simple breeding could not be included in the biotech.
- ♣ **Dr Anni Dugdale** agreed with Dr Suhartono on changing the term to “*biotechnology and related areas*” to stop confusion amongst scientists. Dr Dugdale said that the RAG should take the suggestion and discuss it further.

PRESENTATION OF COUNTRY REPORT FROM SAMOA – F. Lumaava

Sooaemalelagi

Ms Sooaemalelagi gave some background info of the area i.e. population, health conditions, and huge brain drain of educated people. Traditionally women have a high status in her village, for example, she could be the chief of her tribe. When a woman is married if she moves to her husband’s village she will need to serve his family and vice versa. More than 90% of land is customarily owned and women have a lot of say on its management. Ms Sooaemalelagi said that similar to Fiji, the problems faced by Samoan team were: people are not in the office in December and January, the questionnaire was quite lengthy so it involved a lot of translating, the team never found one person who know all about their organization/project but had to interview 3 to 4 respondents, who have slightly different views. The team selected 20 projects e.g. handicraft, fine mat weavers, traditional healers. For water there is one side of Samoa that has no water and has been given water pumped from main island from 8am-9pm. Ms Sooaemalelagi described one of the best practice projects .i.e. Community Tourism because it provide the largest income for the community, has national importance, has technology exchange component: compost, cooking hygiene, handicraft, and most importantly because women are key players in this project. Ms Sooaemalelagi stated some of the findings: Samoa does not have policies in Gender, Science and technology, there is a Ministry of Women’s affairs, there is a gap on academic and community because S&T is not being seen as part of



daily life, in formal education girls performance equals males through secondary schools only, the Polytech has gender mainstreaming policy.

COMMENT

- ♣ **Dr Tran Xuan Dinh** asked for the number of universities in Samoa and organizations involved in women activities. Ms Sooaemalelagi replied that there are two Universities in Samoa - National University and University of the South Pacific. They do not have any institute of research in science and technology. Australia and New Zealand used to offer scholarships to Samoans.
- ♣ **Dr Lilia Ramos** suggested putting the country information in the country report so people could relate the info with the real situation.
- ♣ **Dr Peggy Fairbairn-Dunlop** said that the most important thing is that Samoa has covered a different model for best practice i.e. community tourism
- ♣ **Suhindra Sharma and Dr Minella Alarcon** asked on the price and the idea of composting toilet. Ms Sooaemalelagi replied that the cost is 2500 A\$, half of it raised overseas and half of it in the village. The idea came from local touring company that is concerned about the lack of water in the island.
- ♣ **Wati Hermawati** queried about which area of technology the compost toilet belongs to. Dr Kimbuong Kipgen said that it is a renewable energy if it is linked to biogas plant for cooking. If not, it will only be a sanitation project. Dr Anni Dugdale said that the national park in Australia used this kind of toilets, using solar panels to speed up the aerobic/anaerobic process, she thinks that this could be an example of biotechnology.

PRESENTATION OF COUNTRY REPORT FROM KIRIBATI – Dr Peggy Fairbairn-Dunlop

Dr Peggy Fairbairn-Dunlop presented the report for Kiribati because the National Focal Point for Kiribati was not present. Dr Fairbairn-Dunlop said the Kiribati team was formed in January 2001. The islands in Kiribati are spread out, each island/atoll is not more than 2km at its widest, not more than 6 feet high. So in short, the environment is poor land, scarcity of water, low rainfall, and atoll environment. The main income is copra, fish and phosphate and seaman. GDP is one of the lowest in the Pacific. Population is small, dispersed and isolated. On green health, the Ministry of Health in Kiribati has set up a National Medicine Coordinating Body to do research and development to evaluate the scientific basis of traditional plants, develop a directory of plants, registration and legal controls for traditional healer, give orientation of health staff to the concept of traditional medicine. The Association of Maurin Kiribati Association is the association of traditional healers whose membership is broad from PE teachers, nurse, local healers. The strategies are conservation areas for plants, referrals between doctors and traditional healers, in-country workshops, fee scale for expatriates - all of these are seen as a gateway for research for plants. For renewable energy the team has identified projects on the use of solar energy and biomass.

COMMENTS



- ♣ **Dr Amelia Ancog** asked whether the interface between traditional and western medicine is explained in the report. Dr Fairbairn-Dunlop said that pacific report would be written in its context including political, social economy, and cultural background. Ruth Lechte added that even though there are some health centers, most of the time they are out of drugs. Central hospital has set aside a room for traditional healers. Doctor recommends that patients see traditional healers when possible. The health professional is keen to support traditional healers because of their lack of resources. People usually go to the traditional healer before doctors anyway. Traditional healers are required to keep files on what they have done and whom they have seen.
- ♣ **Dr Amelia Ancog and Dr Minella Alarcon** said that it would be good to have background info in the report so people could understand the situation of Pacific islands. Since the situation is very unique the group might want to put story/value added/anecdote case studies to capture the culture differences and geographical problems.

REGIONAL REPORT FROM THE PACIFIC – Dr Peggy Fairbairn-Dunlop

Dr Peggy Fairbairn-Dunlop gave a regional overview for participants to understand the pacific context

1. Populations are small, distributed, isolated, large percentage of population under 15 years of age, increasing population, urban drift, increased dependence on cash economy, so the traditions of semi subsistence households are eroding
2. Resources are agriculture, marine, and labor. As a result of globalization, most of the things that used to be locally produced are not economically viable anymore.
3. Village customary system are still strong. More than 90% land belongs to community, village rules are stronger than the government's. A lot of development projects are village driven.
4. Information Technology is a recent phenomenon. Email is not cheap, accessible only for ministries, power is not reliable.
5. Awareness raising in gender, science and technology is needed badly, except for health and agriculture
6. The strategy is NGO and private sector driven and relies on regional networks e.g. ecowomen, wainimate.
7. There is a Secretariat of the Pacific Communities. The 8th Triennial meeting will be held in June where APGEST has been scheduled to be presented.
8. There are concerns about how to disseminate the 'lessons from APGEST' to other Pacific countries.
9. Value of APGEST, which is independent, has been a joy for the Pacific team. They are able to link to wider network of individuals and institutions including mentoring new people to gender advocacy.
10. The Pacific report will be a regional efforts of linking in the 5 technology areas, linking with institutions, and sharing ideas.



COMMENT

- ♣ **Dr Sudha Nair** congratulated Dr Fairbairn-Dunlop on the presentation from the Pacific. Dr Nair said that Pacific is the only one who presented aquatic resources. India has some experiences on aquatic resource projects, so if Pacific nations are interested India could provide some information.
- ♣ **Dr Maggy Thenawidjaja Suhartono** asked on the role of seaweed. Ms Lechte and Dr Fairbairn-Dunlop said that seaweed is a regional project, has been seen on a wide spectrum from aids property to cholesterol control. The government was putting a lot of efforts in 1980s in seaweed production efforts.
- ♣ **Dr Lilia Ramos** said that in the Philippines there is a Bureau of Aquatic Resources and several women's NGOs that have developed post harvest technologies on fish processing, fish preservation both fermented or non-fermented, which could be shared.

ANNOUNCEMENTS DAY 2

- ♣ Dr Lilia Ramos proposed a meeting with Nepal and China on water
- ♣ RAG member to meet on the 7th evening - after dinner
- ♣ NFPs meet on the 8th – breakfast meeting



DAY THREE – 7 April 2001 Saturday

PRESENTATION OF COUNTRY REPORT FROM NEPAL - Mr. Sudhindra Sharma

Mr. Sharma who is the NFP for Nepal started his presentation with the history of gender, science and technology in Nepal. He said that there were no specific policies linked to gender, science and technology. A Science and Technology Policy was formulated as early as 1988 but due to a change in regime in 1990 it did not come into effect. The issue of gender equality has become an important concern of the government since the last decades. The Ninth Plan (1997 to 2002) for the first time gave concrete shape to gender concept in the process of formulation, implementation and evaluation of sectoral policies and programmes. The plan has also adopted poverty alleviation as its sole objective. Increasing the access of women to political, economic and social sectors, and reforming legal provisions so as to ensure women's rights for making that access more effective is one of the objectives of the plan. A number of institutions on gender, science and technology have been operational within the government ministries and departments for the advancement of women, science and technology.

Mr. Sharma reported that as part of scanning process they visited 33 organizations engaged in the fields of biotechnology, green health, information technology, renewable energy and water; screened secondary literature and the internet of various GOs, NGOs and academic organizations engaged in G, S&T; analyzed strengths and weaknesses of institutions involved in G, S&T as well as examining the external opportunities and threats in the implementation of initiatives for women's economic empowerment through science and technology. The key informants at the Ministry of Women Children and Social Welfare, Ministry of Science and Technology and National Planning Commission, which are the apex bodies of the government concerned with women, science and technology, were interviewed. Officials at the Department for Women Development were also interviewed. Mr. Sharma mentioned that the findings have been documented. He ended his presentation with pictures of candidate best practice projects.

Comments to Nepal Report

- ♣ **Annie Seranno** commented that that it was a very good report. It was complete without being too detailed, offers a good choice of best practice projects which demonstrate good use of the criteria.

PRESENTATION OF COUNTRY REPORT FROM INDIA - Dr Sudha Nair.

Dr Nair started with the issues of equality in India where the statistic showed 300 Indian women die daily due to childbirth; women work longer and are under represented in many areas including politics, science and technology. The Government of India, however, has taken an essential action by declaring year 2001 as the Year for Women in India. The Department of Biotechnology set up the Biotech Park for Women soon after the Chennai Meeting and Model BioVillage Project in Porbandur; Department of Science and Technology have awards for women scientists. Dr Nair said that due to the vast size of the country, scanning activities were focused in Southern India. Nine states have biotech polices.



COMMENTS

- ♣ **Dr Maggy Thenawidjaja Suhartono** and **Dr Ann Dugdale** asked regarding the participation of women only in the Biotech Park project. Dr Sudha Nair said that it is only for women entrepreneur, to empower and encourage women to participate in biotechnology. Check the policies on <http://www.biotechpark.com>
- ♣ **Dr Minella Alarcon** said that for big countries like India, China and Indonesia, the scanning activities could not cover the entire area. The strategy of scanning, e.g. reasons why certain areas are targeted, is very important. This should be mentioned in the report. Dr Alarcon's second point was that scientific inputs for utilization of medicinal plants e.g. organization of national healers, government initiatives in using traditional medicine, need to be included in the report.

PRESENTATION OF COUNTRY REPORT FROM VIETNAM DR. TRAN XUAN DINH

Dr. Tran Xuan Dinh reported the gender policies which have improved through the years. Men and women are equal in the eyes of the law. Women scientists managed to facilitate the government to change the law of retiring age from 55 to 60. Nowadays women participate in all areas, about 40% of women are educated and 30% of women are in the S&T manpower. Problems of scanning were mentioned such as tight time table and language. Potential best practices for 5 technology areas were chosen e.g. Biogas-Cellar and ecovillage in Yen MO, Y Yen district.

COMMENTS

- ♣ **Dr Maggy Thenawidjaja Suhartono** inquired about the reason why this particular ecovillage was selected as best practice. Dr Tran said that this is because the land and the people are different from the rest of the country.
- ♣ **Dr Amelia Guevara** said that more technological inputs are needed on their green health best practice. She said that National Center for Natural Science and Technology in Hanoi could help. Dr Lilia Ramos said that it might be also good to get in touch with Vietnam Women's Ministry. Caroline Matammu Lampauog said that National Commission for the Advancement of Women should be able to comment and give their input on the national report.

PRESENTATION OF COUNTRY REPORT FROM PHILLIPINES – Dr Maruja Lorica

Dr Lorica reported on existing policies, sex disaggregated data for scientists, and gender sensitive projects. Projects related to the 5 technology areas were identified. She also provided information on the strength of gender sensitive projects in the Philippines due to the availability of legislation and policy structure for S&T and GAD; a pool of committed and capable S&T/R&D workers; national machinery for GAD and national GAD Focal Point System; gender sensitive R&D institutions and workers. Efforts, which are ongoing/continuing, are gender sensitivity/awareness training and gender mainstreaming for research/extension workers; development of gender sensitized IEC materials; Networks and linkages both at national and international level



Potential best practices are: for Biotechnology are use of “Bio-N” as Fertilizer and/or use of *Trichoderma* in Rapid Composting; for Green Health are Outreach Program-Medicinal Plants for Primary Health Care, Alternative Livelihood Options for the Poor through IT-Products from Medicinal Plants; for Renewable Energy are Piloting of Community-Based Microhydro Power Generation Project or New Zealand-Philippine National Oil Company (NZ-PNOC) Social Forestry Project (SFP) and/or Maligaya Rice Hull Stove; for ICT are Regional Research and Development Information System (RRDIS) : The VICARP Case and/or Mango Information Network; for Water are Community Water System and/or National Program on Small Farm Reservoir.

COMMENTS

- ♣ **Dr. Sudha Nair** congratulated on the good presentation and inquired the reasons why the Bio-Nitrogen project was chosen. Dr Lorica said that it was chosen because it was developed by women scientists, the technology has taken off, commercialized to some extent and is adopted in some part of the Philippines.
- ♣ **Dr. Amelia Guevara** said that potential best practices for biotechnology should be the technologies developed by researchers that went to clinical studies and now being produced by local pharmaceutical companies e.g. ASCOF projects. Dr Lorica found the problem with using projects suggested is isolating how the project benefits women at the grass root level. The Bio-N project reflects more gender balance project.
- ♣ **Dr Anni Dugdale** added that which ever best practice is chosen, it is important to know from all stages on how the project benefited women, what are the gender aspects, and what was the position of women in each stages.

EXPERTS COMMENTS ON THE ABOVE PRESENTATIONS

- **Experts comments.** **Dr Anni Dugdale** said that she would read thoroughly all the reports and would give individual written comments. She added that the research team did an excellent exercise, using good methodology, and have made good decisions in choosing strong projects which could be used for national advocacy. She said that she was impressed with the reports so far and the information collected. Dr Dugdale said that the choice of best practice has to be more focussed on the best practices that benefit women. It needs to show women’s involvement during the various stages of the project life and the way gender is integrated into the S&T. NFPs might find that there may not be legislation specific on gender, analysis of legislation for G,S&T. **Dr Sudha Nair** said that there is a need for a common framework on how to write the report. She added that whatever information we have would be interesting. She said that she is very pleased with the result so far. **Dr Minella Alarcon** said that the final country report should still focus on S & T element. The report should give a good idea on S&T development/status and development of those 5 technology areas in all participating countries. **Annie Seranno** said that for best practice the project does not have to be women focused, it could be project that is designed for men and women but in the process should have benefited women. **Dr Amelia Ancog** said that it is important to look at issues such as: at what level should women be involved; to what extent



are women active in marketing/selling/commercial production; who benefit – directly/indirectly?; If the children are healthy, are women still the beneficiaries? Etc. Dr Ancog said that maybe it will be good to have direct/indirect legislation that benefits women included in the report as appendices. **Ruth Lechte** said that on the transfer of technology section we need to mention S&T establishments and their attitudes to S&T. She added that technology is very site specific. Women have not been involved in the invention and application of technology. Not sure how to say it but this should be addressed in the report

- **Length of country reports.** Dr Peggy Fairbairn-Dunlop raised the issue of whether there is any desirable length for the report. This was answered by several people including Dr Minella C Alarcon who said that the length of the report would vary from country to country. Ms Caroline Matammu Lampauog said that the report should follow the National Report outline. Ms Matammu Lampauog added that a two- pages background info such as socio-economy context, laws, culture etc could be added to the report to give a general background information. She also said that the NFPs should elaborate more of the findings and give specific recommendations. On this issue Dr A Ancog said that the length of the report should be free and there should be a country editorial board to help NFPs to finalize the report. Dr Anni Dugdale said that there should be two kinds of reports, one for UNDP and UNESCO and the other one a published report for general public. Dr Minella Alarcon agreed and added that a reader friendly report should be done after the NFP did the report for UNDP/UNESCO. Caroline Matammu Lampauog and Dr Minella Alarcon will read the draft and hopefully the RAG members will help. Dr Ruth Lechte said that we should keep in mind that the objective of this report is to go to the ministry of women/everybody in the country
- **Comments from Resource Persons:** Dr Amelia Guevara said that she does not have enough time to read the reports properly to give more constructive comments. Dr Maggy Thenawidjaja Suhartono said that she has started putting together a written report, and would give her comments before she leaves Yogyakarta. Dr Cheng Donghong asked the resource persons to focus on recommendations. Dr Suhindra Sharma said that all NFPs have noted all comments from the resource persons during the presentations, however it would be better if the comments are written coherently and all comments channeled through Caroline Matammu Lampauog
- **Biotechnology Terminology** - Dr Maggy Thenawidjaja Suhartono said that the term biotechnology is not appropriately used. Probably it would be more accurate to use bio based technology so it does not stretch the term too much. Dr Minella Alarcon answered that the definition of biotechnology was taken from the Chennai meeting. Dr Alarcon also said that it would be nice to have a schematic diagram of the technology including references, so if people interested in the technology they could refer to it.
- **Copyright** – the question of copyright of country reports came to light. The group agreed that this issue should be sorted. One suggestion is maybe UNESCO holds the international right, and the national organizations take care for national level.
- **Mainstream gender in water** Dr Lilia Ramos called for a lunch meeting to discuss attempts to mainstream gender in water by participating in International events on water (policy advocacy, best practices, WWF2). She said that there will be meetings such as: World Water forum in Kyoto Japan in March 2003 where APGEN could prepare activities to do gender mainstreaming; Women and water International Conference in Dhaka Jan 14-18 02 where



UNESCO through APGEST could get into water network and Training program on water & environment sanitation in May 14-15 to interface gender and water alliance

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS AND SYNTEHESES OF WORKSHOP - Ms Caroline Matammu Lampaug (Pls. also see ANNEX xx for recommendation per country)

- 1. Linking water network and APGEST.** Dr Lilia Ramos would like to initiate gender mainstreaming in water by attending International Conferences where showcasing best practices can contribute to policy advocacy. She said that APGEST in the short term could endorse recommendations on gender and water and provide some funding for this activity. She said that there would be international conferences on water where APGEST could establish its own identity at the world water forum and water and gender alliance. The coming workshops are World Water Forum in Kyoto 2003, Women and Water Conference in Dhakar 2002, Third country training programme on Water and Sanitation in Manila September 2001. APPROTECH Asia may get Japan's funding for some of the projects presented by participants for the meeting in Manila. Mr. Suhindra Sharma said that two years ago he participated in a water conference which did not address gender issue. He supported the idea of Dr Ramos with regards to articulate gender concern in this field is important. Mr. Sharma added that there is a need for someone to coordinate these efforts. Dr Minella Alarcon said that the idea of gender mainstreaming in water forum is excellent, but it is not part of APGEST mandate for UNESCO. UNESCO as a holder of APGEST could look for possible funds i.e. link interested participants to an officer for hydrology at UNESCO Jakarta office who organizes the world water forum
- 2. Recommendation from the Secretariat of the Pacific Communities is relevant for APGEST Pacific region.** Dr Fairbairn-Dunlop will present APGEST at the 8th Secretariat of the Pacific Communities Triannual meeting in New Caledonia.
- 3. Promoting APGEST - Women Leader Network** will meet in October, APGEST should consider presenting output, concerns and recommendation on regional S&T policies during the meeting. **The One and Future Action Network** is an international consortium in of Women Science and Technology which is mainly funded by UNIFEM. Ruth Lechte will present APGEST at their next meeting at Harvard in April 2001.
- 4. Funding mechanism.** During the workshop the NFPs reported strength of inter-country linkages e.g. work of women scientists in Mongolia and Korea. Therefore, funding mechanism for this kind of programme should be put in place.
- 5. Continue the regional network of scientists when the project ends.** Regional Secretariat of Science and Technology hopefully will take care of this, however a transfer mechanism should be put in place.
- 6. Regional linkages. Network with Scientists in poverty alleviation network.** There is a newly form Asia-Japan Partnership work in poverty alleviation who will welcome the G,S&T network; **Women Graduate Network** in Pacific will also welcome G,S&T network.

EVALUATION OF THE WORKSHOP – WHERE TO GO FROM HERE – Dr Minella Alarcon.



Dr Alarcon said that the next focus after the gender mainstreaming workshop and regional meeting is finalizing the country reports which will be consolidated to the regional report. National level policy advocacy which presumably has been started by NFPs while contacting and visiting scientist/institutions needs to be continued. For dissemination and application of results, information packages in print and video on 5 technology areas will be produced. To make this an effective medium of communication the product needs to be very attractive and contains lots of visuals. NFPs are requested to provide photos, moving pictures and the like. A regional network, e.g. water network, will be set up as a follow up of this project. Please keep in mind that not all of best practices will be included in the regional document. RAG members will review all country best practices and choose the ones for regional report.

Country reports will be kept as they are. Another important part of the report is policy recommendations which will be forwarded to the governments agencies, related ministries, UN agencies and so on. Again, photographs and other visuals are important. Schedule for finalization of country reports will be discussed on the case by case basis between Regional Coordinator and each NFP. Requests for extension should be formal. Constructive written comments from the experts/RAG members need to be received by NFPs a week from now because in the case of Nepal, Mongolia and Korea NFPs are ready to submit their reports.

Regional conference will serve as a finale where APGEST participating countries could highlight a number of follow up projects. Government Ministers, donors, scientists and technologists, NGOs will be invited. This meeting could serve as a face to face meeting where NFPs could discuss potential funding with donors. This hopefully will happen in the early part of 2002. Sudha Nair requested the meeting to be held in Chennai, India. China and Thailand expressed interest in hosting the meeting as well. Prospective hosts need to provide a matching fund.

COMMENTS:

- ♣ **Follow up projects** –NFP from China, supported by Korea, proposed that UNDP/UNESCO provide seed money for follow up projects to support national gender sensitive scientists. There was also a suggestion to form a network of gender scientists on subject base i.e. water. Dr Lilia Ramos proposed APGEST should continue training in water issues, nominating one key person to take care of regional networking on one subject like water; mandating the group to continue to study the subject. A short proposal should be written to UNDP/UNESCO for possible funding the group to represent and to take a lead on this issue.
- ♣ **Problems with identifying resources.** NFPs shared their problems with identifying scientists who are gender sensitive due to the terminology itself. Suggestions/lesson learned are shared from China, Korea, Mongolia and Indonesia. Changing terminology from ‘gender sensitive’ which might have negative connotation and not very popular to ‘women empowerment’. Some scientists do not want to be included in the database because they doubt the confidentiality of the databases itself.



UNESCO OFFICE, Jakarta

APGEST WEBSITE DISCUSSION - Ms Caroline Matammu Lampauog

Ms Matammu Lampauog presented a draft design of APGEST Website. She showed the website dummy, explained the site map, informed participants about the timetable and finished her presentation by saying that she is expecting participants to comment, send articles to the bulletin etc. The website will be placed in UNESCO Indonesia website <http://www.unesco.id/APGEST>

ENDS