### How can we pro-actively integrate a social equity perspective in food systems research and development?

**Webinar 19 Oct 2021**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your questions:</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My urgent question what are the pre-requisite work to properly assess social equity? is there a proposed methodology?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best practices for 'external' investment (donors; green finance) in ag innovation that is 'internally’ driven (designed by intended beneficiaries)?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would social change be more important than change in itself to multiply the effects of development interventions?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As Nozomi said, hybrid technologies do not benefit women or the poor. What types if innovations do? Are there examples/studies of this?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to overcome the instrumentalization of gender and social equity when it comes to project development and resource allocation?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can we improve targeting of agricultural technology development and dissemination to ensure equity [across different dimensions]?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is so much funding/research inertia towards certain types of technologies. Where are sources of alternative funding and research?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Do no harm&quot; is one consideration - but how about &quot;you can't make an omelette without breaking eggs&quot;? Stefan's point re SP is valid here.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation was mentioned. Are you able to expand more on what this would look like practically in the context of not excluding people?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is gender mainstreaming by challenging inherent cultural norms weakening the marital norms sustaining the hh institution a +ve outcome?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration of mostly males out of Zim's rural South has resulted in women appropriating roles on once done by man -not always empowering</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>We need less of this:</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We need to stop prescriptive approach in agricultural research and development. We need to build on the indigenous norms and values.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientists being enthusiastic about their solutions without listening to needs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technology scaling approaches, as these tend to start with the technology, rather than the user and her/his interests and capacities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simplistic donor focus on &quot;gender&quot; or &quot;youth&quot; without asking about wider social equity.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformation ambition; so laden with beliefs and assumptions.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... belongs in the past... gender mainstreaming current approaches</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development interventions not based on research</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignoring the problem of transaction costs ... participation and having a voice has a cost for poor people, women, how to do this better</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>We need more of this:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Votes</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>... focus on demand, needs, understanding (through qualitative methods or mixed methods approaches)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more social science to understand the effects of scientific solutions in theory and in context</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>localize the intervention and involve all players in the eco-system considering the farmers as players and not beneficiaries</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investing more on researching on the causes of inequality on the society in food system, going along with close relation between researchers and decision making bodies (Decision makers) and ensuring the society is get involved on the process.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De-politicization of global agricultural research and development. Research on wheat in Africa and feminist movements need to be revised.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policy implementation feasibility analysis during design / political negotiation phase. Should be comprehensive and hands-on. 'No harm done'</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not viewing social equity only in terms of a solution (participation, demand-led, etc), but as something in need of study &amp; method development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More focus on the 'politics of inclusion', with emphasis on strengthening local organisations and producer groups to 'cooperate to compete'</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the art of managing risks and do research to test and validate sustainable solutions.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand and explicitly work with inequalities (re: co-design, access, etc). Ag Res &amp; Dev won't change political systems, so stay humble.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quick plug for our Taskforce on developing principles and metrics for agrifood innovation - that includes equity <a href="https://wle.cgiar.org/cosai/principles-and-metrics-taskforce">https://wle.cgiar.org/cosai/principles-and-metrics-taskforce</a></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partially de-projectizing AR4D &amp; int dev would make a big difference! Enables less hot air, more honesty, longer-term engagements</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For external investors incl. governments: what instruments and approaches to engage users, explore equity, etc at reasonable cost/management</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>