



Photo Credit: AGIRED, 2023

FEED THE FUTURE PROGRAMME D'APPUI A LA RENTABILISATION DE L'ELEVAGE

Gender and Youth Inclusion Analysis

Date: November 27, 2023

Disclaimer: This study is made possible through support provided by Feed the Future through the U.S. Agency for International Development, under the terms of Contract No. 72052123C00001. The contents of this study are the sole responsibility of Land O'Lakes Venture37 and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID or the United States Government.

CONTENTS

I.	Executive Summary	4
	I.1 Summary of Findings	4
II.	Introduction	7
	2.1 Project Background.....	7
	2.3 Gender and Youth Inclusion Analysis Purpose.....	9
III.	GYI Analysis Methodology	10
	3.1 Sampling Design.....	10
	3.2 Data Collection Tools	11
	3.3 Data Collection Fieldwork.....	11
	3.4 Challenges in Data Collection	11
IV.	Findings.....	13
	4.0 Gender and Youth Sample Distribution	13
	4.1. Participation in Different Livestock Value Chains.....	17
	4.2 Herd Composition	25
	4.3 Management Practices	27
	4.4 Yield, Sales & Marketing	33
	4.5 Education, Training and Access to Information.....	38
	4.6 Access to Financial Resources.....	44
	4.7 Productive Resources.....	49
	4.8 Household Resilience.....	52
	4.9 Women's Empowerment.....	55
V.	Conclusion & Recommendations.....	57
	5.1 Conclusions.....	57
	5.2 Recommendations	58

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ARSSI	Ability to Recover from Shocks and Stressors Index
ATR	Ability to Recover Index
A-WEAI	The Abbreviated Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index
EGAD	Economic Growth and Agriculture Development
FAMV	La Faculté d'Agronomie et de Médecine Vétérinaire
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
FTF	Feed the Future
GBV	Gender-Based Violence
GYI	Gender and Youth Inclusion
Heifer	Heifer International
ILO	International Labor Organization
KII	Key Informant Interview
LMSRA	Livestock Market Systems Resilience Assessment
LMSRS	Livestock Market Systems Resilience Strategy
MARDNR	Ministère de l'Agriculture des Ressources Naturelles et du Développement Rural
MEL	Monitoring, Evaluation & Learning
MIF	Market Ignition Fund
MSR	Market Systems Resilience
MSME	Micro, Small and Medium-sized Enterprises
MUSO	Mutuelles de Solidarité
Papyrus	Papyrus S.A.
PARE	Programme d'Appui à la Rentabilisation de l'Elevage
PMELP	Project Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Plan
RFZ	Resilience Focus Zones
SDE	Section d'Énumération (Enumeration Areas)
SEI	Shock Exposure Index
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
Venture37	Land O'Lakes Venture37
VSLA	Village Savings and Loan Association
WEAI	Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Land O'Lakes Venture37 (Venture37) conducted a Gender and Youth Inclusion (GYI) Analysis for the five-year Programme d'Appui à la Rentabilisation de l'Élevage (PARE) project, funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). PARE focuses on enhancing household and community resilience in Haiti's Northern and Southern Resilience Focus Zones (RFZs) by bolstering the livestock market system, particularly within the cattle, goat/sheep, and poultry value chains.

The GYI Analysis was conducted by the PARE Monitoring, Evaluation & Learning (MEL) team in partnership with AGIRED, a Haitian evaluation and data collection firm. This study utilized data from the PARE Baseline Assessment, a mixed-method approach that collected sex-disaggregated quantitative data from a representative sample of livestock producer households in the Northern and Southern RFZs through a Producer Household Survey, as well as qualitative data from male, female and youth producers, community leaders and other stakeholders.

The purpose of the GYI Analysis is to document the current status, constraints and opportunities for male, female, and youth livestock producers and their communities in the Northern and Southern RFZs. The GYI Analysis, in cooperation with the PARE Baseline Assessment and the simultaneous Livestock Market Systems Resilience Analysis (LMSRA) study will inform a Gender and Youth Action Plan that will ensure equal participation and outcomes in PARE for women and youth.

A summary of findings and subsequent recommendations are below.

I.1 Summary of Findings

Participation in different livestock value chains

There is a large minority of joint management between men and women. Women are less likely to manage cattle and are most involved in the management of poultry. Women are also involved in goat/sheep. Women do not necessarily view gendered distribution of livestock as inequality, despite the higher value that cattle bring compared to poultry and goats/sheep, but rather as traditional.

Overall, youth are less likely to be involved in livestock production than adults, across all value chains. Goat/sheep and poultry are more feasible for youth in the short term due to finance constraints -- but they could potentially build their way up to cattle. Most ownership seems to come from managing others' animals and receiving an offspring.

Herd/flock composition

Households with male-only management tend to have substantially larger herd sizes than those with female-only management within the cattle and goat/sheep value chains. For poultry, however, flock sizes were relatively equal between male and female-only management.

Differences in herd/flock size between households with youth-only producers and adult-only managers are less pronounced than with gender.

Management practices

Male managers generally apply more improved practices than female managers due to mobility constraints, reduced access to training, and reduced access to credit by women. In poultry management, women producers have equal or higher rates of application of improved practices in most areas. The application of management practices is deeply intertwined with social norms dictating traditional gendered roles and responsibilities for women and men.

Compared to sex, there are few substantial differences between youth and adult management in terms of application of improved practices for cattle, with a few exceptions. Youth producers emphasize again and again that lack of credit and capital was the biggest barrier they face.

Yield, Sales & Marketing

Men have higher yield than either women or youth due to more offtake as well as their higher rate of keeping improved breeds, as larger animals influence yield. In addition, men sell more quantity of their herds/flock than women. For this reason, men have higher yield than women and adults over youth, aside from poultry, where women are close to achieving parity.

Women are highly involved in marketing of livestock, which presents opportunities to further engage them in the livestock sector. Women almost unanimously said they would like to expand their activities in commerce. Many youths view themselves as entrepreneurs and are also interested in exploring activities along the value chain.

Livestock training

All producers have a low level of formal training in livestock. Women advocated for separate opportunities that meet women where they're at- in small livestock, in trade and in processing – rather than trying to push them into more male dominated spaces.

Youth expressed a need for livestock-specific training that focuses on more modern and technical skills that they can learn to improve their production, and they call for more guidance and supervision.

Access to financial resources

Accessing credit was overwhelmingly mentioned as the top barrier for youth in strengthening and expanding their livestock activities. Women also cited it as an issue. Both groups have lower access to formal finance than adult men. Financial management and decision-making within smallholder producer households in Haiti is a complex interplay of cultural, social, and economic factors. Men appeared to have more power in decision making, though women control their livestock income.

Access to animal health services and products

There is little difference in perception of access to animal health workers and veterinary medicine between male and female respondents and youth and adult respondents. At the same time, there is a distinct difference in the rate that men and women apply animal health treatments and diseases, so despite feeling like they have access, women face barriers in utilizing these key services and inputs.

Household Resilience

Male-headed households are generally better able to recover from shocks and stressors than female-headed households. Male-led households have more access to resilience capacities such as savings and diversity of livelihoods.

Women's Empowerment

For many women, livestock offers an opportunity for empowerment, as it allows women an important source of income over which they have control of and with which they can build their assets. Many women believe that if the barriers to their participation in the livestock sector were addressed, they could achieve positive outcomes through the production, processing and trading of livestock products. 30% of women achieved adequacy in Baseline Indicator #13: Resource portion of the Abbreviated Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (A-WEAI).

I.1 RECOMMENDATIONS

The comprehensive analysis of gender and youth dynamics within the livestock value chain offers a foundation for targeted recommendations aimed at fostering inclusivity, empowerment, and equitable growth through a market-based approach.

Recommendations linked to Objective 1

- ***Support projects that are working on improved breeds and henhouses (cross with Objective 1.1.1)***

Leverage women and youth interested in acquiring, breeding and distributing improved breeds, especially in the goat/sheep value chain. Encourage partners to utilize women and youth organizations as centers for this activity. In addition, consider projects that focus on the establishment of henhouses, particularly for youth.

- ***Encourage partners to incorporate women and youth organizations (cross with Objective 1.1.2)***

Work with partners who will support and strengthen women and youth specific organizations, either for market actors to work with for extension; or to partner with them specifically on providing appropriate services for their members. Utilize these organizations as hubs for training that is separate and tailored to needs of women and youth.

- ***Expand extension services (cross with Objective 1.1.2)***

Support and strengthen capacity for women and young people through training focusing on livestock management, financial literacy and entrepreneurship. Strengthen extension services to provide tailored technical assistance and extension services to women and youth farmers on topics such as making fodder, how to build enclosures, and animal care training.

Through expansion of training and extension, work with partners to support gender and youth-sensitive improved practices. For example, instead of trying to change the mobility constraint of women, promote practices that can be done closer to the home. Leverage youth's eagerness to change to demonstrate improved practices, utilizing them as an eager promoter/voice for change.

Recommendations linked to Objective 2

- ***Support veterinary agent training (cross with Objective 2.3.1 and 2.3.2)***

Encourage projects that offer pathways for veterinary training and jobs as community animal health workers for both women and youth.

Recommendations linked to Objective 3

- ***Leverage enthusiasm for marketing and entrepreneurship (cross with Objective 3.1.1)***

Continue to promote women in their roles as traders and provide the support they need for this higher income opportunities. Leverage the interest youth have in entrepreneurship, perhaps through enterprise acceleration.

- ***Expand access to finance (cross with Objective 3.1.3)***

Develop partnerships with financial institutions to develop gender and youth-responsive credit mechanisms to enhance inclusive access to credit. Consider potential partnerships with informal savings and credit groups such as VSLA and MUSO to expand access to loans for women in particular. For youth, encourage partners to provide monitoring and support on credit, as well as training in business development.

II. INTRODUCTION

2.1 Project Background

The Feed the Future Programme d'Appui à la Rentabilisation de l'Évage (PARE) is a 5-year, \$23 million project funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). PARE is implemented by Venture37 in partnership with Heifer International (Heifer) and Papyrus S.A. (Papyrus) from January 9, 2023 – January 8, 2028. The program aims to increase the resilience of households and communities in four Departments (Nord, Nord-Est, Sud and Centre) and 34 communes in the Northern and Southern RFZs of Haiti through the improvement of the livestock market system. PARE will focus on inclusive commercialization of the cattle, goat, sheep, and poultry value chains.

PARE will take a market systems resilience (MSR) approach to reach its goal. PARE will foster livestock market system resilience through strategically partnering with diverse, existing public and private sector market actors to implement livestock systems innovations that support PARE's objectives. PARE will integrate women and youth inclusion and empowerment strategies into these partnerships to foster inclusive growth. The PARE approach places Haitian partners at the center of implementation and will strategically utilize a \$3.6 million Market Ignition Fund (MIF) as a flexible tool to build capacity and mitigate risk for market actor investment. At least 15% of MIF funds will be focused on supporting women and youth entrepreneurs or enterprise owners and firms primarily employing women and/or youth. The three main objectives that PARE will achieve are:

Objective 1: Improve productivity of the livestock sector in the Resilience Focus Zones. PARE will improve livestock productivity in the RFZs by strengthening the private sector to support male, female, and youth farmers to adopt on-farm productivity-enhancing technologies and management practices that are climate smart, contextually adapted and specific to each species of livestock. Innovative partnership models, grants and private sector co-financing mechanisms deployed through the MIF will be at the core of building more sustainable extension systems that are tailored to the needs of male, female, and youth farmers and assisting producers and communities to build more resilience in the face of shocks. Importantly, outcomes from Objective 2 related to access to inputs and services are necessary components for the achievement of this objective. Partners will include private actors such as agro-dealers, end buyers, agro-vets, research universities and NGOs.

Objective 2: Increase the accessibility of inputs and services in the livestock market system. PARE will improve male, female and youth producer access to inputs and services in four key areas: Provision of animal stock inputs and services, livestock nutrition inputs, animal health products and services, access to market information, and access to financial services. PARE will explore business models that provide embedded service provision as well as the expanded networks for input providers that meet the needs of male, female and youth producers. Potential partners could include agro-dealers, cooperatives, end market buyers, aggregators and financial institutions.

Objective 3: Improve marketing and private sector engagement in the sector. To achieve this, PARE will engage the private sector to increase utilization of available and new financial products that meet the needs of male, female and youth-led enterprises, enhance their ability to produce higher-value products for rural and urban markets, and access the inputs and services they need to invest further in the sector and increase profitability. Interventions will include light-touch approaches such as improving linkages through regional platforms, and heavier-touch such as co-investment grants in improved infrastructure and packaging materials for slaughterhouses, meat packers and mini-dairy networks to improve quality and marketing campaigns. PARE will specifically target promising women and youth-led entrepreneurs and Micro, Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (MSMEs) with incubation and business development services.

2.2 HAITIAN CONTEXT

Haiti has an estimated population of 11.4 million as of 2022, with 50.5% women¹. Haiti is a very young country with over 50% of the population below the age of 25¹ and 32% under the age of 14². Unemployment is very high in Haiti, especially for youth. The unemployment rate was estimated to be 14.8% in 2022, 17.3% for women and 34% for youth aged 15-24³. International Labor Organization (ILO) estimates indicate that 18.2% of youth are not in employment, education, or training. This is much more prevalent for women than men with 28% of female youth in rural areas and 43% in urban areas not in employment education or training, compared to 15% of male youth in rural areas and 23% in urban areas⁴.

Within the agricultural sector, women play an important role. Agriculture employs just under half of Haiti's workforce, including 30% of women⁵. Livestock is a key component of the agriculture sector with about 75% of households owning some type of livestock⁶. Women typically engage in rearing of small livestock, with a focus on production and transformation, which are activities that can be performed close to home. This segmentation of work can limit the income possibilities for women from their own managed livestock⁷.

Interestingly, women's empowerment in the agriculture sector is relatively high compared to similar developing nations, although there is still room to improve. In 2014, the Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (WEAI) was measured at 0.85 out of a total of one in Haiti, albeit for a different zone of influence⁸. The WEAI looks at production decision-making, access to productive resources, control over use of income, community leadership and time allocation. The study found that slightly over 50% of the women had achieved empowerment (80% or higher on the 5 dimensions of empowerment), while those not yet empowered had achieved empowerment in two thirds of the dimensions. Nearly two thirds of women (62.9%) achieved gender parity with men on these dimensions⁹.

There is limited research on youth and agriculture in Haiti, and no recent studies focused on livestock. A USAID commissioned Youth Assessment in 2016 found that youth were generally leaving the rural areas

¹ World Population Prospects 2022. United National Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division. <https://population.un.org/wpp/>

² World Bank Open Data. Populations ages 0-14 (% of total population)-Haiti. <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.POP.0014.TO.ZS?locations=HTun>

³ World Bank Open Data. Unemployment (% of workforce).

⁴ World Bank Group. Haiti's Untapped Potential: An assessment of the barriers to gender equality. 2023. <https://thedocs.worldbank.org/en/doc/4b69af839b59351a5d7a245d71a57c13-0370012023/original/Full-report-Haiti-GA-EN.pdf>

⁵ World Bank Open Data. Agriculture, forestry and fishing, value added (% of GDP)- Haiti. <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NV.AGR.TOTL.ZS?locations=HT>

⁶Coello, B., Oseni, G., Savrimootoo, T., & Weiss, E. (2014). Rural development in Haiti.

⁷ Jane Kellum, Ulrick Jean Claude, and Stephen Louis. USAID/Haiti Economic Growth and Agricultural Development: Gender Analysis Report. Prepared by Banyan Global. 2022.

⁸ The zone of influence in 2014 included 14 communes in the Northern Corridor, 4 communes in the Saint-Marc Corridor, and 10 communes in the Cul-de-Sac Corridor.

⁹ Malapit, Hazel Jean, Kathryn Sproule, Chiara Kovarik, Ruth Meinzen-Kick, Agnes Quisumbig, Farzana Ramzan, Emily Hogue, and Sabina Alkire. Measuring Progress Toward Empowerment. Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index: Baseline Report. 2014. https://cg-281711fb-71ea-422c-b02c-ef79f539e9d2.s3.us-gov-west-1.amazonaws.com/uploads/2018/03/ftf_progress_weai_baselinerreport_may2014.pdf

to escape the stigma associated with agriculture work¹⁰. This is a similar finding in many developing economies where youth are not interested in agriculture work and instead migrate to the major cities to find employment. More study is needed on the root causes of these trends in Haiti for programs to provide the appropriate interventions to better integrate youth into the agriculture sector. This report helps contribute to understanding the constraints and opportunities for youth that have stayed in the livestock sector in the USAID RFZs.

2.3 Gender and Youth Inclusion Analysis Purpose

The purpose of the GYI analysis is to document the current status, constraints and opportunities for male, female, and youth livestock producers and their communities in the Northern and Southern RFZs of Haiti for the cattle, goat/sheep, and poultry market systems. This study was conducted concurrently to the Baseline Assessment and drew from the same quantitative and qualitative primary data sources.

In 2022, USAID/Haiti conducted a comprehensive gender analysis on livestock in Haiti to inform the USAID/Haiti's Economic Growth and Agriculture Development (EGAD) strategy. The EGAD gender analysis utilized a desk review and primary qualitative data collection of women and men producers in the Northern and Southern RFZ. This study intends to build on the EGAD gender analysis, by adding quantitative results and an exploration of male and female youth constraints and opportunities that were absent from the previous report. This study also digs deeper into the differences between men, women and youth producers in production, including their ownership, responsibilities, and utilization of improved livestock practices that will inform an important aspect of PARE implementation. Within this report, the author will note where findings align with the EGAD gender analysis and highlight any new or different findings.

The findings from this study in conjunction with the Baseline Assessment and Livestock Market System Analysis will inform a Gender and Youth Strategy as part of the Livestock Market Systems Resilience Strategy (LMSRS) that will drive PARE implementation.

¹⁰ Henry Wallic Charles, Rachelle Cassagnol, Carole Sassine, Nephtaly Andoney Pierre-Louis, Fabiola Rosier. USAID/Haiti Youth Assessment 2016. Prepared by LOGIK. 2017.

III. GYI ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

The GYI analysis utilized the data collected for the PARE baseline assessment. The PARE MEL team led the studies, with data collection by AGIRED. The studies used a mixed methods approach, with a quantitative household survey with cattle, goats/sheep, and poultry producers, qualitative focus group discussions (FGD) with producers, and key informant interviews (KII) with community leaders and other stakeholders.

3.1 Sampling Design

Quantitative Household Survey

The PARE Program will target the Northern and Southern RFZ, which includes 34 communes across 4 departments: Nord, Nord-Est, Centre and Sud. The quantitative data collection was population-based and designed to be statistically relevant at the department level, with a margin of error of 5% and confidence level of 95%, and an assumption of 10% non-response. This led to a total sample of 425 per department. The team took a three-stage sampling approach. At the first stage, a sample of 16 of the 34 PARE target communes was purposively selected based on the proportion of livestock in the communes. At the second stage, a sample of 100 Sections d'Enumération (SDEs) were randomly selected per commune. At the third stage, 17 households per SDE were selected using the random walk method. Table I below shows the plan and final sample size.

Table I. Final sample achieved compared to planned sample

Department	Selected Communes	Planned Sample		Achieved Sample	
		# SDEs	Total # household interviews	# SDEs	Total # household interviews
Nord	Saint-Raphaël	5	85	5	85
	Acul du Nord	6	153	9	151
	Limonade	11	85	5	84
	Pignon	3	102	6	98
	TOTAL	25	425	25	418
Nord Est	Terrier-Rouge	8	136	8	136
	Ouanaminthe	9	153	9	151
	Vallières	3	51	3	47
	Fort-Liberté	5	85	5	83
	TOTAL	25	425	25	417
Centre	Hinche	15	255	15	255
	Cerca Carvajal	2	34	2	34
	Cerca la Source	8	136	8	135
	TOTAL	25	425	25	424
Sud	Chantal	7	119	7	118
	Torbeck	5	85	5	85
	Camp-Perrin	5	85	5	85
	Saint-Jean du Sud	4	68	4	68
	Chardonnières	4	68	4	68
TOTAL		25	1700	25	1683

Qualitative FGDs and KIIs

The qualitative FGDs and KIIs utilized purposive sampling to ensure that a wide range of relevant stakeholders and perspectives were included. A total of 48 FGDs with producers were conducted, three in each of the 16 communes targeted for the quantitative household survey. In each commune, one was conducted with a general group of producers, one with women producers and one with youth producers. A total of 45 KIIs were conducted with community leaders and 20 KIIs with other stakeholders, distributed evenly across each of the four departments. Other stakeholders included training institutions and breeders.

3.2 Data Collection Tools

Quantitative Household Survey

The quantitative producer household survey collects data about demographics, livestock practices, decision-making, yield and sales of animals and animal products, exposure to shocks and coping strategy, asset ownership, access to infrastructure, services & markets. To inform the GYI analysis, the household survey asked questions about gender and youth in a few ways. First, to determine the respondent for the survey, the enumerators asked to speak to the individual in the household that is most knowledgeable about livestock rearing and the sex and age of that person was collected. Second, the sex of the household head was collected. Third, for the different types of livestock, the survey asked about who owns the livestock, who manages that livestock, and who makes decision about the livestock that can be disaggregated by sex.

Qualitative FGDs and KIIs

Discussion guides for qualitative fieldwork were developed based on the quantitative questionnaires. Different discussion guides were created for each type of FGD and KII. For the GYI analysis, the interviews asked specific questions about specific constraints and opportunities for women and youth in the livestock sector. As mentioned above, FGDs were conducted with women and youth producers in each commune to specifically understand their perspective on all discussion points.

3.3 Data Collection Fieldwork

Data collection was carried out by AGIRED by a team of two regional coordinators, four supervisors and 34 local enumerators. Two regional enumerator trainings (one in the north and one in the south) were conducted for three days each, followed by a one-day pilot and debrief. Training focused on the survey methodology, a detailed review of the survey instrument, and best practices in ensuring high-quality data collection.

Data collection was conducted face-to-face with respondents from April 24th to July 14th, 2023, in Haitian Creole using Kobo Collect on tablets. 12 SDEs (12% of total sample SDEs) were replaced due to security issues, lack of households in the SDE, or difficulty in traveling to the location. Replacement was done using random selection.

3.4 Challenges in Data Collection

Data collection coincided with the rainy season as well as the beginning of the hurricane season. In addition, the sample included many rural and hard-to-access areas. Heavy rain and flooding in early June 2023 affected enumerators' ability to travel and delayed fieldwork by a week and a half. In addition, fuel scarcity further slowed down the anticipated fieldwork timeline. Due to the current political crisis and gang activity in Haiti, respondents in many rural areas had increased suspicion of outsiders. Field teams worked with local guides to help overcome this issue.

Most of the data collected for the farmer household survey are self-reported. Limitations of self-reported data include the potential for exaggeration or omission of information, inaccurate recall, the potential for respondents to give responses they perceive as desirable, expected, or acceptable, reporting of untruthful information, and reduced validity if respondents do not fully understand a question. Enumerators were trained in techniques to help mitigate these types of measurement bias. Where possible, enumerators observed the environment of the livestock farming, to improve data quality.

The reliability of self-reported data is particularly challenging for questions related to livestock yield. This issue was discussed with AGIRED prior to the start of fieldwork, and several steps were taken to minimize the effect of errors associated with self-reported estimates. One particular area that was identified was respondents' inability to report on the average weight of each different type and gender of their livestock, which is required to calculate the yield indicator. To mitigate this issue, AGIRED conducted a separate data collection exercise in markets local to the data collection, whereby they weighed and measured the different types and genders of livestock. AGIRED collected 470 observations of animal weight. The average of each type of livestock was used to calculate yield.

IV. FINDINGS

This section presents the main quantitative and qualitative findings related to gender and youth from smallholder cattle, goat/sheep, and poultry producers in the sampled communes across the four departments of the USAID/Haiti RFZs.

This section is structured as follows: first, an overview of the socio-demographic makeup of the sample provides a context for findings. Then, women and youth participation in the three target livestock chains are examined in terms of their rates of management and ownership. Next, the size and composition of household's herds and flocks are described in terms of differences between sex and age. Then, the management practices, yield and sales of livestock production are investigated along each value chain with comparison between sex and age outcomes. Next, the broader market dynamics that affect women and youth livestock producers in particular are examined in terms of education and training, and access to information. Finally, the gender and youth dynamics of household resilience are examined through the lenses of exposure to shocks and stressors, coping strategies and the ability to recover, with a final section on Women's Empowerment.

As described above in *Section 3. GYI Analysis Methodology*, respondents were asked to recall their previous year and values throughout the report refer to the time period of April 2022 to April 2023. All monetary values are in USD using the following exchange rate: 1 USD = 140 HTG.¹¹

4.0 Gender and Youth Sample Distribution

4.0.1 DISAGGREGATION BY SEX AND YOUTH THROUGHOUT THE REPORT

During the inception phase, the PARE MEL team's consultation of previous studies including 2022 USAID/Haiti Gender Analysis Report as well as the expertise of the PARE technical team revealed that the dynamics of ownership and management of livestock within households can be complex. There is often joint ownership and decision making amongst individuals within a household and there are structures of ownership or management of livestock by individuals outside of the household, through *gardien* systems or by individuals who have migrated domestically or internationally. In addition, many households raise more than one type of livestock.

Respondents to the Producer Household Survey were selected based on their self-designation as the person most knowledgeable about the production of livestock in their households. However, the respondent may be most knowledgeable about one value chain but not necessarily the other or may share in the management and ownership of a value chain with others inside or outside of their household. Some questionnaire items used the respondent producer as the unit of analysis and asked about their individual experiences. Other items collected data on household-level variables, for which the producer responded on behalf of the household. This approach allows this analysis to examine sex and age through a number of lenses, both at the individual level and the household level.

Thus, disaggregation of data by sex and youth is done in three separate ways throughout this report and the most theoretically appropriate approach is employed according to the variable in question.

First, for variables that considered the respondent the unit of analysis, such as their own education level or their own past experience with training, the data is disaggregated by the sex and age of the respondent themselves.

Secondly, in the Producer Household Survey, the respondent producers detailed the different individuals responsible for the management and ownership of each value chain in their household. Where management or ownership was done by a single household member, they were coded into categories of

¹¹ <https://www.xe.com/currencyconverter/convert/?Amount=1&From=USD&To=HTG>

female only or male only management or ownership. Where the joint household members had the same gender, they were coded into female only or male only categories, and those that had different genders were coded as both male and female. Management or ownership by an individual or individuals outside of the household, including both relatives and third parties, were coded as outside of the household. This same disaggregation was applied to youth, with youth only, adult only, both youth and adult and outside of the household categories created for the age of livestock managers and owners within each household. To better understand how gender and age influence livestock herd/flock sizes, management practices, yield and sales, as well as other concerning the practice of or outcomes of the separate livestock value chains, sex and age are disaggregated according to these categories.

Finally, for certain household level data, such as coping strategies employed or ability to recover from shocks and stresses, the gender of household head is used to identify how gender in equities can influence household resilience outcomes.

4.0.2 OVERVIEW OF THE SAMPLE

The respondent for the Household Producer Survey was the household member identified as the most knowledgeable about the household's livestock production. Table 2 presents the sex and age distribution of the respondent. Almost half (44%) of the sample were female producers. This proportion of female producers is aligned with findings from the 2022 USAID/Haiti Gender Analysis Report, which notes that women participate in all aspects of farming on their homesteads and their management of livestock is likely much higher than the 38% reported in official data.¹²

In the PARE Baseline Assessment, 14% of the sample were youth livestock producers, representing a slight increase in youth participation since the census. The average age of producers 47 years old, with a minimum age of 18 (capped by the survey protocol) and a maximum age of 95.

The sex and age categories of producers reveals that there was an equal proportion of female and male youth (7%) within the sample of livestock producers. The largest subgroup included was male adults at 49%.

Table 2. Gender and age distribution of sample

Sex and youth subgroups	% of total sample
By sex of livestock producer	
Female	44%
Male	56%
By age of livestock producer	
Youth (ages 18 – 29)	14%
Adult (ages 30+)	86%
By gender and age of livestock producer	
Female youth	7%
Female adult	37%
Male youth	7%
Male adult	49%
<i>n</i>	1,683

¹² Banyan Global. 2022. *USAID/Haiti Economic Growth and Agricultural Development: Gender Analysis Report*.

4.0.2 GENDER OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD

Discussed in subsequent sections, the gender of the head of household can influence households' experience of shocks and stress, as well as the coping strategies that household employ and their ability to recover. Of the smallholder producer households sampled in the PARE Baseline Assessment about a third, (34%), had a female head of household (with the remaining 66% with a male head of household). Female respondents overwhelmingly came from female-headed households. Of all female-headed households, 96% had a female respondent and 4% had a male respondent. Furthermore, in most (96%) of the households with both a female head of household and a female respondent, the respondent was the head of household herself. Female heads of households were less likely to be married (33%) than male head of households (43%) and more likely to be widowed (17%) than their male counterparts (4%). In fact, of the female respondents in the sample, who identified as the most knowledgeable in their household about their livestock production, half (52%) were single heads of household.

For data at the household level, the gender of the head of household is used throughout this report as a disaggregate to better understand how resilience and livelihoods can be affected by gender.

4.0.3 SITUATION OF WOMEN AND YOUTH

Throughout qualitative interviews, respondents offered observations on the situation and context of women in youth in rural Haiti. Two themes in particular arose from these conversations – the gendered social norms and power which affect women and the economically vulnerable position of youth. These themes ground much of the findings that follow and provide a foundation to better understand the barriers these vulnerable groups face as well as opportunities available to them.

Gendered social norms and power

Producers describe how gendered social norms permeate not only livestock production, but all aspects of society. First, producers described the prevalence of deeply ingrained gender roles that dominate much of the division of household labor in rural Haiti. Women are typically responsible for all of the work maintaining the household and caring for children. While women do participate in agriculture and livestock, this is considered the domain of men.

“All the work in the yard and in the house is for the women. A little boy is not allowed to touch the broom, it’s work for girls. Almost all tasks are either for girls and women or for boys and men. You shouldn’t be surprised to hear a 9-year-old boy say to his 11-year-old sister: go get me a glass of water.” -FGD with female producers in Hinche.

As a result of the expectations on women to perform all the household and childcare labor, women who are involved in agriculture or livestock find that the time and effort they are able to dedicate to their other endeavors is limited, hindering their full participation.

“The biggest specific constraint for women is that we are inseparable from home. From morning to evening, we take care of the children, cook food, wash clothes, wash dishes, etc. A woman’s work is never finished. If you want to trade and go to distant markets, you have to ask members of your family to do you a favor and come to your house during your absence.” – FGD with female producers in Hinche.

Many female producers remarked that women have their roles and responsibilities and are quite capable, but the tasks that fall within the woman’s domain are undervalued and her contribution is considered less important.

“Women and men are not equal. In principle, women are capable of doing the same things as men, but they do not find opportunities. Men are dominant in society. Women and men each have their role to

play, there is work for men and work for women. But men's work is more valued and considered more important. But it is women who give birth to children in great pain and suffering. We regularly hear about a case where a woman died during childbirth, it is a great risk. But all this is considered normal and is little valued, because 'she's just a woman'". - FGD with female producers in Vallières.

Producers noted that the disparities in household labor are part of larger systemic inequities, which they attribute to gendered economic and power dynamics. Men are often seen as controlling access to financial resources, which limits women's ability to engage in various economic activities, such as owning land or accessing credit. Some women note that these patriarchal beliefs come from religion and traditional education.

"The origin of inequality is above all the economic monopoly of men. Ouanaminthe is an agricultural area, but women do not have access to finances. The money is in the hands of men." - FGD with female producers in Ouanaminthe.

Some women remarked that this power dynamic places women in a position of subservience, wherein they must depend on men for financial resources.

"We are like children before men. They are the ones who have to give us money for everything we need at home. What little we have is in their hands." - FGD with female producers in Cerca Carvajal.

The inequity in power is not limited to the economic sphere, it also extends to the private sphere, where gender-based violence is seen by some as a way for men to discipline women. Patriarchal values and norms allow men to control and correct women in some households, leading to the experience gender-based violence (GBV). While some women remarked that GBV was not prevalent in their community, all agreed that it was a problem at least in some areas and young girls were especially vulnerable.

"Throughout the country of Haiti, men still think they are superior to women. They are the ones who make the decisions. What a man says is what should be done. Otherwise, as a woman, you can expect acts of violence." - FGD with female producers in Fort Liberté.

Women noted that GBV was exacerbated by poverty. When faced with economic difficulties, men may resort to violence to control their wives. Poverty also limits women's opportunities, making them more vulnerable to violence.

At the same time, other women note that commerce and entrepreneurship offer a path of empowerment. They explained that women maintain separate finances and keep what they earn, so a woman who is able to engage profitably in an income-generating activity will find more autonomy and independence.

"It's a macho society, men always think they are more important. But there are also structural inequalities: for example in the free zone, men are given preference because women are absent for long periods when they are pregnant. So in general, land, houses, money and animals are in the hands of men. The exception is the woman who has her own business and who is financially independent." - FGD with female producers in Ouanaminthe.

Finally, other women note that social norms have shifted, and many opportunities are now open for women, at least professionally. This indicates the complexity of gendered power dynamics and social norms, in which perceived norms and realities can sometimes be at odds.

"Today, there are more women working as professionals than before. For example, there are women who are engineers, lawyers or agronomists." - FGD with female producers in Ouanaminthe.

Economic vulnerability of youth

As discussed above in Section 2.2 *Haitian Context*, youth in Haiti currently face a catastrophically high unemployment rate. Youth explained the precariousness of their situation because of this phenomenon, noting that even with an education, there are few opportunities for them and they remain dependent on their parents. Many youth explained that even at the ages of their late twenties, they were still living with their parents because they could not find any work. This led to a pervasive feeling of frustration and hopelessness.

“The situation is catastrophic, there is nothing at all, no work, no library, no leisure center and no good schools. Even if they are not good, we go there, we graduate, and then we sit at home, there is nothing we can do.” - FGD with youth producers in Cerca Carvajal.

Many youth felt like, in addition to the lack of employment, there were no structured path for them to learn a trade or any other means to earn a living outside of a job. They explained that any income generating activity available required an investment, and that they did not have the economic means to start.

“There is no supervision to allow young people to do something serious. There are a few of us who learn a trade by working as an apprentice to a tradesman, but it is rare.” – FGD with youth in Hinche

For many youth, they see leaving as their only alternative. At present, there is a rural exodus in Haiti as many youth leave their homes for cities or abroad to countries such as the Dominican Republic. Some did not want to make this move but felt that it may become inevitable if the situation does not improve. Youth remarked that many of their peers are saving money for a passport, which they see as the first step to leaving and which offers a level of prestige.

“If there is a possibility to live decently, we would like to stay in Cerca Carvajal, close to our family. But if there is not this possibility, we will be forced to leave. And that’s why there are so many young people who are really leaving.” - FGD with youth producers in Cerca Carvajal.

Without employment to occupy them, youth are sometimes viewed as lazy or involved in bad habits, but youth explained that they have no other occupations, highlighting the air of futility around their situation.

“There are people who complain that young people do nothing, that we wander around, that we drink, that we smoke, that we gamble, but there is nothing else to do for us youth.” - FGD with youth producers in Fort Liberté.

4.1. Participation in Different Livestock Value Chains

4.1.1 HOUSEHOLD PRODUCTION OF CATTLE, GOATS/SHEEP AND POULTRY

As described in Section 3. *Methodology*, sampling for the PARE Baseline Assessment considered the incidence of livestock production using the 2009 MARNDR Agricultural Census¹³ to ensure that the survey adequately represented livestock producers across the three target value chains, but quotas were not implemented for particular value chains. Most (75%) of rural households in Haiti practice some form of traditional small-scale livestock production¹⁴ and the data from the PARE Baseline Assessment represents the natural occurrence of household livestock production of the targeted value chains in the sampled areas.

¹³ Ministère de l’agriculture des ressources naturelles et du développement rural (MARDNR). *Synthèse nationale des résultats du recensement général de l’agriculture (RGA)*, 2009.

¹⁴ Coello, B., Oseni, G., Savrimootoo, T., & Weiss, E. (2014). Rural development in Haiti.

It is common practice for rural Haitian households to practice a combination of livestock production, to diversify their income sources and reduce risk. On average, households in the sample reared two of the three target value chains. About a third (35%) of households engaged in just one of the target value chains, 45% engaged in two and 20% engaged in all three.

Table 3 describes the distribution of households across different livestock types, with their production of the three target value chains in general followed by their specific combination of livestock chains. The majority of households in the baseline sample (78%) keep goats/sheep, followed by cattle (56%) and poultry (52%).

Goat/sheep and poultry is the most common combination at 21% of households and cattle and poultry is the least prevalent at 4%. Goats/sheep are more likely to be raised in combination with another value chain than alone and appear to be a complementary value chain to both cattle and poultry. Cattle producers are more likely to raise goats/sheep with their cattle (19%) than producing cattle alone (12%). Similarly, producers are not likely to raise poultry alone (6%) but rather in combination with goats/sheep.

Table 3. Production of target livestock value chains

Livestock value chain	% of households who produce this
By general livestock value chain	
Produce cattle	56%
Produce goats/sheep	78%
Produce poultry	52%
By combinations of livestock value chains	
Households engaged in <i>only cattle</i> production	12%
Households engaged in <i>only goat/sheep</i> production	17%
Households engaged in <i>only poultry</i> production	6%
Households engaged in <i>both cattle and goat/sheep</i> production	19%
Households engaged in <i>both cattle and poultry</i> production	4%
Households engaged in <i>both goat/sheep and poultry</i> production	21%
Households engaged in production of <i>all 3 livestock</i>	20%
<i>n</i>	1,683

The type of livestock production is determined by a number of factors, including region, household income, and the sex of the household head.¹⁵ While the PARE Baseline Assessment describes the geographic trends of livestock production, the next two sections discuss the production of livestock by sex and age.

4.1.2 STRUCTURES OF OWNERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT

Based on the sample, ownership and management of livestock can take several forms, involving either sole or joint arrangements both within the household and outside of it. Table 4 illustrates that the majority of households have a sole owner and manager of their livestock, but joint ownership is found in a substantial minority of households. In addition, joint management of livestock is higher than sole management,

¹⁵ Banyan Global. 2022. *USAID/Haiti Economic Growth and Agricultural Development: Gender Analysis Report*.

indicating that it is common for a single member of the household to own the livestock, but have multiple members of the household manage it. Within the cattle value chain specifically, sole ownership and management is more common than for goats/sheep and poultry, with a single member of the household both owning and managing the cattle. In addition, 9% of cattle ownership is outside of the household. These owners are a combination of relatives who live outside of the region or the country, or third parties.

In qualitative interviews, producers and key informants described these arrangements and how gender and age influence ownership and management structures. Many women described how they will help their husbands with some of the tasks of cattle management, such as feeding and watering, but that men are the primary managers and decision makers.

Youth producers also described situations where, because they lack the economic means to purchase their own cattle or goats, they will manage animals of third parties. Remuneration is done through the offspring of the animal they care for. They are entitled to keep the second litter of cattle, the second kid of goats and half of chicks. Some women also described engaging in arrangements like this through a women's organization. These arrangements, though they may take time for payout, provide a pathway to ownership that may otherwise be unavailable to women and youth.

“It is the hope of owning an animal that brings young people into this system, even if it can last 3 years or more, especially if you are responsible for an animal that is still young.” - FGD with youth producers in Ouanaminthe.

“We organized ourselves in women's organizations. Often, we can get help purchasing goats or cattle for our members. For goats, one kid from the first three litters must be returned. Afterwards you have nothing more to put back. For cattle, you only need to return the first calf after weaning. The animals that return to the organization allow us to give them to other members.” -FGD with female producers in Hinche.

Another common arrangement for youth that was described during FGDs was ownership by an adult who then has their child practice the daily management. The adult owner is ultimately responsible for decision-making, but uses this structure to teach their children livestock husbandry.

Table 4. Management and ownership structures of livestock

Livestock value chain	Solely within household	Jointly within household	Outside of household	n
Management structures of livestock				
Cattle	73%	25%	2%	938
Goats/sheep	66%	33%	1%	1309
Poultry	64%	35%	0%	876
Ownership structures of livestock				
Cattle	70%	20%	9%	938
Goats/sheep	72%	24%	4%	1280 ¹⁶
Poultry	71%	29%	0%	876

¹⁶ 2% (29 cases) of goat/sheep producers replied “Other” when asked about the ownership structures of their goats/sheep, and these responses have been removed for comparability with other value chains.

4.1.3 WOMEN'S MANAGEMENT AND OWNERSHIP OF CATTLE, GOATS/SHEEP AND POULTRY

As noted in the 2022 USAID/Haiti Gender Analysis Report, there are distinct patterns of engagement in livestock production that are driven by gender. To better understand how women are involved in livestock, the sex of the manager and owner of each livestock value chain is examined below.

Table 5 illustrates the sex of the manager and owner across the different livestock value chains. Women are involved in managing all of the target livestock value chains, though their participation differs across type of livestock. As the 2022 USAID/Haiti Gender Analysis Report notes, women are progressively becoming more involved in livestock production, even of cattle, than in years past.

Women are least likely to manage cattle, with 11% female-only management, though when combined with their joint management by men, 36% of households have some female participation in cattle management. A slightly higher percentage of households (14%) have female-only ownership and 34% of households have cattle that are partially or jointly owned by women. The 2022 USAID/Haiti Gender Analysis Report noted that some women who own cattle employ a male *gardien* for management, which allows women to conform to gendered social norms that discourage women from managing cattle while still benefitting economically from the ownership of cattle.¹⁷ Interestingly, in this sample, 71% of the female-only owned cattle is managed by women only, with the remaining 29% managed by a combination of men and women in the household – only 1% of female owned cattle is managed by a male only. Furthermore, in households where the cattle are both female-only owned and managed, 100% of cases are the respondent herself. Those women who do own cattle tend to manage by themselves. The 29% of women who own cattle but have mixed-gendered management do so with their children, thus, while female cattle ownership is the exception in Haiti, women in this study who own their own cattle are highly involved in the management of them with no indication of employing a *gardien*.

Women are more involved in the goat/sheep value chain, with 42% of households owned entirely or partially by women (compared to 36% for cattle) and also 42% managed entirely or partially by women (compared to 34% for cattle). Of the households with female-only ownership of goats/sheep, the majority (74%) is also managed by women only, with only 3% managed by men and the remainder (21%) managed by both men and women together.

Women are most involved in the management of poultry, with 37% of households' poultry being managed by women alone and 60% of households involving either women alone or with women and men. Poultry has the most gender equitable ownership as the birds in 59% of poultry-producing households are owned entirely or partially by women., compared to 34% for cattle and 42% of goats/sheep.

These distinctly gendered trends amongst livestock well recognized by men and women alike in qualitative interviews. Producers attributed these trends to the long-held roles that each gender has traditionally played, noting that it has always been this way.

"Men take care of large and small livestock, while women take care of small livestock and poultry." - FGD with female producers in Saint Jean du Sud.

¹⁷ USAID Gender Study

Table 5. Livestock management and ownership by sex

Livestock value chain	Female only	Male only	Both male and female	Outside of household	n
Management of livestock					
Cattle	11%	62%	25%	2%	938
Goats/sheep	23%	55%	19%	1%	1309
Poultry	37%	39%	23%	0%	876
Ownership of livestock					
Cattle	14%	56%	20%	9%	938
Goats/sheep	27%	52%	15%	4%	1309
Poultry	38%	40%	21%	0%	876

Cattle production by sex

Cattle was frequently described by producers as the domain of men. Even where women own cattle, producers explained that men often led the management. This is reflected in the quantitative data, where the female only rate of cattle ownership is higher than management.

Cattle breeding is the domain of men. You can say that almost 100% of the cattle are in the hands of men, even if a woman is the owner. - FGD with female producers in Ouanaminthe.

When asked to explain why men dominate cattle, producers pointed to deeply entrenched societal norms that prohibit or restrict certain activities by women. For example, respondents explained that the physical labor that large livestock requires has generally deterred women's participation in cattle production. Many female producers explained that the breeding of large livestock (cattle) will always remain in the hands of men, partly because men will not let go of their control but mainly because women do not want to have access to it. They think it is too dangerous for a woman to undertake it. Fear of cattle was a recurrent theme, with many women noting that cattle attack women more than men.

"Women fear cattle and cattle fear men more than women. This year, bandits from Jérémie have stolen 25 to 30 cattle in the area. This increases fear and decreases women's access to livestock." - KII with MARNDR male stakeholder in Sud.

Additionally, producers noted that freedom of travel for women also dictated women's lack of involvement in cattle some degree. The care of large livestock requires travel to the feeding grounds, which are not near to the women's homes. Their responsibilities for household duties and childcare precludes them from this travel.

"We women are responsible for the house and the activities near the house. This is the reason why we are more involved in raising small livestock which are close to the house and poultry. These are the men who will change the animals tied far from the house, sometimes several kilometers away." - FGD with female producers in Hinche.

At the same time, other women noted that while women's involvement in cattle was limited, they still had a role. They mentioned certain tasks that were considered appropriate for women. They also noted that women were willing to work with cattle they consider more docile, such as calves or milking breeds.

"This sector is in the hands of men. But women help. They can go change a cow if it is not naughty and carry water to drink, even milk it. Women can buy a new rope for a cattle, they do the whole thing." - FGD with female producers in Hinche.

Some women even challenged the accepted norms that women don't do cattle. In FGDs in Nord Est, where cattle production is the most prevalent, some women explained that they know of women who rear their own cattle, though they acknowledge that this is rare.

Goat/sheep production by sex

In the goat/sheep value chain, producers explained that there is more of a balance between men and women in terms of ownership and management and women are highly involved in the care of these animals. They noted that while inequality exists in terms of access to productive resources and capital (discussed below in Section 4.7 Productive Resources), in terms of participation in this value chain, there is more gender equality than with cattle.

For small livestock, the only inequality is in the level of available means, but apart from that, women can be active like men. - FGD with female producers in Fort Liberté.

Poultry production by sex

Poultry was frequently described as the value chain of women, where women are equal to men or even dominate the production. Producers remarked that women were even more active in poultry than in goats/sheep, largely because poultry breeding takes place within the homestead and does not involve outside travel.

"Poultry is mainly an occupation of women and they own it. The poultry is in the yard, and that is where the woman is responsible" - FGD with female producers in Cerca Carvajal.

Poultry production also involved the highest rate of joint management (35%). This is due to poultry often being a household-wide activity, especially compared to the other value chains. In fact, 17% of all joint management of poultry was ascribed to the entire household. In qualitative interviews, producers described how women would often raise poultry in cooperation with their daughters.

Inequality in distribution of value chains by sex

Interestingly, during FGDs, many women clarified that they do not view these gendered domains of livestock as a manifestation of inequality, despite the higher value that cattle bring compared to poultry and goats/sheep. Rather, due to social norms and traditional practices, they view this division as a natural expression of gendered roles and responsibilities and did not necessarily seek to disrupt it.

"There is no inequality between men and women. Each one takes care of their own domain. Men raise large livestock out of habit and based on the types of activities they most often undertake. The same goes for women, who take care of small livestock." - FGD with female producers, St. Jean du Sud.

Instead, some women called for fostering opportunities within their designated domains and explained that projects and assistance should give priority here rather than strive for parity in male dominated roles.

"It is necessary to strengthen cattle farming in the area. In the case of beef distribution, women should also be considered because many of them are already involved in cattle farming – FGD with female producers in Chantal.

In addition, a few women brought up examples of other women they know who engage in typically male-dominated work. They acknowledge while it is rare, it does occur.

4.1.4 YOUTH MANAGEMENT AND OWNERSHIP OF CATTLE, GOATS/SHEEP AND POULTRY

Age is also a contributing factor to the type of livestock that individuals and households manage and own, though it is less distinct than gender.

As with gender, the individual and joint managers and owners of livestock within a household have been categorized into age groupings of youth only, adult only and youth and adult, with youth defined as ages 15 to 29. For this report, youth are defined as ages 18 to 29, as the survey followed standard guidelines and did not survey minors under the age of 18.

Table 6 illustrates the managers and owners of each livestock value chain according to these age groups. Overall, youth are less likely to be involved in livestock production than adults, across all value chains. Youth are slightly more involved in the smaller livestock of poultry and goats/sheep than in cattle.

This distribution largely follows that of women, with adult men dominating cattle production and women and youth more involved in goats/sheep and poultry. As noted in qualitative interviews, these patterns follow traditional perceptions and social norms about the roles of youth and women in livestock farming.

"Men raise cattle, while the youth and women mainly raise goats, sheep, and poultry." – FGD with female producers in Saint Jean du Sud.

Table 6. Livestock management and ownership by age

Livestock value chain	Youth only	Adult only	Both youth and adult	Outside of household	n
Management of livestock					
Cattle	12%	68%	18%	2%	938
Goats/sheep ¹⁸	-	-	-	-	-
Poultry	13%	56%	31%	0%	876
Ownership of livestock					
Cattle	8%	73%	9%	9%	938
Goats/sheep	-	-	-	-	-
Poultry	12%	64%	24%	0%	876

Cattle production by age

Youth explained that cattle production is limited, as it is typically the domain of adult men, leading to large inequality for this high-value chain. Their estimates of 5% cattle ownership are not far from the quantitative findings of 8% cattle ownership by youth. Cattle require a large amount of investment, which is often not available to youth, and the payoff takes time. Youth can assist their fathers, who supervise all aspects of cattle management. Some youth report that they take care of their parents' cattle and after the first calf,

¹⁸ Due to errors in fieldwork, the age component of the manager and owner of goats/sheep was not accurately collected. If the respondent was the sole manager (70% of goat producers) or the sole owner (65% of goat producers), then age can be attributed to them, but not for any other arrangements where the respondent managed or owned jointly with others or if the manager/owner was another household member solely. Thus, quantitative figures are not included in the age disaggregation tables for goats/sheep as they would not be comparable with the other value chains. However, since it is possible to compare youth to adult in terms of respondents who were the sole owners or managers, throughout the report these comparisons are made where relevant for additional context on the goat/sheep value chain.

their parents give them newborns, for which they become the owners, which speaks to part of the 18% joint ownership.

“If you register 100 cattle in our area, you will see that there are not even 5 whose owner is less than 30 years old. And you want to talk about inequality? That’s inequality, it’s clear.” - FGD with youth producers in Ouanaminthe.”

Goat/sheep production by age

Youth producers expressed great interest in entering or expanding goat/sheep production and they like these animals as they are easy to manage – they can tolerate drought, they reproduce twice a year, and their meat is in high demand. In FGDs, producers explained that while occasionally a youth may receive a kid from their parents, the majority of goats are owned by adults and youth assist in their care. Youth expressed a high level of interest in starting or expanding goat/sheep breeding.

Poultry production by age

In terms of poultry, youth producers liked the shorter-term results that this value chain provides. As discussed above, poultry is more often managed by the household than in other value chains. A majority of the joint ownership arrangements between women involve a mother and her daughter raising the poultry together, and producers explained in FGDs that young girls will often receive a chick from their mother to start their own breeding. Additionally, some youth said that they raised broiler chickens or were very interested in this aspect of poultry. Others noted the opportunity available in fighting cocks.

In Vallières, youth producers referenced a henhouse project for broiler production in which they were encouraged to purchase on credit. However, that project has been on hold for more than seven months and youth can no longer take advantage of the opportunity.

Barriers to livestock ownership by age

Youth recognize livestock as one of the only economic pathways available to them if they are to stay in rural areas. They explained that often, it is all they have to live on. At the same time, they emphasized over and over again they youth lack the economic means to invest in livestock. Without access to key productive resources like capital, credit and land, they are effectively blocked from this economic opportunity.

“For young people in Cerca Carvajal, there are three possibilities: agriculture/livestock; business or school teacher. To be active in agriculture/livestock, you must first have the means to invest. - FGD with youth producers in Cerca Carvajal.

In some cases, youth were able to enter the livestock sector through inheritance of land or animals from their parents or grandparents. And others were able to find a pathway to ownership through managing an animal for a third party. Producers noted that in the past, many young people received a kid or chick from their parents, but this practice has declined, and it is mainly by keeping animals for third parties that a young person can become an owner.

But for the majority of youth, they do not own or even formally manage the livestock in their households. They explained that they frequently help their parents with the care of livestock, such as moving the cattle and goats to a new place “changing the rope” before and after school. But they don’t consider this to be management as they are not part of the decision-making process, explaining the low rate of youth management solely or jointly in Table 6 above. Rather, they serve as an assistant to their parents. While they have an interest in owning or managing their own livestock, they are frustrated with the financial barriers they face and discouraged from pursuing livestock.

“You are always available to help them, but you cannot start your own business. For example, our parents have fields and sometimes organize joint work (“konbit”). You're going to help, obviously, because it's your parents who are organizing this day. And you work, but it is not on your field that you work, it is on the field of your father or your mother.” - FGD with youth producers in Vallières.

“I like taking care of an animal. As a young person, I would like to be more active in production, we would all like to have our own animals like adults.” - FGD with youth producers in Ouanaminthe.

4.2 Herd Composition

Examining herd/flock size and composition can help shed light on the intensity of production and any disparities across gender and age. The disaggregates used in this section are those of sex (female only, male only, both male and female) and age (youth only, adult only, both youth and adult) management of livestock. By using management, we can account for some of the arrangements described above to understand the composition of the herds and flocks that women and youth manage on a daily basis. Ownership by age and sex was also examined for comparison and no substantial differences were found in outcomes compared to using management as the disaggregate. Management outside of the household is not included in this analysis as the base sizes were too small for meaningful analysis.

4.2.1 WOMEN'S HERD/FLOCK SIZE AND COMPOSITION

Table 7 displays the average current herd and flock size per household for each value chain as well as the percentage of households with improved breeds. Households with male-only management tend to have substantially larger herd sizes than those with female-only management within the cattle and goat/sheep value chains. For poultry, however, flock sizes were relatively equal between male (8.8) and female-only management (8.3). Furthermore, flock sizes of mixed-gender management (10.4) were larger than either male or female-only. Given the observation above that poultry is often a household endeavor, this joint management could allow for bigger flocks due to the increased labor available from the whole household.

In terms of the production of sheep within this value chain, sheep are more likely to be produced in households with male only management (20%) than households with female-only management (14%) or mixed-gender management (11%). For poultry, there is a similar incidence of other birds (including turkey, guinea fowl, pigeons and ducks) between households with male-only and female-only managers.

The prevalence of improved breeds is relatively equal between male-only and female-only management for goats/sheep and poultry. Many female goat/sheep producers remarked that they have an interest in improved breeds but noted that they are restrained by lack of capital. They explained that women's organizations are an ideal vehicle for distributing improved breeds, through a sharing system where the offspring is passed to the next member.

“The opportunity available to us is the sale of foreign breed hens produced in henhouses. But, the lack of financial means prevents us from taking advantage of this opportunity.” - FGD with female producers in Limonade.

Households with male-only management are more likely to have improved breeds in their cattle herds (10%) compared to female-only (6%). The smaller herd sizes of cattle and lower prevalence of improved breeds maintained by female-only managers helps drive the smaller yield of this group, discussed below in Section 4.4. Yield, Sales & Marketing.

Table 7. Herd/ flock size and composition by sex of livestock manager

	Female only management	Male only management	Both male and female management
Cattle herds			
Average current herd size	1.6	2.5	2.8
% of producers with improved breeds	6%	10%	4%
<i>n</i>	104	584	235
Goat/sheep herds			
Average current herd size	4.0	5.8	4.7
% of producers with improved breeds	5%	6%	4%
<i>n</i>	353	677	193
Poultry flocks			
Average current flock size	8.3	8.8	10.9
% of producers with improved breeds	2%	2%	0%
<i>n</i>	334	352	188

Milk production amongst all households sampled was limited, with 18% of households overall producing milk in the past year. Households with male-only cattle managers were more likely (19%) to produce milk than households with female-only managers (13%). However, in qualitative interviews, female producers remarked that there was an economic opportunity for them in milk production. They believe that milking cows are more docile than bulls and thus easier for them to manage. They also noted that there is an opportunity for them in milk processing and production of by-products of milk.

"If we could organize cattle breeders and produce a quantity of milk to trade, we could engage in processing activities and produce candies and cremas. -FGD with female producers in Hinche.

Though only 18% of all households produced eggs, egg production is more prevalent in households with women-only management (19%) compared to male-only (14%) and is most likely to occur in households with both male and female management (24%). This higher rate could be related to the household-wide management of poultry and the larger flocks they manage. With more labor available and larger flocks, they are better able to cultivate laying hens. Women also recognize the potential that eggs can offer them as producers, both for home consumption as well as commerce.

"There are many opportunities. In animal husbandry, with high prices, we can earn a lot of money. There are also opportunities in eggs, which can be used for family consumption or for sale. The lack of economic means prevents us from seizing these opportunities." – FGD with female producers in Camp Perrin.

4.2.2 YOUTH HERD/FLOCK SIZE AND COMPOSITION

Differences in herd/flock size between households with youth-only producers and adult-only managers are less pronounced than with gender. In the cattle and poultry value chains, average herd and flock sizes are roughly equal between youth-only and adult-only management, as shown below in Table 8.

In the goat/sheep value chain, adult producers tended to have larger herds than youth producers. As described by young producers in FGDs. Given that caring for the goats of others is the most common way that youth find themselves a path into ownership, they may care for fewer goats than adults who own their herds.

"There is an inequality in that a young person may own 1 to 2 animals (goats or sheep) while an adult may own 4 to 6 or even more (goats, sheep, cattle)." – FGD with youth producers in Chantal.

Poultry also had a substantially higher flock size (10.4) in households with both youth and adult management. As described above with gender, this could be linked to the overall household management of poultry, which enables larger flock sizes. There was no difference between age groups in terms of raising birds other than chicken.

The prevalence of improved breeds was not substantially different between youth and adult management. As described above, youth patterns of livestock management follow gender trends, with young men typically adopting cattle management and young women poultry and both involved in goats/sheep. Thus, we see larger differences between gender than between ages. However, in FGDs, youth called for the availability of more improved breeds.

Table 8. Herd/ flock size and composition by age of livestock manager

	Youth only management	Adult only management	Both youth and adult management
Cattle herds			
Average current herd size	2.5	2.3	3.0
% of producers with improved breeds	7%	9%	4%
<i>n</i>	117	635	171
Poultry flocks			
Average current flock size	8.4	8.5	10.4
% of producers with improved breeds	1%	2%	1%
<i>n</i>	82	392	227

Households with youth-only management had slightly higher rates of milk production (21%) than those with adult only management (18%) and households with both youth and adult management were lower at 16%.

Egg production was roughly equal between households with youth-only management (15%) and those with adult only management (17%), but higher for households with both youth and adult management (21%). This is likely due to the same dynamics discussed above with gender, where poultry production is managed by the entire household. Youth producers expressed an interest in expanding their egg production, especially through henhouses and broiler chickens as well as the construction of chicken coops. They noted that to do so, however, they would require additional training. More discussion on livestock-specific training is included below in *Section 4.5.2 Livestock Training*.

"If we had the means to make chicken coops, that would be a good thing for the whole community. But we need supervision and training, to learn how to do it, to have food for the chickens, to avoid diseases, such as chicken disease. - FGD with youth producers in Vallières.

4.3 Management Practices

By examining the rate of application of improved practices, and understanding the barriers to implementing these practices, we can better understand how to support women and youth producers to implement best practices and ultimately increase their yield and sales.

As with herd composition, the sex and age of management is used as a disaggregate to analyze the differences between men and women and youth and adults. Because the managers are more closely connected to management practices applied, it was the most relevant disaggregate grouping. However, ownership was also examined, and no substantial differences were found.

4.3.1 WOMEN'S APPLICATION OF IMPROVED PRACTICES

Table 9 illustrates the percentage of households who applied improved practices for each livestock chain, grouped into the type of improved practice (feeding, nutrition, water provision, housing, animal health) and compared by sex of the manager. The definition of what constitutes an improved practice for each value chain is detailed in the PARE Baseline Assessment.

Households with cattle and goats/sheep follow a similar pattern. Those with male-only management have higher rates of improved practice among each type, with the exception of water provision. Female-only and mixed-gender managed households have better outcomes in improved water provision practices than men.

In poultry management, we see that women producers have higher rates of application of improved practices in nutrition, and water provision, and relatively equal rates with men in feeding, housing and animal health.

Table 9. Application of improved practices in cattle by gender of livestock management

	Female only management	Male only management	Both male and female management
Cattle			
Feeding	1%	7%	6%
Nutrition	0%	5%	4%
Water provision	18%	16%	20%
Housing	2%	6%	4%
Animal health	60%	67%	60%
<i>n</i>	104	584	235
Goats/sheep			
Feeding	4%	8%	5%
Nutrition	3%	4%	4%
Water provision	36%	30%	35%
Housing	4%	5%	5%
Animal health	46%	56%	44%
<i>n</i>	296	725	255
Poultry			
Feeding	3%	3%	1%
Nutrition	19%	14%	17%
Water provision	40%	31%	29%
Housing	6%	8%	2%
Animal health	50%	50%	42%
<i>n</i>	325	343	205

Roles and responsibilities in management by sex

The application of management practices is deeply intertwined with social norms dictating traditional gendered roles and responsibilities for women and men. During qualitative interviews, producers emphasized the social norms that influenced different gendered activities in livestock, leading men to dominate cattle and women to focus on goats/sheep and poultry. However, as noted above, the day-to-day management can involve cooperative work amongst both men and women in the household. But even then, roles and responsibilities often follow established gender norms. Hard physical labor and traveling with animals to graze and is the domain of men, while women take care of tasks close to home.

“In our eyes, the difference between the work of a man and the work of a woman is not really an inequality. We look at it more as a sharing of work. There is work for men and work for women. Hard work in the fields is for men. Going to change animals that are tied up far away in the savannah is for men. Women are responsible for the house and the yard, they take care of the children, cook meals, wash clothes, etc. We do not see it as an inequality. We share work and responsibilities. When my husband works hard in the field, I am happy to bring him food and drink. Afterwards, I come home to do my part of the daily work.” - FGD with female producers in Cerca Carvajal.

These norms lead to a division of labor in livestock management tasks, as producers described women mainly taking responsibility for marketing and processing and men handling health care and transport of animals as well as milking.

It should be noted that some producers mentioned that not all women conform to these norms that some manage activities that are considered in the male domain.

“Women do everything. The other day a cow had fallen and was strangling itself on its rope. And it was the woman of the house who saved her because she was the first to arrive there. Between partners in a household, there is no strict separation of tasks. - FGD with female producers in Vallières.

Barriers to feeding and nutrition by sex

Improved practices in feeding and nutrition were defined as feeding animals within an enclosure including a fence and providing additional nutrition such as forage or supplemental feed. As noted below in *Section 4.8: Challenges for Women and Youth in Livestock Production*, obtaining a sufficient quantity of feed is an ongoing challenge for all producers regardless of sex, which has been exacerbated by recent drought. As explored in the PARE Baseline Assessment, men will often move their tethered cattle and goats/sheep from spot to spot to allow them to access as much grass as possible and supplement with fodder when possible. During qualitative interviews, women expressed their difficulty in accessing enough food for their animals because they do not feel safe travelling into open fields alone and are unable to move their animals. Thus, they must attempt to gather enough forage and fodder near to their homestead or rely on the men and boys in their household to move their animals for them.

“A woman cannot risk going in the savannah. Our animals are tied with a rope and do not roam free. Even if a woman has an ox, her ox will always be on the rope. We look for grass and other foods to give to our animals. We raise livestock without going too far from home.” - FGD with female producers in Fort Liberté.

To mitigate this challenge, some women called for additional training in the production of fodder, so they can sufficiently feed their animals despite the barriers they face. Additional discussion on training is below in *Section 4.5.2. Livestock Training*. In addition, some suggested that the establishment of communal parks would allow women to safely feed their animals inside a fence.

“Sometimes I go into the fields with a bag and I collect leaves to feed my goats. But it’s not easy to find enough food. I would like to take training on how I can make fodder, to know how I can better manage the problem of lack of food during drought.” - FGD with female producers in Hinche.

In the case of poultry, there is no gender discrepancy between women and men. Because feeding of poultry is done within the area of the homestead, women do not face any specific gendered barriers to applying best practices. In addition, producers described how mothers and daughters organize themselves so that one is caring for the feeding and watering of the poultry. The rate of applying best practice for both men and women is low, as few households can be supplying their poultry with supplemental feeds.

Barriers to housing by sex

Housing animals in an enclosure or at least a fence was defined as a best practice. Women expressed that it was particularly difficult for them to establish enclosures for their animals, due to lack of knowledge and training as well as lack of capital to invest. They explained how they lost their goats/sheep and poultry to dogs at night, but they lacked the infrastructure to protect them. They also explained how tethering, a common housing practice amongst all producers, led to accident and left animals unprotected.

“We lack financial and technical support and training to be able to do more. In production, the women do what they already know and it is each one for themselves in their breeding. Women have never received training to do what they do. For example, we lose a lot of goats every year because they cannot stand the rain. The majority of women do not have shelter for their goats. - FGD with female producers in Hinche.

Given the investment required to build a shelter, some women suggested that through developing women’s organizations, women could jointly work together to establish goat sheds as well as acquire other key inputs.

Women also noted that free breeding, especially in the Nord Est, was an established norm for many, and women had to rely on boys and men in their household for this. They explained that putting a stop to the practice of free breeding and constructing more enclosures would allow women to not only become more involved in the cattle and goat/sheep value chains but would enable them to apply improved housing practices.

Barriers to animal health services by sex

Improved practices in this domain includes providing animal health treatments such as deworming and treating for parasites, as well as providing vaccines. The gendered gap in improved practices in cattle and goat/sheep is largely explained by women’s hampered access to animal health workers and veterinary medicines, as discussed below in *Section 4.7.1 Access to Animal Health Services and Products*. In the poultry value chain, women are more involved and specialized and are thus able to achieve parity with men in terms of applying animal health treatments and vaccines, though the rate of vaccination is low all around at 9%.

Another driver for the disparity between men and women’s application of improved health practices is women’s lack of knowledge on animal health care. In interviews, women explained that they do not have a sufficient level of skill in animal health care and advocate for training, particularly around diseases in poultry and goats/sheep. Moreover, women are highly interested in additional training to become veterinary agents. They see this not only as a way to improve their animals’ health and productivity, but as in income generating activity. *Section 4.7.1 Access to Animal Health Services and Products* discusses this in further detail.

Barriers to water provision by sex

Improved practices in water were defined as either having a water source such as a tank at the house, or bringing a minimum quantity of water to animals. Interestingly, water provision was an area in which female managers applied improved practices at an equal or higher rate than male managers. While there was no clear explanation of this provided in qualitative interviews, there are a few dynamics that could potentially be influencing this. First, bringing water to animals, rather than walking animals to a water source and tiring them, was designated as one component of improved practices (note that this had to be paired with an adequate amount of water provided). Households with female-only management practiced this at a higher rate than households with male-only managers for cattle (28% for female-only compared to 19% for male-only) and goats/sheep (67% compared to 50%). Because women manage their livestock close to their homes, they are already able to implement this practice, while men who are open grazing or moving their tethered animals around are less likely to. For poultry, the rate of this practice was similar between female-only management (42%) and male-only management (39%) due to the nature of poultry rearing, which is within the confines of the homestead.

In addition, many producers mentioned social norms surrounding women's role for feeding and watering animals and providing general care around the homestead. This could also influence their ability to provide adequate water through best practices.

“Food and water are the women’s domain, like health care. Women like to take care of animals as they do their children. Women like it, when animals have babies, they can take care of these babies. - FGD with female producers in Fort Liberté.

4.3.2 YOUTH APPLICATION OF IMPROVED PRACTICES

Using the same disaggregation method as sex, Table 10 illustrates the percentage of households who applied improved practices for each livestock chain, grouped into the type of improved practice (feeding, nutrition, water provision, housing, animal health) and compared by age group.

Compared to sex, there are few substantial differences between youth and adult management in terms of application of improved practices for cattle, with a few exceptions. Provision of animal health for poultry is higher for households with adult-only management than youth-only management, while provision of water is higher for youth-only managers than adult-only for this same value chain.

Table 10. Application of improved practices in cattle by age of livestock management

	Youth only management	Adult only management	Both youth and adult management
Cattle			
Feeding	8%	6%	7%
Nutrition	4%	4%	5%
Water provision	15%	17%	20%
Housing	4%	5%	6%
Animal health	67%	66%	59%
<i>n</i>	117	635	171
Poultry			
Feeding	3%	3%	2%
Nutrition	14%	16%	18%
Water provision	42%	34%	31%
Housing	5%	8%	2%

Animal health	45%	52%	44%
n	110	489	274

Barriers to animal health services by age

As will be described below in Section 4.6.1. Access to credit, youth producers emphasize again and again that lack of credit and capital was the biggest barrier they face. This also affects their ability to apply improved practices, particularly in animal health. Youth described how they were not able to treat disease and sickness effectively nor access vaccinations due to lack of financial resources.

“When our animals are sick, we have no money to take care of the animals. And it is our parents who have no money either, who do not help us with the expenses relating to our breeding.” - FGD with youth producers in Cerca la Source.

In addition, youth, similarly to women, commented that they also lack knowledge and training in animal care. They too explained that creating pathways for them to become veterinary agents would help alleviate this and also create income generating opportunities.

“We should improve animal care, in terms of food and health. We must create opportunities for young people to become veterinary agents and we must organize training so that the level of knowledge of all breeders increases and we know what we can do ourselves when there is a problem.” - FGD with youth producers in Hinche.

Barriers to housing by age

Like women, youth remarked that they need to find means and opportunities to build enclosures for their animals. They called for more modern practices to be implemented to replace the traditional ones of free range or tethering.

“We must put an end to free breeding and rope breeding. We must put the animals in parks or enclosures, there must be a shed so that they can protect themselves against the rain, the cold and the humidity. We need to change the system and introduce more modern breeding.” - FGD with youth producers in Cerca la Source.

Youth also expressed interest in constructing chicken coops so that they could produce day-old chicks, to replace the import market. Overall, youth are interested in pursuing innovative practices for economic gain.

Young people could operate chicken coops with broilers or laying hens. This way, we no longer have to buy them elsewhere. The first obstacle for all these activities is that we do not have the means. But to operate a henhouse, you will also need support and training. - FGD with youth producers in Cerca Carvajal.

Barriers to feeding by age

Youth explained that they are interested in learning to make hay, fodder, silage and other techniques to provide food during periods of drought. Obtaining enough feed is a recurrent challenge faced by all farmers and youth feel that this is an area where they could apply their entrepreneurial mindset, provided they had the right training.

In terms of feeding practices, youth are often responsible for bringing food and water to their parents' cattle and goats, with young girls mostly responsible for goats. However, this assistance is done under the supervision of their parents, with youth feeling like they lack autonomy to make decisions regarding the care of livestock.

“Young people are used to changing their parents' goats and cattle before and after school. The animals are on a rope so they have to be changed twice a day. In the afternoons, we take them out to drink first. But everything is done under the supervision and responsibility of the parents.” - FGD with youth producers in Cerca Carvajal.

4.4 Yield, Sales & Marketing

Examining the sex and age differences in yield and sales of livestock products, as well as the dynamics underpinning these differences, can help illuminate area of potential intervention and opportunity for these groups. As with improved practices, disaggregating by both management and ownership of gender and age was considered. Ownership was selected here as it is the owner who ultimately makes the final decision on offtake of animals, including sales. When compared to the management disaggregate, the only difference was a slightly higher yield for female-only owners compared to female-only managers.

4.4.1 YIELD

Yield by gender of livestock owner

Yield is a measure of the total output of production divided by the total number of units of production. For beef, goats/sheep and poultry meat, the total output is considered as the offtake quantity that includes the entire weight of all animals that were sold, slaughtered, gifted or exchanged in the past year. The total number of units in production is the maximum herd or flock size over the past year. Yield is expressed in kilograms/herd or flock.

Table 11 illustrates the average yield per household for each livestock product, as well as the total percentage of herd or flock offtaken that the yield represents.

For beef and goats/sheep, households with male-only ownership had a higher yield than those with female-only or mixed-gender ownership. Average beef yield of male-only owned households was 29.8 kg/herd compared to 24.8 kg/herd for female-only households. Average of goat/sheep yield of male-only owned households was 2.1 kg/herd compared to 1.4 kg/herd for female-only.

Beef yield was driven by sales and more male-only owned households sold their cattle (30%) than female-only households (26%). Slaughter was similar with almost no households slaughtering their cattle in the past year. However, overall offtake in terms of the percentage of the herd was similar between genders (14% each). Therefore, the difference in yield can be attributed to both the number of animals offtaken and their individual weights. Male-only households had more improved breeds, resulting in higher total kilograms of offtake.

In terms of goat/sheep yield, the rate of slaughter was slightly higher for male-only owned households (6%) compared to female-only households (3%) and male-only owners sold more animals than female-only owners (37% compared to 27%)

Because so few households sold milk and eggs, base sizes are too small to disaggregate by sex of ownership. However, data suggests that more male respondents sold dairy milk than female producers, while more female respondents sold their eggs than male producers.

Table 11. Average yield of livestock products by sex of livestock owner

	Female only ownership	Male only ownership	Both male and female ownership
Beef			
Average yield (kg/herd)	24.8	29.8	22.0
% of herd offtaken	14%	14%	12%
<i>n</i>	136	521	190
Goats/sheep			
Average yield (kg/herd)	1.4	2.1	1.8
% of herd offtaken	9%	13%	12%
<i>n</i>	353	677	193
Poultry			
Average yield (kg/flock)	0.7	0.6	0.8
% of flock offtaken	14%	14%	20%
<i>n</i>	334	351	188

Yield by age of livestock owner

Table 12 illustrates yield and percentage of total herd or flock offtaken for each age grouping of owners within a household. Overall, households with adult-only ownership had a higher yield than those with youth-only management. This was especially true for cattle where households with adult-only ownership averaged a yield of 29.6 kilograms/herd compared to 19.4 for youth-only ownership.

As mentioned above, cattle yield was driven by sales and 30% of adult-only owned households sold their cattle compared to 21% of youth-owned households, driving the difference in yield. Within the poultry value chain, adults saw a higher average yield at 0.7 kilograms/flock compared to youth owners with 0.4 kilograms per flock. This is due to adults' offtake activities, as adult-only owners both slaughtered poultry at a higher rate (38%) than youth-only owners (32%) but sold more poultry (24%) compared to youth (17%).

For goats/sheep, youth and adult producers saw similar yield, with youth sole owners averaging 3.6 kg/herd compared to 3.7 for adult sole owners. As described above, due to difficulty of comparability, this data is not included in the table, though we can compare by age for respondents who are sole owners.

Table 12. Average yield of livestock products by age of livestock owner

	Youth only ownership	Adult only ownership	Both youth and adult ownership
Beef			
Average yield (kg/herd)	19.4	29.6	15.4
% of herd offtaken	9%	15%	9%
<i>n</i>	75	688	84
Poultry			
Average yield (kg/flock)	0.4	0.7	0.8
% of flock offtaken	11%	15%	20%
<i>n</i>	103	560	210

4.4.2 SALES

Sales by sex of livestock owner

Table 13 illustrates the percentage of households that sold each livestock production the past year. As mentioned above, the base size for milk and eggs was too small for this disaggregation. In addition, Table 14 provides the average annual sales of each product, of those households that sold anything in the past year.

Sales of agricultural products are based on the number of animals sold, as well as the type of animal and the price received for each. A minority of households sold any of their livestock in the past year, with households of male-only goat/sheep owners selling at the highest rate of 37%.

In the cattle and goat/sheep value chains, male-owned households earned more in average annual sales. In the poultry value chain, male-only households also earned more than female-only owned households. This is due to two factors. First, male owners sold more birds on average than female owners (1.2 compared to 1.1) and secondly, for some of the most common types of birds sold, male owners earned higher prices than female owners. The price differential is linked to the access to different markets by each gender, with women more likely to sell to middleman traders than local markets, as discussed below in *Section 4.4.3 Marketing*.

Table 13. Percentage who sold livestock products by gender of livestock ownership

	Female only ownership	Male only ownership	Both male and ownership
Beef			
% who sold this commodity	26%	30%	27%
<i>n</i>	136	521	190
Goats/sheep			
% who sold this commodity	27%	37%	39%
<i>n</i>	353	677	193
Poultry			
% who sold this commodity	24%	22%	32%
<i>n</i>	334	351	188

*Low base size

Table 14. Average annual sales of livestock products (of those who sold) by gender of livestock ownership

	Female only ownership	Male only ownership	Both male and ownership
Beef			
Average annual sales (USD) (of those who sold)	\$543*	\$1,057	\$712
<i>n</i>	35	153	50
Goats/sheep			
Average annual sales (USD) (of those who sold)	\$145	\$202	\$148
<i>n</i>	94	249	75

Poultry			
Average annual sales (USD) (of those who sold)	\$58	\$70	\$64
<i>n</i>	80	77	61

*Low base size

Sales by age of livestock owner

Table 15 illustrates the average annual sales earned by households for each livestock product, disaggregated by age groups. As mentioned above, the base size for milk and eggs was too small for this disaggregation.

Due to small base sizes for youth, it is difficult to draw final conclusions about this data.

Table 15. Average annual sales of livestock products by age of livestock ownership

	Youth only ownership	Adult only ownership	Both youth and adult ownership
Beef			
% who sold this commodity	21%	30%	18%
Average annual sales (USD) (of those who sold)	\$942*	\$911	\$845*
<i>n</i>	24	207	15
Poultry			
% who sold this commodity	17%	24%	32%
Average annual sales (USD) (of those who sold)	\$66*	\$61	\$69
<i>n</i>	18	133	67

*Low base size

4.4.3 MARKETING

Access to markets is a crucial element of ensuring that livestock production supports the livelihoods of households and improves their resilience to shocks and stresses. Marketing and commerce in rural Haiti, like other aspects of the livestock value chain, is influenced by social norms and traditional roles related to age and gender.

Women in livestock marketing

As the 2022 USAID/Haiti Gender Analysis Report explained, women tend to dominate the livestock marketing system in Haiti, but men are increasingly participating in these activities as intermediaries en-route to market. Interviews with female producers, confirmed this, with women explaining that they love marketing, that it is an activity they feel is their domain and that they are highly involved in the selling of livestock products. While women are nervous to travel into open fields or the savannah with animals to graze, they feel more confident traveling to markets to trade.

“We are all active in commerce and we love it. We travel everywhere, to other distant communities, to buy and sell. Any business activity interests us. – FGD with female producers in Hinche.

When asked about opportunities for women along the livestock value chain, women almost unanimously said they would like to expand their activities in commerce. Women described some of their various

activities. First and foremost, they sell meat, milk and eggs from their own household's production. They note that there is good profit to make in this.

Women are also involved in other types of trading. Some mentioned that they process milk to make candy and sell it at a profit. Others explained that they buy chicken and eggs from other producers and sell them at the local markets. Some buy goats from others and slaughter them to sell meat or even prepared meals, noting that prepared meals are especially lucrative. Depending on their location, women observed that in some areas there is not much potential for selling meat, as due to poverty, meat consumption is limited. Thus, they will buy in one place and sell to another, if they have the capital to invest.

"A man can have a henhouse, but there will always be a woman to sell the eggs and meat at the market. A man can have a cow and milk it, but it is a woman who will sell the milk." - FGD with youth producers in Ouanaminthe.

Some women noted that they believe that women are more skilled in negotiating prices than men (despite the fact that the reported average prices received for many livestock products was lower for women). Both men and women alike lauded the entrepreneurial spirit and commerce-oriented attitudes of women.

Youth in livestock marketing

Many youth view themselves as entrepreneurs. Some youth in Nord Est are involved in trading agricultural products from the Dominican Republic. They buy broiler chickens and slaughter them to resell them in pieces as "vyann poul tiye" or chicken meat.

For some youth, though they do not participate widely in marketing or trading at the moment, they see many opportunities for them in this space. Young girls especially remarked that they especially would like to get into trading, as they see that there is a lot of profit to be made in the animal and meat trades.

They envisioned future businesses for themselves in many aspects of trading – not only selling livestock, but some mentioned reselling of dairy milk or transforming it into other products. However, they felt that their lack of financial means was a barrier to their entry into trading.

"We would like to be more active in commerce but due to lack of resources, we can't. We could be involved in the animal trade, but also the milk trade and the transformation of milk into sweets, cakes, cremas and other things." - FGD with youth producers in Cerca Carvajal.

Another barrier that youth encountered was their lack of ownership. They observed that in many cases, they cannot sell animals without permission from their parents, who ultimately own the animals. Thus, they are not able to enter the markets on their own.

"When it comes to selling our livestock, very often it is adults who are in charge, which sometimes limits our knowledge of the market." - FGD with youth producers in Saint Raphael.

Markets for selling livestock

While all producers sold agricultural products at local markets most frequently, there were some gendered differences in some of the less common end markets.

For cattle trading, households with female-only ownership were more likely to sell to neighbors (11%) than households with male-only owners (5%). Similarly, female owners were more likely to sell to traders (9%) than male owners (0%). However, in poultry trading, female-only owners were more likely to sell to neighbors than male-only (5% compared to 10%). There were no major age differences in terms of markets sold to.

Theft of sales

Both women and youth producers noted that they do not always have control over their animals, even if they are the owners. They noted cases where husbands, or the adults in the household, will sell their animals without their knowledge or permission.

"Some adults in the area sell animals that belong to their children without their knowledge" – FGD with youth producers in Torbeck.

"There are men who don't respect anything at all. They can go and sell your goat or your chicken. But it is rather exceptional. A man who behaves like this may find himself alone one day." -FGD with female producers in Hinche.

In both cases, this speaks to larger trends around financial management and decision making within households around the sale of livestock and use of income, which is discussed in detail in Section 4.6.3. Financial Management and Decision Making.

4.5 Education, Training and Access to Information

Literacy and education level, access to timely and relevant training and the right information at the right time are known to help producers adopt productivity-enhancing management practices to improve the feeding, health and reproduction of their livestock. By examining gender and age differences in access to training and uncovering barriers, we can better create opportunities to increase inclusion of these groups in the livestock sector in a meaningful and sustainable way. Because education level, past experience with training and exposure to information, was asked at the respondent level, the sex and age of the respondent producer is used as a disaggregate in this section.

4.5.1 FORMAL EDUCATION

The education level attained by livestock producers can have a significant impact on their agricultural outcomes and household resilience. Table 16 below illustrates the highest level of education attained by sex and age of producer, as well as the sex of the head of household. Overall, education and literacy levels of Haitian smallholder livestock producers are low, with almost one third (30%) of producers lacking any formal schooling. Using the achievement of any formal schooling (primary and above) as a proxy for literacy, we see that 70% of producers are literate. Only 23% of producers have an education level above primary school.

Female producers have less education and are less literate than their male counterparts - 65% of women are literate compared to 74% of men. A total of 19% of female producers have attained an education level above primary, while 27% of male producers have. The education levels of Haitian livestock producers here are in line with other studies' findings which noted that in rural Haiti 31% of women and 24% of men have no formal education.¹⁹

Youth producers have more education and are more literate than adult livestock producers, with a literacy rate of 78% and 35% with an education level above primary. Comparatively, 69% of adult producers are literate and 20% have gained more education than primary school.

Both youth and adult producers observed that while youth are more highly educated than their parents, youth unemployment is so rampant that they are unable to find jobs. There is a generation of youth with

¹⁹ MSPP. 2018. *EMMUS VI 2016-2017*

education and modern IT skills, but a total lack of employment opportunities. As a result, some youth are valuing education less because they no longer see its value.

“We have a lot of problems paying for our children's schooling. And what's more, even if our children finish their studies with a diploma, they cannot find a job, they sit at home, condemned to do nothing.” – FGD with female producers in Hinche.

Interestingly, while women overall have lower education rates than men, young female producers are better educated than the other sex and age subgroups. Over three-quarters (81%) of female youth producers are literate and 36% have attend school after primary. This far exceeds adult women, of whom only 62% are literate and 16% have an education above primary. Even adult men, who have a similar proportion of education above primary at 36%, are less literate, with 74% attending formal school. In qualitative interviews, producers explained that there has been a shift in norms and educational equity and now boys and girls attend school at the same rate.

“There is no inequality at the educational level. Maybe there was more inequality when our parents and grandparents went to school. But today, all the children go to school. You can look at primary school, secondary school and even university, you will always find as many girls as boys.” - FGD with female producers in Cerca Carvajal.

Many respondents noted that girls often drop out at the secondary level due to pregnancy, or households prioritize boys for secondary education above girls. However, among producers, young women still maintain a slightly higher rate of education than young men.

Table 16. Highest education level attained

	No school/ illiterate	Primary	Secondary	University/ Vocational/ Technical	N
Total sample	30%	47%	20%	3%	1 683
By sex of respondent					
Female	35%	46%	17%	2%	742
Male	26%	47%	22%	5%	941
By age of respondent					
Youth (ages 18 – 29)	22%	42%	32%	3%	236
Adult (ages 30+)	31%	47%	17%	3%	1 446
By sex and age of livestock respondent					
Female youth	19%	44%	34%	3%	125
Female adult	38%	46%	14%	2%	617
Male youth	24%	39%	31%	5%	111
Male adult	26%	48%	20%	4%	830
Sex of Head of Household (HOH)					

Female HOH	37%	46%	15%	1%	567
Male HOH	26%	47%	22%	4%	1114

Producers with higher levels of education often have access to more training, knowledge and information about modern management practices, animal health practices, and innovative technologies. In this study, those with higher levels of education were more likely to apply improved practice and saw higher average annual sales from livestock.

The education level of the head of household can also have implications on household resilience, as higher levels of education and literacy can influence decision making, access to information and diversity of income sources. Households where the head of household has a higher level of education also saw higher average annual sales. In addition, they are more likely to have savings, have more diversity of income sources and ultimately have a higher ability to recover from shocks and stresses. These topics are all discussed in more detail below in *Sections 4.6 Access to Financial Resources* and *4.8 Household Resilience*.

4.5.2 LIVESTOCK TRAINING

Though there are agricultural extension service providers in Haiti, they are largely fragmented. Overall, only 3% of all producers have received any livestock training in the past year, indicating that the smallholder livestock sector in Haiti needs the development and expansion of sustainable extension services, such as private sector embedded services, agro-dealer agents, and agro-vet networks to build producers' skills in improved livestock husbandry techniques, technologies, and practices.

As shown in Table 17, male respondents accessed livestock training at a slightly higher rate (5%) than female respondents (1%), while youth and adult accessed training at the same low rate of 3%.

In qualitative interviews, female producers identified a lack of technical training as one of the primary barriers to the application of improved practices, along with access to credit. Women say that they follow traditional practices passed down to them and have never received training on any aspect of animal husbandry.

“We lack technical support and training to be able to do more. In production, we do what we already know and it is each one for ourselves in our breeding. Women have never received training to do what they do.” - FGD with female producers in Hinche.

To a greater degree, technical training on livestock was identified as a gap by youth. While the 2022 USAID/Haiti Gender Analysis Report found that youth participation in livestock producer organizations has increased in recent years, youth overall still felt that there was a dearth of livestock-specific training options and vocational schools. They expounded on the need for greater technical resources and knowledge to succeed in livestock production. Some youths were able to learn animal husbandry from their parents, but many felt they had a distinct lack of guidance and did not know where to find it.

“We are not aware of any training programs for livestock farmers. The BAC (Bureau of Animal Care) is nearby, but we don't even know what they do. They don't offer anything to the population. Therefore, there is no training in livestock farming”- FGD with youth producers, Torbeck.

Table 17. Received livestock training

	% who received any training in livestock	n
By sex		
Female respondent	1%	742
Male respondent	5%	941
By age		
Youth respondent	3%	236
Adult respondent	3%	1446

Barriers to and opportunities in training for women

Women felt that existing training resources, such as the Government of Haiti extension agents, do not target women and few international NGOs extended this service to them. Women commented that when NGO or government projects arise in their communities, the projects often end up favoring men in the extension and distribution of animals or inputs. This exacerbated existing disparities between men and women in terms of knowledge and ownership of animals.

"We believe there is inequality between men and women, especially regarding distribution projects where men predominate. They are better informed and receive more consideration." – FGD with female producers in Chantal.

Women also remarked that trainings are often tailored to men, without consideration of the topics that most interest female producers. As producers explained above, women largely agreed that the gendered differences inherent in livestock production were not a manifestation of inequality, but rather reflected traditional gender roles and responsibilities. To this end, they advocated for separate training opportunities that meet women where they're at- in small livestock, in trade and in processing – rather than trying to push them into more male dominated spaces. Women noted that it's not necessary for them to participate in the same activities as men and training should reflect this.

Particular topics of interest for women were making fodder, hay and silage, which they felt could increase their ability to obtain a sufficient quantity of feed for their cattle and goats/sheep. Women also wanted training on creating enclosures for their cattle and goats/sheep as well as chicken coops for their chickens. In addition, women wanted to focus on training in animal health treatments (specifically poultry and goat/sheep diseases), which would result in less loss for them overall. Women expressed interest not only in learning more about animal health for their purposes, but in creating pathways for them to become community animal health workers. They saw this as a means to improve the health of their own animals, but also as an income-generating activity for themselves.

Finally, women expressed the preference to organize trainings, as well as other collective activities, through women's organizations. They stressed that trainings for women should be separate, and women's organizations provided a platform for collaboration and mutual support. Women advocated for the development of, or expansion of women's organizations dedicated to livestock, with training as one of the primary activities, as well the organization of collective actions.

"A woman or girl is very weak in society if she is alone. It is together, when we organize, that we can defend ourselves. Women's organizations have a crucial role to play in society." -FGD with female producers in Hinche.

Barriers to and opportunities in training for youth

Youth, much like women, felt that previous training projects favored adults over youth, and did not share the knowledge or resources equally.

"When there are distribution projects in the area, they are allocated to adults and not to the youth." - FGD with youth producers in Torbeck.

Youth expressed a need for livestock-specific training that goes above and beyond school. They lamented the lack of training resources on agricultural and livestock. Youth explained that they have learned about animal husbandry through caring for their parents' animals, but they believe that there are more modern and technical skills that they can learn to improve their production, and they call for more guidance and supervision.

"You have to know how to take care of an animal, know what care the animal needs. We are not totally ignorant, because we help our parents and in this way we have learned quite a few things. But that's not enough. We need guidance." - FGD with youth producers in Ouanaminthe.

Youth were especially interested in exploring training that provided profitable activities along the livestock value chain. While they had a range of ideas for opportunities, youth recognize that they are hindered by a lack of capital and land. At the same time, they consider themselves to be entrepreneurs and seek training in innovative and new ways to participate in the livestock value chain.

Youth discussed ideas including raising pigeons and rabbit, as well as dairy and milk processing. Many did not have a clear idea on exactly what innovations or value chain activities they could become involved in but were seeking anything that could generate sufficient income. Some producers observed that chicken coops are not found in their areas and that they do not require much land, and this could be an innovation that youth can own and expand.

"But there are livestock activities that do not need a lot of land. You could build a chicken coop, it doesn't take up much space. But then there is the problem of knowledge. We don't have enough experience to make this kind of innovation. Operating a henhouse is something that young people do not master. Do we know, for example, which diseases we need to monitor, what preventive measures we need to take, how we should treat different diseases? And I could still add a bunch of other questions. So, there is still a problem of know-how." - FGD with youth producers in Cerca Carvajal.

Another popular idea among producers was training to become community animal health workers. Like women, they envisioned this as an income generating activity that they would be able to dominate.

Youth also advocated for other activities that would support livestock production. For example, training on the production and preservation of fodder would enable them to set up workshops for the sale of hay and silage. They are interested in accessing improved breeds or establishing a dairy. Youth also mentioned that they would like to be involved in projects that build drainage canals or drill artesian wells to battle the frequent drought.

Like women, youth believe that they need trainings that are focused on their specific needs and separate from adults. They were especially aware of the need for youth livestock producers to maintain autonomy and not fall into traditional age roles where adults dominate the conversation. Youth noted that this separation would be especially helpful for young girls.

I especially want to insist that we must involve young people in all activities and especially young girls. I am in favor of planning separate activities with only young people and even activities with only young girls. We need our own space, where we can develop our own activities without adult intervention. -FGDs with youth in Hinche.

Youth organizations were considered a useful platform for these trainings, as they bring youth together under a common cause.

4.5.3 ACCESS TO INFORMATION

Producers were exposed to a variety of information in the past year, ranging from rainfall (60%) to early warnings for natural hazards (36%) and market prices for food (41%) and animal health news (24%). Male and female respondents accessed information at much the same rate, with women hearing information on rainfall and weather prospects (62%) slightly more than men (58%) and slightly more men (44%) learning about market prices of food than women (38%).

The difference between youth and adults was somewhat bigger, with 48% of youth being exposed to market prices compared to 40% of adults and 31% of youth learning about animal disease, epidemics and prevention compared to 23% of adults.

Table 18. Information accessed in past year by sex and age

	Female respondents	Male respondents	Youth respondents	Adult respondents
Rainfall/ weather prospects for coming growing season	62%	58%	65%	59%
Market prices of the food you buy	38%	44%	48%	40%
Early warning for natural hazards (flooding, hail, landslide)	36%	36%	36%	36%
Long-term changes in weather patterns	24%	25%	27%	24%
Animal health (e.g., disease, epidemic, prevention)	25%	23%	31%	23%
Child nutrition and health information	19%	19%	20%	19%
Crop health (e.g., pest outbreaks, disease, prevention)	13%	16%	19%	14%
Opportunities for borrowing money	14%	12%	14%	13%
Human rights	6%	11%	8%	9%
Water prices and availability in local boreholes, wells, etc.	8%	8%	8%	8%
Gender-based violence	5%	9%	7%	7%
Business and investment opportunities	8%	6%	10%	6%
Natural resource management	4%	8%	8%	6%
Improved crop production practices/technologies (CA, seeds)	3%	5%	5%	4%
Conflict or security issues	3%	5%	4%	4%
Improved livestock production practices (fodder, husbandry)	2%	4%	5%	3%
<i>n</i>	941	742	236	1446

In terms of sources of information, men and women rely on much the same sources, as shown below in Table 19. Youth, however, are connected to informal networks, using friends/family (47%) and word of mouth (23%) as information sources more than adults (38% and 19% respectively). Social media and internet are not common information sources for any group, though youth use them slightly more than average.

Table 19. Source of information by sex and age

	Press (TV, radio, papers)	Relatives, friends, neighbors	Word of mouth	Internet or SMS	Social media	<i>n</i>
Total sample	36%	39%	19%	1%	2%	1 683
By sex						
Female respondents	34%	39%	19%	1%	2%	742
Male respondents	37%	39%	20%	1%	2%	941
By age						
Youth respondents	33%	47%	23%	2%	4%	236
Non-youth respondents	36%	38%	19%	1%	2%	1 446

4.6 Access to Financial Resources

4.6.1 ACCESS TO SAVINGS

Access to cash savings play a significant role in enhancing household resilience by providing a financial buffer that helps producer households navigate unexpected challenges and maintain stability during times of uncertainty. Sex of the household head plays a role in a household's tendency to save, with 40% of male-headed likely to have cash savings compared to 30% of female-headed houses. As mentioned above in *Section 4.5.1. Formal Education*, the accumulation of cash savings is related to level of education, and female heads of households are less educated on average than male heads of households.

In terms of the location of savings shown in Table 20, we see clear gendered differences, with female-headed households more likely to keep their savings in a village savings group (23%) than male-headed households (18%). Use of a formal bank for savings is limited, regardless of the sex of the head of household.

Table 20. Location of savings by sex of head of household

	Female Head of Household	Male Head of Household
At home	53%	65%
Village savings/credit group	23%	18%
Bank	4%	7%
MFI	5%	3%
Mobile banking	2%	1%
Other	12%	5%
<i>n</i>	169	451

4.6.2 ACCESS TO CREDIT

Access to credit, especially through formal financial institutions, provides livestock producers with the means to invest in their operations, diversify income, adopt improved practices, enhance animal health, and build adaptive resilience against shocks.

Table 21 below illustrates respondents' perceptions of their ability to access loans from different sources. This question was posed to individual respondents, so it is disaggregated by the gender and age of the respondent producer.

There are currently few avenues for formal financing for livestock available to producers. With 44% of respondents feeling like they have access to any type of credit and 7% feelings like they could take a loan from a formal lender, producers are limited in their ability to invest more fully in their livestock production and improve their practices. Between female/male respondents and youth/adults, the perception of access is fairly equal, with women and youth feeling slightly more able to secure a loan from informal credit/savings groups than their male and adult counterparts. Adults also feel more able to get a loan from a group-based microfinance organization than youth.

Table 21. Access to loans by producer sex and age

	Female respondents	Male respondents	Youth respondents	Adult respondents
% of producers that feel they could take a loan from any source if they wanted	44%	44%	40%	45%
<i>n</i>	742	941	236	1,446
Friends or relatives	20%	25%	20%	23%
Informal credit/savings groups	24%	20%	11%	7%

Group based microfinance/lending	11%	9%	6%	11%
Informal lender	8%	8%	11%	7%
Formal lender (bank/financial institution)	6%	8%	7%	7%
Non-governmental organization (NGO)	6%	5%	4%	6%
<i>n</i>	742	941	236	1446

In terms of households who have actually taken loans in the past year, Table 22 illustrates the different sources of loans and the rate of loans taken overall. Since loans are often secured for the household, this figure is disaggregated by the sex of the head of household. This analysis reveals that the same proportion of male and female-headed households have taken any loan in the past year, but the sources are different. Female-headed households are more likely to secure a loan from an informal credit/savings groups (56%) than a male-headed household (41%), while more male-headed households (48%) took loans from friends or relatives than female-headed households (34%). Additionally, fewer female-headed households secured a loan from a formal lender (7%) than male-headed households (11%).

Table 22. Household loans taken in the past year by sex of head of household

	Female Head of Household	Male Head of Household
% of households that have taken any loan in the past year	37%	38%
<i>n</i>	567	1114
Source of loans		
Friends or relatives	34%	48%
Informal credit/savings groups	56%	41%
Group based microfinance or lending	19%	16%
Informal lender	6%	7%
Formal lender (bank/financial institution)	7%	11%
<i>n</i>	209	428

Access to credit for women

In qualitative interviews, women noted that access to credit and formal financial resources was a constraint for their production, and that only men could benefit from formal finance. Additionally, they noted that credit was often not available for smallholder farmers, especially those involved in small livestock like goats/sheep and poultry, which they tend to be involved in. Where credit was available, very small limits were imposed, restricting what women could invest in.

“Credit institutions like banks and credit unions don’t want to lend more than 25 thousand gourdes to women, while men can borrow as much as they want. Even the Bureau de Crédit Agricole benefits men more.” FGD with female producers, Ouanaminthe.

This aligns with findings in the 2022 USAID/Haiti Gender Analysis Report which reported that financial institutions in Haiti were not likely to offer a loan for women who want to open a business in non-traditionally “feminine” sectors or segments of value chains, despite the accepted knowledge that women often pay their debts.²⁰

Women did advocate for the expansion of mutual societies where women pool their money to offer rotating loans. This is substantiated in the quantitative data that illustrates how women are more likely to feel like they have access to informal mutual society savings and credit groups than other types of lenders.

Access to credit for youth

Accessing credit was overwhelmingly mentioned as the top barrier for youth in strengthening and expanding their livestock activities. Youth equated all of their challenges in establishing ownership of animals, adopting improved practices and increasing yield to their lack of economic means, inhibiting their ability to fully participate in the livestock sector.

"The situation of the youth is characterized by a lack of economic means. There isn't really inequality between the youth and adults except that the adults have more economic and financial capacity." – FGD with youth producers in Chantal.

According to youth, financial institutions often perceive youth as inexperienced and insolvent, leading to hesitancy in offering credit opportunities. This is also due to their lack of experience and financial background. While access to credit is difficult for all livestock producers, young people are most vulnerable. The limited opportunities for credit stifles youth innovation, limits technological adoption and hampers youth abilities to seize emerging opportunities in the livestock value chain.

“The Crédit Agricole Bureau does not provide credit for young people; young people are considered inexperienced and not creditworthy. And the result is that there are no opportunities for young people to seize.” - FGD with youth producers in Fort Liberté.

All participants agreed that the greatest need is to make credit accessible specifically to young people, so that they can embark on in livestock production or a commercial activity in the value chain. Youth producers called for a credit system that enabled young people to invest in long term, sustainable livestock activities, acknowledging that not all youth would be able to qualify but that they would like to see resources for support that help young producers properly target a specific activity in the livestock value chain, develop an investment plan and properly manage the activity once the credit has been approved.

4.6.3 FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND DECISION MAKING

Financial management and decision-making within smallholder producer households in Haiti is a complex interplay of cultural, social, and economic factors. Traditional gender roles and age-based power dynamics are present in all decisions regarding the sales of livestock and use of income.

Table 23 below depicts the sex of the decision maker regarding the use of savings and loans in the household. As with management and ownership of livestock, respondents described the sex of the sole or joint decision makers of savings or loans, and these were coded into the categories below. Because

²⁰ Banyan Global. 2022. *USAID/Haiti Economic Growth and Agricultural Development: Gender Analysis Report*.

youth are not commonly involved in the financial decision making of a household, this disaggregation focused on only on sex.

Men appeared to have more power in decision making over savings, with 57% of households' decisions on the use of savings made by men only. In comparison only a quarter (26%) of households' decisions on savings were made by women only.

Table 24 illustrates the gender of the decision maker on loans taken out by the household. Note that the gender of the other member of the household was not specified here. In households where only females made decisions regarding the use of the loan, loans were more likely to be sources from microfinance organizations (50%) than in households where only males made decisions regarding use of loans (45%).

Table 23. Decision maker on use of savings by sex

	Female only	Male only	Both male and female	Outside of household	n
Savings	26%	57%	15%	0%	620

Table 24. Decision maker on use of loans by sex

	Female only	Male only	Other member of household	n
Friends or relatives	37%	59%	4%	276
Informal credit/savings groups	49%	46%	5%	294
Group based microfinance	50%	45%	5%	112
Informal lender	27%	66%	9%	44
Formal lender	34%	58%	8%	62

*Low base size

Financial decision making by sex

Qualitative interviews revealed how complex and varied financial management and decision making can be within smallholder households in rural Haiti and the extent to which gendered disparities persist within the different approaches to decision making.

In principle, the owner of an animal, regardless of their sex, decides when and how to sell their animal. For many producers, they expressed that women have full autonomy over the animals under their ownership.

“A woman can sell her own animals. There is no man who can sell the animal that belongs to a woman. The woman is master of her own animals, if she has any.” - FGD with female producers in Fort Liberté.

Given that cattle hold much more value than goats/sheep and poultry, and there are far more men in the cattle value chain than women, men tend to earn more money and have decision making power over the household income.

Other producers offer a more collaborative approach to financial decision making within their households. Producers explained that often the sale of large livestock is done through mutual agreement, while women take charge for the sale of small livestock. In these situations, women are often left in charge of deciding how to use the income to allocate to household expenses.

"Decisions are made collectively for sales, but it is mainly the woman who uses the money because she has more responsibilities at home." - FGD with female producers, Camp Perrin.

Producers did comment on cases where men will unilaterally make decisions regarding the sale of livestock and use of income, sometimes without their wife's knowledge. Respondents noted that these cases are rare, but that this dynamic does occur.

"There are men who collaborate and have a good relationship with their wife. These men will discuss the sale with their wives and they will decide together on the use of the funds. But there are others who won't say anything. It will be other people who will tell his wife that her husband sold an ox. And she will never know how the money from the sale was used." – FGD with female producers in Hinche.

Reasons for selling livestock

As discussed in the PARE Baseline Assessment, households leverage different livestock for different financial reasons. Large livestock like cattle has traditionally been used as a form of savings to cope with emergencies or to invest, while goats are often referred to as "the bank of the peasants" because they act as a savings account for households, being used for school fees. With their rapid growth rate and short production cycle, chicken and other birds allow for quicker returns on investment and producers are most likely to use their sales from poultry on daily home needs, such as purchasing food.

According to producers, household finances are often managed separately, and livestock are used for the payment of school fees. Typically, men pay for the school fees, and women are responsible for the uniform and other required materials. But producers noted that in cases where a woman has livestock activities that generate money, it can be common for men to ask that she pay for the children's schooling, totally or partially.

4.7 Productive Resources

Access to productive resources, including animal health services and products, land, and agricultural and household assets, serves as a critical determinant of the extent to which women and youth actively participate and contribute to livestock farming.

4.7.1 ACCESS TO ANIMAL HEALTH SERVICES AND PRODUCTS

Smallholder livestock farmers often encounter significant barriers in accessing veterinary services and medicines. Table 25 examines how male and female respondents, as well as youth and adult respondents perceive their access to veterinary services and medicine. As evidenced below, there is little difference in feelings of access to animal health workers and veterinary medicine between male and female respondents and youth and adult respondents. At the same time, there is a distinct difference in the rate that men and women apply animal health treatments and diseases, so despite feeling like they have access, women face barriers in utilizing these key services and inputs.

Table 25. Access to veterinary services and medicines by gender and age

	% who feel they have access to animal health workers	% who feel they have access to veterinary medicine	n
Total sample	71%	30%	1683
By sex			
Female respondents	69%	29%	742
Male respondents	72%	30%	941
By age			
Youth respondents	69%	31%	236
Adult respondents	71%	29%	1446

According to producers, limited financial resources make it difficult for women and youth to afford professional veterinary care or purchase essential medicines for their livestock. Both cite the expense of these services and drugs as prohibitive in many cases.

In addition, as detailed in the PARE Baseline Assessment, the average time to travel to the nearest animal health worker is one hour, making access costly and time-consuming, especially for women who are burdened with the care of the household and children.

“Regarding illnesses, when our animals are sick, we are sometimes unable as women to go to Cap Haitien to purchase medicine because of our family obligations, especially when we are a single mother.” - FGD with female producers in Acul du Nord.

As discussed above in Section 4.5.2 *Livestock Training*, both women and youth feel that they lack proper knowledge of animal health care and both recommended that specific training focused on animal health care, especially for small livestock, would benefit them greatly. Moreover, they expressed a desire to access more professionalized training to prepare them as veterinary agents or community animal health workers, which is currently unavailable to them as smallholder livestock producers.

“If there was a possibility for women or young girls to follow veterinary training, there would certainly be many candidates. There are women in the GSB, but we should have female veterinary agents too.” – FGD with female producers in Hinche.

“Young people could become veterinary agents, there is a shortage of them. But where can we go to learn this and who will pay for the tuition?” - FGD with youth producers in Cerca Carvajal.

Women and youth also both advocated for the establishment of a veterinary pharmacy run by them, through a women’s or youth organization. They explained that this would be a key income generating activity that would also get veterinary drugs into the hands of women and youth producers who need them most.

4.7.2 ACCESS TO LAND

Access to land, particularly for livestock producers, ensures a stable resource base that can be used to support the household's needs and generate income during both normal and challenging times. Table 26

illustrates the average amount of land in hectares that households have under their management (including renting or owning), as well as the percentage that formally own that land.

Households with a male head have access to slightly more land on average, 2.1 hectares, than those with a female head, which average 2.0 hectares. In addition, male-headed households are slightly more likely to formally own their land, at 79% compared to 74%.

Table 26. Land access and ownership by sex of head of household

	Female Head of Household	Male Head of Household
Av. # hectares of land under household management	2.0	2.1
% of households that own this land	74%	79%
<i>n</i>	488	982

Lack of available land is another resource that limits youth full participation in the livestock sector. Youth explained that the only way to obtain land is through inheritance. Youth who have access to productive resources such as land and animals have these advantages due to their parents or grandparents, but for many producers, this type of inheritance will not materialize for them.

"All the land is occupied, and if you want a field, you have to ask your father for one."- FGD with youth producers in Vallières.

"Adults have fields, they are the ones who have land, we are dependent on our parents to get some land if we need it to do something. Most young people find themselves in a situation where their father does not have enough land to give them." – FGD with youth producers in Hinche.

While limited, some plots of land are for sale, but young people are unable to buy land due to rising prices and competition from more experienced breeders, as well as their challenges in securing loans. This leads to the discouragement that youth feel in accessing the necessary resources to embark in livestock production on their own.

4.7.3 ACCESS TO ASSETS

Table 27 illustrates the percentage of households with sole or joint ownership of key productive agriculture and household assets by the sex of head of household. As evidenced below, male-headed households have more access to both mechanized and non-mechanized farm equipment.

Table 27. Household asset ownership by sex of head of household

	Female Head of Household	Male Head of Household
Mechanized farm equipment	24%	34%
Non-mechanized farm equipment	69%	83%
Large durable consumer goods	8%	10%
Small durable consumer goods	38%	38%
Mobile phone	24%	24%
Transport	2%	2%

<i>n</i>	567	1114
----------	-----	------

4.8 Household Resilience

Gender and household resilience are inextricably intertwined. Research shows us that the sex of the head of household impacts the availability of resilience capacities as well as the decisions that households make in terms of coping strategies. In this section, households' experience of shocks, their diversification of livelihoods and their ability to recover from shocks and stressors are examined through the lens of sex of the head of household, with relevant topics on youth included, to better understand resilience can be supported in a gender and youth-sensitive manner.

4.8.1 EXPERIENCE OF SHOCKS

On average, male-headed households reported experiencing slightly more shocks, averaging 8.0, compared to female-headed households, with an average of 7.5.

As shown in Table 28, male headed households were more likely to experience crop diseases and crop pests than female headed households. When we look at households' involvement in cultivation of crops, we see that male-headed households are more involved in agriculture (89% of female-headed households cultivate crops compared to 94% of male-headed). The severity of shocks experienced was equal between the sexes of head of household.

Table 28. Shocks and stressors experienced by household by sex of head of household

Type of shock and stressor	Female Head of Household	Male Head of Household
Sharp increase in the price of food	93%	94%
Increased price of ag and livestock inputs	84%	88%
Drought	84%	88%
Youth unemployment	78%	81%
Crop pests	59%	65%
Weeds	60%	60%
Socio-political unrest	53%	57%
Crop diseases	46%	54%
Erosion of land	34%	50%
Human disease	27%	30%
Death in the household	26%	24%
Livestock theft	25%	24%
Hurricane	18%	24%
Flooding	14%	17%
Conflict over grazing/fodder	14%	12%
Delay in delivery of food aid	12%	11%
Theft of household items	11%	12%
<i>n</i>	567	1114

Youth unemployment was the fourth highest shock cited by both male and female-headed households alike. Haiti's youthful demographic structure is made vulnerable by the extremely high unemployment rate, estimated to be 14.8% in 2022, 17.3% for women and 34% for youth aged 15-24²¹. Households' resilience is severely impacted by this ongoing crisis, as youth are unable to find work, despite their education. This is leading to a rural exodus of young people, who are seeking the cities or further afield in the Dominican Republic to find work.

"Haiti is not like other countries, where there is support for young people. Here we do not find opportunities to take a step forward. Even if you have a university degree, you won't find a job. This is the main cause that makes all young people want to leave." - FGD with youth producers in Fort Liberté.

4.8.2 LIVELIHOOD DIVERSITY

As mentioned above, the main sources of income for female livestock producers are the sale of milk, eggs, meat and dairy products. However, prices for these products are often low and unstable, making it difficult for livestock producers to generate sufficient income to support themselves and their families.

Underscoring this, we see that male-headed houses averaged more income sources, with 3.3. compared to female-headed households with 2.6.

4.8.3 ABILITY TO RECOVER FROM SHOCKS AND STRESSES

The ability to meet food needs is a helpful indicator to understand a household's ability to recover from shocks and stresses. Table 29 illustrates the respondent's perception of their household's ability to meet their household's food needs currently and in the future. Respondents who live in male-headed households feel more confident than those who live in female-headed households that their family is able to meet their food needs both now and, in the future, indicating the potential vulnerability of female-headed households.

Table 29. Ability to meet food needs now and in the future

	Better than before shocks	Same as before shocks	Worse than before shocks	n
Ability to meet food need now				
Female head of household	4%	49%	47%	500
Male head of household	7%	51%	42%	1002
Ability to meet food needs over next year				
Female head of household	7%	45%	48%	500
Male head of household	13%	41%	45%	1002

Leveraging different resilience capacities, smallholder producers can employ a range of coping strategies to navigate shocks and stresses while bolstering their household resilience. Positive coping strategies include diversification of income sources, where farmers engage in various agricultural and non-agricultural activities to spread risk. Table 30 illustrates the different coping strategies that households employed, disaggregated by the gender of the head of household. This approach can enhance income stability and

²¹ World Bank Open Data. Unemployment (% of workforce).

provide alternative sources of support during challenging times. To that end, taking up new or additional work used more by male-headed households, potentially because there is more availability of work for men.

Table 30. Top ten coping strategies used by sex of household head

Type of coping strategy	Female Head of Household	Male Head of Household
Reduced non-essential HH expenses	48%	56%
Reduced food consumption	41%	40%
An Took up additional work	31%	39%
Engaged in spiritual efforts (e.g., prayed, sacrifices, etc.)	38%	34%
Got food on credit from a local merchant	20%	23%
Took up new work	14%	18%
Sold livestock	12%	16%
Used own savings to pay for other household necessities	14%	13%
Used savings to feed the family	11%	10%
Sent livestock in search of pasture	7%	8%
<i>n</i>	567	1,114

PARE Indicator #13: Ability to recover from shocks and stresses index

Aligned with PARE's goal of improving resilience, the baseline assessment measures the ability of households to recover from shocks and stressors, using *PARE Indicator #13: Ability to recover from shocks and stresses index (Standard RESIL-a)*. This indicator utilizes the Ability to Recover from Shocks and Stresses Index (ARSSI). This index is comprised of a Shock Exposure Index (SEI), which takes into accounts the total number of shocks and stressors that a household experienced and the perceived severity of that shock on household income and food consumption. The SEI was calculated based on the experience of 12 shocks and stressors. It also includes a base "ability to recover" index, which is calculated based on the household's perception of their ability to meet their household's food needs currently and in the future. Finally, the shock exposure-corrected ARSSI is calculated to create a measure of ability to recover that corrects for any differences between households in their shock exposure and is therefore comparable across them. In summary, ARSSI ranges between 2 and 6, with a margin of approximately ± 0.5 on each interval limit and the higher the score, the better the ability of the household to recover. Households in the Baseline Assessment had a middling ability to recover at 3.28. Male-headed households saw a higher average score at 3.36 than female-headed households at 3.13.

Table 31. Baseline Indicator #13: Ability to recover from shocks and stresses index

Disaggregate	ARSSI Score	n
Total	3.28	1484
By gender of head of household		
Female head of household	3.13	490
Male head of household	3.36	993

4.9 Women's Empowerment

Women and girls serve as the cornerstone of both Haitian society and the local economy. About a third (34%) of smallholder producer households are headed by women. Moreover, women play integral roles in the economic landscape of Haiti, serving as street vendors and providing vital support to agricultural supply chains. Despite this, women feel that they bear the largest burden of the recent crises and that there few avenues for help.

"It is we, the women, who suffer the most, who endure all the humiliations we can imagine. We do not have a state that protects us or gives us supervision. Even the few goats we have can die every day from lack of food. And at the same time, there are thieves outside who want to deprive us of our goats. And yet, it is we who carry the baskets on our heads, it is thanks to us that the children go to school." -FGD with female producers in Hinche.

For many women, livestock offers an opportunity for empowerment, as it allows women an important source of income over which they have control and with which they can build their assets. Many women believe that, if the barriers to their participation in the livestock sector were addressed, they could achieve positive outcomes through the production, processing and trading of livestock products.

"We can do anything. We can produce, we can sell, we can provide care. We only ask for a chance to prove what we can do." - FGD with female producers in Cerca Carvajal.

PARE utilized the Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (WEAI) to measure the empowerment, agency and inclusion of women in the agriculture sector. Specifically, one of the PARE project indicators is the Abbreviated WEAI (A-WEAI), which is a shorter, streamlined version of the original WEAI. Each A-WEAI indicator measures whether an individual has surpassed a certain threshold (achieved adequacy) in that indicator. PARE will only measure the "Resources" dimension of the A-WEAI above since that is the empowerment that is expected to be influenced by the program. The resources portion includes ownership of assets and access to and decisions on credit.

Ownership of assets is considered adequate under the Resources domain if the individual owns (solely or jointly) at least one major asset. When all major assets (cattle, goats/sheep, land, large durable goods, mechanized farm equipment, mobile phone and transport) were calculated, 95% of female producers were considered adequate (compared to 98%). This high level in asset ownership is driven by the fact that for most non-agricultural assets like consumer durables, they can be considered household-level goods and

therefore for 'ownership' is hard to determine on an individual level. This challenge has been cited by other studies employing this indicator.²²

Access to and decisions on credit were considered adequate if the individual makes decisions about at least one source of credit accessed by her household. Within the PARE Baseline sample, 31% of women achieved this threshold (compared to 32% of men).

If the women achieve adequacy in both indicators, then they are considered empowered within the Resources domain. Table 32 below illustrates that 30% of women achieved adequacy across these two indicators (compared to 32% of men).

Table 32. Baseline Indicator #8: Percent of women achieving adequacy across the two indicators in the resource portion of the Abbreviated Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (A-WEAI)

Disaggregates	Total Sample	Age*		Location	
		Youth	Non-youth	Northern RFZ	Southern RFZ
% of women achieving adequacy across the two indicators in the resource portion of the Abbreviated Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (A-WEAI)	30%	18%	32%	32%	24%
<i>n</i>	742	125	617	571	171

²² Gupta, Soumya. Adapting the Women's empowerment in agriculture index to specific country context: Insights and critiques from fieldwork in India. 2019.

V. CONCLUSION & RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Conclusions

Gender and age play significant roles in shaping the experiences and outcomes of smallholder livestock producers in Haiti. Social norms surrounding gender and age can influence ownership and decision-making of livestock, and gender and age-based barriers to training, access to finance and productive resources can limit the ability to apply improved practices, ultimately leading to different yield and sales outcomes for women and youth producers. Recognizing and addressing the unique challenges faced by these vulnerable but high-potential groups is essential for promoting a sustainable and resilient livestock sector in Haiti.

Key takeaways from this analysis are:

Gendered social norms are intertwined with the roles and responsibilities that women take in the livestock sector. Women are less involved in cattle and more involved in goats/sheep and poultry, following traditional gendered differences. There is a large minority of joint management between men and women and the specific tasks that each takes on is often dictated by gender norms. Female producers largely agreed that the gendered differences inherent in livestock production were not a manifestation of inequality, but rather reflected traditional gender roles and responsibilities. To this end, they advocated for separate opportunities that meet women where they're at- in small livestock, in trade and in processing – rather than trying to push them into more male-dominated spaces.

With a high level of unemployment, youth in Haiti are in a vulnerable position and are seeking out income generating activities and careers. While there is interest in livestock due to the potential of high profit, youth feel disenfranchised and limited by barriers to financial resources and land. Overall, youth are less likely to be involved in livestock production than adults, across all value chains. Goat/sheep and poultry are more feasible for youth in the short term due to finance constraints -- but they could potentially build their way up to cattle. Most ownership seems to come from managing others' animals and receiving an offspring.

Men tend to implement improved practices at a higher rate, have larger herds and more improved breeds. They also sell more of their herds/flock than women. For this reason, men have higher yield and sales than women and adults over youth. Women are hampered by social norms and fears which do not allow them travel freely into the fields.

Producers believe they have access to animal health services; however, their utilization rates remain low, primarily due to challenges related to affordability and geographical distance. Both women and youth are particularly interested in becoming veterinary agents.

Women point to a lack of training as one of the primary constraints they face in the livestock value chain. For women, they are interested in learning to make fodder, which would enable them to provide more food to their animals without traveling into the fields, which they largely do not do. Youth expressed a need for livestock-specific training that focuses on more modern and technical skills that they can learn to improve their production, and they call for more guidance and supervision overall.

The primary obstacle to bolstering and broadening livestock endeavors was the challenge of obtaining credit, specifically from formal lenders. While this affected women, youth found it to be an especially big hindrance.

The dynamics of financial management and decision-making within smallholder producer households in Haiti are intricate, influenced by a combination of cultural, social, and economic factors. While men seem to hold more influence in the decision-making process, women retain control over the income generated from their livestock activities.

Women play a significant role in the marketing of livestock which offers a promising avenue for increased participation in the livestock sector. Virtually all women expressed a desire to extend their involvement in commerce. Meanwhile, numerous young individuals consider themselves entrepreneurs and express keen interest in exploring various opportunities along the livestock value chain.

Livestock represents a pathway to empowerment and engagement for many women and youth, offering a vital source of income that they can manage independently and leverage to accumulate assets. Women and youth alike are enthusiastic that addressing the obstacles hindering their engagement in the livestock sector could lead to favorable outcomes through the production, processing, and trading of livestock products.

5.2 Recommendations

The comprehensive analysis of gender and youth dynamics within the livestock value chain offers a foundation for targeted recommendations aimed at fostering inclusivity, empowerment, and equitable growth through a market-based approach.

Recommendations linked to Objective 1

- ***Support projects that are working on improved breeds and henhouses (cross with Objective 1.1.1)***

Leverage women and youth interested in acquiring, breeding and distributing improved breeds, especially in the goat/sheep value chain. Encourage partners to utilize women and youth organizations as centers for this activity. In addition, consider projects that focus on the establishment of henhouses, particularly for youth.

- ***Encourage partners to incorporate women and youth organizations (cross with Objective 1.1.2)***

Work with partners who will support and strengthen women and youth specific organizations, either for market actors to work with for extension; or to partner with them specifically on providing appropriate services for their members. Utilize these organizations as hubs for training that is separate and tailored to needs of women and youth.

- ***Expand extension services (cross with Objective 1.1.2)***

Support and strengthen capacity for women and young people through training focusing on livestock management, financial literacy and entrepreneurship. Strengthen extension services to provide tailored technical assistance and extension services to women and youth farmers on topics such as making fodder, how to build enclosures, and animal care training.

Through expansion of training and extension, work with partners to support gender and youth-sensitive improved practices. For example, instead of trying to change the mobility constraint of women, promote practices that can be done closer to the home. Leverage youth's eagerness to change to demonstrate improved practices, utilizing them as an eager promoter/voice for change.

Recommendations linked to Objective 2

- ***Support veterinary agent training (cross with Objective 2.3.1 and 2.3.2)***

Encourage projects that offer pathways for veterinary training and jobs as community animal health workers for both women and youth.

Recommendations linked to Objective 3

- ***Leverage enthusiasm for marketing and entrepreneurship (cross with Objective 3.1.1)***

Continue to promote women in their roles as traders and provide the support they need for this higher income opportunities. Leverage the interest youth have in entrepreneurship, perhaps through enterprise acceleration.

- ***Expand access to finance (cross with Objective 3.1.3)***
Develop partnerships with financial institutions to develop gender and youth-responsive credit mechanisms to enhance inclusive access to credit. Consider potential partnerships with informal savings and credit groups such as VSLA and MUSO to expand access to loans for women in particular. For youth, encourage partners to provide monitoring and support on credit, as well as training in business development.