



More than an add-on?

Evaluating the integration of gender in
Green Climate Fund projects and programs

Compendium: Individual project/program gender analysis reports and pattern analysis overview table

Authors: Eliza McCullough and Elaine Zuckerman, Gender Action

 **HEINRICH BÖLL STIFTUNG**
WASHINGTON, DC



Published by Heinrich Böll Stiftung, Washington, DC and Gender Action

Place of publication: <https://us.boell.org/> and <https://genderaction.org/>

October 2021

Contact:

Liane Schalatek


liane.schalatek@us.boell.org

Elaine Zuckerman

elainez@genderaction.org

Table of Contents

05	Foreword
06	Annex 3: Pattern analysis overview table of GCF Gender Portfolio Study
42	Annex 4: Individual project/program gender analysis reports
43	FP024: Empower to Adapt: Creating Climate-Change Resilient Livelihoods through Community-Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM)
53	FP028: MSME Business Loan Program for GHG Emission Reduction
62	FP061: Integrated physical adaptation and community resilience through an enhanced direct access pilot in the public, private, and civil society sectors of three Eastern Caribbean small island developing states
73	FP082: Catalyzing Climate Finance -- Shandong Green Development Fund
81	FP084: Enhancing climate resilience of India's coastal communities
91	FP094: Ensuring climate resilient water supplies
102	FP099: Climate Investor One
110	FP100: REDD-PLUS results-based payments for results achieved by Brazil in the Amazon biome in 2014 and 2015
121	FP107: Supporting Climate Resilience and Transformational Change in the Agriculture Sector
132	FP109: Safeguarding rural communities and their physical and economic assets from climate induced disasters
143	FP110: REDD-plus RBP for results period 2014
152	FP112: Addressing Climate Vulnerability in the Water Sector (ACWA)



- 161** **FP114:** Program on Affirmative Finance Action for Women in Africa (AFAWA): Financing Climate Resilient Agricultural Practices
- 171** **FP115:** Espejo de Tarapacá
- 180** **FP116:** Carbon Sequestration through Climate Investment in Forests and Rangelands
- 188** **FP117:** Implementation of the Lao PDR Emission Reductions Programme through improved governance and sustainable forest landscape management
- 197** **FP118:** Building a Resilient Churia Region
- 205** **FP119:** Water Banking and Adaptation of Agriculture to Climate Change in Northern Gaza
- 213** **FP120:** REDD-plus results-based payments for results period 2014-2016
- 221** **FP121:** Recognising Paraguay's REDD+ results for the years 2015-2017
- 229** **FP122:** Blue Action Fund (BAF): GCF Ecosystem Based Adaptation Programme
- 237** **FP127:** Building Climate Resilience of Vulnerable Agricultural Livelihoods
- 245** **FP128:** Arbaro Fund – Sustainable Forestry Fund
- 254** **SAP007:** Integrated Climate Risk Management for Food Security and Livelihoods in Zimbabwe focusing on Masvingo and Rushinga Districts
- 262** **SAP008:** Extended Community Climate Change Project-Flood (ECCCP-Flood)
- 270** **SAP009:** Building resilience of urban populations with ecosystem-based solutions
- 279** **SAP010:** Multi-Hazard Impact-Based Forecasting and Early Warning System
- 287** **SAP011:** Climate-resilient food security for women and men smallholders in Mozambique through integrated risk management
- 295** **SAP012:** Inclusive Green Financing for Climate Resilient and Low Emission Smallholder Agriculture
- 303** **SAP013:** Scaling Smart, Solar, Energy Access Microgrids

Foreword

In 2020, the Heinrich Böll Stiftung Washington, DC and Gender Action embarked on a research project to assess how successful the Green Climate Fund (GCF), the largest multilateral climate fund and a key part of the financial support to developing countries for the implementation of the Paris Agreement, has been in integrating gender equality considerations in its funding portfolio.

At the heart of this research, which we conducted over the course of 2020/2021, was the thorough analysis of 30 individual projects and programs approved by the GCF Board by looking at publicly available project and program documentation, including supportive annexes to the extent they were disclosed. Each project and program, selected to ensure we covered a broad cross-section of the GCF portfolio, was evaluated against a set of 27 ecofeminist indicators and sub-indicators looking at the “quality-at-entry” of gender integration efforts as predictive of the potential for meaningful gender equality outcomes and impacts during the implementation of these approved GCF projects and programs. The findings of the individual project/program analysis reports were then aggregated to look for patterns and relevant findings. These are described in detail in our main study report, **More than an add-on? Evaluating the integration of gender in Green Climate Fund projects and programs**, available on the websites of the [Heinrich Böll Stiftung Washington, DC](#) and of [Gender Action](#).

This compendium serves as a complement to the main study report. It contains a detailed overview table of findings for each of the 27 indicators across the 30 analyzed GCF project and programs, revealing important pattern and portfolio-relevant findings. It also collects the 30 individual GCF

gender analysis reports of the studied projects and programs. The study overall would not have been possible without the comprehensive and diligent expert analysis on the individual GCF projects and programs selected that was led by Eliza McCullough and Elaine Zuckerman from Gender Action.

Publishing these documents in this compendium does allow those interested to dig deeper into the gender-equality integration assessments of the 30 analyzed GCF projects and program than the narrative of the main study allows for. It also transparently discloses the analytic work done to substantiate the findings, conclusions and recommendations detailed in the main study report. Lastly, the ecofeminist indicator framework used, while it has elements that are specific to GCF operational policies and procedures, might nevertheless serve as a template or starting point for similar research endeavors into the gender equality integration ambitions of climate projects and programs and as a checklist of sort to improve the gender quality-at-entry of climate investments more generally.



ANNEX 3

Pattern analysis overview table of GCF Gender Portfolio Study

(For reference, a of analyzed projects/programs by number, implementing entity, title and recipient country/ies follows the pattern analysis)

Finalized October 2021

Indicator	Strong	Adequate	Weak
<p>Indicator 1:</p> <p>Does the project or program narrative include gender-equality considerations and an eco-feminist cost-benefit analysis?</p>	<p>FP112 -- C: Mentions inclusion of women in multiple project components and focuses one project output entirely on enhancing women’s leadership</p> <p>FP119 -- C: Mentions inclusion of women in multiple project components, includes many measures to ensure women benefit</p> <p>FP122 -- C: Plans to increase women’s leadership in water and sanitation decision-making, focuses one project output entirely on enhancing women’s leadership</p> <p>SAP007 -- B: Mentions the inclusion of women in several project outputs, acknowledges indigenous environmental knowledge</p> <p>SAP008 -- A: Requires that women-headed households and other disadvantaged groups are prioritized in beneficiary selection</p> <p>SAP008 -- B: Highlights how floods increase women’s vulnerability, considers outcomes given that the project does or does not occur and includes specific outcomes for women and girls</p>	<p>FP024 -- C: Mentions gender in the description for the project activity titles but does not consider potential costs and benefits of the activities for women</p> <p>FP028 -- A: Plans to target women but does not consider how loans may drive some women business-owners deeper into cycles of debt and poverty</p> <p>FP028 -- C: Sets project objectives aimed at women-led MSMEs but provides a weak definition of women-led MSMEs</p> <p>FP084 -- A: Acknowledges women’s disproportionate vulnerability to climate change but does not undertake a gender-responsive cost-benefit analysis</p> <p>FP084 -- C: Mentions the inclusion of women multiple times but fails to fully integrate an eco-feminist framework in project description</p> <p>FP099 --C: Mentions that the projects will “intentionally impact women” and plans to employ women through project components but fails to adequately integrate a gender lens into project description</p> <p>FP110 -- C: Notes that women and women’s groups were included at multiple steps in project design but does not incorporate gender-equality considerations in overall project description</p> <p>FP114 -- A: Plans to target women-led MSMEs through project loans but does not consider how loans may drive some women deeper into cycles of debt and poverty</p> <p>FP115 -- A: Notes that the project will “promote empowerment of women” by providing local communities with funds and training to diversify their community but does not clarify whether women will be targeted</p> <p>FP115 -- C: Includes some gender-sensitive project objectives and plans to target women in some project activities but does not adequately integrate gender in project design</p>	<p>FP061 -- A: Fails to integrate gender in project description, assumes that because women make up half of the target population, they will automatically make up half of the beneficiaries</p> <p>FP061 -- C: Does not adequately target women or LGBTQ people through project activities, overlooks how loan debt could push vulnerable populations further into poverty</p> <p>FP082 -- A: Includes no mention of gender in project description</p> <p>FP082 -- C: Fails to integrate gender-equality considerations throughout the overall project narrative</p> <p>FP094 -- All: Fails to mention gender or women whatsoever</p> <p>FP094 -- C: Makes one brief mention of gender and fails to adequately integrate gender consideration</p> <p>FP099 -- A: Fails to mention gender or women and ignores how the transition to clean energy will disproportionately impact women and gender minorities</p> <p>FP100 -- A: Fails to mention gender or women whatsoever in project description</p> <p>FP100 -- C: Makes no mention of women or gender in project description, ignores gender risks of deforestation prevention efforts</p> <p>FP107 -- A: Overlooks how women and LGBTQ people are disproportionately harmed by climate change, does not mention gender in project description</p> <p>FP107 -- C: Fails to integrate a gender-sensitive approach into overall project design</p> <p>FP109 -- A: Fails to mention gender or women whatsoever in project description, fails to undertake a gender-responsive cost-benefit analysis</p> <p>FP109 -- C: Fails to integrate an eco-feminist framework in project description or undertake a gender-responsive cost-benefit analysis</p>

Indicator	Strong	Adequate	Weak
		<p>FP116 -- C: Provides opportunities for women to participate in and benefit from multiple project components but fails to recognize women's unique role in agriculture and forest preservation</p> <p>FP117 -- B: Plans to target women-led SMEs in loan distribution and through other project components but overlooks how loans could deepen poverty</p> <p>FP118 -- C: Notes that 51% of project beneficiaries are women and includes several other mentions of women as direct beneficiaries but does not fully integrate gender-equality considerations</p> <p>FP119 -- A: Explains that the project will improve livelihoods for 23,553 people, half of whom will be women</p> <p>FP122 -- B: Limits mention of gender to a section on "gender strengthening" that explains how a gender consultant will be hired to advise all NGO applicants on how to mainstream gender in their proposals</p> <p>FP127 -- A: Mentions women as a key beneficiary throughout project summary but does not consider multiple means towards strengthening women's resilience to climate risks</p> <p>FP127 -- C: Continues to identify women farmers as target beneficiaries throughout project description but does not consider non-market-based actions to increase women's resilience to climate change</p> <p>SAP007 -- A: Explains that the project will support climate adaptation efforts for 50,000 people, 66% of which will be women but makes no other mention of gender</p> <p>SAP009 -- B: Plans to work with the National Women's Union for some project components, plans to investigate the impact of flooding on women when developing national urban ecosystem-based adaptation guidelines</p> <p>SAP011 -- A: Does not explicitly mention that women are disproportionately impacted by climate change but includes women as direct beneficiaries for two of the three project components</p> <p>SAP012 -- A: Aims to reduce the impact of climate change on the food security of smallholder farmers, particularly women, but does not acknowledge how microcredit schemes often harm poor women</p> <p>SAP012 -- B: Explains that a key project goal is reforming financial services to benefit rural women but does not acknowledge how microcredit schemes often harm poor women</p>	<p>FP109 -- C: Fails to integrate an eco-feminist framework in project description or undertake a gender-responsive cost-benefit analysis</p> <p>FP110 -- A: Makes no mention of women or gender in project description</p> <p>FP112 -- A: Notes that 49% of the project area population are women but makes no other mention of women in project description</p> <p>FP116 -- A: Notes that the project will "diversify livelihood opportunities for women and men" but makes no other mention of women or gender</p> <p>FP117 -- A: Notes that the project will have "significant socio-economic and gender-positive co-benefits" but makes no other mention of women or gender</p> <p>FP118 -- A: Makes no mention of gender in project description whatsoever</p> <p>FP120 -- C: Includes no mention of women or gender in project description</p> <p>FP121 -- C: Does not adequately integrate gender equity considerations</p> <p>FP122 -- A: Includes no mention of women or gender whatsoever</p> <p>FP128 -- A: Makes no mention of women or gender and fails to adequately integrate a gender lens into the project description</p> <p>FP128 -- B: Fails to adequately integrate a gender lens into the project description and ignores how climate mitigation and forest conservation are highly gendered issues and disproportionately impact women</p> <p>SAP009 -- A: Includes no mention of women or other marginalized gender groups in project description</p> <p>SAP010 -- A: Includes no mention of women or other marginalized gender groups in project description</p> <p>SAP010 -- B: Barely mentions women or gender in project description, ignoring how women are disproportionately at risk of harm due to extreme weather events</p> <p>SAP011 -- B: Adopts a paternalistic tone towards women, ignores how loans can be harmful to poor women and other marginalized groups</p>

Indicator	Strong	Adequate	Weak
		<p>SAP013 -- B: Promotes gender mainstreaming across all project components but does not consider potential gender costs of further privatizing the energy grid</p>	
<p>Indicator 2:</p> <p>Is there a gendered description and gender-disaggregated data of beneficiaries (baseline and intended reach)?</p>	<p>FP112 -- C: Notes that 49% of project-affected people are women, targets women through multiple project activities</p> <p>FP127 -- C: Indicates that women farmers are direct beneficiaries for almost every project component, includes some gender-disaggregated data</p> <p>SAP008 -- A: Includes gender-disaggregated data of the target population and notes that women will comprise roughly 50% of direct beneficiaries</p> <p>SAP008 -- B: Reiterates that women-headed households will be prioritized in beneficiary selection for all project activities and will comprise 50% of project beneficiaries</p> <p>SAP013 -- B: Names women as key beneficiaries, plans to support women-led SMEs, sets many strong requirements to ensure that women benefit</p>	<p>FP028 -- A: Targets women through project components but ignores how loans often lead to increased indebtedness for vulnerable borrowers</p> <p>F0028 -- C: Ignores how the project’s weak definition of women-led MSMEs may fail to actually benefit women</p> <p>FP061 -- C: Will collect gender-disaggregated data “when possible” for two project outcomes, includes gender targets for some project outputs</p> <p>FP084 -- C: Mentions that select project components are aimed at women but fails to provide gender-disaggregated data for beneficiaries</p> <p>FP109 -- C: Explains the project will benefit many women-headed households but does not provide a detailed gender breakdown of beneficiaries</p> <p>FP112 -- A: Explains that 49% of project-affected people are women but does not explain how the project will ensure all women in the project-affected area will benefit</p> <p>FP114 -- A: Notes the project will benefit 400 women-led MSMEs but does not disaggregate the overall number of direct and indirect beneficiaries by gender</p> <p>FP114 -- C: Sets strong, gender-disaggregated beneficiary targets for all project components but sets a weak definition for women-led MSMEs</p> <p>FP115 -- C: Identifies multiple activities that will target and benefit women and sets gender-sensitive project objectives but does not provide a more exact gender description of project beneficiaries</p> <p>FP116 -- A: Asserts that the project expects to directly benefit 432,450 individuals of which 246,497 are women but does not explain how the project will ensure that the number of women in the project area will actually benefit</p> <p>FP117 -- A: Explains that half of direct and indirect beneficiaries will be women but does not provide a rationale for this expected outcome</p> <p>FP118 -- C: Includes some gender descriptions of beneficiaries but not for all project components</p> <p>FP119 -- A: States the intended number of women beneficiaries but does not describe collection of gender-disaggregated baseline or monitoring data</p>	<p>FP024 -- C: Does not gender-disaggregate beneficiary targets and only mentions women as direct beneficiaries for one project component</p> <p>FP061 -- A: Explains that the target population eligible for loans is 40% women, ignoring how this gender ratio could exacerbate gender inequality</p> <p>FP082 -- A: Includes no mention of gender of beneficiaries</p> <p>FP082 -- C: Barely mentions gender impacts in project description, does not gender-disaggregate beneficiaries</p> <p>FP084 -- A: Fails to provide a detailed gendered description of project beneficiaries</p> <p>FP094 -- A: Includes no gender description of project beneficiaries</p> <p>FP094 -- C: Fails to provide gender-disaggregated data for beneficiaries</p> <p>FP099 -- A: Provides no gender description of project beneficiaries</p> <p>FP099 -- C: Explains that the project will “intentionally impact women” and plans to employ women through project components but does not specify the expected amount of women beneficiaries</p> <p>FP100 -- A: Includes no gender description of project beneficiaries</p> <p>FP100 -- C: Excludes women from the “target audience groups” for the project</p> <p>FP107 -- A: Includes no gender description of project beneficiaries</p> <p>FP107 -- C: Implies that the project will benefit women by reducing the impact of climate change but does not otherwise describe how the project will benefit women</p> <p>FP109 -- A: Includes no gender description of project beneficiaries</p> <p>FP110 -- A: Does not describe the gender makeup of project beneficiaries</p> <p>FP110 -- C: Notes the inclusion of women in outreach and consultation efforts but does not indicate that any project components will specifically target women</p>

Indicator	Strong	Adequate	Weak
		<p>FP119 -- C: Describes in detail how the project will ensure women are direct beneficiaries but does not describe collection of gender-disaggregated data</p> <p>FP122 -- B: Notes that sub-projects must demonstrate how women will benefit and that the sub-projects are "invited" to "design women-specific measures" that mainly benefit women</p> <p>FP127 -- A: Identifies women as target beneficiaries but does not provide gender-disaggregated data</p> <p>SAP007 -- A: Explains that project beneficiaries will be 66% women but does not further explain how the project will ensure this gender makeup</p> <p>SAP007 -- B: Mentions the targeting and inclusion of women in multiple project outputs but does not give any gender-disaggregated data for project beneficiaries</p> <p>SAP011 -- A: Includes a gender-sensitive description of project beneficiaries but fails to include gender-disaggregated data for the direct or indirect beneficiary targets</p> <p>SAP012 -- A: Includes a gender-sensitive description of project beneficiaries but does not give any gender-disaggregated data for project beneficiaries</p> <p>SAP012 -- B: Notes that project activities will particularly target women does not require any gender-disaggregated data for project beneficiaries</p>	<p>FP115 -- A: Plans to target women in some project activities but does not explicitly note gender makeup of project beneficiaries</p> <p>FP116 -- B: Plans to target women in multiple project components but does not explicitly note gender makeup of project beneficiaries</p> <p>FP118 -- A: Makes no mention of gender in description of beneficiaries</p> <p>FP120 -- C: Overlooks gender in description of beneficiaries</p> <p>FP121 -- C: Fails to note the gender makeup of intended beneficiaries whatsoever</p> <p>FP122 -- A: Does not explicitly state that women and girls are target beneficiaries</p> <p>FP128 -- A: Fails to note the gender makeup of intended beneficiaries whatsoever</p> <p>FP128 00 C: Includes no gender-disaggregated data on project beneficiaries</p> <p>SAP009 -- A: Does not provide a gender description of project beneficiaries or consider the project's gendered impacts</p> <p>SAP009 -- B: Fails to provide a gendered description of project beneficiaries or consider the project's gendered impacts</p> <p>SAP010 -- A: Does not provide a gendered description of project beneficiaries</p> <p>SAP010 -- B: Does not provide a gendered description of project beneficiaries</p> <p>SAP011 -- B: Notes that project will attempt to decrease food insecurity for "women and men farmers" but does not mention women as beneficiaries in any other project component description</p> <p>SAP013 -- A: Does not state that women and girls are target beneficiaries</p>

Indicator	Strong	Adequate	Weak
<p>Indicator 3:</p> <p>Are “gender co-benefits” elaborated against the GCF investment criteria?</p>	<p>FP084 -- E: Includes a section on “Gender-Sensitive Development Impact” which gives a brief description of women’s economic struggles in the project-affected areas and explains how the project aims to benefit women</p> <p>FP107 -- E: Describes how the project will contribute to gender empowerment and explains that the project has thoroughly considered the unique needs of women farmers</p> <p>FP112 -- E: Notes the project will improve women’s involvement in water resource management, reduce their time collecting water during droughts, and provide women more opportunities to generate income</p> <p>FP114 -- E: Includes many mentions of the project’s gender co-benefits</p> <p>FP119 -- E: Indicates that creating more equitable and gender-balanced access to water distribution is a key project goal</p> <p>FP127 -- E: Notes that the project expects to “transform existing gender norms around women’s capacity to manage soil, water, and biomass resources” as well as increasing their income and political power</p> <p>SAP007 -- E: Explains that project gender co-benefits include gender-sensitive, participatory approaches for resilience building interventions and decreased workloads for women</p> <p>SAP008 -- E: Includes a section on “Gender-sensitive development impact” which includes target benefits such as increasing women’s economic empowerment, leadership and skills, and decision making within the family as well as stopping violence against women</p> <p>SAP011 -- E: Notes the project aims to reduce gender inequality by diversifying sources of income, increasing access to financial services, and challenging the gender division of labor</p> <p>SAP012 -- E: Includes a section on “Gender considerations” with strong descriptions of how the project will benefit women</p>	<p>FP028 -- E: Plans to increase women-led MSMEs’ access to loans but provides a weak definition of women-led MSMEs</p> <p>FP061 -- E: Notes that the loan program is gender-responsive and will help women but overlooks how the loan eligibility criteria will exclude many women and how loans have the potential to hurt poor women</p> <p>FP082 -- E: Disaggregates core indicator by gender, requires subprojects produce M&E reports with gender-disaggregated data, overlooks other opportunities to integrate gender</p> <p>FP094 -- E: Notes that the project has the potential to reduce time women spend fetching water but not explain whether women will be included in project employment opportunities</p> <p>FP100 -- E: Notes that the project will ensure proposed activities do not discriminate against women but does not specify how the project will benefit women</p> <p>FP107 -- E: Provides a gender breakdown of beneficiaries for each major project component but fails to provide an in-depth description of gender co-benefits</p> <p>FP110 -- E: Describes Ecuador’s gender policy framework but does not specify how the project will benefit women</p> <p>FP115 -- E: Explains that the project will aim to empower women and will ensure that women and men have equal access to project opportunities but notes that the beneficiary population is 59% men</p> <p>FP116 -- E: Asserts that the project will expand women’s access to livelihood and business opportunities but does not explain how the project will ensure women receive these benefits</p> <p>FP117 -- E: Includes gender-sensitive project targets but does not describe how the project ensure benefits for women</p> <p>FP118 -- E: Notes several ways the project will benefit women</p> <p>FP120 -- D: Notes that gender-sensitive safeguards will be included to ensure that women can access benefits but does not give a full description of project benefits</p> <p>FP121 -- D: Gives a mediocre description of how the project will “contribute to addressing gender gaps in the environmental and rural sectors”</p> <p>FP122 -- D: Requires NGO applicants include “gender-sensitive” proposals but fails to adequately integrate gender considerations or co-benefits throughout the GCF Investment criteria</p>	<p>FP024 -- E: Fails to promise that any gender minimums for project beneficiaries will be met or enforced and assumes that women will benefit from the project because they are overrepresented in population</p> <p>FP099 -- E: Explains that the project will help reduce women’s “energy poverty” but provides no other explanation of how the project will ensure gender co-benefits</p> <p>FP128 -- D: Does not indicate that the project will target women in hiring efforts and rather plans to let women’s ‘preferences’ shape the workforce which could worsen gender inequality</p> <p>SAP010 -- E: Does not explain how the project will ensure benefits reach women and that the number of direct women beneficiaries is equal to the number of men beneficiaries</p>

Indicator	Strong	Adequate	Weak
		<p>SAP009 -- E: Acknowledges women’s vulnerability to climate change and promises to increase their resilience but incorrectly assumes that women are ignorant about climate change</p> <p>SAP013 -- E: Expects that at least 50% of direct and indirect beneficiaries are women even though the project description describes a component with an exclusive focus on women that suggests that these percentages should be higher</p>	
<p>Indicator 4a:</p> <p>Are gender-related expenditures integrated in the overall project or program budget?</p>	<p>FP119 -- B: Includes budgets for gender-sensitive project inputs, assigns funding for local gender consultants and integration of women in the governance bodies of the Water Users Associations</p>	<p>FP114 -- B: Does not directly mention women or gender in project budget but allocates funding to project components that will target women</p> <p>FP120 -- C: States in a footnote that “40% of the [overall project] budget will be used to comply with the indicators of the Gender Action Plan” but does not include GAP indicators in overall budget</p> <p>FP121 -- C: Includes a couple of mentions of gender in project budget but does not assign a specific budget to the Gender Specialist</p> <p>FP127 -- B: Provides no direct mention of budget for gender-related expenditures but integrates women-focused activities throughout the project components which have allocated funding</p> <p>SAP007 -- C: Makes no direct mention of gender in overall project budget but allocates funding to project components that are required to include at least 50% women</p> <p>SAP008 -- C: Makes no direct mention of gender in overall project budget but allocates \$212,000 to development of climate change adaptation groups which will be comprised of 80% women</p> <p>SAP012 -- C: Makes no direct mention of gender in overall project budget but allocates funding to project components that will target women</p> <p>SAP013 -- C: Allocates \$368,036 USD (0.8% of project funding) to the “Feminist Electrification” project component, which makes up the bulk of the women-targeted project actions</p>	<p>FP024 -- B: Makes no mention of women or gender in the project budget whatsoever</p> <p>FP028 -- B: Makes no mention of women or gender in the project budget</p> <p>FP061 -- B: Makes no mention of women or gender in the project budget</p> <p>FP082 -- B: Assigns some funding to project aspects that include gender-related activities but offers no direct funds to gender activities</p> <p>FP084 -- B: Makes no direct mention of gender in project budget</p> <p>FP094 -- C: Includes just one mention of gender in the project budget, for an activity that will receive just 0.8% of total project funding</p> <p>FP099 -- B: Makes no direct mention of gender in project budget</p> <p>FP100 -- C: Allocates funding for project components that include women but makes no direct mention of gender in project budget</p> <p>FP107 -- B: Makes no mention of gender in project budget</p> <p>FP109 -- B: Makes no mention of gender in project budget</p> <p>FP110 -- B: Makes no mention of gender in project budget</p> <p>FP112 -- B: Barely mentions gender in project budget</p> <p>FP115 -- B: Makes no mention of gender in project budget</p> <p>FP116 -- B: Allocates funding to some project components that include gender-related activities but allocates no funds for explicitly gender-focused activities</p> <p>FP117 -- B: Allocates funding to some project components that include gender-related activities but allocates no funds for specific gender-related activities</p> <p>FP118 -- B: Includes no budget for gender-related activities, even though the GAP requires significant funding to carry out proposed activities</p>

Indicator	Strong	Adequate	Weak
			<p>FP122 -- C: Does not include direct funding for any gender-related expenditure</p> <p>FP128 -- B: Makes no mention of women or gender in the project budget whatsoever</p> <p>SAP009 -- C: Makes no mention of gender in overall project budget</p> <p>SAP010 -- C: Makes no mention of gender in overall project budget</p> <p>SAP011 -- All: Makes no direct mention of gender in overall project budget</p>
<p>Indicator 4b:</p> <p>Can women’s groups/local groups/grassroots women get access to project or program funding?</p>	<p>SAP009 -- B, GAP: Notes that the National Women’s Union and village-level Women’s Unions will be project partners and will assist with project components, suggesting they will have access to project funding</p>	<p>FP028 -- B, GAP: Includes Asia Foundation Women in Business Center as a responsible organization for multiple GAP activities and plans to engage women’s economic empowerment NGOs but does not confirm they will have access to project funding</p> <p>FP061 -- B, GAP: Notes that a women’s organizations will be included in the Steering Committee, lists women’s organizations as having an “oversight function” in project implementation but does not confirm they will have access to project funding</p> <p>FP084 -- B, GAP: Does not explicitly note that women’s groups will have access to project funds but includes women’s groups as the beneficiaries for some project outputs</p> <p>FP100 -- B, GAP: Sets GAP target to include one representative from a women’s organization but never specifies which women’s organization and provides no other opportunities for inclusion</p> <p>FP110: Explains that the REDD+ Mesa de Trabajo, which includes one women’s organization, will oversee the project implementation, suggesting that this group may have some control over project funds</p> <p>FP112 -- B, GAP: Includes representatives from Women’s United Together Marshall Islands (WUTMI) on the Project Board, suggesting they may have some control over and access to project funding</p> <p>FP114 -- B, GAP: Plans to provide funding to women-led farmer-based associations but provides a weak definition of women-led and ignores how loans could drive women into poverty</p> <p>FP116 -- B, GAP: Includes a representative from a women’s council in each Community Landscape Management Groups and identifies women’s councils as a beneficiary institution which suggests they will have access to project funding</p>	<p>FP024 -- B, GAP: Fails to mention women’s groups or provide any opportunities for them to access project funding</p> <p>FP082 -- B, GAP: Does not clarify whether women’s groups/local groups/grassroots women will be able to access project funding</p> <p>FP094 -- B, GAP: Includes women’s groups in multiple project components but does not indicate that they will have access to project funds</p> <p>FP099 -- B, GAP: Fails to mention women’s groups or provide any opportunities for them to access project funding</p> <p>FP107 -- B, GAP: Notes the project consulted women’s groups in project planning but never indicates that they will have access to project funding</p> <p>FP108 -- B, GAP: Includes women’s groups in agriculture advisory associations but does not confirm they will have access to project funding</p> <p>FP115 -- B, GAP: Does not mention the inclusion of women’s groups/local groups/grassroots women in the funding proposal or GAP</p> <p>FP120 -- B, GAP: Does not include any gender indicators that provide opportunities for women’s/local groups to access funding</p> <p>FP127 -- B, GAP: Notes that the project will “empower existing women’s groups in the development of small businesses” but does not explicitly indicate that local-level women’s groups will be able to access project funding</p> <p>FP128 -- B, GAP: Fails to mention women’s groups or provide any opportunities for them to access project funding</p> <p>SAP007 -- B, GAP: Does not mention the inclusion of women’s groups/local groups/grassroots women in the funding proposal or GAP</p>

Indicator	Strong	Adequate	Weak
		<p>FP117 -- B, GAP: Explains that women’s collectives will be targeted for agricultural capacity building activities, suggesting they may have access to funds</p> <p>FP118 -- B, GAP: Includes women’s organizations/CSOs as entities responsible for a variety of GAP gender indicators, which suggests these groups may be able to access project funding</p> <p>FP119 -- B, GAP: Indicates some opportunities for women’s groups to access project funding but fails to provide adequate detail</p> <p>FP121 -- B, GAP: Includes the percentage of women’s groups in workshops “associated with the design of the fund” as a project indicator in the GAP which suggests that these groups may be able to advocate for access to funding</p> <p>FP122 -- B, GAP: Notes that the project will form “self-help groups” for women to “increase their voice” in project planning which suggests they may get access to funding</p> <p>SAP012 -- B, GAP: Identifies provision of credit to women’s organizations and MSMEs as a project goal but ignores how loans often increase indebtedness and poverty, particularly for poor women</p>	<p>SAP008 -- B, GAP: Notes that a representative from the Ministry of Women and Children Affairs will be included in project workshops but does not explain whether the organization will have access to project funding</p> <p>SAP010 -- B, GAP: Makes no mention of women’s organizations</p> <p>SAP011 -- B, GAP: Makes no mention of women’s organizations in GAP or funding proposal</p> <p>SAP013 -- B, GAP: Aims to conduct surveys in each project-affected town with local women’s groups but does not set a target or action plan or mention access to project funding</p>
<p>Indicator 4c:</p> <p>Does the Gender Action Plan (GAP) have an adequate budget that funds local capacity for gender mainstreaming?</p>	<p>FP120 -- GAP: States in a footnote in the Funding Proposal that “40% of the [overall project] budget will be used to comply with the indicators of the Gender Action Plan” and includes strong budget allocations for objective areas in the GAP</p> <p>FP127 -- GAP: Includes a detailed budget for each GAP indicator</p>	<p>FP061 -- GAP: Sets a budget for each GAP sub-activity but assigns a total budget that makes up just 3.4% of total project funding</p> <p>FP082 -- GAP: Sets a budget but suggests the majority of funding will go to two gender specialists (one national, one international)</p> <p>FP084 -- GAP: Allocates funding for each GAP indicator but assigns a total budget that makes up just 8.3% of total project funding</p> <p>FP094 -- GAP: Allocates funding for each GAP output and assigns a responsible entity but fails to provide sufficient information on spending within each output</p> <p>FP107 -- GAP: Includes an adequate budget for each GAP activity and assigns responsible entities but fails to include the GAP budget in the overall project budget</p> <p>FP110 -- GAP: Includes budget allocations for each GAP sub-activity but fails to include the GAP budget in the overall project budget</p>	<p>FP024 -- C, GAP: Includes no budget which threatens implementation of any GAP activities whatsoever</p> <p>FP028 -- GAP: Includes no budget in the GAP</p> <p>FP099 -- GAP: Includes no budget in the GAP</p> <p>FP100 -- GAP: Provides no budget for GAP activities</p> <p>FP109 -- GAP: Provides no budget for GAP activities</p> <p>FP115 -- GAP: Sets a budget of \$230,000 which makes up just .02% of project funding and allocates the largest portion of funding to the microcredit program</p> <p>FP122 -- GAP: Provides no budget for GAP activities</p> <p>FP128 -- GAP: Fails to include any budget in the GAP</p> <p>SAP010 -- GAP: Includes no budget for any GAP outputs or sub-activities</p> <p>SAP013 -- GAP: Does not explicitly state a GAP budget and instead notes that the budget for each Feminist Electrification Indicator will be “proportional to grid size,” giving no further clarification</p>

Indicator	Strong	Adequate	Weak
		<p>FP112 -- GAP: Includes budget allocations for each project indicator and sub-indicator but assigns less than 5% of total project budget to GAP activities</p> <p>FP114 -- GAP: Includes a budget section in the GAP and notes the funding source for each GAP activity but does not provide a detailed breakdown</p> <p>FP116 -- GAP: Includes strong budget allocations for all of the proposed activities does not fully explain how funds will be used within each activity</p> <p>FP117 -- GAP: Includes strong budget allocations for half of the proposed activities</p> <p>FP118 -- GAP: Includes strong budget allocations for each project indicator but does not fully explain how funds will be used within each indicator</p> <p>FP119 -- GAP: Includes strong budget allocations for each project indicator but does not fully explain how funds will be used within each indicator</p> <p>FP121 -- GAP: Includes a detailed GAP budget but gives the majority of the funding to a Gender Specialist rather than to actions that will more directly benefit project-affected women</p> <p>SAP007 -- GAP: Makes no mention of the GAP funding allocations in the funding proposal budget but includes a robust budget in the GAP</p> <p>SAP008 -- GAP: Makes no direct mention of a GAP budget but does outline funding allocations for each project activity, suggesting that all project components will have adequate funding to reach women and men beneficiaries</p> <p>SAP009 -- GAP: Includes a detailed budget for each GAP output and sub-activity; sets a total budget that makes up just 4% of total project funding</p> <p>SAP011 -- GAP: Includes a budget for three objectives in the GAP but makes no direct mention of a GAP budget in funding proposal and fails to break down budget allocations</p> <p>SAP012 -- GAP: Makes no direct mention of a GAP budget in funding proposal but outlines costs for each GAP activity</p>	
<p>Indicator 5:</p> <p>Does the project or program have an intersectional approach to gender?</p>	None	<p>FP084 -- All: Incorporates some intersectional framing but fails to acknowledge how religion, which exacerbates social conflict, and sexuality affect women's ability to access project benefits</p>	<p>FP024 -- All: Does not directly acknowledge how ethnicity, class, or sexuality may affect women's ability to access project benefits</p>

Indicator	Strong	Adequate	Weak
		<p>FP094 -- All: Incorporates some intersectional framing but fails to acknowledge how religion and sexuality affect women’s experiences and their ability to access project benefits</p> <p>FP109 -- All: Incorporates some intersectional framing but fails to acknowledge how other identities impact women’s experiences and their ability to access project benefit</p> <p>FP110 -- All: Notes in the Gender Assessment that lesbian and trans women are disproportionately at risk of SGBV but fails to integrate this strong intersectional framework into other project documents</p> <p>FP117 -- All: Mentions how the project will work to meet the needs of indigenous people and marginalized ethnic groups but fails to acknowledge how other identities impact women’s experiences and their ability to access project benefit</p> <p>FP118 -- All: Provides a lengthy, gender-sensitive description of mitigation measures to prevent changes in land use that harm vulnerable populations but does not fully integrate an intersectional lens</p> <p>FP120 -- All: Notes multiple times the need to target indigenous women when working with women in project design and implementation but does not fully integrate an intersectional lens</p> <p>FP121 -- All: Explains that indigenous women face even more discrimination than non-indigenous women in the Gender Assessment but does not integrate this intersectional approach throughout</p> <p>SAP007 -- All: Targets poor women farmers but does not consider how women’s ethnicity, religion, and sexuality may affect their ability to access project benefits</p> <p>SAP008 -- All: Does not explicitly note the particular barriers faced by women who experience other forms of marginalization, such as class, ethnicity, or religious marginalization but does include protections for ethnic minorities and indigenous groups and prioritizes poor households throughout the project</p> <p>SAP009 -- All: Incorporates some intersectionality into framing but ignores indigenous climate knowledge</p> <p>SAP013 -- All: Acknowledges that poor women are particularly vulnerable to climate change but does not fully integrate an intersectional lens</p>	<p>FP028 -- All: Assumes women to be a homogenous group who will access project benefits evenly, even though the project will make loans which may harm poor women</p> <p>FP061 -- All: Assumes women to be a homogenous group who will access project benefits evenly</p> <p>FP082 -- All: Includes protections for ethnic minorities and indigenous groups but does not mention other intersecting identities that may shape a project-affected person’s vulnerability</p> <p>FP099 -- All: Does not acknowledge or account for how ethnicity, class, or sexuality may affect women’s ability to access project benefits</p> <p>FP100 -- All: Barely mentions indigenous women in project documents even though the project heavily impacts indigenous communities, fails to integrate an intersectional lens in project design</p> <p>FP107 -- All: Fails to integrate an intersectional lens in project design even though many indigenous women will be affected</p> <p>FP112 -- All: Does not directly acknowledge how ethnicity, class, or sexuality may affect women’s ability to access project benefits</p> <p>FP114 -- All: Does not acknowledge how ethnicity, class, religion, or sexuality may affect women’s ability to access project benefits</p> <p>FP115 -- All: Does not acknowledge how ethnicity, class, religion, or sexuality may affect women’s ability to access project benefits</p> <p>FP116 -- All: Does not acknowledge challenges faced by women ethnic minorities, even though the Gender Assessment notes that the project area is not mono-ethnic</p> <p>FP119 -- All: Fails to consider how sexuality, class, ethnicity, and religion will affect women’s ability to access project components</p> <p>FP122 -- All: Makes no acknowledgment of how women’s experiences differ due to class status or racial and sexual identities</p> <p>FP127 -- All: Acknowledges that women farmers are more likely to experience poverty but does not consider how shifting women subsistence farmers to market-oriented farming may inadvertently harm poor women</p> <p>FP128 -- All: Does not acknowledge how ethnicity, class, or sexuality may affect women’s ability to access project benefits</p>

Indicator	Strong	Adequate	Weak
			<p>SAP010 -- All: Does not acknowledge that indigenous women face particular barriers to access project benefits and are particularly at risk of experiencing harm</p> <p>SAP011 -- All: Does not tailor project activities to ensure that the most marginalized women are reached, fails to adequately consider intersections between environmental issues and the experience of women farmers</p> <p>SAP012 -- All: Attempts to target poor, rural women through the project but fails to consider how provision of credit rather than grants may drive these women deeper into poverty</p>
<p>Indicator 6:</p> <p>Does the project or program acknowledge and include people with marginalized gender and sexual identities?</p>	None	None	<p>FP024 -- All: Notes in the Gender Assessment that people in Namibia are marginalized due to sexual orientation and gender identity, among other identities, but does not integrate this fact into project design</p> <p>FP028 -- All: Includes no mention of people with marginalized gender and sexual identities in any project documents</p> <p>FP061 -- All: Includes no mention of people with marginalized gender and sexual identities in any project documents</p> <p>FP082 -- All: Includes no mention of people with marginalized gender and sexual identities in any project documents</p> <p>FP084 -- All: Includes no mention of people with marginalized gender and sexual identities in any project documents</p> <p>FP094 -- All: Explains in the ESMF that discrimination due to sexual orientation is prohibited but does not explain how this discrimination will be prevented, makes no other mention of LGBTQ people</p> <p>FP099 -- All: Includes no mention of people with marginalized gender and sexual identities in any project documents</p> <p>FP100 -- All: Identifies LGBTQ people as a group at risk of discrimination but does not create safeguards</p> <p>FP107 -- All: Fails to adequately integrate the particular needs and vulnerabilities of LGBTQ people in the project plan</p> <p>FP109 -- All: Fails to adequately integrate the particular needs and vulnerabilities of LGBTQ people in the project plan</p> <p>FP110 -- All: Fails to adequately integrate the particular needs and vulnerabilities of LGBTQ people in the project plan</p> <p>FP112 -- All: Fails to adequately integrate the particular needs and vulnerabilities of LGBTQ people in the project plan</p>

Indicator	Strong	Adequate	Weak
			<p>FP114 -- All: Acknowledges that LGBTQ people are marginalized but provides no accommodations</p> <p>FP115 -- All: Fails to adequately integrate the particular needs and vulnerabilities of LGBTQ people in the project plan</p> <p>FP116 -- All: Includes no mention of people with marginalized gender and sexual identities in any project documents</p> <p>FP117 -- All: Includes no mention of people with marginalized gender and sexual identities in any project documents</p> <p>FP118 -- All: Acknowledges that LGBTQ people are marginalized but provides no accommodations</p> <p>FP119 -- All: Contains a transphobic definition of "sex" in the Gender Assessment that equates gender and sex, but includes no mention of people with marginalized gender and sexual identities in any project documents</p> <p>FP120 -- All: Includes no direct mention of people with marginalized gender and sexual identities in any project documents</p> <p>FP121 -- All: Includes no direct mention of people with marginalized gender and sexual identities in any project documents</p> <p>FP122 -- All: Includes no mention of people with marginalized gender and sexual identities in any project documents</p> <p>FP127 -- All: Includes no mention of people with marginalized gender and sexual identities in any project documents</p> <p>FP128 -- All: Includes no mention of people with marginalized gender and sexual identities in any project documents</p> <p>SAP007 -- All: Includes no mention of people with marginalized gender and sexual identities in any project documents</p> <p>SAP008 -- All: Includes no mention of people with marginalized gender and sexual identities in any project documents</p> <p>SAP009 -- All: Includes no mention of people with marginalized gender and sexual identities in any project documents</p> <p>SAP010 -- All: Includes no mention of people with marginalized gender and sexual identities in any project documents</p> <p>SAP011 -- All: Includes no mention of people with marginalized gender and sexual identities in any project documents</p>

Indicator	Strong	Adequate	Weak
			<p>SAP012 -- All: Includes no mention of people with marginalized gender and sexual identities in any project documents</p> <p>SAP013 -- All: Includes no mention of people with marginalized gender and sexual identities in any project documents</p>
<p>Indicator 7:</p> <p>Does the project or program acknowledge and take into account potential impacts on sexual- and gender-based violence (SGBV) and sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment (SEAH)?</p>	<p>FP117 -- All: Includes data on rates of SGBV and SEAH against women in Laos, acknowledges that project disruption of gender division of labor may increase SGBV, and recommends the project create trainings that empower women and change men's attitudes towards gender equality</p> <p>SAP007 -- All: Plans to raise awareness about challenges faced by women, including SGBV, and will ensure that the project's empowerment of women will not result in increased SGBV</p>	<p>FP084 -- All: Acknowledges that women face disproportionate violence but notes that the project may cause increased violence between beneficiaries and fails to provide gender-sensitive mitigation measures</p> <p>FP107 -- All: Notes the project does not expect to exacerbate violence against women but ignores how introducing construction workers into communities could increase SGBV</p> <p>FP109 -- All: Acknowledges that women are at risk of SGBV but designs no safeguards</p> <p>FP115 -- All: Sets "reduction in violence against women" as an outcome indicator in the GAP and plans to have trainings on gender empowerment and sexual harassment management but ignores some SGBV risks posed by the project</p> <p>FP127 -- All: Explains that the project has the potential to increase community conflict and SGBV and accounts for this risk by developing a GRM but provides little mention of gender needs in the description of the GRM</p> <p>SAP008 -- All: Notes that reduction of SGBV and SEAH are key goals of the project but ignores significant SGBV risks posed by the project</p> <p>SAP013 -- All: Includes the increased safety of women due to street lighting as a project goal but does not acknowledge how construction projects may increase risk of SGBV and SEAH</p>	<p>FP024 -- All: Notes in the GAP that the project will give "special attention to GBV" but includes no other mention of, or protections against, SGBV or SEAH</p> <p>FP028 -- All: Includes almost no acknowledgment of SGBV in Mongolia and ignores how the project could increase SGBV by disrupting gender-roles</p> <p>FP061 -- All: Includes no acknowledgment of or protection against potential SGBV or SEAH project impacts</p> <p>FP082 -- All: Includes no acknowledgment of or protection against potential SGBV or SEAH project impacts</p> <p>FP094 -- All: Includes a section on SGBV but fails to acknowledge that the project risks exacerbating SGBV for women and LGBTQ people</p> <p>FP099 -- All: Includes no acknowledgment of or protection against potential SGBV or SEAH project impacts</p> <p>FP100 -- All: Does not acknowledge that women and LGBTQ people are disproportionately at risk of SGBV or SEAH or set any safeguards</p> <p>FP110 -- All: Acknowledges that the project risks exacerbating "conflicts among project-affected communities and individuals" but does not mention any project safeguards that specifically protect against violence and SGBV</p> <p>FP112 -- All: Includes a section on SGBV but fails to acknowledge that the project risks exacerbating SGBV for women and LGBTQ people</p> <p>FP114 -- All: Barely acknowledges SGBV and provides no safeguards to prevent increased SGBV</p> <p>FP116 -- All: Barely acknowledges SGBV and provides no safeguards to prevent increased SGBV</p> <p>FP118 -- All: Includes no acknowledgment of or protection against potential SGBV or SEAH project impacts</p> <p>FP119 -- All: Does not clarify how the project will prevent SGBV or SEAH in the workplace</p> <p>FP120 -- All: Barely acknowledges SGBV and provides no safeguards to prevent increased SGBV</p>

Indicator	Strong	Adequate	Weak
			<p>FP121 -- All: Barely acknowledges SGBV and provides no safeguards to prevent increased SGBV</p> <p>FP122 -- All: Requires that subprojects integrate SGBV and SEAH into trainings for “law enforcement staff” but does not otherwise clarify the role of law enforcement staff in project implementation, includes no other mention of or safeguards to prevent SGBV or SEAH risks</p> <p>FP128 -- All: Notes in the Gender Assessment that “women working in the forestry sector sometimes suffer from sexual harassment” but sets no safeguards to prevent this outcome and provides no protection against other potential SGBV or SEAH project impacts</p> <p>SAP009 -- All: Barely acknowledges SGBV and provides no safeguards to prevent increased SGBV</p> <p>SAP010 -- All: Does not acknowledge that women and LGBTQ people are disproportionately at risk of SGBV and SEAH, particularly following climate disasters that disrupt homes and livelihoods, or provide safeguards</p> <p>SAP011 -- All: Barely acknowledges SGBV and provides no safeguards to prevent increased SGBV</p> <p>SAP012 -- All: Barely acknowledges SGBV and provides no safeguards to prevent increased SGBV</p>
<p>Indicator 8:</p> <p>Does the Gender Assessment analyze the current state of gender dynamics in the project- or program-affected area?</p>	<p>FP024 -- All: Conducted a literature review, consultations, field visits, and focus group discussions; gives a strong overview of women’s relationship to climate change and agriculture</p> <p>FP061 -- All: Conducted a literature review, consultations, and field visits and gives a strong overview of women’s relationship to climate change</p> <p>FP082 -- All: Gives an extensive background on gender dynamics in China and Shandong province</p> <p>FP084 -- All: Conducted a desktop literature review and stakeholder consultations, incorporates some intersectional framing</p> <p>FP094 -- All: Conducted a desktop literature review and stakeholder consultations, includes a detailed analysis of women’s relationship to water; brings a nuanced analysis of gender roles</p> <p>FP109 -- All: Used primary data collection through site visits, focus groups, and consultation workshops and acknowledges that LGBTQ people face discrimination</p>	<p>FP028 -- All: Conducted a literature review to inform the Gender Assessment but did not complete any original research, does not provide much context on women’s relationship to climate change or the environment</p> <p>FP099 -- All: Conducted a strong literature review to inform the Gender Assessment but did not complete any original research and fails to complete robust gender assessments for each project-affected country</p> <p>FP100 -- All: Used a desktop literature review and an analysis of national gender policies but makes some patronizing comments about indigenous communities</p> <p>FP107 -- All: Conducted stakeholder consultations with potential women beneficiaries and undertook a desk review but ignores experiences of LGBTQ and indigenous women</p> <p>FP115 -- All: Conducted a brief literature and policy review but provides very little analysis of women’s relationship to climate change and agriculture</p>	<p>FP114 -- All: Conducted a literature review on Ghanaian gender roles does not provide much context on women’s relationship to climate change or the environment</p>

Indicator	Strong	Adequate	Weak
	<p>FP110 -- All: Conducted a literature review, acknowledges the existence and struggles of LGBTQ people in Ecuador</p> <p>FP112 -- All: Conducted a literature review, national and community-level consultations, site visits, school consultations, local research, and provided a strong analysis of women’s relationship to water and sanitation facilities</p> <p>FP118 -- All: Held a targeted gender workshop with “key actors” to develop the Gender Action Plan, gives a strong overview of women’s relationship to land and forests</p> <p>FP119 -- All: Provides a literature review of existing scholarship on gender in Palestine, conducts an independent survey of gender roles, and gives a strong overview of women’s relationship to water and irrigation</p> <p>FP127 -- All: Provides detailed description of and data on women’s experiences in Zimbabwe</p> <p>SAP007 -- All: Provides a strong analysis of gender dynamics in Zimbabwe, conducted gender-segregated consultations to inform the local-level gender information</p> <p>SAP008 -- All: Provides an extremely in-depth analysis of gender dynamics in Bangladesh, including women’s role in decision making, vulnerability to climate change and flooding, and social position in Bangladesh</p> <p>SAP009 -- All: Conducts a strong literature review and independent research on gender dynamics and gives a strong overview of women’s relationship to flooding and climate disasters</p> <p>SAP013 -- All: Provides a strong gender analysis of the overall state of women in Haiti; includes detailed gender background for each of the project’s components</p>	<p>FP116 -- All: Provides a brief literature review but does not conduct independent research or acknowledge the existence of LGBTQ</p> <p>FP117 -- All: Provides a literature review of existing scholarship on gender in Laos but adopts a paternalistic tone towards women at points and cites outdated studies about the benefits of microfinance</p> <p>FP120 -- All: Gives a strong analysis of specific barriers women face in accessing land, political power, and paid work but does not address these inequities in overall project design</p> <p>FP121 -- All: Gives a strong analysis of specific barriers women face in accessing land, political power, and paid work but does not account for these inequities in overall project design</p> <p>FP122 -- All: Provides an overview of gender context in all four project-affected countries by extracting excerpts from select gender policies rather than conducting original research</p> <p>FP128 -- All: Conducts an extensive literature review but fails to conduct any original data collection</p> <p>SAP010 -- All: Conducts a strong literature review on gender dynamics and the experiences of women in the Philippines but overlooks that women often carry intergenerational environmental knowledge and instead assumes that women need more climate information</p> <p>SAP011 -- All: Provides an analysis of gender dynamics in Mozambique based on a literature review and consultations but fails to include a history of Mozambican women’s experiences with microcredit or note that microcredit has repeatedly failed to help poor women around the world</p> <p>SAP012 -- All: Provides an in-depth analysis of gender dynamics in Niger but fails to include a history of Nigerien women’s experiences with microcredit or note that microcredit has repeatedly failed to help poor women around the world</p>	
<p>Indicator 9a:</p> <p>Does the project pr program predict and address potential harmful gendered impacts in overall project or program design?</p>	<p>FP109 -- All: Identifies multiple gender-risks posed by the project and proposes strong mitigation measures</p> <p>FP121 -- All: Includes gender risks and notes that a Gender Specialist will be responsible for ensuring that women and girls are protected from project risks</p>	<p>FP061 -- All: Includes a few gender-sensitive mitigation measures in the Risks Register but ignores how the project threatens to increase SGBV and poverty</p> <p>FP082 -- All: Requires a risk screening prior to project and subproject implementation but does not clarify whether it will be gender-sensitive</p> <p>FP084 -- All: Includes some gender-sensitive mitigation measures but ignores significant gender risks</p>	<p>FP024 -- All: Identifies few risks in Part G that take the needs of project-affected people into consideration, disregards how many of the risks identified have a gender dimension, includes no gender-sensitive safeguards</p> <p>FP028 -- All: Does not identify or protect against any specific gender risks in project documents and overlooks how the project could harm women entrepreneurs and perpetuate gender inequality</p>

Indicator	Strong	Adequate	Weak
		<p>FP094 -- All: Includes some gender risks but does not provide adequate safeguards, ignores SGBV risks posed by project</p> <p>FP100 -- All: Identifies some gender-sensitive safeguards in ESMF</p> <p>FP107 -- All: Identifies some activities to prevent gendered harm but overlooks the gender dimension of several project risks</p> <p>FP112 -- All: Includes some gender risks and mitigation efforts but overlooks how the project could harm women and LGBTQ people if FPIC is not obtained during project design</p> <p>FP118 -- All: Notes that the project risks excluding women, indigenous peoples, Dalits, and other marginalized groups from project activities; provides some mitigation measures but not enough</p> <p>FP120 -- All: Notes that the project poses some gender risks, attempts to account for these risks primarily through the Gender Action Plan and not through the overall project design</p> <p>FP127 -- All: Gives a detailed list of potential risks posed by the project as well as mitigation measures but does not address the economic and environmental risks posed, particularly for women, by replacing subsistence with market-based farming</p>	<p>FP099 -- All: Ignores gender in project Risk Assessment even though the Gender Assessment notes significant project-related gender risks</p> <p>FP110 -- All: Does not mention relevant gender-related risks and safeguards</p> <p>FP114 -- All: Overlooks serious gender risks, such as how the project could perpetuate gender inequality and drive women deeper into poverty</p> <p>FP115 -- All: Focuses primarily on financial risks that the project poses to the GCF and ignores all gender risks</p> <p>FP116 -- All: Does not integrate any gender-specific risks in overall risk assessment and management framework</p> <p>FP117 -- All: Does not integrate any gender-specific risks in overall risk assessment and management framework</p> <p>FP119 -- All: Does not integrate any gender-specific risks in overall risk assessment and management framework</p> <p>FP122 -- All: Overlooks how women and LGBTQ are disproportionately vulnerable to risks posed by the project</p> <p>FP128 -- All: Includes no gender-related risks or safeguards in the funding proposal and ignores how women are disproportionately at risk of being excluded from project benefits and even harmed by project activities</p> <p>SAP007 -- All: Fails to consider how the project could harm marginalized gender groups</p> <p>SAP008 -- All: Overlooks how women and LGBTQ are disproportionately vulnerable to risks posed by the project</p> <p>SAP009 -- All: Focuses entirely on risks posed by flooding rather than risks posed by the project, even though the project has the potential to exacerbate existing gender, ethnic, and class inequalities</p> <p>SAP010 -- All: Provides no mention of gender risks posed by the project or gender-sensitive safeguards to prevent them</p> <p>SAP011 -- All: Provides no mention of gender risks posed by the project or gender-sensitive safeguards to prevent against them even though the project involves microcredit which historically has harmed many poor women</p> <p>SAP012 -- All: Fails to consider or provide safeguards against the many gender risks posed by the project</p> <p>SAP013 -- All: Fails to consider or provide safeguards against the many gender risks posed by the project</p>

Indicator	Strong	Adequate	Weak
<p>Indicator 9b:</p> <p>Does the project or program predict and address potential harmful gendered impacts through concrete actions in the project- or program-specific GAP?</p>	None	<p>FP120 -- All: Includes some gender risks and safeguards</p> <p>FP121 -- All: Requires that gender-disaggregated data is included in reporting of safeguards and plans to measure the percentage of safeguard reports that include gender-disaggregated data</p> <p>FP127 -- All: Provides an extensive list of potential risks faced by the project and concrete mitigation measures but does not adequately address how poor women may be harmed by becoming market-oriented farmers</p>	<p>FP024 -- All: Includes no mention of gender risks or safeguards in the GAP</p> <p>FP028 -- All: Includes no mention of gender risks or safeguards in the GAP</p> <p>FP061 -- All: Includes no mention of gender risks or safeguards in the GAP</p> <p>FP082 -- All: Includes no mention of gender risks or safeguards in the GAP</p> <p>FP084 -- All: Includes no mention of gender risks or safeguards in the GAP</p> <p>FP094 -- All: Includes no mention of gender risks or safeguards in the GAP</p> <p>FP099 -- All: Includes no mention of gender risks or safeguards in the GAP</p> <p>FP100 -- All: Includes no mention of gender risks or safeguards in the GAP</p> <p>FP107 -- All: Includes no mention of gender risks or safeguards in the GAP</p> <p>FP109 -- All: Includes no mention of gender risks or safeguards in the GAP</p> <p>FP110 -- All: Includes no mention of gender risks or safeguards in the GAP</p> <p>FP112 -- All: Includes no mention of gender risks or safeguards in the GAP</p> <p>FP114 -- All: Includes no mention of gender risks or safeguards in the GAP</p> <p>FP115 -- All: Includes no mention of gender risks or safeguards in the GAP</p> <p>FP116 -- All: Includes no mention of gender risks or safeguards in the GAP</p> <p>FP117 -- All: Includes no mention of gender risks or safeguards in the GAP</p> <p>FP118 -- All: Includes no mention of gender risks or safeguards in the GAP</p> <p>FP119 -- All: Includes no mention of gender risks or safeguards in the GAP</p> <p>FP122 -- All: Includes no mention of gender risks or safeguards in the GAP</p> <p>FP128 -- All: Includes no mention of gender risks or safeguards in the GAP</p> <p>SAP007 -- All: Includes no mention of gender risks or safeguards in the GAP</p> <p>SAP008 -- All: Includes no mention of gender risks or safeguards in the GAP</p>

Indicator	Strong	Adequate	Weak
			<p>SAP009 -- All: Includes no mention of gender risks or safeguards in the GAP</p> <p>SAP010 -- All: Includes no mention of gender risks or safeguards in the GAP</p> <p>SAP011 -- All: Includes no mention of project risks in GAP whatsoever</p> <p>SAP012 -- All: Includes no mention of gender risks or safeguards in the GAP</p> <p>SAP013 -- All: Includes no mention of gender risks or safeguards in the GAP</p>
<p>Indicator 10:</p> <p>Does the project or program take into account potential impacts on the gender division of labor?</p>	<p>SAP007 -- All: Explains that the project attempts to overcome some of the disparities created by the gender division of labor by “actively promoting women in leadership positions” and “enhancing their leadership skills through relevant trainings”</p> <p>SAP008 -- All: Acknowledges the gender division of labor, prioritizes women-headed households in beneficiary selection to challenge gender division of labor, and includes multiple means to increase women’s leadership</p>	<p>FP024 -- All: Recognizes gender division of labor but does not explore how the project may impact women’s reproductive labor responsibilities</p> <p>FP082 -- All: Recognizes gender division of labor but does not explore how the project may impact women’s reproductive labor responsibilities</p> <p>FP084 -- All: Recognizes gender division of labor but fails to create safeguards to prevent increasing women’s domestic labor</p> <p>FP094 -- All: Recognizes gender division of labor but does not explore how the project may impact women’s reproductive labor responsibilities</p> <p>FP099 -- All: Notes in the Gender Assessment that while the project has the opportunity to reduce women’s domestic labor workloads but does not integrate this insight into project design</p> <p>FP100 -- All: Acknowledges how the project could impact women’s domestic labor burden but fails to include any safeguards</p> <p>FP107 -- All: Provides a detailed description of the gender division of labor in agriculture but fails to create safeguards to prevent increasing this labor</p> <p>FP109 -- All: Provides a detailed description of the gender division of labor in agriculture but fails to create safeguards to prevent increasing this labor</p> <p>FP110 -- All: Recognizes gender division of labor and plans to promote the equal participation of women in management but fails to include any safeguards against increased domestic labor</p> <p>FP112 -- All: Recognizes the impact of climate change on women’s domestic labor burden but does not explore how the project may impact their reproductive labor responsibilities</p>	<p>FP028 -- All: Has somewhat contradictory descriptions of the gender division of labor, never acknowledges women’s unpaid reproductive care burden or how the project may impact this burden</p> <p>FP061 -- All: Notes that even though the project will increase women’s paid workload, they will still be responsible to “fit in” their domestic labor responsibilities</p> <p>FP115 -- All: Does not acknowledge that women are disproportionately responsible for reproductive activities and assumes that women do not participate in the formal sector due to lack of confidence and knowledge, rather than their reproductive labor burdens</p> <p>FP119 -- All: Overlooks women’s role in collecting water for domestic activities; does not consider how the project could impact the gender division of labor</p>

Indicator	Strong	Adequate	Weak
		<p>FP114 -- All: Acknowledges the gender division of labor but does not explore potential project impacts on this</p> <p>FP116 -- All: Acknowledges the gender division of labor does not consider how the project may exacerbate the gender division of labor or increase women's workloads</p> <p>FP117 -- All: Acknowledges the gender division of labor does not consider how the project may exacerbate the gender division of labor or increase women's workloads</p> <p>FP118 -- All: Includes mitigation measures to ensure that women and other marginalized groups are not harmed by the project but does not include specific measures to prevent negative impacts on the gender division of labor</p> <p>FP120 -- All: Acknowledges the gender division of labor does not consider how the project may exacerbate the gender division of labor or increase women's workloads</p> <p>FP121 -- All: Acknowledges the gender division of labor does not consider how the project may exacerbate the gender division of labor or increase women's workloads</p> <p>FP122 -- All: Acknowledges the gender division of labor does not consider how the project may exacerbate the gender division of labor or increase women's workloads</p> <p>FP127 -- All: Notes that the project may face challenges in engaging women farmers due to the gender division of labor and attempts to account for this barrier but does not acknowledge how marketizing women's subsistence farms may push some women deeper into poverty</p> <p>FP128 -- All: Acknowledges the gender division of labor does not consider how the project may exacerbate the gender division of labor or increase women's workloads</p> <p>SAP009 -- All: Acknowledges some but not all aspects of gender division of labor, does not consider how the project may impact the division of labor</p> <p>SAP010 -- All: Acknowledges the gender division of labor and plans to assess unpaid domestic work in the project area but does not consider how the project may worsen the division of labor</p> <p>SAP011 -- All: Acknowledges the gender division of labor does not attempt to challenge the division of labor</p> <p>SAP012 -- All: Acknowledges some but not all aspects of gender division of labor, does not consider how the project may impact the division of labor</p> <p>SAP013 -- All: Notes multiple times that women are disproportionately responsible for domestic work and that electrification could reduce this burden but does not acknowledge how further privatization of energy could increase costs for poor women and even exacerbate the gender division of labor</p>	

Indicator	Strong	Adequate	Weak
<p>Indicator 11:</p> <p>Does the GAP include activities that are assigned to responsible entities, include a timeline, cover the project or program period, and have adequate funding?</p>	<p>FP082 -- All: Extends staffing of gender positions throughout project implementation, requires annual gender results reporting, assigns responsible entities</p> <p>FP110 -- All: Includes a timeframe for each GAP output, allocates funding, assigns responsible entities</p> <p>FP112 -- All: Includes a timeframe for each GAP output, allocates funding, assigns responsible entities</p> <p>FP117 -- All: Includes a timeframe for each GAP output, allocates strong funding</p> <p>FP118 00 All: Includes an implementation budget, monitoring and evaluation budget, and timeline for all gender outputs</p> <p>FP119 -- All: Includes an implementation budget, monitoring and evaluation budget, and timeline for all gender outputs</p>	<p>FP028 -- All: Includes a clear timeframe for each GAP activity, assigns a variety of responsible entities to each sub-output, and provides clear targets but sets no GAP budget and identifies very few GAP activities that will directly impact project-affected women</p> <p>FP061 -- All: All: Includes a clear timeframe for each GAP activity, assigns a variety of responsible entities to each sub-output but fails to provide targets for many GAP sub-outputs</p> <p>FP084 -- All: Allocates funding and assigns responsible entities to each sub-output but includes vague timeframes</p> <p>FP094 -- All: Assigns timeframe and funding to each GAP sub-output but only assigns responsible entities to overall outputs, preventing a more complete analysis of division of labor</p>	<p>FP024 -- All: Includes weak timeframes for GAP outputs, does not confirm responsible entities to each sub-output, provides no budget for the GAP</p> <p>FP099 -- All: Includes weak timeframes for GAP outputs, does not confirm responsible entities to each sub-output, provides no budget for the GAP</p> <p>FP100 -- All: Assigns the same two entities to nearly every activity, provides no budget or timeframe</p> <p>FP107 -- All: Includes a budget for each GAP activity but provides no time frame and assigns the same three responsible entities to every activity</p> <p>FP109 -- All: Provides no time frame or budget for GAP activities and does not assign responsible entities for any of the GAP activities</p>
	<p>FP127 -- All: Integrates gender-specific targets throughout the project cycle and in each project component</p> <p>SAP007 -- All: Includes an implementation budget and timeline for all gender outputs, requires that at least 50% of the funds go to women</p> <p>SAP008 -- All: Sets strong, gender-disaggregated targets for each project activity, sets budgets for all activities</p> <p>SAP009 -- All: Includes a detailed budget, responsible entities, and timeline for all GAP activities</p> <p>SAP012 -- All: Includes a detailed budget, responsible entities, and timeline for all GAP activities</p> <p>SAP013 -- All: Integrates strong, gender-specific targets throughout the project cycle and in each project component</p>	<p>FP114 -- All: Provides clear targets for every GAP activity and assigns responsible entities but provides vague timelines and funding allocations</p> <p>FP115 -- All: Includes a timeframe, responsible entity, targets, and outcomes for each GAP activity but sets a very low budget and assigns the same responsible entity to every activity</p> <p>FP116 -- All: Includes a timeframe and budget for each GAP activity but does not indicate that any activity needs to be completed until Project year 7</p> <p>FP120 -- All: Includes a timeframe and budget for each GAP activity but includes few indicators that will directly benefit women</p> <p>FP121 -- All: Sets targets for all GAP activities but designs majority of them around “gender trainings” which occur near the beginning of the project cycle</p> <p>SAP011 -- All: Allocates funding amounts to each GAP objective but fails to breakdown the allocations and only provides vague timelines</p>	<p>FP122 -- All: Sets a very weak timeline and provides no budget for the GAP whatsoever</p> <p>FP128 -- All: Sets no budget for GAP, sets weak indicators, includes no baseline data</p> <p>SAP010 -- All: Fails to provide a budget for any of the GAP outputs or sub-outputs, sets poor indicators and timelines</p>

Indicator	Strong	Adequate	Weak
<p>Indicator 12:</p> <p>Does the project or program create safeguards to prevent potential harms and gender-sensitive risk assessment and monitoring frameworks?</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>FP082 -- F: Requires that subprojects integrate a gender analysis, sets the trigger for Involuntary Resettlement safeguards at 200 affected people which could disproportionately harm women</p> <p>FP084 -- F: Acknowledges some gender risks and includes mitigation measures but overlooks potential SGBV risks</p> <p>FP094 -- G: Includes a list of actions to ensure women are included in project but does not mention any gender risks</p> <p>FP109 -- G: Identifies some gender risks and mitigation measures but overlooks other major risks</p> <p>FP110 -- F: Notes that the UNDP completed several studies on gender in the project area but includes no safeguards to prevent potential gender harms</p> <p>FP112 -- F: Notes one potential gender risk and provides strong mitigation measures</p> <p>FP118 -- F, G: Notes that the project risks excluding women and other marginalized groups and includes mediocre mitigation measures</p> <p>FP119 -- F: Describes an in-depth, gender-inclusive consultation process but does not mention any gender risks posed by the project</p> <p>FP127 -- G: Identifies some gender risks but does not adequately acknowledge the economic and environmental risks, particularly for women, posed by replacing subsistence with market-based farming</p> <p>SAP009 -- Annex 7: Includes some safeguards to prevent exclusion of women but overlooks gender dimensions of other project risks</p>	<p>FP024 -- F: Does not explain whether the project will aim to ensure a gender-equal distribution of roles in production and notes that the project will not challenge gender roles whatsoever</p> <p>FP028 -- F: Does not identify or protect against any specific gender risks and ignores how loans could drive women entrepreneurs deeper into poverty</p> <p>FP061 -- F: Notes that “no adverse Environmental, Social and Gender impacts are expected” but later contradicts this statement and overlooks many potential gender harms</p> <p>FP099 -- F: Describes no gender safeguards and ignores how the project could deepen gender inequities in energy access by further privatizing energy in project-affected countries</p> <p>FP100 -- F: Fails to include any mention of gender in project risks or mitigation measures</p> <p>FP107 -- G: Makes no acknowledgment of gender risks posed by the project whatsoever</p> <p>FP114 -- F: Overlooks significant gender risks and potential mitigation measures</p> <p>FP115 -- F: Ignores how the project threatens to worsen gender inequality by directly benefiting a population that is 59% men and ignores how microloans can often harm poor women</p> <p>FP116 -- G: Overlooks significant gender risks and potential mitigation measures</p> <p>FP117 -- F: Does not integrate any gender-specific risks in overall risk assessment and management framework</p> <p>FP120 -- E: Ignores how the risk of social violence posed by the project would disproportionately harm women and other gender minorities</p> <p>FP121 -- E: Overlooks significant gender risks and potential mitigation measures</p> <p>FP122 -- F: Fails to note or provide safeguards against project risks that disproportionately harm women and LGBTQ people</p> <p>FP128 -- F: Includes no gender-related safeguards in the funding proposal</p> <p>SAP007 -- Annex 7: Includes no gender-related safeguards in the funding proposal</p> <p>SAP008 -- Annex 7: Ignores how women would be disproportionately harmed by water pollution, acknowledges that the project risks gender discrimination but does not provide adequate mitigation measures</p> <p>SAP010 -- Annex 7: Includes no gender-related safeguards in the funding proposal</p>

Indicator	Strong	Adequate	Weak
<p>Indicator 13</p> <p>Does the project or program apply free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) and give project- or program-affected persons the right to accept or refuse?</p>	<p>FP110 -- All: Provides clear, gender-sensitive processes for obtaining consent from project-affected people and included a women's organization in designing the FPIC process</p> <p>FP117 -- All: Requires that the project obtain free, prior, and informed consent from all project-affected people, makes many gender-sensitive accommodations to FPIC process</p> <p>FP118 -- All: Provides a detailed and gender-sensitive description of project FPIC process</p>	<p>FP061 -- All: Implies but does not directly state that project-affected people will be able to accept or refuse the project; provides no gender-sensitive accommodations</p> <p>FP100 -- All: Implies that project consultations will provide project-affected people with the chance to accept or refuse the project but does not confirm</p> <p>FP109 -- All: Includes a section with guidelines on how an FPIC process should be conducted but does not clarify whether the project will actually implement this process</p> <p>FP115 -- All: Promises in the ESMF that the process of obtaining consent will be "culturally appropriate," "inclusive and gender-sensitive" and "free of coercion" but provides no further details</p> <p>FP120 -- All: Focuses need for consent primarily on indigenous peoples and makes no mention of the need to obtain consent from women or LGBTQ people</p> <p>FP121 -- All: Focuses need for consent primarily of indigenous peoples and makes no mention of the need to obtain consent from women or LGBTQ people</p> <p>SAP007 -- All: Plans to conduct extensive consultations, including gender-segregated consultation, but does not mention consent explicitly</p>	<p>FP024 -- All: Makes no direct mention of consent in publicly available project documents</p> <p>FP028 -- All: Mentions consent just once and does not indicate that project-affected people will have the opportunity to accept or refuse the project</p> <p>FP061 -- All: Mentions consent but does not clarify the FPIC process or whether it will be gender-sensitive</p> <p>FP082 -- All: Never mentions the need to obtain explicit consent or refusal from project-affected persons</p> <p>FP084 -- All: Makes no mention of consent in publicly available project documents</p> <p>FP094 -- All: Indicates that the project will seek FPIC but does not clarify how this process will occur</p> <p>FP099 -- All: Barely mentions consent in project documents and provides no clear process for obtaining consent from project-affected people</p> <p>FP107 -- All: Explains that the project will only undertake activities on private land after receiving "full consent" of landowners but fails to describe this process</p> <p>FP112 -- All: Does not indicate that the project will seek consent from project-affected people</p> <p>FP114 -- All: Does not indicate that the project will provide project-affected people with the opportunity to accept or refuse the project</p> <p>FP116 -- All: Does not require that the project obtain free, prior, and informed consent from all project-affected persons</p> <p>FP119 -- All: Does not require that the project obtain free, prior, and informed consent from all project-affected persons</p> <p>FP122: Makes no mention of need for consent from project-affected people</p> <p>FP127 -- All: Makes no direct mention of consent in publicly available project documents</p> <p>FP128 -- All: Does not indicate that the project will obtain consent from non-indigenous people, including non-indigenous women</p> <p>SAP013 -- All: Makes no mention of consent in publicly available project documents</p> <p>SAP008 -- All: Does not require that the project obtain free, prior, and informed consent from all project-affected persons</p>

Indicator	Strong	Adequate	Weak
			<p>SAP009 -- All: Includes no mention of consent in any project documents whatsoever</p> <p>SAP010 -- All: Includes no mention of consent in any project documents whatsoever</p> <p>SAP011 -- All: Includes no mention of consent in any project documents whatsoever</p> <p>SAP012 -- All: Includes no mention of consent in any project documents whatsoever</p> <p>SAP013 -- All: Includes no mention of consent in any project documents whatsoever</p>
<p>Indicator 14:</p> <p>Is there a project- or program-level, gender-responsive redress mechanism?</p>	<p>FP117 -- C: Integrates gender-sensitive provisions throughout design of GRM and assigns Laos Women’s Union to assist with raising awareness about the GRM</p> <p>FP118 -- C, ESMF: Integrates many gender-sensitive provisions throughout design of GRM</p> <p>FP121 -- B, ESMF: Requires that the Gender Specialist design project-level, gender-responsive grievance redress procedures that are overseen by an independent office</p>	<p>FP061 -- C, ESMF: Never clarifies if there will be a project-level GRM but indicates the project will make gender-sensitive accommodations to whatever complaints mechanism is available</p> <p>FP084 -- C, ESMF: Describes a GRM, allows complaints to be submitted orally, plans to “raise awareness about the GRM through publicity campaigns”</p> <p>FP094 -- C, ESMF: Describes a GRM and makes some gender accommodations</p> <p>FP100 -- C: Plans to have a GRM and makes some gender accommodations, plans to address “power relations between stakeholders and grievance officers” but does not elaborate</p> <p>FP107 -- C, ESMF: Describes a GRM and makes some gender accommodations such as oral complaint submission</p> <p>FP109 -- C, ESMF: Describes a GRM and creates some gender accommodations, including gender training for the Safeguards Manager</p> <p>FP110 -- C, ESMF: Does not have a project-level GRM but plans to consider developing a gender-sensitive one in the future</p> <p>FP112 -- C, ESMF: Plans to create a GRM with some gender accommodations</p> <p>FP116 -- C, ESMF: Plans to have a GRM and creates some gender accommodation</p> <p>FP119 -- B, ESMF: Provides a detailed description of the GRM, makes some gender accommodations</p> <p>FP127 -- B, ESMF: Integrates some gender-sensitive provisions in design of GRM but does not include any specific mention of women or their accommodation needs</p> <p>FP128 -- C: Requires that all projects develop a GRM and requires some gender-sensitive accommodations</p> <p>SAP008 -- B, ESMF: Describes the GRM, includes a few gender accommodations</p>	<p>FP024 -- C, ESMF: Explains that the Accredited Entity has a GRM but provides no project-level GRM or gender accommodations</p> <p>FP028 -- C, ESMG: Does not mention a grievance redress mechanism in any project documents</p> <p>FP082 -- C, ESMF: Outlines the GRM but includes no mention of gender in its description</p> <p>FP099 -- C: Notes multiple times in the founding proposal that the project includes a gender-responsive, project-level GRM but fails to provide working links to the ESMR, which contains a more detailed description of the GRM</p> <p>FP114 -- C, ESMF: Only provides suggestions for what the GRM should include rather than a concrete description</p> <p>FP115 -- C, ESMF: Does not indicate that a project-level GRM will be created</p> <p>FP120 -- B, ESMF: Does not create a project-level GRM</p> <p>FP122 -- C: Does not describe a redress mechanism in publicly available documents</p> <p>SAP007 B: Fails to include a grievance redress mechanism in project design</p> <p>SAP009 -- B, ESMF: Makes no mention of a grievance redress mechanism</p> <p>SAP010 -- B, ESMF: Does not plan to create a project-level GRM, and instead relies on LANDMARKBANK’s customer complaint process</p> <p>SAP011 -- B: Fails to mention a grievance redress mechanism in the funding proposal</p> <p>SAP012 -- B: Fails to mention a grievance redress mechanism in the funding proposal</p> <p>SAP013 -- B: Does not describe a redress mechanism in publicly available documents</p>

Indicator	Strong	Adequate	Weak
<p>Indicator 15:</p> <p>Does the project or program provide compensation in case of harm that disproportionately impacts women and other marginalized gender groups, such as indebtedness, SGBV, and displacement?</p>	<p>FP118 -- C: Provides a lengthy, gender-sensitive description of mitigation measures to prevent changes in land use that harm vulnerable populations</p>	<p>FP084 -- C: Does not indicate that the project will cause resettlement and will provide compensation if anyone's access to resources is affected; makes no gender accommodations</p> <p>FP094 -- C, F: Does not plan to cause resettlement but explains that if any resettlement did occur, the project must provide culturally-sensitive compensation</p> <p>FP107 -- C: Does not plan to cause resettlement but notes that "no compensation will be paid to any land holder" under any circumstances</p> <p>FP109 -- C, F: Explains that the project does not anticipate any resettlement but that if any does occur, the project will provide fair compensation</p> <p>FP110: Explains that the project does not expect to cause involuntary resettlement but risks causing some economic displacement which will trigger compensation</p> <p>FP114 -- C: Notes the project may result in physical or economic displacement and includes some gender-sensitive accommodations in the Resettlement Policy Framework</p> <p>FP115 -- C, F, ESMF: Explains that the project does not expect to cause resettlement but mentions that compensation for harm may be given on a case by case basis</p> <p>FP117 -- C, F: Explains that the project may result in involuntary resettlement but does not anticipate this outcome, promises compensation will be gender-sensitive but does not elaborate</p> <p>FP119 -- C, F: Notes that the project will result in "isolated cases of expropriation," creates some but not enough gender accommodations for the compensation process</p> <p>FP120 00 C, F: Explains that this project triggered the GCF policy for Protection of Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage and will produce a report in the next year that outlines potential harms and compensation options, although the project does not expect to cause involuntary resettlement</p> <p>FP121 -- C: Notes that involuntary resettlement is not expected but compensation will be provided if it does occur, makes no gender accommodations</p> <p>SAP008 -- C: Does not indicate that the project will cause resettlement, outlines other gender risks and includes mitigation measures but does not include compensation or other forms of redress</p>	<p>FP024-- C: Does not indicate that the project will cause involuntary economic or physical resettlement but fails to mention compensation in case of harm that disproportionately impacts women and other marginalized gender groups</p> <p>FP028 -- C, ESMF: Does not indicate that the project will cause involuntary economic or physical resettlement but fails to mention compensation in case of harm that disproportionately impacts women and other marginalized gender groups</p> <p>FP061 -- C, F: Indicates that some "squatters" may be displaced, does not indicate that any compensation in case of resettlement will be gender-sensitive</p> <p>FP082 -- C: Indicates that safeguards, such as compensation for resettlement, must only be implemented when resettlement causes displacement of 200 people</p> <p>FP099 -- C: Fails to mention compensation in case of harm that disproportionately impacts women and other marginalized gender groups</p> <p>FP100 -- C, F, ESMF: Notes that the project could involve physical and economic displacement but provides no compensation plan</p> <p>FP112 -- C, F: Explains that the project will take place primarily on privately owned land where "land use agreements have been put in place" so there is no need for compensation but never elaborates, suggests the project will cause some displacement but provides no compensation guidelines</p> <p>FP116 -- C: Does not indicate that the project will cause involuntary economic or physical resettlement but fails to mention compensation in case of harm that disproportionately impacts women and other marginalized gender groups</p> <p>FP122 -- C, ESMF: Includes no mention of compensation for harmed people, provides no gender-sensitive safeguards</p> <p>FP128 -- C, ESMS: Describes the framework for compensation but does not make any gender-accommodations</p> <p>FP129 -- C, F: Makes no mention of compensation for those harmed by project</p> <p>SAP007 -- C, F: Explains that the project will offer small-holder farmers with agricultural microinsurance for a fee, ignoring how this may prevent especially poor farmers (such as women) from accessing the insurance</p>

Indicator	Strong	Adequate	Weak
			<p>SAP009 -- C, F: Makes no mention of compensation in case of harm that disproportionately impacts women and other marginalized gender groups</p> <p>SAP010 -- C: Makes no mention of compensation in case of harm that disproportionately impacts women and other marginalized gender groups</p> <p>SAP011 -- C: Makes no mention of compensation in case of harm that disproportionately impacts women and other marginalized gender groups</p> <p>SAP012 -- C: Makes no mention of gender-sensitive mitigation measures or compensation in case of harm that disproportionately impacts women and other marginalized gender groups</p> <p>SAP013 -- C: Does not describe project safeguards in project documents</p>

Indicator	Strong	Adequate	Weak
<p>Indicator 16a:</p> <p>Does the project or program include women's groups and national gender machineries in project or program planning?</p>	<p>FP107 -- All: Included National Commission of Women and Children and the gender focal points of the Gross National Happiness Commission as well as many women's organizations in project consultations</p>	<p>FP028 -- All: Notes that the project will engage women's economic empowerment NGOs but does not indicate that any national gender machineries will be involved in project planning</p> <p>FP061 -- All: Does not confirm that national gender machineries will be involved in project planning, includes women's organizations in the Steering Committee which may assist planning</p> <p>FP082 -- All: Does not confirm that national gender machineries will be involved in project planning but includes local women's federations</p> <p>FP084 -- All: Included women's organizations in project consultations but does not confirm that national gender machineries will be involved in project planning</p> <p>FP094 -- All: Explains that the project conducted consultations with women's organizations but does not include national gender machinery</p> <p>FP110 -- All: Explains that the project conducted consultations with women's organizations but does not include national gender machinery</p> <p>FP112 -- All: Included Women's United Together Marshall Islands in project and GAP consultations, does not confirm any national gender machineries were involved in planning</p> <p>FP114 -- All: Consulted with the Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Protection as well as Ghana Association of Women Entrepreneurs during project design but no other women's groups</p> <p>FP116 -- All: Notes that consultations included representatives from women's councils but does not include national gender machinery</p> <p>FP117 -- All: Consulted with Lao Women's Union (LWU) multiple times but does not include women's groups or national gender machineries outside of the LWU</p> <p>FP118 -- All: Notes that women's organizations, including indigenous women's organizations, participated in project consultation meetings but does not include national gender machineries</p> <p>FP120 -- All: Notes that women's organizations were included in stakeholder consultations, lists "Government Sector" as a participant for the stakeholder consultations and workshops but does not clarify which aspects of the government sector were included</p>	<p>FP024 -- All: Makes no mention of involvement of women's groups or national gender machinery in project stakeholder engagement</p> <p>FP099 -- All: Makes no mention of involvement of women's groups or national gender machinery in project stakeholder engagement</p> <p>FP100 -- All: Acknowledges the importance of women's organizations but does not indicate that they will be included in project planning; does not include national gender machineries in planning</p> <p>FP109 -- All: Makes no mention of involvement of women's groups or national gender machinery in project planning</p> <p>FP115 -- All: Makes no mention of involvement of women's groups or national gender machinery in project planning</p> <p>FP119 -- All: Does not indicate that women's groups or national gender machinery will be involved in project planning</p> <p>FP122 -- All: Requires that NGO applicants provide information on how they ensure that relevant institutions, groups, and local communities are involved in planning and implementation but does not specify whether these include women's groups; does not mention national gender machinery</p> <p>SAP010 -- All: Makes no mention of involvement of women's groups or national gender machinery in project stakeholder engagement</p> <p>SAP011 -- All: Notes that "local and national women's organizations will be involved as key stakeholders" and that the project will "partner with women's rights and gender equality organization" in the Gender Assessment but makes no other mention of their involvement in any other project documents; does not mention national gender machineries</p> <p>SAP012 -- All: Notes that "consultations were held with potential beneficiaries," which may include women's organizations but does not confirm; does not mention national gender machineries</p> <p>SAP013 -- All: Does not confirm that women's organizations or national gender machinery were involved in stakeholder consultations</p>

Indicator	Strong	Adequate	Weak
		<p>FP121 -- All: Explains that consultations included women's groups but not national gender machinery</p> <p>FP127 -- All: Indicates that "National Gender Machineries" were included in consultation for the GAP but does not indicate these machineries were included in broader project consultation</p> <p>FP128 -- All: Explains in the ESS sub-project report for Paraguay that one consultation meeting included representatives from a "women's committee" but does not indicate that inclusion of women's groups will be required across all sub-projects</p> <p>SAP007 -- All: Included the Ministry of Women Affairs in consultations but not women's groups</p> <p>SAP008 -- All: Indicates that women's groups may be included in consultations, does not mention national gender machinery</p> <p>SAP009 -- All: Explains that representatives from the National Women's Union will provide advisory support during project planning but does not include women's groups</p>	
<p>Indicator 16b:</p> <p>Does the project or program include women's groups and national gender machineries in project or program implementation?</p>	None	<p>FP028 -- All: Assigns women's economic empowerment NGOs to oversee various GAP activities but does not indicate that any national gender machineries will be involved in project implementation</p> <p>FP061 -- All: Does not confirm that national gender machineries will be involved in implementation, includes women's organizations in the Steering Committee which may assist implementation</p> <p>FP082 -- All: Does not confirm that national gender machineries will be involved in implementation but includes local women's federations</p> <p>FP084 -- All: Includes women's organizations in implementation of multiple project components but does not include national gender machineries</p> <p>FP094 -- All: Plans to include women's organizations in implementation but does not clarify the National Commission for Gender's role in implementation</p> <p>FP100 -- All: Sets GAP target for hiring one representative from a women's organization for project implementation, does not include any national gender machineries in implementation</p> <p>FP110 -- All: Plans to include women's organizations in project implementation but does not include national gender machinery</p> <p>FP112 -- All: Plans to include women's organizations in implementation but does not indicate that any national gender machineries will be included</p>	<p>FP024 -- All: Does not indicate that any national gender machineries or women's organizations will be included in project implementation</p> <p>FP099 -- All: Does not indicate that any national gender machineries or women's organizations will be included in project implementation</p> <p>FP107 -- All: Does not indicate that any national gender machineries or women's organizations will be included in project implementation</p> <p>FP109 -- All: Makes no mention of involvement of women's groups or national gender machinery in project implementation</p> <p>FP115 -- All: Makes no mention of involvement of women's groups or national gender machinery in project implementation</p> <p>FP116 -- All: Does not indicate that any national gender machineries will be included in project implementation and weak description of women's organizations' involvement in project prevents full evaluation</p> <p>FP121 -- All: Requires that the project strengthen women's groups' access to formal credit systems but ignores how these can be harmful; makes no mention of national gender machinery</p> <p>FP128 -- All: Does not indicate that any national gender machineries or women's organizations will be included in project implementation</p>

Indicator	Strong	Adequate	Weak
		<p>FP114 -- All: Assigns the Directorate for Women in Agricultural Development to oversee a project component, plans to include women-led farmer-based associations as primary beneficiaries and Executing Entities but sets a weak definition for women-led farmer-based associations</p> <p>FP117 -- All: Plans to continue to include Lao Women's Union in multiple aspects of project implementation but does not indicate that any women's groups will be included</p> <p>FP118 -- All: Plans to include women's organizations in implementation but does not indicate that any national gender machineries will be included</p> <p>FP119 -- All: Includes women's organizations in implementation; indicates that Ministry of Women's Affairs will be included in a small portion of project implementation</p> <p>FP120 -- All: Explains that the PMU will consult with Chile's National Forestry Corporation Unit for Gender Equality for gender-related activities throughout project implementation but does not include women's groups</p> <p>FP122 -- All: Plans to form women's self-help groups which will be involved in project implementation but does not include national gender machinery</p> <p>FP127 -- All: Mentions that the Ministry of Women Affairs will be responsible for some project components; plans to work with some women's groups</p> <p>SAP008 -- All: Notes that a representative from the Ministry of Women and Children Affairs will be included in project workshops; does not include women's groups in implementation</p> <p>SAP009 -- All: Assigns local chapters of the National Women's Union to implement various project activities but makes no mention of involvement of women's groups</p> <p>SAP012 -- All: Involves women's groups in implementation of multiple project components; does not include national gender machinery in implementation</p>	<p>SAP007 -- All: Does not indicate that any national gender machineries or women's organizations will be included in project implementation</p> <p>SAP010 -- All: Makes no mention of involvement of women's groups or national gender machinery in project implementation</p> <p>SAP011 -- All: Does not indicate that any national gender machineries or women's organizations will be included in project implementation</p> <p>SAP013 -- All: Does not indicate that any national gender machineries or women's organizations will be included in project implementation</p>
<p>Indicator 17a:</p> <p>Does the Project/ Program Management Unit (PMU) include local gender experts?</p>	<p>FP082 -- C, GAP: Recommends that two gender/social development specialists (one domestic specialist contracted for 22 months, one international specialist for 5 months) be hired to implement the GAP</p> <p>FP112 -- C, GAP: Notes that the Project Management Unit (PMU) includes a Gender and Youth Specialist and that UNDP gender experts assisted in project design</p>	<p>FP061 -- C, GAP: Explains that the Project Management Unit will include a Gender Expert but does not set a budget for this position, specify the gender of the Gender Expert, or note whether they will be hired from within the target countries</p> <p>FP100 -- C, GAP: Sets "hire gender expert" as an action in GAP but fail to include a budget for this position, mention the position in the funding proposal, or explain whether the expert will be in the PMU</p>	<p>FP024 -- C, GAP: Notes that the project PMU will include an "Environmental and Social Safeguard Expert" but does not clarify whether they will have a gender background</p> <p>FP028 -- C, GAP: Does not indicate that the Project Management Unit will include a gender expert</p> <p>FP084 -- C, GAP: Does not indicate that any gender experts will be included in the Project Management Unit</p>

Indicator	Strong	Adequate	Weak
	<p>FP121 -- C, GAP: Includes a local Gender Specialist on GAP and assigns funding to position</p> <p>SAP009 -- C, GAP: Explains that a Gender Officer will be part of the Project Management Unit.</p>	<p>FP107 -- C, GAP: Plans to hire a gender expert but does not clarify if they will be from Bhutan or included in the PMU</p> <p>FP110 -- C, GAP: Plans to "create a specialized team composed of male and female experts focusing on supporting the mainstreaming of gender" but never clarifies whether the team will be included in the PMU or whether they will be hired locally</p> <p>FP112 -- C, GAP: Does not indicate that the Project Management Unit will include a gender expert but Plans to build gender expertise by providing training to at least 20 local financial institutions in Ghana on gender issues</p> <p>FP114 -- C, GAP: Does not indicate that the Project Management Unit will include a gender expert but plans to build gender expertise by providing gender training to local financial institutions and government staff</p> <p>FP116 -- C, GAP: Notes the PMU will have a gender expert but does not explain their role or if they will be local</p> <p>FP117 -- C, GAP: Includes a "safeguard, gender, and M&E specialist" in PMU who will consult with a gender specialist "if necessary" but does not elaborate</p> <p>FP118 -- C, GAP: Does not indicate that a gender expert will be in the PMU but includes gender specialists on the FAO Technical Capacity Development Team, which is a co-Executing Entity</p> <p>FP119 -- C, GAP: Includes a GAP Coordinator on the PMU but does not clarify if they are from Palestine</p> <p>FP120 -- C, GAP: Notes that the PMU will include a Safeguards Specialist but does not confirm if they will have a gender background, explains that the PMU will also consult with CONAF's Unit for Gender-equality for "gender-related work"</p> <p>FP122 -- C, GAP: Plans to hire gender consultants to assist with some project components but does not clarify if they are local</p> <p>FP127 -- C, GAP: Plans to include a part-time gender specialist in the PMU</p> <p>SAP007 -- GAP: Plans to employ a regional gender expert and a "back-up gender expert" to support the project manager "as needed"</p> <p>SAP010 -- C, GAP: Notes in the GAP that a "gender expert / consultant" will be hired but does not mention the position in the funding proposal or confirm whether they will be part of the PMU</p> <p>SAP011 -- C, GAP: Explains that a Regional Gender Advisor will oversee GAP implementation and monitoring, does not confirm whether they will be hired locally or will be part of the PMU</p>	<p>FP094 -- C, GAP: Assigns a Gender Expert to oversee nearly every GAP activity but never mentions the Gender Expert in the funding proposal</p> <p>FP099 -- C, GAP: Mentions a gender expert several times in the GAP but fails to include a timeline, target, or budget for any GAP activities and never mentions a gender expert in the funding proposal</p> <p>FP109 -- C, GAP: Plans to hire a variety of experts but fails to include a gender expert even though many GAP activities require gender expertise</p> <p>FP115 -- C, GAP: Does not indicate that any gender experts will be included in the Project Management Unit</p> <p>FP128 -- C, GAP: References a "Environmental and Social Safeguard Expert" but does not clarify this specialist's experience in gender work or whether they will be hired from within the project-affected countries</p> <p>SAP008 -- C, GAP: Encourages but does not require that local-level institutions involved with the project recruit female consultants to provide training on how to mainstream gender in addressing climate change</p>

Indicator	Strong	Adequate	Weak
		<p>SAP012 -- C, GAP: Explains that the PMU will include a gender and youth specialist as well as a Finance Manager, Environmental and Gender Specialist but does not specify if they will be hired locally</p> <p>SAP013 -- C, GAP: Explains that a NEFCO (the executing entity) gender specialist will support implementation of the GAP but does not confirm if they will be hired locally or will be part of the PMU</p>	
<p>Indicator 17b:</p> <p>Are national gender machineries involved in project or program implementation structures?</p>	<p>FP117 -- C, GAP: FP117 -- C: Includes the National REDD+ Task Force, which includes the Laos Women's Union, on the PMU and in District Nutrition Teams</p> <p>FP120 -- C, GAP: Notes that Chile's National Forestry Corporation has a Unit for Gender-equality which will help oversee implementation of gender-related activities and that the PMU will also consult with this Unit for Gender-equality for certain project activities</p>	<p>FP061 -- C, GAP: Recommends in the GAP that the project draw on expertise from the Antigua Directorate of Gender Affairs but never confirms if they will actually be involved</p> <p>FP082 -- C, GAP: Indicates that local Women's federations will be involved in GAP implementation</p> <p>FP100 -- C, GAP: Does not explicitly indicate that any national gender machinery will be included but assigns the National Designated Authority Ministry of the Environment of Brazil, which has a gender committee, to oversee the GAP</p> <p>FP107 -- C, GAP: Suggests that gender offices within national machineries will be involved in implementation structures but never explicitly explains whether they will be included as Executing Entities or on an Advisory Board</p> <p>FP114 -- C, GAP: Does not include any national gender machineries in the PMU but notes that the Directorate for Women in Agricultural Development will oversee a project component and consulted with the Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Protection during project design</p> <p>FP119 -- C, GAP: Indicates that the project will help increase gender capacity for the Ministry of Women's Affairs but does not elaborate</p> <p>FP127 -- C, GAP: Mentions that the Ministry of Women Affairs will be one of the entities responsible for implementing certain project components</p> <p>SAP007 -- C, GAP: Explains that representatives from the Ministry of Women Affairs will participate in consultations, includes Ministry of Women Affairs in trainings but not in permanent project structures</p> <p>SAP008 -- C, GAP: Notes that a representative from the Ministry of Women and Children Affairs will be included in project workshops</p>	<p>FP024 -- C, GAP: Fails to include any national gender machinery in project implementation structures</p> <p>FP028 -- C, GAP: Does not indicate that any national gender machinery will be involved in project implementation structures</p> <p>FP084 -- C, GAP: Does not indicate that any national gender machinery will be involved in project implementation structures</p> <p>FP094 -- C, GAP: Briefly mentions the National Commission for Gender in the GAP but never clarifies their role</p> <p>FP099 -- C, GAP: Fails to include any national gender machinery in project implementation structures</p> <p>FP109 -- C, GAP: Does not indicate that any national gender machinery will be included in the project</p> <p>FP110 -- C, GAP: Does not indicate that any national gender machinery will be included in the project</p> <p>FP112 -- C, GAP: Does not include national gender machineries in project implementation structures</p> <p>FP115 -- C, GAP: Makes no mention of national gender machineries</p> <p>FP116 -- C, GAP: Makes no mention of national gender machineries</p> <p>FP118 -- C, GAP: Makes no mention of any gender machineries in project documents</p> <p>FP121 -- C, GAP: Includes no direct mention of national gender machinery or whether they will be involved in project implementation structures</p> <p>FP122 -- C, GAP: Makes no mention of any gender machineries in project documents</p> <p>FP128 -- C, GAP: Fails to include any national gender machinery in project implementation structures</p> <p>SAP009 -- C, GAP: Makes no mention of any gender machineries in project documents</p>

Indicator	Strong	Adequate	Weak
			<p>SAP010 -- C, GAP: Plans to assist government agencies in mainstreaming gender in climate resilience activities but makes no mention of involvement of national gender machineries in project implementation structures</p> <p>SAP011 -- C, GAP: Makes no mention of involvement of national gender machineries in project implementation structures</p> <p>SAP012 -- C, GAP: Makes no mention of involvement of national gender machineries in project implementation structures</p>
<p>Indicator 17c:</p> <p>Are civil society groups, particularly women’s groups, indigenous peoples and local or community groups, and gender experts involved as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards, etc?</p>	<p>FP061 -- C: Includes Gender Expert in PMU, Notes that women’s organizations will be included in the Steering Committee</p> <p>FP110 -- C: Explains that the REDD+ Mesa de Trabajo, which includes one women’s organization, will oversee the project implementation and plans to create a team of gender experts</p> <p>FP112 -- C: Includes representatives from Women’s United Together Marshall Islands on the Project Board and plans to partner with WUTMI to implement several consultations and Water Safety Plan trainings</p> <p>SAP009 -- C: Assigns National Women’s Union as a primary project partner</p>	<p>FP028 -- C: Includes Asia Foundation Women in Business Center as a responsible organization for multiple GAP activities and plans to engage women’s economic empowerment NGOs but does not indicate that a gender expert will be involved</p> <p>FP094 -- C: Includes women’s groups in multiple project components but does not indicate they will be included as Executing Entity or Advisory Board members</p> <p>FP100 -- CP: Plans to include a gender expert in project management structure but provides no budget, does not indicate that women’s groups will be involved</p> <p>FP114 -- C: Does not indicate that any gender experts will be involved as Executing Entities, identifies women-led farmer-based associations as both primary beneficiaries and Executing Entities for many project components</p> <p>FP115 -- C: Partners with seven civil society groups in project implementation but does not clarify the gender makeup of these groups or whether any of them have expertise in gender issues</p> <p>FP116 -- C: Notes that women’s collectives will be included in project components but does not indicate they will be included as an Executing Entity or Advisory Board members</p> <p>FP118 -- C: Does not indicate that women’s groups will be an Executing Entity but includes them in implementation. Includes gender specialists on the FAO Technical Capacity Development Team, which is an Executing Entity</p> <p>FP127 -- C: Plans to consult with and integrate women’s groups but does not indicate that any local gender experts will be consulted</p> <p>SAP012 -- C: Does not indicate that women’s groups will be included in the Executing Entity or Advisory Board, includes two gender experts in the PMU</p>	<p>FP024 -- C: Does not confirm whether the “Environmental and Social Safeguard Expert” will have a gender background, does not include any women’s groups in Executing Entities or Advisory Boards</p> <p>FP082 -- C: Does not include women’s groups, indigenous peoples and local/community groups, or other gender experts on project entities such as Executing Entities or Advisory Boards</p> <p>FP084 -- C: Does not indicate that women’s organizations or the Gender Specialist will be on project Executing Entities or Advisory Boards</p> <p>FP099 -- C: Indicates that the project will include a gender expert in project oversight and monitoring in the GAP but does not include a timeline, target, or budget; does not mention the inclusion of any civil society groups</p> <p>FP107 -- C: Consulted with women’s groups during project design but does not indicate they will be involved in project entities</p> <p>FP109 -- C: Does not indicate that project entities will include gender experts, national gender machinery, or women’s groups</p> <p>FP117 -- C: Does not include any women’s groups or gender experts in Executing Entities</p> <p>FP119 -- C: Makes no significant mention of women’s groups or their involvement in Executing Entities or project implementation</p> <p>FP120 -- C: Does not indicate women’s groups will be involved as Executing Entities</p> <p>FP121 -- C: Does not include women’s groups, indigenous peoples and local/community groups, or other gender experts on project entities such as Executing Entities or Advisory Boards</p> <p>FP122 -- C: Does not indicate women’s groups will be involved as Executing Entities</p> <p>FP128 -- C: Does not include women’s groups, notes that the project will have an Environmental, Social, and Governance Expert but does not clarify if they will have a gender background</p>

Indicator	Strong	Adequate	Weak
			<p>SAP007 -- C: Makes no mention of involvement of women's groups</p> <p>SAP008 -- C: Makes no mention of involvement of women's groups, indigenous peoples, or local/community groups in description of Executing Entities</p> <p>SAP010 -- C: Makes no mention of involvement of civil society groups or women's groups in project implementation structures</p> <p>SAP011 -- C: Makes no mention of involvement of civil society groups or women's groups in project implementation structures</p> <p>SAP013 -- C: Assigns a gender expert to assist with GAP implementation but does not include women's groups as Executing Entities</p>
<p>Indicator 18:</p> <p>Does the project or program make information available to all project- or program-affected persons (including in local languages)?</p>	<p>FP114 -- All: Plans to publish all project-related information and hold consultations in locally-appropriate languages and locations convenient to all project-affected people</p> <p>FP117 -- All: Plans to publish information in many languages and formats and will partner with Lao Women's Union in dissemination of project information</p> <p>FP118 -- All: Requires that project information must be communicated in a format understandable and culturally sensitive to all project-affected persons</p> <p>SAP007 -- All: Plans to hold extensive consultations, will provide material in "local languages if necessary," and will create "at least 1 channel of information intended specifically for women"</p> <p>SAP009 -- All: Plans "map out the different needs and preferred information channels of both women and men" and "design messages in plain language and images," plans to conduct gender-sensitive information campaigns</p>	<p>FP024 -- All: Plans to hold an "on-going consultation process" with women, people with disabilities, and other vulnerable groups but does not indicate that the project will provide information in multiple languages or formats</p> <p>FP028 -- All: Plans to do a variety of outreach activities targeted at women-led MSMEs to spread information about the project but does not indicate that project information will be available in multiple languages</p> <p>FP061 -- All: Plans to translate some project materials and will collect gender-disaggregated data on public awareness of the project</p> <p>FP100 -- All: Will provide translation of project information "when possible," requires that project information is distributed through a variety of formats, does not plan to target women through information distribution</p> <p>FP107 -- All: Requires translation of project information and hopes to distribute information through multiple, accessible mediums</p> <p>FP109 -- All: Recommends that the project distribute project information to vulnerable people in "the most appropriate language and medium" in the ESMF but never confirms that the project will actually do this</p> <p>FP110 -- All: Plans to disclose project information through accessible formats but does not plan to do specific outreach to marginalized gender groups</p> <p>FP112 -- All: Held inclusive consultations with stakeholders but does not confirm whether project information will be available in multiple languages or formats</p>	<p>FP082 -- All: Does not indicate that the project will take any actions to ensure marginalized gender groups have access to project information</p> <p>FP084 -- All: Does not indicate that the project will take any actions to ensure marginalized gender groups have access to project information</p> <p>FP094 -- All: Does not indicate that the project will take any actions to ensure marginalized gender groups have access to project information</p> <p>FP099 -- All: Indicates that the "Project Disclosure Package" was provided in English and in local languages in some project-affected countries but does not clarify whether this will occur in all countries or whether any other gender-sensitive accommodations will be made</p> <p>FP120 -- All: Does not describe specific actions to ensure that women can access all project information including the grievance redress mechanism</p> <p>FP122 -- All: Does not specify how project information will be made available to women and other marginalized groups</p> <p>SAP008 -- All: Does not specify how project information will be made available to women and other marginalized groups</p> <p>SAP011 -- All: Does not explain how project information will be disseminated and focuses information dissemination measures on ensuring women have better access to climate/weather information, overlooking the intergenerational environmental knowledge that women often carry</p> <p>SAP012 -- All: Does not include clear, gender-sensitive plans to disseminate project information to all project-affected people</p>

Indicator	Strong	Adequate	Weak
		<p>FP115 -- All: Explains in the ESMF that project information will be “culturally appropriate,” “inclusive and gender-sensitive,” and “disclosed in a timely manner and in an understandable format” but does not elaborate</p> <p>FP116 -- All: Promises that the project will “disclose project information in a manner that is accessible and culturally appropriate” and will pay attention to “literacy needs and gender differences in language” but does not elaborate</p> <p>FP119 -- All: Provides a detailed overview of this stakeholder engagement process which includes multiple checkpoints for the project team to provide stakeholders with project information but few gender accommodations</p> <p>FP121 -- All: Does not target women in outreach but requires that project information is given to stakeholders in a format and language understandable to the actors involved</p> <p>FP127 -- All: Does not target women in outreach but requires that project information is given to stakeholders in a format and language understandable to the actors involved</p> <p>FP128 -- All: Notes in the GAP that investee companies must address potential barriers to project information dissemination for women but sets weak targets for these GAP activities, does not indicate that project information will be distributed orally</p> <p>SAP010 -- All: Includes strong gender accommodations for dissemination of project “knowledge-products” but does not clarify whether this includes all project information</p>	<p>SAP013 -- All: Does not specify how project information will be made available to women and other marginalized groups</p>
<p>Indicator 19:</p> <p>Does the project or program collect gender-disaggregated data as part of monitoring and evaluation and include gendered indicators in the results management framework?</p>	<p>FP094 -- H: Includes several gender-related indicators in the results monitoring framework, specifies baseline data for these indicators, and sets target data at strong amounts</p> <p>FP112 -- GAP: Includes detailed gender indicators for each GAP sub-output, including baseline and target data, connects all GAP and project targets in project design</p> <p>FP114 -- GAP: Includes detailed gender indicators for each GAP sub-output, including baseline and target data, connects all GAP and project targets in project design</p> <p>FP118 -- GAP: Includes detailed gender indicators for each project component, including target proportions at high amounts</p> <p>FP127 -- GAP: Includes detailed gender indicators for each project component, including target proportions at high amounts</p>	<p>FP061 -- GAP: Includes many strong gender indicators for each GAP sub-output but fails to connect GAP and project targets in project design</p> <p>FP082 -- H: Sets many requirements for gender-disaggregated data but does not require gender equity indicators in the system that the Shandong Green Development Fund will establish to evaluate applicant projects</p> <p>FP100 -- GAP: Outlines detailed gender indicators for each GAP objective, including target data and baseline data but sets some targets at disappointing levels</p> <p>FP084 -- GAP: Includes gender indicators for GAP activities with targets but sets some targets disappointingly low</p>	<p>FP024 -- GAP: Only includes targets for some indicators, sets a weak timeline, fails to connect GAP and project targets in project design</p> <p>FP028 -- GAP: Connects GAP and project targets in project design but includes many indicators that will not directly benefit women</p> <p>FP099 -- GAP: Includes no target or baseline data for any gender indicators, provides no targets, budget, timeline, or responsible entities</p> <p>FP128 -- Includes no baseline data, sets many weak indicators and timelines for activities</p> <p>SAP010 -- GAP: Sets many GAP indicators that are not gender-sensitive, fails to include gender-disaggregated baseline and annual target data</p>

Indicator	Strong	Adequate	Weak
	<p>SAP007 -- GAP: Includes detailed gender indicators for each project component, including target proportions at high amounts</p> <p>SAP008 -- GAP: Includes detailed gender indicators for each project component, including target proportions at high amounts</p> <p>SAP011 -- GAP: Includes gender-disaggregated baseline and strong target data for each GAP target</p> <p>SAP013 -- GAP: Plans to collect gender-disaggregated baseline and monitoring data, integrates gender indicators in overall monitoring framework</p>	<p>FP107 -- H: Does not set any project outcomes in the results management framework that focus on women but mentions the inclusion of women in four targets, plans to collect gender-disaggregated data for two targets</p> <p>FP109 -- H: Plans to collect gender-disaggregated beneficiary data for evaluation of some of the project components</p> <p>FP110 -- GAP: Outlines detailed gender indicators for each GAP activity with targets and baseline data but focuses the majority of indicators on consultation participation</p> <p>FP115 -- GAP: Includes targets, timelines, responsible organizations, and budgets for each GAP activity but assigns the largest budget out of all GAP activities to the microcredit program, ignoring how microloans often harm poor women</p> <p>FP116 -- GAP: Includes gender-disaggregated baseline and target data for each component and sub-activity but does not provide indicators that allow women to access project funds</p> <p>FP117 -- GAP: Includes detailed gender indicators and targets for many project components but sets some targets at low rates and fails to include baseline data</p> <p>FP119 -- H: Includes detailed gender indicators for each project component, including baseline data and targets but sets some targets at low rates</p> <p>FP120 -- GAP: Includes detailed gender indicators for each project component, including baseline data and targets but sets some targets at low rates</p> <p>FP121 -- GAP: Includes detailed gender indicators for each project component but includes few that directly benefit women</p> <p>FP122 -- GAP: Requires subprojects collect gender-disaggregated baseline and monitoring data for some gender indicators</p> <p>SAP009 -- GAP: Sets mediocre "outputs" for each GAP component that includes an indicator, target amount, and responsible agency</p>	<p>SAP012 -- GAP: Fails to include gender-disaggregated baseline data for any GAP target and sets targets as absolute numbers rather than percentages which prevents full evaluation</p>

List of analyzed projects/programs by number, title, implementing entity and recipient country/ies

Number	Implementing Entity	Title	Recipient Country/ies
FP024	Environmental Investment Fund (EIF)	Empower to Adapt: Creating Climate-Change Resilient Livelihoods through Community-Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM)	Namibia
FP028	XacBank	MSME Business Loan Program for GHG Emission Reduction	Mongolia
FP061	Department of Environment (DOE), Antigua and Barbuda	Integrated physical adaptation and community resilience through an enhanced direct access pilot in the public, private, and civil society sectors of three Eastern Caribbean small island developing states	Antigua & Barbuda, Dominica, Grenada
FP082	Asian Development Bank (ADB)	Catalyzing Climate Finance -- Shandong Green Development Fund	China
FP084	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)	Enhancing climate resilience of India's coastal communities	India
FP094	UNDP	Ensuring climate resilient water supplies	Comoros Islands
FP099	Nederlandse Financierings-Maatschappij voor Ontwikkelings-landen (FMO)	Climate Investor One	18 countries (15 Africa; 2 Asia; 1 LAC)
FP100	UNDP	REDD-PLUS results-based payments for results achieved by Brazil in the Amazon biome in 2014 and 2015	Brazil
FP107	UNDP	Supporting Climate Resilience and Transformational Change in the Agriculture Sector	Bhutan
FP109	UNDP	Safeguarding rural communities and their physical and economic assets from climate induced disasters	Timor-Leste
FP110	UNDP	REDD-plus RBP for results period 2014	Ecuador
FP112	UNDP	Addressing Climate Vulnerability in the Water Sector (ACWA)	Marshall Islands
FP114	African Development Bank (AfDB)	Program on Affirmative Finance Action for Women in Africa (AFAWA): Financing Climate Resilient Agricultural Practices	Ghana
FP115	MUFG Bank	Espejo de Tarapacá	Chile
FP116	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)	Carbon Sequestration through Climate Investment in Forests and Rangelands	Kyrgyz Republic
FP117	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)	Implementation of the Lao PDR Emission Reductions Programme through improved governance and sustainable forest landscape management	Lao PDR
FP118	FAO	Building a Resilient Churia Region	Nepal
FP119	Agence Française de Développement (AFD)	Water Banking and Adaptation of Agriculture to Climate Change in Northern Gaza	Palestine
FP120	FAO	REDD-plus results-based payments for results period 2014-2016	Chile

Number	Implementing Entity	Title	Recipient Country/ies
FP121	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)	Recognising Paraguay's REDD+ results for the years 2015-2017	Paraguay
FP122	Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau (KfW)	Blue Action Fund (BAF): GCF Ecosystem Based Adaptation Programme	Western Indian Ocean
FP127	UNDP	Building Climate Resilience of Vulnerable Agricultural Livelihoods	Zimbabwe
FP128	MUFG Bank	Arbaro Fund – Sustainable Forestry Fund	7 countries (4 Africa; 3 Latin America and the Caribbean)
SAP007	World Food Programme (WFP)	Integrated Climate Risk Management for Food Security and Livelihoods in Zimbabwe focusing on Masvingo and Rushinga Districts	Zimbabwe
SAP008	Palli Karma-Sahayak Foundation (PKSF)	Extended Community Climate Change Project-Flood (ECCCP-Flood)	Bangladesh
SAP009	UNEP	Building resilience of urban populations with ecosystem-based solutions	Lao PDR
SAP010	Landbank of the Philippines	Multi-Hazard Impact-Based Forecasting and Early Warning System	Philippines
SAP011	WFP	Climate-resilient food security for women and men smallholders in Mozambique through integrated risk management	Mozambique
SAP012	International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)	Inclusive Green Financing for Climate Resilient and Low Emission Smallholder Agriculture	Niger
SAP013	Nordic Environment Finance Corporation (NEFCO)	Scaling Smart, Solar, Energy Access Microgrids	Haiti

ANNEX 4

Individual Project/Program Gender Analysis Reports

Analysis by Elizabeth McCullough and
Elaine Zuckerman, Gender Action



FP024

Empower to Adapt: Creating Climate-Change Resilient Livelihoods through Community-Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) in Namibia

This [GCF project](#) under the Enhanced Direct Access (EDA) pilot program is built on the strong institutional foundation of the Namibian Community-based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) network, which consists of communal conservancies and community forests in the rural communal areas of Namibia. It comprises eight Non-Government Organizations (NGOs) and the University of Namibia. These existing institutions are ideally placed to be the conduits for the implementation of local-level climate action aimed at improving land management of an area of 7,200,000 hectares. The project has the goal to empower rural communities to respond to climate change in terms of awareness, adaptive capacity and low-carbon rural development.

Assessment Grade

-  WEAK
-  ADEQUATE
-  STRONG

Main Project/Program Characteristics

- Country: Namibia
- Total value: US\$10 million
- GCF funding support: US\$10.00
- GCF financing instrument: grant
- Accredited Entity: Environmental Investment Fund (EIF)
- Direct access (DA)
- Direct implementation (DI)
- Public sector (P)
- Adaptation
- ESS risk categorization: C
- Regular approval process
- Pilot program: Enhanced Direct Access (EDA)
- Under implementation: Yes, since May 2017
- Expected completion: May 2022

FP024

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 1: To what extent is there an integration of gender equality considerations in the narrative and the technical elaboration of the overall project/program proposal document and project description? To what extent does the project undertake a gender-responsive, transparent, collaborative cost-benefit analysis and seriously consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends? Does it contain elements of an ecofeminist cost-benefit analysis? And if so which?



PART A: N/A



PART C: ADEQUATE

- Mentions gender in the description for the project activity titles "Community Based Organization (CBO) diagnostic designed and carried out in all 13 regions

to identify CBO capacity and support needs," noting that the project will "identify and evaluate potential risks relating to gender or marginalized groups needs"

- Notes in one of the project outputs that the project will "provide climate investments" to reach the poorest and most climate-vulnerable communities, such as women
- Explains that the "adoption of climate-smart rural production and landscape management investments" will achieve multiple benefits including "gender inclusion"
- Makes no other mentions of women or gender and fails to adequately integrate a gender lens into project description
- Does not undertake a gender-responsive cost-benefit analysis or consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends



INDICATOR 2: To what extent is there a specific gendered description, including provision of gender-disaggregated data (baseline and expected reach), of intended direct and indirect beneficiaries? Including targeting women and girls?



PART A: N/A



PART C: WEAK

- Notes that the project aims to directly benefit 15,000 women and men and indirectly benefit 60,000 women and men but fails to provide a more detailed gender breakdown
- Only mentions women as direct beneficiaries for one project component, noting that the

project will provide climate investments that will reach the poorest and most climate-vulnerable communities, such as women

- Does not further explain whether or how women will be targeted in any project components or how the project will ensure all women in the project affected area will benefit



INDICATOR 3: To what extent are "gender co-benefits" elaborated against the GCF Investment Criteria?



PART E: WEAK

- Includes a section titled "Environmental, social and economic co-benefits, including gender-sensitive development impact" in Part E

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Uses somewhat noncommittal language, noting that the project will “aim at ensuring equal participation by gender groups,” will “attempt to enhance the trend of increasing participation by women in CBO-level decision-making,” and “expect to result in an approximate 50/50 split between genders in terms of employment and other income-generating opportunities”
- Fails to promise that any gender minimums for project beneficiaries will be met or enforced
- Explains that the benefits for women will be “significant” as the project will improve infrastructure and provide market opportunities for local craft weavers as well as producers of “bio-trade and natural indigenous product,” who are all disproportionately women
- Assumes that because women are overrepresented in this target population, they will au-

tomatically benefit from project activities

INDICATOR 4: Is the project/program budget allocation gender-responsive? (“gender budgeting”)

- Are gender-related expenditures integrated in the overall project budget?



PART B: WEAK

- Makes no mention of women or gender in the project budget whatsoever
- Can women’s groups/local groups/grassroots women get access to project funding?



PART B AND PROJECT GAP: WEAK

- Fails to mention women’s groups or provide any opportunities for them to access project funding, although women’s organizations likely exist within the project areas and could assist the project in ensuring women benefit
- Does not clarify whether the Namibian Community-based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) network includes any women’s organizations
- Does the Gender Action Plan (GAP) have its own budget? Is it adequate/ commensurate with overall budget and intent? What is the money spent on (gender consultants? Building local capacity for gender mainstreaming?)
- Includes no budget which threatens implementation of any GAP activities whatsoever, as many GAP activities would require significant funding

INDICATOR 5: (To what extent) does the project/program acknowledge and discuss (implicitly or explicitly) an intersectional approach to gender?



WEAK

- Does not directly acknowledge how ethnicity, class or sexuality may affect women’s ability to access to project benefits
- Assumes women to be a homogenous group who will access project benefits evenly

INDICATOR 6: (To what extent) does the project/program (implicitly or explicitly) acknowledge and include people with marginalized gender and sexual identities?

FP024

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator



WEAK

- Notes in the Gender Assessment that people in Namibia are marginalized due to sexual orientation and gender identity, among other identities, but does not integrate this fact into project design
- Includes no other mention of people with marginalized gender and sexual identities in any project documents and makes no accommodations to ensure the inclusion of LGBTQ people

INDICATOR 7: To what extent does the project acknowledge and take into account potential impacts on sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) or sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment (SEAH)?



WEAK

- Notes in the GAP that the project will give “special attention to Gender Based Violence (GBV)” but provides no further details
- Provides no other mentions of SGBV or SEAH in any project documents
- Includes no acknowledgement of or protection against potential SGBV or SEAH project impacts in any project documents
- Fails to prevent increased SGBV and SEAH due to influxes of construction workers

INDICATOR 8: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis assess the needs of women and other gender groups and

current state of gender dynamics in the project-affected country/region/community prior to project inception, implementation, monitoring, and reporting?



STRONG

- Conducted a literature review, consultations, field visits, and focus group discussions to inform the Gender Assessment
- Provides an analysis of gender in Namibia, exploring topics such as women’s access to income, education, and decision-making
- Provides a description of gender policy in Namibia
- Gives a strong overview of women’s relationship to climate change and agriculture

INDICATOR 9: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender

impact analysis predict and address potential harmful gendered impacts in order to prevent them?

- With recommendations and conclusions in the overall project design



WEAK

- Does not mention gender in description of project risks but outlines the following two safeguards to prevent exclusion of women: 1) “equitable access of women and men to production means, including land, training, financing, etc., and to collective and community decisionmaking centers” and 2) “the distribution of roles and responsibilities in production between men and women”
- Identifies few risks in Part G that take the needs of project affected people into consider-

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- ation, instead focusing on risks faced by the Accredited Entity
- Disregards how many of the risks identified have a gender dimension, such as “climate change awareness raising and training events do not have appropriate stakeholders attending” which ignores how women and LGBTQ people could be underrepresented at these training events
- Includes no safeguards to prevent potential harms against marginalized gender groups
- Overlooks how the project could harm women and LGBTQ people if their consent is not obtained during project design
- With concrete actions in the project-specific gender action plan



WEAK

- Includes no mention of gender risks or safeguards in the GAP even though the project has the potential to disproportionately exclude and harm women and LGBTQ people

INDICATOR 10: To what extent does the project take into account potential impacts on the gender division of labor?



ADEQUATE

- Includes a section on the gender division of labor in the Gender Assessment that contains findings from a focus group
- Explains that women are “typically responsible for fetching water and wood and bringing it to the house” and therefore “more vulnerable in the absence of infrastructure to facilitate these activities”

- Notes that due to domestic labor responsibilities, women are less active in natural resource management which reduces their access to economic opportunities
- Provides a detailed gender breakdown of various economic sectors, highlighting how men dominate high-pay sectors
- Does not explore how the project may impact women’s reproductive labor responsibilities
- Fails to acknowledge how neglecting to target women in project activities that mitigate the impact of climate change on agriculture could lead to the long-term increase of women’s unpaid domestic labor burden

INDICATOR 11: To what extent does the project-specific gender action plan fully articulate and cover the project period (integrat-

ed activities vs “add-ons”, define clear responsibilities/ accountability and meaningful gender indicators? Inclusion of an adequate, multi-year budget?)



WEAK

- Includes a timeframe for each GAP output but marks many as “ongoing” with no further details, making monitoring of these outputs more difficult
- Assigns a variety of responsible entities to each sub-output, but marks many as acronyms (such as “EE”) without ever defining who these acronyms refer to
- Provides no budget for the GAP in the funding proposal or GAP, threatening the implementation of GAP activities

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 12: To what extent does the project create safeguards to prevent potential harms, including those that will disproportionately impact women, men, sexual and gender minorities? To what extent is there a comprehensive and project-adequate elaboration on gender in the project/program risk assessment and monitoring frameworks and arrangements?



PART F: WEAK

- Notes that women are “the primary and most active and responsive workforce” but remain “strongly marginalized in the access to production means and responsibilities”
- Plans to undertake two strategies to safeguard against the exclusion of women: 1) “equitable access of women and men to

production means, including land, training, financing, etc., and to collective and community decisionmaking centers” and 2) “the distribution of roles and responsibilities in production between men and women”

- Does not explain whether the project will aim to ensure an equal distribution of roles and responsibilities in production between men and women
- Notes troublingly that “the project has no intention of challenging frontally and immediately the age-old social rules governing the life of local communities for fear of rejection and tensions because such a gender process should run over time,” implying that the project effectively condones and will not attempt to address sexism and marginalization of women and LGBTQ people
- Explains that while the project will not “challenge” sexism fron-

tally, the project “will contribute to reducing this barrier by applying participation criteria and procedures marked with positive discrimination”

- Does not specify which participation criteria will be used or further describe “positive discrimination”
- Fails to acknowledge how the project not only has the opportunity to exclude women but could also harm them by increasing SGBV or their reproductive care burden

INDICATOR 13: To what extent does the project apply the principle of Free, Prior and Informed Consent and give project-affected persons (especially women and LGBTI people and Indigenous Peoples as well as other marginalized social groups) the right to accept or refuse? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



WEAK

- Provides no mention of consent in any project documents, indicating that project affected people will not have the opportunity to accept or refuse the project
- Risks harming marginalized groups, such as women and LGBTQ people, by failing to give them the opportunity to accept or refuse project participation

INDICATOR 14: Is there a fully articulated, gender-responsive redress mechanism available to women at the project /national level in addition to the GCF IRM?



PART C AND ANNEX REFERENCING ESIA OR ESMF: WEAK

FP024

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Explains that the Environmental Investment Fund (EIF), the Accredited Entity, has a grievance redress mechanism that “ensures complaints are being promptly reviewed and addressed by the responsible units”
- Describes the “independent committee” which oversees the grievance redress mechanism consists of a “Company Lawyer, External Auditor (PWC), Representative from a Commercial Bank (Credit Expert), Communication Officer (Appeals Administration), UNDP/SGP National Grants Manager, and Board member (Chair)”
- Does not note the gender make-up of the committee or whether any members will have gender expertise
- Provides no description of the complaints process
- Does not outline any specific accommodations to ensure women and LGBTQ people can use

the grievance mechanism, such as women intake officers or a verbal intake process

- Fails to provide a project-level grievance mechanism

INDICATOR 15: To what extent does the project provide compensation in case of harm that disproportionately impacts women and other marginalized gender groups, for example housing and land that is equal to or better than pre-settlement and compensating women and marginalized gender groups who are not legally recognized land owners?

PART C, PART F AND RELEVANT ANNEXES SUCH AS RESETTLEMENT PLANS: WEAK

- Does not indicate that the project will cause involuntary economic or physical resettle-

ment, although does not directly clarify

- Fails to mention compensation in case of harm that disproportionately impacts women and other marginalized gender groups, even though the project has the potential to harm these communities

INDICATOR 16: To what extent does the project ensure full, effective and ongoing/sustained participation of gender groups throughout the project/program cycle?

- Comprehensive stakeholder engagement at the planning stage with documentation includes women’s groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



WEAK

- Explains in the Gender Assessment that women’s organizations in Namibia have tried to form a national umbrella organization but have failed to do so and therefore joined the Namibian Non-Governmental Organizations’ Forum (NANGOF) instead
- Fails to include NANGOF or any independent women’s organizations in project planning
- Fails to include any national gender machinery in project planning, even though Namibia has the Ministry of Gender Equality, Poverty Eradication, and Social Welfare
- Do the annexes include stakeholder engagement plans for project implementation that includes women’s groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annex)

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator



WEAK

- Fails to include NANGOF or any independent women's organizations in project implementation
- Does not clarify whether CBNRM includes any women's organizations
- Fails to include any national gender machinery in project implementation, even though Namibia has the Ministry of Gender Equality, Poverty Eradication, and Social Welfare



INDICATOR 17: Is there gender-responsive governance of project management and implementation?

- Does the Accredited Entity's Project Management Unit include gender experts and operate to support and

build gender expertise in-country (including providing gender capacity building and oversight to Executing Entities)?



PART C, GAP: WEAK

- Notes that the project will include a "Environmental and Social Safeguard Expert" who will oversee monitoring and evaluation and later refers to them as an "ESS & Gender Specialist"
- Does not clarify this specialist's experience in gender work or whether they will be hired from within Namibia
- Includes "appoint gender and social mainstreaming specialist to serve on the Project Steering Committee (part time or full time)" as an indicator in the GAP but never references this specialist in the funding proposal

- Fails to include a budget for this GAP indicator, reducing the likelihood that the specialist will be hired

- Is the national gender machinery involved in project implementation structures (as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures)?



PART C, GAP: WEAK

- Fails to include any national gender machinery in project implementation structures, even though the Gender Assessment notes that Namibia has a Ministry of Gender Equality, Poverty Eradication, and Social Welfare
- Are civil society groups, particularly women's groups, Indigenous Peoples and local/community groups, and gender experts involved as Exe-

cuting Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures?



PART C: WEAK

- Includes an "ESS & Gender Specialist" in the Project Management Unit (PMU) but fails to clarify their experience in gender work
- Explains that Civil Society Organizations will be included in the Project Steering Committee but does not note whether women's organizations will be included
- Notes in the description of the PMU that "equal gender representation on all management structures of the project will be promoted," but does not guarantee equal gender representation
- Does not indicate that any local women's groups (or women's groups from within CBNRM) will be included Advisory Boards or similar structures

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 18: To what extent does the project provide complete available project information, including in national/local languages, to all project-affected persons including women and marginalized gender/social groups?



ADEQUATE

- Notes that the project will have an “on-going consultation process” with women, people with disabilities, and other vulnerable groups which may provide an avenue for disseminating project information
- Includes the following as a goal for the Project Steering Committee in the GAP: “monitor project activities to ensure integration of gender elements in outreach strategies”

- Does not clarify whether this means that the project will undertake gender accommodations when disseminating project information

- Acknowledges extreme economic disparity between different “language groups” in Namibia, suggesting that the project must work to include marginalized groups in outreach by providing project materials in multiple languages

- Explains that most women subsistence farmers speak Khoisan or Rukavango, rather than English, and cannot read or write

- Does not indicate that the project will provide information in multiple languages or formats, threatening the inclusion of women and other marginalized groups

INDICATOR 19: To what extent does the project have a gender-responsive monitoring process including collecting baseline and monitoring and evaluation gender-disaggregated data? To what extent are gendered indicators (quantitative and qualitative) reflected in the project/program results management framework?



GAP: WEAK

- Includes gender indicators for each GAP sub-output but only includes targets for some indicators
- Leaves targets for other indicators open-ended such as “special efforts are made to ensure participation of women and marginalized communities” but fails to set requirements for how many “special efforts” must be made or how often they must occur

FP024

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Fails to connect GAP and project targets in project design, which reduces the likelihood that GAP activities will be implemented
- Sets weak targets such as achieve "better gender balance if necessary"
- Requires project staff to receive gender training in the "first 8 months of the project," rather than immediately

FP028

MSME Business Loan Program for GHG Emission Reduction

Ninety percent of Mongolian businesses are run by Micro, Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises (MSMEs). The lack of accessible commercial finance by local banks impedes the ability of Mongolian enterprises to invest in energy efficiency and renewable energy. This [GCF program](#) provides XacBank, one of Mongolia's leading banks, with an enhanced ability to support loans to Mongolian enterprises investing in energy efficiency and renewable energy projects. The GCF's contribution is blended with other financial sources to fund low-carbon projects. This helps help alleviate the current prevalence of high financing costs and relatively short-term loan periods.

Assessment Grade

-  WEAK
-  ADEQUATE
-  STRONG

Main Project/Program Characteristics

- Country: Mongolia
- Total value: US\$60 million
- GCF funding support: US\$20 million
- GCF financial instruments: loan (97.5% of funding), grant (2.5% of funding)
- Accredited Entity: XacBank
- Direct access (DA)
- Financial intermediation (FI)
- Private sector (PR)
- Mitigation
- ESS risk categorization: I-2
- Regular Approval Process
- Pilot program: Micro, Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises (MSME)
- Under implementation: Yes, since June 2017
- Estimated completion: June 2022

FP028

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 1: To what extent is there an integration of gender equality considerations in the narrative and the technical elaboration of the overall project/program proposal document and project description? To what extent does the project undertake a gender-responsive, transparent, collaborative cost-benefit analysis and seriously consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends? Does it contain elements of an ecofeminist cost-benefit analysis? And if so which?



PART A: ADEQUATE

- Explains that the project “will look to support women-led MSMEs as much as possible by offering more concessional loan terms to such entities”
- Aims for the facility’s portfolio to be made up of at least 50% women-led MSMEs by the end of year three

- Does not consider how loans may drive some women business-owners, who already experience poverty at higher rates than men business-owners, deeper into cycles of debt and poverty
- Does not explain the gender makeup of XacBank’s current MSME clients
- Does not undertake a gender-responsive cost-benefit analysis or consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends




PART C: ADEQUATE

- Notes that the Accredited Entity has worked to capture the women-led MSME market since 2014 and is therefore “primed to launch this women-centered MSME program”
- Sets “increase women’s access to climate finance by bolstering their economic empowerment” as a key project objective

- Explains that the project will promote gender equal access to the funding by making sure that women-led MSMEs are a core focus of the loan activities
- Notes that women-led MSMEs include firms with at least 30% women on the Board of Directors or in senior management positions, 51% ownership by women, or 40% women employment
- Ignores how many companies that have 40% or more women employment are owned by men and perpetuate gender pay and wealth gaps as well as gender inequality
- Does not consider how loans may drive some women business-owners, who already experience poverty at higher rates than men business-owners, deeper into cycles of debt and poverty
- Does not undertake a gender-responsive cost-benefit analysis or

consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends



INDICATOR 2: To what extent is there a specific gendered description, including provision of gender-disaggregated data (baseline and expected reach), of intended direct and indirect beneficiaries? Including targeting women and girls?



PART A: ADEQUATE

- Sets the beneficiary target as 50% women-led MSMEs by year three
- Targets women through project components, such as by offering women-led MSMEs more concessional loan terms
- Ignores how concessional loans have also led to increased indebtedness for borrowers

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Does not explain the gender makeup of XacBank’s current MSME clients, who will initially be targeted by the project



PART C: ADEQUATE

- Aims for the XacBank’s portfolio to be made up of at least 50% women-led MSMEs by the end of year three (out of six years)
- Notes that women-led MSMEs include firms with at least 30% women on the Board of Directors or in senior management positions, 51% ownership by women, or 40% women employment
- Ignores how many companies that have 40% or more women employment are owned by men and perpetuate gender pay and wealth gaps

- Ignores how women at businesses owned by men but with 40% women employment will not necessarily benefit if the business receives a loan

- Ignores how companies with 30% women on their Board of Directors are often still controlled and operated by men and may perpetuate gender inequality

- Ignores how companies with at least 51% women ownership can still be controlled by men and perpetuate gender inequality given that men often maintain power even when they are physically outnumbered

INDICATOR 3: To what extent are “gender co-benefits” elaborated against the GCF Investment Criteria?



PART E: ADEQUATE

- Includes a section on “gender-sensitive development impact,” noting that Mongolia has a strong presence of women in the formal workforce

- Explains that women-led SMEs are more often rejected for loans from banks

- Plans to address this inequity by creating an enabling environment for women-led SMEs, “which in turn will create economic opportunity for female employees as women-led SMEs employ women at significantly higher rates than male led SMEs”

- Notes that only 38.9% of SMEs in Mongolia have a female participation in ownership, which suggests that many of the women-led MSMEs that the project will target may be led by men but have 40% women employed (and therefore will qualify as “women-led”)

- Ignores how these businesses often perpetuate gender pay and

wealth gaps and that women employees in these businesses will not necessarily benefit if the business receives a loan

INDICATOR 4: Is the project/program budget allocation gender-responsive? (“gender budgeting”)

- Are gender-related expenditures integrated in the overall project budget?



PART B: WEAK

- Makes no mention of women or gender in the project budget whatsoever, even though many of the project components plan to include women and the GAP requires significant funding
- Can women’s groups/local groups/grassroots women get access to project funding?

FP028

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator



PART B AND PROJECT GAP: ADEQUATE

- Includes Asia Foundation Women in Business Center as a responsible organization for multiple GAP activities, which suggests they may have some access to project funding
- Plans to engage women's economic empowerment NGOs to identify and target loans towards women-led MSMEs but does not clarify whether these NGOs will have access to project funding
- Notes that XanBank is currently identifying other relevant women's NGOs with whom the program can partner
- Does the Gender Action Plan (GAP) have its own budget? Is it adequate/ commensurate with overall budget and intent? What is the money spent on (gender consultants?)

Building local capacity for gender mainstreaming?)



PROJECT GAP: WEAK

- Includes no budget in the GAP, which threatens the implementation of all GAP activities
- Notes in the funding proposal that "resources will be allocated" to GAP activities but never does so in the funding proposal or GAP

INDICATOR 5: (To what extent) does the project/program acknowledge and discuss (implicitly or explicitly) an intersectional approach to gender?



WEAK

- Makes very few mentions of class in any project documents, which is troubling given that class will affect how the loans given by the project impact recipients of all genders
- Does not acknowledge how ethnicity, class, religion or sexuality may affect women's ability to access project benefits
- Assumes women to be a homogenous group who will access project benefits evenly

INDICATOR 6: (To what extent) does the project/program (implicitly or explicitly) acknowledge and include people with marginalized gender and sexual identities?



WEAK

- Includes no mention of people with marginalized gender and sexual identities in any project documents and makes no accommodations to ensure the inclusion of LGBTQ people

INDICATOR 7: To what extent does the project acknowledge and take into account potential impacts on sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) or sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment (SEAH)?



WEAK

- Notes that "domestic violence is a serious problem for women in Mongolia" and an estimated one in three women in Mongolia is a victim of domestic violence
- Includes no other acknowledgment of or protection against

FP028

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

potential SGBV or SEAH project impacts in any project documents

- Does not acknowledge how lending to women-led MSMEs could disrupt gender roles and make women more vulnerable to SGBV and SEAH
- Ignores how LGBTQ people are disproportionately at risk of SGBV and SEAH

INDICATOR 8: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis assess the needs of women and other gender groups and current state of gender dynamics in the project-affected country/region/community prior to project inception, implementation, monitoring, and reporting?



ADEQUATE

- Conducted a literature review to inform the Gender Assessment but did not complete any original research
- Provides an analysis of gender inequality in the Mongolia and relevant legal codes and structures
- Gives a strong overview of women's MSMEs and women's access to the financial sector
- Does not provide much context on women's relationship to climate change or the environment
- Provides a small set of recommendations based of the Gender Assessment findings

INDICATOR 9: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis predict and address potential harmful gendered impacts in order to prevent them?

- With recommendations and conclusions in the overall project design



WEAK

- Does not identify or protect against any specific gender risks in the project Risk Assessment
- Includes "MSMEs default on loans" as a risk in the Risk Assessment but ignores the gender dimension of this risk and focuses mitigation measures on protecting the interests of XacBank rather than MSME loan recipients
- Overlooks how the project has the opportunity to harm women entrepreneurs through the loans program or by financing a sub-project that harms or excludes women
- Overlooks how the project could perpetuate gender inequality by financing more men-owned

businesses than women-owned businesses, given the loose definition of "women-led" that the project uses

- With concrete actions in the project-specific gender action plan



WEAK

- Includes no mention of gender risks or safeguards in the GAP even though the project has the potential to disproportionately exclude and harm women and LGBTQ people

INDICATOR 10: To what extent does the project take into account potential impacts on the gender division of labor?

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Notes in the Gender Assessment that “pronounced gender bias exists in the division of labor between men and women” and “the labor market is highly occupationally segmented by gender”
- Has somewhat contradictory descriptions of the gender division of labor, once noting that “the issues confronting women entrepreneurs do not differ considerably from those confronting male entrepreneurs” but later noting that women-led MSMEs are significantly smaller and less profitable than men-led MSMEs on average
- Never acknowledges women’s unpaid reproductive care burden
- Has the potential to improve women’s ability to access paid work by supporting women-led MSMEs but also has the potential to exacerbate women’s workload if proper steps are not

taken to address women’s existing reproductive labor burden




INDICATOR 11: To what extent does the project-specific gender action plan fully articulate and cover the project period (integrated activities vs “add-ons”, define clear responsibilities/ accountability and meaningful gender indicators? Inclusion of an adequate, multi-year budget?)



ADEQUATE

- Includes a clear timeframe for each GAP activity and assigns a variety of responsible entities to each sub-output
- Provides clear targets for every GAP activity

- Creates very few GAP activities that will directly impact project affected women
- Sets no budget for the GAP in any project documents, significantly reducing the likelihood that GAP activities will occur



INDICATOR 12: To what extent does the project create safeguards to prevent potential harms, including those that will disproportionately impact women, men, sexual and gender minorities? To what extent is there a comprehensive and project-adequate elaboration on gender in the project/program risk assessment and monitoring frameworks and arrangements?



PART F: WEAK

- Does not identify or protect against any specific gender risks
- Includes a section titled “Gender Considerations” in Part F that notes that XacBank produced a GAP for the project which includes “specific activities, expected outputs, outcomes and impacts as well as monitoring indicators”
- Overlooks how the project has the opportunity to harm women entrepreneurs through the loans program or by financing a sub-project that harms or excludes women
- Overlooks how the project could perpetuate gender inequality by financing more men-owned businesses than women-owned businesses, given the loose definition of “women-led” that the project uses



FP028

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 13: To what extent does the project apply the principle of Free, Prior and Informed Consent and give project-affected persons (especially women and LGBTI people and Indigenous Peoples as well as other marginalized social groups) the right to accept or refuse? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



WEAK

- Mentions consent just once in project documents, noting that XacBank must receive explicit consent from the credit risk analyst to perform any transactions with the loan funds from the GCF
- Provides no other mention of consent in any project documents, indicating that project affected people will not have the opportunity to accept or refuse the project after receiving complete information

- Threatens to harm other marginalized groups, such as women and LGBTQ people, by failing to give them the opportunity to accept or refuse project participation

INDICATOR 14: Is there a fully articulated, gender-responsive redress mechanism available to women at the project /national level in addition to the GCF IRM?



PART C AND ANNEX REFERENCING ESIA OR ESMF: WEAK

- Does not mention a grievance redress mechanism in any project documents
- Provides no clear mechanism for people of any gender to safely submit a complaint and seek redress following project-re-

lated harm, which is especially troubling given that the project is not free of risks

INDICATOR 15: To what extent does the project provide compensation in case of harm that disproportionately impacts women and other marginalized gender groups, for example housing and land that is equal to or better than pre-settlement and compensating women and marginalized gender groups who are not legally recognized land owners?



PART C, PART F AND RELEVANT ANNEXES SUCH AS RESETTLEMENT PLANS: WEAK

- Does not indicate that the project will cause involuntary resettlement but fails to confirm
- Makes no mention of compensation in case of harm, which is

troubling given that the project has the potential to exclude women business-owners (given the weak definition of “women-led” used by the project) as well as push women business-owners into cycles of debt and poverty

INDICATOR 16: To what extent does the project ensure full, effective and ongoing/sustained participation of gender groups throughout the project/program cycle?

- Comprehensive stakeholder engagement at the planning stage with documentation includes women’s groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



ADEQUATE

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Notes that the project will engage women’s economic empowerment NGOs and that XanBank is currently identifying additional relevant women’s NGOs with whom the program can partner, suggesting they may be involved in project planning

- Does not indicate that any national gender machineries will be involved in project planning

- Do the annexes include stakeholder engagement plans for project implementation that includes women’s groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annex)



ADEQUATE

- Notes that women’s economic empowerment NGOs will assist in identifying and engaging women-led MSMEs in the project

- Assigns women’s economic empowerment NGOs to oversee various GAP activities
- Does not indicate that any national gender machineries will be involved in project implementation



INDICATOR 17: Is there gender-responsive governance of project management and implementation?

- Does the Accredited Entity’s Project Management Unit include gender experts and operate to support and build gender expertise in-country (including providing gender capacity building and oversight to Executing Entities)?



PART C, GAP: WEAK

- Does not indicate that the Project Management Unit will

include a gender expert whatsoever

- Is the national gender machinery involved in project implementation structures (as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures)?



PART C, GAP:

- Does not indicate that any national gender machinery will be involved in project implementation structures

- Are civil society groups, particularly women’s groups, Indigenous Peoples and local/community groups, and gender experts involved as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures?



PART C: ADEQUATE

- Includes Asia Foundation Women in Business Center as a responsible organization for multiple GAP activities

- Plans to engage women’s economic empowerment NGOs to identify and target loans towards women-led MSMEs

- Notes that XanBank is currently identifying other relevant women’s NGOs with whom the program can partner

- Does not indicate that a gender expert will be involved in the project whatsoever



INDICATOR 18: To what extent does the project provide complete available project information, including in national/local languages, to all project-affected persons including women and marginalized gender/social groups?

FP028

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator



ADEQUATE

- Plans to do a variety of outreach activities targeted at women-led MSMEs, such as “develop outreach programs targeted at existing XacBank clients that are women-led MSMEs” and “undertake targeted advertising in women in business forums and organizations”
- Includes “spread awareness on the gender diversity dimensions of the project through marketing and publicity strategies” as an activity in the GAP
- Plans to work with women’s NGOs to identify and target women-led MSMEs
- Does not indicate that project information will be available in multiple languages or formats, even though Mongolia is home to many languages besides Mongolian



INDICATOR 19: To what extent does the project have a gender-responsive monitoring process including collecting baseline and monitoring and evaluation gender-disaggregated data? To what extent are gendered indicators (quantitative and qualitative) reflected in the project/program results management framework?



GAP: WEAK

- Connects GAP and project targets in project design, which increases the likelihood that GAP activities will be implemented
- Sets very few targets, focusing primarily on ensuring that 50% of loan recipients are women-led MSMEs
- Uses non-committal language for some of the targets, such

as “aim for 50% of all external advisors to be women”

- Includes many targets that will not directly benefit women, such as “publish case studies to represent gender diversity of the program”

FP061

Integrated physical adaptation and community resilience through an enhanced direct access pilot in the public, private, and civil society sectors of three Eastern Caribbean small island developing states

This [GCF project](#) aims to strengthen the resilience of three Caribbean islands – Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica and Grenada – to climate change-related threats by improving the hurricane resilience of community buildings, homes, and businesses, and through flood prevention. Small grants for community organizations, together with revolving loans for households and businesses, will improve the resilience of infrastructure to withstand category 5 hurricanes. A funding mechanism for public infrastructure (including drainage and irrigation) and ecosystems will also reduce disruptions in the water system and improve soil and water conservation, which are all threatened by climate change.

Assessment Grade

-  WEAK
-  ADEQUATE
-  STRONG

Main Project/Program Characteristics

- Countries: Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, Grenada
- Total value: US\$22.6 million
- GCF funding support: US\$20 million
- GCF financing instrument: grant
- Accredited Entity: Department of Environment, Ministry of Health and Environment, Government of Antigua and Barbuda (DOE)
- Direct Access (DA)
- Financial intermediation (FI)
- Public Sector (P)
- Adaptation
- ESS risk categorization: B
- Regular approval process
- Pilot program: Enhanced Direct Access (EDA)
- Under implementation: Yes, since July 2019
- Expected completion: July 2023

FP061

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 1: To what extent is there an integration of gender equality considerations in the narrative and the technical elaboration of the overall project/program proposal document and project description? To what extent does the project undertake a gender-responsive, transparent, collaborative cost-benefit analysis and seriously consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends? Does it contain elements of an ecofeminist cost-benefit analysis? And if so which?



PART A: WEAK

- Notes that the project aims to “strengthen institutional capacities and increase the resilience of at least 5% of the population in the Eastern Caribbean pilot countries to climate variability and change, of which 50% are women”

- Assumes that because women make up half of the target population, they will automatically make up half of the beneficiaries
- Notes that the project will use the following metrics to evaluate success: “90% of beneficiaries believe project-related decision making is inclusive and responsive by sex” and “300 vulnerable households and 100 businesses use Fund-supported microfinancing to respond to climate variability and projected climate change, of which approximately 40% are female-headed”
- Fails to integrate gender in project description although the project has the potential to enhance women’s leadership in climate decision-making by strengthening local control of climate adaptation work
- Does not clarify whether women or LGBTQ people are included in “vulnerable populations who suffer disproportionately from

climate impacts” and will be targeted in Output 4

- Plans to give loans to “vulnerable populations” (who may include women and LGBTQ people) which threatens to push these populations into debt and further poverty
- Notes that the target population of homeowners and small business owners is “generally indebted due to past losses and damages” but does not explain why the project will provide this population loans rather than grants
- Does not undertake a gender-responsive cost-benefit analysis or consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends



PART C: WEAK

- References the GAP recommendations in project description and

an existing bank program that targets women entrepreneurs but otherwise fails to target women in project design

- Includes a graphic of women’s CSOs in Antigua and Barbuda but does not clarify how these CSOs will be integrated into the project
- Requires collection of gender disaggregated data “when possible” for outcomes of two project outputs
- Does not clarify whether women and LGBTQ people are included as vulnerable populations, who are the target of many project components
- Requires that loans to vulnerable populations and small grants for community adaptation go through a “gender screening”
- Creates criteria for loan eligibility that may exclude women and LGBTQ people, such as “owner of the home or business”

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

and “employed or has a source of income”

- Overlooks how loans could push vulnerable populations further into poverty
- Does not undertake a gender-responsive cost-benefit analysis or consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends

INDICATOR 2: To what extent is there a specific gendered description, including provision of gender-disaggregated data (baseline and expected reach), of intended direct and indirect beneficiaries? Including targeting women and girls?

PART A: WEAK

- Notes that the project aims to “strengthen institutional capac-

ities and increase the resilience of at least 5% of the population in the Eastern Caribbean pilot countries to climate variability and change, of which 50% are women”

- Assumes that because women make up half of the target population, they will automatically make up half of the beneficiaries
- Explains that 40% of the 300 vulnerable households and 100 businesses that are eligible for loans are headed by women
- Ignores how offering project benefits to more men-headed households and businesses could exacerbate gender inequality
- Fails to target women in any project component, even though the project acknowledges this population is especially vulnerable to climate change



PART C: ADEQUATE

- Explains that women make up 50% of the overall target population and 40% of the population eligible for loans but assumes this means that they will automatically benefit from the project
- Requires collection of gender disaggregated data “when possible” for outcomes of two project outputs
- Includes gender targets for some project outputs such as: “Train at least 100 people, of which 50% are female, to identify, implement, evaluate adaptation strategies” and “Public awareness activities targeting 5 knowledge products reaching over 50,000 people, of which 50% are female”
- Does not further explain whether or how women will be targeted in any project components or

how the project will ensure all women in the project affected area will benefit

INDICATOR 3: To what extent are “gender co-benefits” elaborated against the GCF Investment Criteria?

PART E: ADEQUATE

- Fails to include a section on “gender co-benefits” but notes that the project contributes to Sustainable Development Goals 5: “Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls by improving water and sanitation infrastructure”
- Notes that the project has four gender-disaggregated indicators which include: “number of people trained and represented on decision-making committees and

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

units; beneficiaries who believe project-related decision making is inclusive and responsive; public awareness outreach (where possible); and beneficiaries of Fund-supported microfinancing to respond to climate change and variability”

- Notes that the loan program is gender-responsive and will help women build long-term economic stability
- Overlooks how the loan eligibility criteria will exclude many women and how loans have the potential to push poor women further into poverty
- Does not attempt to challenge any existing gender inequities through the project and only tries to prevent worsening these inequities

INDICATOR 4: Is the project/program budget allocation gender-responsive? (“gender budgeting”)

- Are gender-related expenditures integrated in the overall project budget?



PART B: WEAK

- Makes no mention of women or gender in the project budget whatsoever, even though many of the project components plan to include women and the GAP requires significant funding

- Can women’s groups/local groups/grassroots women get access to project funding?



PART B AND PROJECT GAP: ADEQUATE

- Notes that a women’s organizations will be included in the

Steering Committee, suggesting that they may be able to access project funds as the Steering Committee will oversee funds disbursement at a local level

- Lists women’s organizations as having an “oversight function” in the Enhancing Direct Access (EDA) project implementation
- Does not include women’s organizations as a key beneficiary of any project components

- Does the Gender Action Plan (GAP) have its own budget? Is it adequate/ commensurate with overall budget and intent? What is the money spent on (gender consultants? Building local capacity for gender mainstreaming?)



PROJECT GAP: ADEQUATE

- Sets a budget for each GAP sub-activity, noting that the

same amount will be given to each country

- Includes funding for indicators that will directly impact women beneficiaries, such as “Provide entrepreneurship training for women” and “Inform and train women...on how to access and utilize the complaints mechanism”
- Sets a total GAP budget of \$780,000, which makes up just 3.4% of total project funding

INDICATOR 5: (To what extent) does the project/program acknowledge and discuss (implicitly or explicitly) an intersectional approach to gender?



WEAK

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Recommends in the Gender Assessment that the project “provide gender sensitization/training to policy makers, planners and analysts in the economic and social development sectors...to the specific needs of poor women”
- Does not otherwise acknowledge how ethnicity, class or sexuality may affect women’s ability to access to project benefits
- Assumes women to be a homogenous group who will access project benefits evenly

INDICATOR 6: (To what extent) does the project/program (implicitly or explicitly) acknowledge and include people with marginalized gender and sexual identities?



WEAK

- Includes no mention of people with marginalized gender and sexual identities in any project documents and makes no accommodations to ensure the inclusion of LGBTQ people

INDICATOR 7: To what extent does the project acknowledge and take into account potential impacts on sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) or sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment (SEAH)?



WEAK

- Includes no acknowledgement of or protection against potential SGBV or SEAH project impacts in any project documents
- Fails to prevent increased SGBV and SEAH due to influxes of construction workers

INDICATOR 8: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis assess the needs of women and other gender groups and current state of gender dynamics in the project-affected country/region/community prior to project inception, implementation, monitoring, and reporting?



STRONG

- Conducted a literature review, consultations, and field visits to inform the Gender Assessment
- Provides an analysis of gender in the Eastern Caribbean, exploring topics such as women’s access to income, education, and decision-making
- Examines gender disparities in each of the three target countries

- Gives a strong overview of women’s relationship to climate change
- Provides a strong set of recommendations based of the Gender Assessment findings

INDICATOR 9: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis predict and address potential harmful gendered impacts in order to prevent them?

- With recommendations and conclusions in the overall project design



ADEQUATE

- Notes in Part F that “No adverse Environmental, Social and Gender impacts are expected to result from this Outputs’ activities” but later explains

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- in Part G that a Risks Register, which is publicly available, includes a more comprehensive list of gender-related risks and mitigation measures
- Includes a section on “ESS and Gender Risks” in the Risks Register but focuses primarily on broad social risks rather than gender risks
- Includes the following gender-sensitive risks in the Risks Register: “biased procurement process” and “most competitive candidates are not selected due to other (unfair) factors”
- Sets “balanced representation of women and men on all Tender evaluation committees” and “non discrimination in all hiring policies” as mitigation measures for these risks
- Includes no other gender-sensitive mitigation measures
- Overlooks how a balanced gender representation on Tender evalua-

tion committees does not necessarily prevent gender discrimination in the lending process

- Ignores how the project could also harm women and LGBTQ people by increasing SGBV (as some project components require significant construction work) or pushing them further into poverty through loans
- With concrete actions in the project-specific gender action plan



WEAK

- Includes no mention of gender risks or safeguards in the GAP even though the project has the potential to disproportionately exclude and harm women and LGBTQ people

INDICATOR 10: To what extent does the project take into account potential impacts on the gender division of labor?



WEAK

- Asks “will the project help create a better balance between women’s productive and household tasks (e.g. childcare, domestic work)?” in the Gender Assessment
- Notes the following response to the question: “More time will be spent out of the home but once women are committed, child care and other household tasks and activities will fit in. Women should be able to bring their children to meetings”
- Does not explain how reproductive labor will be made to “fit in” alongside project activities or whether women will be

responsible for making this labor burden “fit in”

- Does not confirm whether women will actually be able to bring children to meetings
- Asks “what will be the impact of the project interventions on women’s workload and income?” in the Gender Assessment and answers “it is likely that women will take on more work, taking on more responsibilities”
- Admits that the project will likely increase women’s labor burden, which contributes heavily to gender inequities, and does not attempt to prevent this outcome
- Includes the following recommendation in the Gender Assessment: “Ensure that equitable provisions for elderly men and women are determined not only by their contribution to the formal wage sector, but an understanding of their contribution to the care economy (reproductive work in the home

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

and community), contribution to subsistence agriculture, and participation in the informal economy”

- Does not confirm in other project documents whether this recommendation will be taken into account
- Does not clarify whether this recommendation extends to other age groups beyond elderly men and women, who are also responsible reproductive labor

INDICATOR 11: To what extent does the project-specific gender action plan fully articulate and cover the project period (integrated activities vs “add-ons”, define clear responsibilities/ accountability and meaningful gender indicators? Inclusion of an adequate, multi-year budget?)



ADEQUATE

- Includes a clear timeframe for each GAP sub-output and assigns a variety of responsible entities to each sub-output
- Sets a budget for each GAP sub-output
- Fails to provide targets for many GAP sub-outputs, reducing the likelihood that the actions will be completed
- Sets an overall budget of \$780,000, which makes up just 3.4% of total project funding

INDICATOR 12: To what extent does the project create safeguards to prevent potential harms, including those that will disproportionately impact women, men, sexual and gender minorities? To what extent is there a comprehensive and project-ade-

quate elaboration on gender in the project/program risk assessment and monitoring frameworks and arrangements?



PART F: WEAK

- Notes in Part F that “No adverse Environmental, Social and Gender impacts are expected to result from project activities” but later explains in Part G that a Risks Register, which is publicly available, includes a comprehensive list of gender-related risks and mitigation measures
- Includes very few gender-sensitive risks in the Risks Register
- Overlooks how the project has the opportunity to exclude women through other means outside of employment, such as through the loan program, and could harm women by increasing SGBV (as some project

components require significant construction work) or by pushing them further into poverty

INDICATOR 13: To what extent does the project apply the principle of Free, Prior and Informed Consent and give project-affected persons (especially women and LGBTI people and Indigenous Peoples as well as other marginalized social groups) the right to accept or refuse? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



WEAK

- Includes “Procedures for Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC)” as a mitigation measure to prevent project harm to indigenous people

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Does not specify what these procedures will include or whether they will be gender sensitive
- Provides no other mention of consent in any project documents, indicating that non-indigenous project affected people will not have the opportunity to accept or refuse the project after receiving complete information
- Threatens to harm other marginalized groups, such as women and LGBTQ people, by failing to give them the opportunity to accept or refuse project participation

INDICATOR 14: Is there a fully articulated, gender-responsive redress mechanism available to women at the project /national level in addition to the GCF IRM?



PART C AND ANNEX REFERENCING ESIA OR ESMF: ADEQUATE

- Notes at one point in the funding proposal that the project will have an Independent Redress Mechanism that will be overseen by an Audit Committee but later explains that the Department of Environment will oversee the Complaints Mechanism
- Does not describe the gender makeup or experience of the Audit Committee or the Department of Environment personnel who will oversee the complaint mechanism
- Includes the following as an indicator in the GAP: "Inform and train women, persons with disabilities, indigenous people, other vulnerable groups how to access and utilize the complaints mechanism and empower them as 'allies' within

their communities to share this knowledge with others who are likely to benefit"

- Plans to track the number of complaints received through the complaint mechanism to measure how well women have been informed about the complaint mechanism
- Plans to begin a social media campaign made by women for women to educate them on the complaints mechanism
- Allocates \$200,000 USD per country for this indicator
- Does not outline any specific accommodations to ensure women and LGBTQ people can use the grievance mechanism, such as women intake officers or a verbal intake process
- Fails to provide a project-level grievance mechanism



INDICATOR 15: To what extent does the project provide compensation in case of harm that disproportionately impacts women and other marginalized gender groups, for example housing and land that is equal to or better than pre-settlement and compensating women and marginalized gender groups who are not legally recognized land owners?



PART C, PART F AND RELEVANT ANNEXES SUCH AS RESETTLEMENT PLANS:

- Explains in the ESMP that "there will be no involuntary resettlement under this project, and mechanisms are in place to ensure unidentified sub-projects do not result in involuntary resettlement" but admits that "there may be squatters in hazard zones where adaptation actions

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

are proposed" who could face involuntary resettlement

- Notes in the Risk Register that the project has a "low" rating for Land Acquisition and Involuntary Resettlement but will undertake the following mitigation measures to prevent harm: "make sub-projects that result in involuntary resettlement ineligible for funding," and "provide training and sensitization to sub-projects on identifying involuntary resettlement risks"
- Does not indicate that these trainings will be gender-sensitive
- Does not indicate that any compensation in case of resettlement will be gender-sensitive
- Does not acknowledge that women and LGBTQ people are more likely to be poor, and therefore may be overrepresented in the group of squatters most at risk of resettlement

INDICATOR 16: To what extent does the project ensure full, effective and ongoing/sustained participation of gender groups throughout the project/program cycle?

- Comprehensive stakeholder engagement at the planning stage with documentation includes women's groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



ADEQUATE

- Notes that the Social Gender Affairs Division will have an "oversight function" in project implementation but does not clarify whether this division is a national gender machinery or whether this oversight function includes project planning
- Recommends in the GAP that the project draw on expertise

from the Antigua Directorate of Gender Affairs

- Confirms in the ESMP that the Project Management Committee will draw on expertise from the Directorate of Gender Affairs, suggesting they will be involved in project planning
- Notes that women's organizations will be included in the Steering Committee and will have an "oversight function" in the project implementation but does not clarify whether they will be involved in project planning

- Do the annexes include stakeholder engagement plans for project implementation that includes women's groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annex)



ADEQUATE

- Notes that women's organizations will be included in the Steering Committee and will have an "oversight function" in project implementation
- Includes "nominate a CSO/ women's organization representative to the Loans Board decision-making body" as an indicator in the GAP
- Notes that the Social and Gender Affairs Division will have an "oversight function" in project implementation but does not clarify whether this division is a national gender machinery

INDICATOR 17: Is there gender-responsive governance of project management and implementation?

- Does the Accredited Entity's Project Management Unit include gender experts and operate to support and

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

build gender expertise in-country (including providing gender capacity building and oversight to Executing Entities)?



PART C, GAP: ADEQUATE

- Explains that the Project Management Unit will include a Technical Expert Committee which will include an Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS) and Gender Expert
- Notes in the GAP that this ESS and Gender Expert will “provide technical advice in the decision-making process of the project’s subactivities”
- Does not set a budget for this position, specify the gender of the ESS and Gender Expert, or note whether they will be hired from within the target countries
- Does not provide a more complete description of the ESS and Gender Expert’s duties

■ Is the national gender machinery involved in project implementation structures (as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures)?



PART C, GAP: WEAK

- Notes that the Social Gender Affairs Division will have an “oversight function” in project implementation but does not clarify whether this division is a national gender machinery or which country the Division is located in
- Recommends in the GAP that the project draw on expertise from the Antigua Directorate of Gender Affairs
- Fails to confirm in the funding proposal whether the Directorate of Gender Affairs will be involved in the funding proposal
- Does not mention inclusion of national gender machineries from Dominica or Grenada

■ Are civil society groups, particularly women’s groups, Indigenous Peoples and local/community groups, and gender experts involved as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures?



PART C: STRONG

- Explains that the Technical Expert Committee which will include an ESS and Gender Expert
- Notes that women’s organizations will be included in the Steering Committee and will have an “oversight function” in the project implementation
- Includes “nominate a CSO/ women’s organization representative to the Loans Board decision-making body” as an indicator in the GAP
- Does not specify which women’s organizations will be included in the project

INDICATOR 18: To what extent does the project provide complete available project information, including in national/local languages, to all project-affected persons including women and marginalized gender/ social groups?



ADEQUATE

- Includes “translations into local languages for Community Requests for Proposals and Revolving Loans Opportunities” as a mitigation measure to prevent exclusion of indigenous people
- Sets “inform and train women, PWDs, indigenous people, other vulnerable groups on how to access and utilize the complaints mechanism and empower them as ‘allies’ within their communities to share this knowledge with others who are likely to

FP061

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

benefit” as an indicator in the GAP along with key targets

- Plans to collect gender disaggregated data on public awareness of the project
- Does not clarify whether all project materials, besides Community Requests for Proposals and Revolving Loans Opportunities, will be translated or available in multiple formats

INDICATOR 19: To what extent does the project have a gender-responsive monitoring process including collecting baseline and monitoring and evaluation gender-disaggregated data? To what extent are gendered indicators (quantitative and qualitative) reflected in the project/program results management framework?



GAP: ADEQUATE

- Includes many strong gender indicators for each GAP sub-output with a timeline, designated responsible entity, and cost
- Includes some targets for some of the indicators, such as “Social media campaign made by women for women” and “Social media campaign made by women for women” but fails to specify the target amount for many of the indicators
- Fails to connect GAP and project targets in project design, which reduces the likelihood that GAP activities will be implemented

FP082

Catalyzing Climate Finance - Shandong Green Development Fund in China

This [GCF project](#) focuses on catalyzing private finance to maximize mitigation and adaptation impacts in China's Shandong province. Among China's provinces, Shandong has the highest energy consumption and is one of the most carbon-intensive – driven by its high use of coal as an energy source for its large industrial base. Limited public finance makes it difficult to meet the province's goals to green its economy. GCF loan financing used in this program will catalyze private finance by offering adequate returns thanks through the blending of public finance, concessional donor finance, and private finance. It will support investments that maximize mitigation and adaptation initiatives across several sectors, in line with Shandong's mitigation and adaptation policies, while tapping co-financing 7.3 times GCF's contribution.

Assessment Grade

-  WEAK
-  ADEQUATE
-  STRONG

Main Project/Program Characteristics

- Country: China
- Total value: US\$1.4 billion
- GCF funding support: US\$100 million
- GCF financing instrument: loan
- Accredited Entity: Asian Development Bank (ADB)
- International access (MIE)
- Financial intermediation (FI)
- Public sector (P)
- Cross-cutting
- ESS risk categorization: Intermediation 1
- Regular approval process
- Under implementation: No (approved November 2019)
- Expected completion: July 2039

FP082

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 1: To what extent is there an integration of gender equality considerations in the narrative and the technical elaboration of the overall project/program proposal document and project description? To what extent does the project undertake a gender-responsive, transparent, collaborative cost-benefit analysis and seriously consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends? Does it contain elements of an ecofeminist cost-benefit analysis? And if so which?



PART A: WEAK

- Includes no mention of gender if project description
- Focuses primarily on how project will help overcome economic challenges posed by climate change rather than social challenges



PART C: WEAK

- Considers multiple methods towards reaching climate change mitigation and adaptation, including water resource improvement and protection which could benefit women
- Fails to integrate gender equality considerations throughout the overall project narrative
- Remains focused on economic growth rather than social impacts of climate change
- Briefly mentions potential risks of the project but does not consider the social risks involved, focused on management and performance of Shandong Green Development Fund (SGDF)



INDICATOR 2: To what extent is there a specific gendered description, including provision of gender-disaggregated data (baseline and expected reach), of intended direct and indirect beneficiaries? Including targeting women and girls?



PART A: WEAK

- Includes no mention of gender of beneficiaries



PART C: WEAK

- Briefly mentions that the second priority of the project is to “maximize environmental impacts and benefits to the population, including gender and vulnerable people”
 - Sentence is grammatically incorrect and does not clarify whether marginalized

gender groups are a targeted beneficiary group

- Mentions that project priorities were determined based on the number of people at risk of adverse effects of climate change disaggregated by sex
- Requires that each SGDF investment include a gender action plan



INDICATOR 3: To what extent are “gender co-benefits” elaborated against the GCF Investment Criteria?



PART E: ADEQUATE

- Includes the number of people, disaggregated by gender, whose lives are saved from disruption due to climate-related disasters as a core indicator

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Aims for 50% of beneficiaries to be women
- Requires subprojects produce M&E reports with gender disaggregated data
- Requires subprojects ensure women’s equitable participation, implement gender-responsive features, promote employment and income generation opportunities for women, and build institutional capacity for gender mainstreaming
- Aims to meet the ABD’s Effective Gender Mainstreaming categorization by monitoring whether the project increases women’s “resilience due to the use of clean technologies and better knowledge to deal with climate changes,” and improves women’s “skills and understanding in climate finance and green procurement.”
- Includes the number of households with access to low-emis-

sion energy as an indicator which could especially benefit women but fails to disaggregate this household-level indicator by gender

- Does not explain whether gender impacts will be considered in the policy changes that the SGDF hopes to inspire and create



INDICATOR 4: Is the project/program budget allocation gender-responsive? (“gender budgeting”)

- Are gender-related expenditures integrated in the overall project budget?



PART B: WEAK

- Allocates \$10 million of the total project financing (\$1.49 billion)

to Technical Assistance Program which includes monitoring, evaluation, and verification of safeguards and gender policy

- Allocates \$6.4 million USD of the Technical Assistance Program financing for capacity development, M&E System Development, and Green rating System Development, some of which includes gender-related expenditures such as the collection of gender disaggregated data

- Relies on other funders (ADB, AFD, KfW) to provide this funding and offers no direct GCF funds for these gender-related purposes

- Can women’s groups/local groups/grassroots women get access to project funding?



PART B AND PROJECT GAP: WEAK

- Does not clarify whether women’s groups/local groups/grassroots women will be able to access project funding in Part B

- Requires that “local Women Federation staff,” an organization that has historically promoted only binary gender equality, are included in the professional training provided by the project and indicates that these trainings will be paid for through the overall project budget

- Does the Gender Action Plan (GAP) have its own budget? Is it adequate/ commensurate with overall budget and intent? What is the money spent on (gender consultants? Building local capacity for gender mainstreaming?)



PROJECT GAP: ADEQUATE

- Indicates that GAP implementation will be conducted by

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

two gender/social development specialists (one national, one international) which suggests that the majority of GAP funding will go towards their employment costs

INDICATOR 5: (To what extent) does the project/program acknowledge and discuss (implicitly or explicitly) an intersectional approach to gender?



WEAK

- Includes protections for ethnic minorities and indigenous groups but does not mention other intersecting identities that may shape a project-affected person's vulnerability, such as class, ethnic/racial identity, immigration status, gender and sexuality

INDICATOR 6: (To what extent) does the project/program (implicitly or explicitly) acknowledge and include people with marginalized gender and sexual identities?



WEAK

- Includes no mention of people with marginalized gender and sexual identities in any project documents

INDICATOR 7: To what extent does the project acknowledge and take into account potential impacts on sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) or sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment (SEAH)?



WEAK

- No project documents mention the potential impacts of the project on rates of SGBV or SEAH

INDICATOR 8: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis assess the needs of women and other gender groups and current state of gender dynamics in the project-affected country/region/community prior to project inception, implementation, monitoring, and reporting?



STRONG

- Gives an extensive background on gender dynamics in China and Shandong province
- Describes gender dynamics in relation to poverty, economic

development, government, and employment

- Includes no mention of LGBTQ people in China or Shandong

INDICATOR 9: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis predict and address potential harmful gendered impacts in order to prevent them?

- With recommendations and conclusions in the overall project design



ADEQUATE

- Requires ESMS Staff conduct a risk screening prior to project and subproject implementation
- Includes a Grievance Redress Mechanism so that project affected persons can file complaints against the project and subprojects

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Does not specify whether the risk screening or Grievance Redress Mechanism will be gender sensitive

- With concrete actions in the project-specific gender action plan



WEAK

- Makes no mention of potential harmful gendered impacts or prevention methods

INDICATOR 10: To what extent does the project take into account potential impacts on the gender division of labor?



ADEQUATE

- Acknowledges in the GAP that women are responsible for a disproportionate share of domestic labor which often prevents their participation in paid work and exposes them to household pollution

- Requires that all employers ensure equal payment for women and men workers

- Does not consider how projects and subprojects may exacerbate women's domestic burden or provide mechanisms to prevent this outcome

INDICATOR 11: To what extent does the project-specific gender action plan fully articulate and cover the project period (integrated activities vs "add-ons", define clear responsibilities/ accountability and meaningful gender indicators? Inclusion of an adequate, multi-year budget?)



STRONG

- Notes that staffing of gender positions will continue throughout the project implementation

- Requires that gender results are reported annually and that ADB staff with gender expertise participate "in one review mission per year for the first 10 years of the Programme implementation and as required for the next 10 years"

- Extends timeframe for all gender indicators to 2024 (the end of project implementation)

INDICATOR 12: To what extent does the project create safeguards to prevent potential harms, including those that will disproportionately impact women, men, sexual and gender minorities? To what extent is there a comprehensive and project-ade-

quate elaboration on gender in the project/program risk assessment and monitoring frameworks and arrangements?



PART F: ADEQUATE

- Requires that subprojects include baseline and monitoring data that is disaggregated by sex and identifies vulnerable people in the project area

- Requires that subprojects include a gender analysis as part of the baseline and a gender action plan

- Requires that subprojects' M&E reporting tracks the gender indicators in the Outcome and the Outputs

- Requires that ADB Review Mission focuses on social development, gender and safeguards at least once a year

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Uses 'gender' and 'sex' interchangeably which raises concerns that needs of trans people may be overlooked
- Sets the trigger for Involuntary Resettlement safeguards (which include mechanisms to prevent harm and distribute entitlements) at 200 affected people which could disproportionately harm women as they are often most impacted by resettlement, particularly when safeguards are not in place

INDICATOR 13: To what extent does the project apply the principle of Free, Prior and Informed Consent and give project-affected persons (especially women and LGBTI people and Indigenous Peoples as well as other marginalized social groups) the right to accept or refuse? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



WEAK

- Outlines consultation processes and notes the need to include key stakeholder groups and vulnerable populations, like women and indigenous people, but no projects mention the need to obtain explicit consent or refusal from project-affected persons

INDICATOR 14: Is there a fully articulated, gender-responsive redress mechanism available to women at the project /national level in addition to the GCF IRM?



PART C AND ANNEX REFERENCING ESIA OR ESMF: WEAK

- Outlines the Grievance Redress Mechanism in the ESMS which applies to the project and sub-projects
- Notes that any costs of filing a complaint against project or subprojects should be covered by the SGDF
- Includes no mention of gender in description of Grievance Redress Mechanism and does not indicate how this mechanism will be made available to vulnerable groups that face barriers in filing complaints, such as women and LGBTQ people

INDICATOR 15: To what extent does the project provide compensation in case of harm that disproportionately impacts women and other marginalized gender groups, for example housing and land that is equal to or better than pre-settlement and compensating women and

marginalized gender groups who are not legally recognized land owners?



PART C, PART F AND RELEVANT ANNEXES SUCH AS RESETTLEMENT PLANS: WEAK

- Indicates that safeguards, such as compensation for resettlement, must only be implemented when resettlement causes displacement of 200 people or more in Part F although resettlement of any number of people inevitably has harmful impacts especially on women and girls who for example often find themselves homelessly exposed to rape and sexual harassment while awaiting promised resettlement into new housing with private toilets
- Does not clarify whether landowners who are not legally recognized will be considered in distribution of compensation

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Includes no other description of compensation for involuntary resettlement



INDICATOR 16: To what extent does the project ensure full, effective and ongoing/sustained participation of gender groups throughout the project/program cycle?

- Comprehensive stakeholder engagement at the planning stage with documentation includes women's groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



ADEQUATE

- Notes that the project and all subprojects must ensure the equitable participation of women in all consultations and that "their views and concerns

are made known to, understood by, and taken into consideration by decision-makers"

- Requires that "at least 40% of local women participate in consultation meetings during design period" for all subprojects
- Fails to note whether consultations will make adjustments to better include women, such as holding meetings at convenient times and offering transportation, translation and child care services

- Do the annexes include stakeholder engagement plans for project implementation that includes women's groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annex)



ADEQUATE

- Notes that "key stakeholders" will be identified in consultation process and that "stakeholders will need to include affected people and concerned non-government organizations, among others"
- Indicates that "local Women's federations" will be included in capacity building for gender mainstreaming activities, such as technology and skills trainings and professional trainings
- Includes no other mention of inclusion of women's groups or national gender machineries



INDICATOR 17: Is there gender-responsive governance of project management and implementation?

- Does the Accredited Entity's Project Management Unit include gender

experts and operate to support and build gender expertise in-country (including providing gender capacity building and oversight to Executing Entities)?



PART C, GAP: STRONG

- Recommends that two gender/social development specialists (one domestic specialist contracted for 22 months, one international specialist for 5 months) be hired to implement the GAP
- Only requires that "at least one" gender/social specialist be hired in GAP Indicator Targets without specifying which of the above two would receive priority hiring.

- Is the national gender machinery involved in project implementation structures (as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures)?

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator



PART C, GAP: ADEQUATE

- Indicates that local Women's federations (which have a history of advocating for binary gender equality) will be involved in implementation of the GAP, such as providing women with technology and skills training and professional training

- Are civil society groups, particularly women's groups, Indigenous Peoples and local/community groups, and gender experts involved as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures?



PART C: WEAK

- Makes no mention of involvement of women's groups, Indigenous Peoples or local/community groups in description of Executing Entities


INDICATOR 18: To what extent does the project provide complete available project information, including in national/local languages, to all project-affected persons including women and marginalized gender/social groups?



WEAK

- Notes that the Initial Environmental Examination, Resettlement Plan, and Environmental Management Plan must be made available in a form "a form and language(s) understandable to affected people and other stakeholders"
- Does not specify whether information about the Grievance Redress Mechanism will be made available in appropriate languages
- Does not acknowledge that women are more likely to be illiterate

and therefore may need to access project information in non-written form



INDICATOR 19: To what extent does the project have a gender-responsive monitoring process including collecting baseline and monitoring and evaluation gender-disaggregated data? To what extent are gendered indicators (quantitative and qualitative) reflected in the project/program results management framework?



PART H: ADEQUATE

- Requires that the total number of direct and indirect beneficiaries are 50% women and that M&E data is disaggregated by gender as part of the fund-level impacts
- Requires project trainings and workshops collect gender-disag-

gregated participation data and mandates that women make up at least 40% of attendees in the GAP

- Does not include gender requirements for SGDF staffing or subprojects although the GAP does indicate that women must make up at least 30% staff for construction and operations jobs
- Does not require including gender equity indicators in the Green Rating System that the SGDF will establish to evaluate applicant projects

FP084

Enhancing climate resilience of India's coastal communities

India's coastline is expected to be among the most affected by climate change. Climate change impacts such as extreme weather events and sea level rise are exacerbated by urbanization, overfishing, and poorly planned coastal development. This means that approximately 250 million people (14 percent of the country's population) who live within 50 kilometers of coastal areas are particularly vulnerable to climate change. This [GCF project](#) will strengthen the climate resilience of coastal communities by protecting and restoring India's natural ecosystems such as mangroves and seagrass, which are essential for buffering against storm surges. The project will also support climate-adaptive livelihoods and value chains to increase the climate resilience of these coastal communities. The project will be implemented in 24 target ecosystems in 12 coastal districts across the states of Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra, and Odisha. The project's ecosystem restoration benefits have an estimated lifespan of 30 years.

Assessment Grade

-  WEAK
-  ADEQUATE
-  STRONG

Main Project/Program Characteristics

- Country: India
- Total value: US\$130.30 million
- GCF funding support: US\$43.42 million
- GCF financing instrument: grant
- Accredited Entity: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
- International access (MIE)
- Direct implementation (DI)
- Public sector (P)
- Cross-cutting
- ESS risk categorization: B
- Regular approval process
- Under implementation: Yes, since June 2019
- Expected completion: June 2027

FP084

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 1: To what extent is there an integration of gender equality considerations in the narrative and the technical elaboration of the overall project/program proposal document and project description? To what extent does the project undertake a gender-responsive, transparent, collaborative cost-benefit analysis and seriously consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends? Does it contain elements of an ecofeminist cost-benefit analysis? And if so which?



PART A: ADEQUATE

- Acknowledges women's disproportionate vulnerability to the economic impacts of climate change
- Explains that the project aims to increase climate resilience for populations in coastal India most vulnerable to climate change

- Notes that the project conducted "extensive stakeholder consultations" but fails to undertake a gender-responsive cost-benefit analysis or consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends



PART C: ADEQUATE

- Explains that enhancing the climate resilience of "rural populations – particularly women and other vulnerable population groups" is the key project objective
- Explains that the project will produce a climate vulnerability map that will take "gender biases" into consideration and will be used to inform project activities
- Promises multiple times to "pay particular attention to the needs of women" for various project

components including sustainable livelihood development initiatives

- Notes other ways in which the project will include women, such as ensuring that women "participate fully in livelihoods activities and decision-making processes"
- Mentions the inclusion of women multiple times but fails to fully integrate an eco-feminist framework in project description or undertake a gender-responsive cost-benefit analysis

INDICATOR 2: To what extent is there a specific gendered description, including provision of gender-disaggregated data (baseline and expected reach), of intended direct and indirect beneficiaries? Including targeting women and girls?



PART A: WEAK

- Notes that the project aims to benefit populations in coastal India most vulnerable to climate change, particularly women, to increase their resilience
- Fails to provide a more detailed gendered description of project beneficiaries or gender-disaggregated data of beneficiaries



PART C: ADEQUATE

- Explains that the project's key objective is to increase climate resilience for coastal communities in India, particularly vulnerable groups like women
- Mentions that select project components are aimed particularly at women and that the project will actively include women

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Fails to provide gender-disaggregated data for beneficiaries

INDICATOR 3: To what extent are "gender co-benefits" elaborated against the GCF Investment Criteria?



PART E: STRONG

- Notes that the project "has a specific focus on the climate vulnerabilities of women" and that "many of the livelihood activities target women as primary beneficiaries"
- Explains that other project components will also target women, such as knowledge products targeted for women's groups and women's capacity development programmes

- Includes a section on "Gender-Sensitive Development Impact" which gives a brief description of women's economic struggles in the project-affected areas and explains how the project aims to benefit women by increasing their income and improving access to healthcare and education

- Notes that the project is modeled after similar interventions that were successful in increasing women's income

INDICATOR 4: Is the project/program budget allocation gender-responsive? ("gender budgeting")

- Are gender-related expenditures integrated in the overall project budget?



PART B: WEAK

- Allocates funding for project components that include women, such as conducting a climate vulnerability assessment and building climate resilient livelihoods
- Makes no direct mention of gender in project budget even though the GAP calls for funding

- Can women's groups/local groups/grassroots women get access to project funding?



PART B AND PROJECT GAP: ADEQUATE

- Does not explicitly note that women's groups will have access to project funds but does include women's groups as the primary beneficiaries for certain project outputs, such as climate adaptation knowledge products
- Explains that the project will involve women's groups in multiple

project components including "village-level capacity building on climate change"

- Notes that the project aims to strengthen the capacity of community based organizations including women's groups
- Explains that the project will engage women's groups throughout the project to ensure they "take advantage of livelihood opportunities and strengthen their capacity"

- Does the Gender Action Plan (GAP) have its own budget? Is it adequate/ commensurate with overall budget and intent? What is the money spent on (gender consultants? Building local capacity for gender mainstreaming?)



PROJECT GAP: ADEQUATE

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Allocates funding for each GAP indicator and provides a detailed description of the responsible entity for each indicator, which further clarifies how the funding will be used
- Includes a total budget of \$15,633,238 USD which accounts for just 8.3% of the total project budget
- Does not reflect the GAP budget in the overall project budget

INDICATOR 5: (To what extent) does the project/program acknowledge and discuss (implicitly or explicitly) an intersectional approach to gender?



ADEQUATE

- Acknowledges the feminization of poverty and notes that women-

headed households disproportionately suffer from poverty due to discrimination and the gender division of work

- Acknowledges that women are disproportionately harmed by climate risks and climate disasters
- Explains that gender inequality is “mediated by other aspects of social identity in India, especially caste” and later notes that project-affected people are disproportionately Scheduled Caste
- Fails to explore how Scheduled Caste women are particularly vulnerable to project harm and exclusion
- Notes that the GAP study examined the “interaction of gender dynamics with other social variables such as class, caste, age, and economic status” but does not integrate this intersectional framework into project design

- Fails to acknowledge how religion and sexuality affect women’s experiences and their ability to access project benefits

INDICATOR 6: (To what extent) does the project/program (implicitly or explicitly) acknowledge and include people with marginalized gender and sexual identities?



WEAK

- Makes no mention of LGBTQ people in other project documents and fails to adequately integrate the particular needs and vulnerabilities of this group in the project plan

INDICATOR 7: To what extent does the project acknowledge and take into account potential impacts on sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) or sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment (SEAH)?




ADEQUATE

- Includes a section on violence against women in the Gender Assessment which notes that 2.24 million crimes against women have been reported in the last decade and that the majority of perpetrators were husbands
- Explains that violence against women and rape cases often go unreported due to pressure of patriarchal society norms and insensitive societal systems
- Ignores how sexist reporting processes often actively prevent women from seeking justice

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Notes that women often face increased violence following climate disasters
- Fails to explain how project affected people could safely report an instance of SGBV or SEAH through the GRM
- Notes that the project may cause “conflict between potential beneficiaries of livelihood interventions in target communities” but fails to acknowledge and take measures to prevent domestic violence that often results from increased women’s income and household power
- Does not acknowledge that LGBTQ people are also disproportionately at risk of SGBV



INDICATOR 8: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis assess the needs of women and other gender groups and

current state of gender dynamics in the project-affected country/region/ community prior to project inception, implementation, monitoring, and reporting?



STRONG

- Used a desktop literature review, a summary of information learned from similar projects managed by UNDP in Sindhudurg district, and stakeholder consultations with government departments, civil society organizations, and community members to inform the Gender Assessment
- Provides an analysis of gender in Sindhudurg district, exploring topics such as women’s access to income, education, and health-care
- Incorporates some intersectional framing, noting that women

from Scheduled Caste are more likely to experience poverty and poor health outcomes

- Fails to acknowledge the presence of LGBTQ people in Sindhudurg district



INDICATOR 9: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis predict and address potential harmful gendered impacts in order to prevent them?

- With recommendations and conclusions in the overall project design



ADEQUATE

- Includes the following risk in the Risk Factors and Mitigation Measures section: “limited involvement and participation of women and other marginalized groups in project implementation”

- Includes mitigation measures to prevent this outcome, such as continued consultation with women and girls during project implementation, and inclusion of women in co-management structures and livelihood opportunities

- Notes that women will also be targeted through certain project activities which will also mitigate this risk

- Fails to include a gender lens in other project risks that could disproportionately harm women and LGBTQ people, such as “conflict between potential beneficiaries of livelihood interventions in target communities”

- With concrete actions in the project-specific gender action plan



WEAK

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Includes no mention of gender risks or safeguards in the GAP even though the ESMF acknowledges that the project has the potential to disproportionately exclude and harm women

INDICATOR 10: To what extent does the project take into account potential impacts on the gender division of labor?



ADEQUATE

- Includes a section on labor in the GAP and notes that women are overrepresented in the informal sector which has lower average income and no occupational safety and health safeguards
- Notes that women are "appointed as the water provider

in society" and that climate change risks increasing women's workload

- Notes that "climate change leads to migration, particularly male migration, leaving women behind in the rural areas to take care of both agriculture and unpaid care work"

- Cites a study that found women aged 15-29 spend 57.5 percent of their time on unpaid work while women ages 30-44 years old spend 65.8 percent of their time on unpaid work

- Aims to promote women's involvement in sustainable livelihoods which could challenge the current gender division of labor and increase income generating opportunities for women

- Fails to include any safeguards to prevent increasing women's domestic labor burden in project design

INDICATOR 11: To what extent does the project-specific gender action plan fully articulate and cover the project period (integrated activities vs "add-ons", define clear responsibilities/ accountability and meaningful gender indicators? Inclusion of an adequate, multi-year budget?)



ADEQUATE

- Includes vague timeframes for each GAP output such as "year 2 and onwards"
- Allocates funding for each output
- Assigns responsible entities to each sub-output with a detailed description of how implementation will occur
- Includes a total budget of \$15,633,238 USD which accounts for just 8.3% of the total project budget

INDICATOR 12: To what extent does the project create safeguards to prevent potential harms, including those that will disproportionately impact women, men, sexual and gender minorities? To what extent is there a comprehensive and project-adequate elaboration on gender in the project/program risk assessment and monitoring frameworks and arrangements?



PART F: ADEQUATE

- Acknowledges that "limited involvement and participation of women and other marginalized groups in project implementation" is a project risk
- Includes mitigation measures, noting that the project has included women and members of other marginalized groups in project planning and targets

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

women as primary beneficiaries for certain activities

- Notes that the project will promote “women’s participation in both co-management structures and livelihood opportunities”
- Fails to acknowledge and take measures to prevent domestic violence that often results from increased women’s income and household power

INDICATOR 13: To what extent does the project apply the principle of Free, Prior and Informed Consent and give project-affected persons (especially women and LGBTI people and Indigenous Peoples as well as other marginalized social groups) the right to accept or refuse? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



WEAK

- Does not mention consent in any project documents, even though the project conducted extensive consultations and had multiple opportunities to ask for consent from project-affected people
- Does not indicate that the project will give project-affected people an opportunity to accept or reject the project, which is particularly troublesome for women and LGBTQ people who are disproportionately at risk of being harmed by the project

INDICATOR 14: Is there a fully articulated, gender-responsive redress mechanism available to women at the project /national level in addition to the GCF IRM?



PART C AND ANNEX REFERENCING ESIA OR ESMF: ADEQUATE

- Notes in the funding proposal that the project will include a two-tiered Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) that will be “designed in consideration of the specific local context and will draw on existing processes and procedures for the resolution of complaints and grievances in India”
- Explains that the GRM is free to use but “when a complaint and/or grievance is seen to be ineligible, the GRM will not cover these costs”
- Requires that a summary list of complaints received and their disposition be published every six months to promote transparency
- Plans to “raise awareness about the GRM through publicity campaigns” but does not further clarify

ify how this publicity campaign will be conducted or whether marginalized gender groups will be targeted

- Notes that complaints can be made orally or in writing which will improve access for women
- Does not outline any other specific accommodations to ensure women and LGBTQ people can use the current mechanism, such as women intake officers or special accommodations for survivors of SGBV

INDICATOR 15: To what extent does the project provide compensation in case of harm that disproportionately impacts women and other marginalized gender groups, for example housing and land that is equal to or better than pre-settlement and compensating women and marginalized gender groups who are not legally recognized land owners?

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator



PART C, PART F AND RELEVANT ANNEXES SUCH AS RESETTLEMENT PLANS: ADEQUATE

- Notes that “none of the project interventions will require the displacement of people” although the project does risk collateral environmental damage which suggests that economic displacement and health harms could occur (although India passed legislation protecting people displaced by development projects in 2013, see <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/up-front/2013/10/21/progress-in-india-new-legislation-to-protect-persons-internally-displaced-by-development-projects/>)
- Makes no mention of compensation for these potential harms in the funding proposal
- Explains in the ESMF that the project will provide due compensation “if there are any

cases where access to resources is being permanently curtailed”

- Does not explain whether loss of access to resources is likely or clarify the compensation process
- Makes no other mention of compensation in the ESMF

INDICATOR 16: To what extent does the project ensure full, effective and ongoing/sustained participation of gender groups throughout the project/program cycle?

- Comprehensive stakeholder engagement at the planning stage with documentation includes women’s groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



ADEQUATE

- Notes in the funding proposal that women’s organizations were involved in project consultations
- Indicates in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan that a representative from a women’s self-help group was included in a project consultation
- Explains that women’s organizations contributed to the development of the GAP
- Does not indicate that any national gender machinery will be included in project planning

- Do the annexes include stakeholder engagement plans for project implementation that includes women’s groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annex)



ADEQUATE

- Notes in the funding proposal that women’s organizations will be involved in and beneficiaries of various project components, such as climate knowledge products and sustainable livelihood development opportunities
- Does not indicate that any national gender machinery will be included in project planning implementation

INDICATOR 17: Is there gender-responsive governance of project management and implementation?

- Does the Accredited Entity’s Project Management Unit include gender experts and operate to support and build gender expertise in-country (including providing gender capacity building and oversight to Executing Entities)?

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator



PART C, GAP: WEAK

- Does not indicate in the funding proposal that any gender experts will be included in the Project Management Unit
- Notes once in the GAP that the project will include a Gender Specialist who will implement gender related activities
- Makes no other mention of the Gender Specialist or whether they will be included in the Project Management Unit.
- Is the national gender machinery involved in project implementation structures (as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures)?



PART C, GAP: WEAK

- Does not indicate that any national gender machinery will be included in the project

- Are civil society groups, particularly women's groups, Indigenous Peoples and local/community groups, and gender experts involved as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures?



PART C: WEAK

- Notes that women's organizations were involved in project consultations and will be beneficiaries of multiple project components but does not indicate that they will be involved as Executing Entities
- Notes once in the GAP that the project will include a Gender Specialist but does not explain whether they will be involved as an Executing Entity
- Fails to mention the Gender Specialist in the funding proposal



INDICATOR 18: To what extent does the project provide complete available project information, including in national/local languages, to all project-affected persons including women and marginalized gender/social groups?



WEAK

- Notes that knowledge products developed by the project will be translated into local languages and made "gender sensitive" but does not explain whether information about the project will be translated or made gender sensitive
- Does not describe in project documents how information about the project will be distributed or made accessible to vulnerable populations



INDICATOR 19: To what extent does the project have a gender-responsive monitoring process including collecting baseline and monitoring and evaluation gender-disaggregated data? To what extent are gendered indicators (quantitative and qualitative) reflected in the project/program results management framework?



GAP: ADEQUATE

- Outlines detailed gender indicators for each GAP activity, including target data but no baseline data
- Connects each GAP activity with overall project outputs
- Includes strong indicators that cover all aspects of the project cycle, from planning to implementation and monitoring

FP084

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Sets some target proportions to include a minimum of 50% women but includes some more disappointing targets such as “at least 20 percent of participants in paid work opportunities on restoration of ecosystems are women”

FP094

Ensuring climate resilient water supplies in the Comoros Islands

This [GCF project](#) in the Comoros Islands targets adaptation measures to address increasing climate risks that impact the country's drinking and irrigation water supply. The Comoros Islands, separated into three islands, has a land area of only 2,612 square kilometers and no land further than 7 kilometers from the coast. This means the country is highly vulnerable to climate effects such as cyclones, erosion, flash floods and droughts. Rising temperatures will also reduce water availability and cause saline intrusion from rising sea levels. The project, with an estimated lifespan of 25 years, aims to strengthen the national governance of water by integrating climate change into the country's new water code. This will include integrating climate information into revised water legislation reforms, and upgrading tariff reforms to include the additional costs of reducing climate risks. Enhanced climate-resilient water infrastructure will incorporate expanded water storage tanks to store more water through longer dry periods.

Assessment Grade

- WEAK
- ADEQUATE
- STRONG

Main Project/Program Characteristics

- Country: Comoros Islands
- Total value: US\$160.8 million
- GCF funding support: US\$41.92 million
- GCF financing instrument: grant
- Accredited Entity: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
- International access (MIE)
- Direct implementation (DI)
- Public sector (P)
- Adaptation
- ESS risk categorization: B
- Regular approval process
- Under implementation: Yes, since June 2019
- Expected completion: June 2027

FP094

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 1: To what extent is there an integration of gender equality considerations in the narrative and the technical elaboration of the overall project/program proposal document and project description? To what extent does the project undertake a gender-responsive, transparent, collaborative cost-benefit analysis and seriously consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends? Does it contain elements of an ecofeminist cost-benefit analysis? And if so which?



PART A: WEAK

- Fails to mention gender or women whatsoever in project description
- Overlooks how women are disproportionately harmed by climate change impacts, particularly impacts on water supply, and have the potential to be key beneficiaries of this project

- Fails to undertake a gender-responsive cost-benefit analysis or consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends



PART C: WEAK

- Notes that women currently spend 2.5 hours per day on water collection which will only be exacerbated by climate change
- Mentions gender in description of one project activity: "design and conduct trainings on best practices and gender-sensitive techniques of climate change adaptation"
- Makes no other mentions of gender and fails integrate an eco-feminist framework in project description or undertake a gender-responsive cost-benefit analysis



INDICATOR 2: To what extent is there a specific gendered description, including provision of gender-disaggregated data (baseline and expected reach), of intended direct and indirect beneficiaries? Including targeting women and girls?



PART A: WEAK

- Includes no gender description of project beneficiaries, which threatens the project's ability to benefit women and LGBTQ people
- Fails to provide gender-disaggregated data for baseline or expected reach of project beneficiaries




PART C: WEAK

- Notes that Comorian women currently spend 2.5 hours per

day on water collection which will only be exacerbated by climate change but does not explain whether women are target beneficiaries for the project

- Fails to provide gender-disaggregated data for beneficiaries



INDICATOR 3: To what extent are "gender co-benefits" elaborated against the GCF Investment Criteria?



PART E: ADEQUATE

- Explains that the project "will directly benefit 450,000 people, of which 229,500 are women"
- Notes that the project has the potential to reduce time women spend fetching and carrying water
- Includes a section titled Gender-Sensitive Development

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

Impacts, describing how the project can benefit people of all genders by improving water treatment thereby reducing salt water intake and improving nutrition

- Explains that the project will also improve “women’s skills on operation and maintenance of local water management systems, and knowledge on water resource management,” overlooking how women are already often stewards of environmental knowledge
- Does not explain whether or how women will be included in project implementation and employment opportunities
- Does not explicitly attempt to reduce class inequalities although doing so is critical not only because women compose the majority of the poor but also because Comoros has the world’s highest Gini coefficient

INDICATOR 4: Is the project/program budget allocation gender-responsive? (“gender budgeting”)

- Are gender-related expenditures integrated in the overall project budget?



PART C: WEAK

- Includes one mention of gender in the project budget: “design and conduct trainings on best practices and gender sensitive techniques of climate change adaptation”
- Allocates \$505,082 in funding to this project activity, which accounts for just .8% of the project budget
- Makes no other mention of gender in project budget even though many actions described in the GAP appear to require funding (such as “develop a gender responsive monitoring and

evaluation framework and data collection systems to systematically document differential losses and damages on males and females”)

- Can women’s groups/local groups/grassroots women get access to project funding?



PART B AND PROJECT GAP: WEAK

- Includes women’s groups in multiple project components, such as in reforming the Water Code and the Decentralization Strategy of the Comoros
- Includes “increased implication of local women’s organizations in water and climate-related projects” as a project outcome
- Does not clarify whether women’s groups’ inclusion in project components will give them access to project funding

■ Does the Gender Action Plan (GAP) have its own budget? Is it adequate/ commensurate with overall budget and intent? What is the money spent on (gender consultants? Building local capacity for gender mainstreaming?)



PROJECT GAP: ADEQUATE

- Allocates funding for each GAP output, assigns a responsible entity, and provides a timeline for each indicator, which somewhat clarifies when and how the funding will be used
- Does not reflect the GAP budget in the overall project budget
- Sets a GAP budget of \$2,727,931, which accounts for just 4.5% of total project funding
- Fails to provide sufficient information on spending within each output, which prevents a

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

more complete analysis given that outputs include fairly broad activities such as “prepare recommendations and legal guidance on the integration of climate change adaptation into the national and regional water sector agencies”

INDICATOR 5: (To what extent) does the project/program acknowledge and discuss (implicitly or explicitly) an intersectional approach to gender?



ADEQUATE

- Acknowledges that women are disproportionately harmed by climate-related water scarcity and notes in the ESMF that “climate change affects women and men differently”

- Explains that Islam shapes gender roles in Comoros and that the project has been designed to accommodate for these gender roles
- Does not acknowledge that 2% of the population in Comoros is not Muslim and/or account for barriers that this segment of the population could face in accessing project benefits
- Notes in the ESMF that the Comoros Islands are home to many indigenous groups but does not acknowledge how indigenous identity may affect women, men and LGBTQ people’s ability to access project benefits
- Fails to acknowledge how other factors such as religion and sexuality affect women’s experiences and their ability to access project benefits
- Fails to integrate an intersectional lens in project design



INDICATOR 6: (To what extent) does the project/program (implicitly or explicitly) acknowledge and include people with marginalized gender and sexual identities?



WEAK

- Explains in the ESMF that discrimination due to sexual orientation is prohibited but does not explain how this discrimination will be prevented
- Notes the following in the ESMF: “References to ‘women and men’ or similar is understood to include women and men, boys and girls, and other groups discriminated against based on their gender identities, such as transgender people and transsexuals”

- Fails to actually accommodate for the specific needs of LGBTQ people in the ESMF or in overall project design, instead assuming that this group’s needs are identical to those of ‘women and men’
- Makes no mention of LGBTQ people in other project documents and fails to adequately integrate the particular needs and vulnerabilities of this group in the project plan



INDICATOR 7: To what extent does the project acknowledge and take into account potential impacts on sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) or sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment (SEAH)?



WEAK

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Includes a section on Gender Based Violence in the Gender Assessment, noting that women and girls “often suffer from physical, sexual and psychological violence, most often from family members and inlaws”
- Explains that women must often walk long distances to latrines facilities, which increases their risk of SGBV so they often consume less water during the day in order to avoid going outside during the night, making them more sensitive to certain diseases
- Notes that “there is reason to believe” the project may indirectly reduce SGBV and SEAH “by reducing the stress on couples and families, providing opportunities for women and youth to actively participate in the project’s interventions through capacity buildings and training workshops, minimizing the time spent to fetch water and creating economic opportunities for women and youth”

- Fails to acknowledge that the project also risks exacerbating SGBV, such as by introducing construction workers into communities to complete infrastructure projects
- Does not acknowledge that LGBTQ people are also disproportionately at risk of SGBV
- Does not mention SGBV or SEAH in any other project documents

INDICATOR 8: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis assess the needs of women and other gender groups and current state of gender dynamics in the project-affected country/region/community prior to project inception, implementation, monitoring, and reporting?



STRONG

- Uses a desktop literature review, a summary of information learned from previous UN and Government of Comoros gender studies, and stakeholder consultations to inform the Gender Assessment
- Provides an adequate analysis of gender in Comoros, exploring topics such as women’s access to resources, education, and political decision making
- Includes a detailed analysis of women’s relationship to water and how climate change will impact this relationship
- Acknowledges that women “provide knowledge, skills and perspective to help mitigate vulnerability to climate change, improve livelihoods, productivity and the well-being of their communities”

- Brings a nuanced analysis of gender roles, noting that “Comorian women have acquired a certain presence in society due to parallel matrilineal traditions” and that they often “have the power of decision within the family and are also able to take employment outside of the home”
- Fails to acknowledge the presence of LGBTQ people in the Comoros

INDICATOR 9: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis predict and address potential harmful gendered impacts in order to prevent them?

- With recommendations and conclusions in the overall project design

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator



ADEQUATE

- Notes that the project risks “exclusion of or adverse impacts to women and vulnerable groups” but does not identify a clear mitigation strategy in the funding proposal risk assessment table
- Includes the following activities in the ESMF as mitigation measures to ensure inclusion of women and other vulnerable groups: “implement GAP, ensure that needs of disabled people and other vulnerable groups is taken into account during project planning, design and execution, ensure adequate representation of vulnerable groups in stakeholder engagement activities, ensure compliance with the GRM”
- Includes a detailed list of safeguards to ensure the inclusion of women in the funding proposal, such as “ensure women are fully represented and empowered on

water management committees and water user associations” and “ensure women are equitably involved in IWRM plan implementation, monitoring and evaluation”

- Does not provide any acknowledgement of or safeguards for gender risks outside of exclusion, such as increased SGBV or increased domestic labor burdens
- Provides no safeguards aimed at protecting LGBTQ people
- With concrete actions in the project-specific gender action plan



WEAK

- Does not identify any gender risks posed by the project or provide any safeguards, which is troubling given that the project is not free of risks for women or LGBTQ people



INDICATOR 10: To what extent does the project take into account potential impacts on the gender division of labor?



ADEQUATE

- Notes that women are responsible for fetching water, “which reduces time available to actively participate in the labour market”
- Explains that women and girls spend up to roughly 2.5 hours a day to fetching water in the Comoros and that climate change may increase time spent on water collection
- Notes that the project may decrease women’s domestic labor burden by improving access to potable water sources
- Includes “time saved for water collection by women and girls”

as a gender-specific project indicator in the Gender Assessment and GAP

- Fails to include any safeguards that explicitly prevent increasing women’s domestic labor burden in project design



INDICATOR 11: To what extent does the project-specific gender action plan fully articulate and cover the project period (integrated activities vs “add-ons”, define clear responsibilities/ accountability and meaningful gender indicators? Inclusion of an adequate, multi-year budget?)



ADEQUATE

- Includes time frames for each GAP output and allocates funding for each output

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Assigns a list of responsible entities to each output but does not provide a description of how roles will be divided, preventing a more complete analysis
- Sets a GAP budget of \$2,727,931, which account for just 4.5% of total project funding

INDICATOR 12: To what extent does the project create safeguards to prevent potential harms, including those that will disproportionately impact women, men, sexual and gender minorities? To what extent is there a comprehensive and project-adequate elaboration on gender in the project/program risk assessment and monitoring frameworks and arrangements?



PART G: ADEQUATE

- Includes a list of actions in Part F to ensure women are included in project design and implementation, including “ensure women are fully involved in water supply management committees” and “ensure women are fully represented on Integrated Water Resources and Wastewater Management (IWRM) committees”
- Includes several gender-related indicators in the overall results monitoring framework described in Part H, such as “percentage of Water Management Committees with women leading discussions on the integration of climate-informed practices into water management”
- Includes no mention of gender risks in the Part G Risk Assessment even though the project is not free of risk for women or LGBTQ people

- Does not acknowledge how some of the identified risks, such as “natural hazards damage and/or destroy pre-existing and or project activities,” could disproportionately impact women and LGBTQ people as they are disproportionately impacted by climate disasters

INDICATOR 13: To what extent does the project apply the principle of Free, Prior and Informed Consent and give project-affected persons (especially women and LGBTI people and Indigenous Peoples as well as other marginalized social groups) the right to accept or refuse? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



WEAK

- Includes guidelines for how to ask for Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) in the ESMF that includes a checklist of necessary FPIC activities for project-affected people but fails to fill out the checklist
- Includes the following requirement at a later point in the ESMF: “Obtain landholder consent and engagement prior to undertaking any works – ensure that land parcel is clearly identified on agreement”
- Does not otherwise clarify what steps will be taken to obtain consent from all project affected people, including marginalized gender groups

INDICATOR 14: Is there a fully articulated, gender-responsive redress mechanism available to women at the project /national level in addition to the GCF IRM?

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator



PART C AND ANNEX REFERENCING ESIA OR ESMF: ADEQUATE

- Includes “grievance mechanism established” as an indicator in the GAP
- Provides a detailed description of the Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) in the ESMF
- Requires that the GRM provides equitable, fair, and respectful treatment to all complainants
- Allows complainants to submit complaints either orally (to the field staff), by phone, in complaints box or in writing, which will improve accessibility for women and LGBTQ people
- Notes that the GRM “will cover any reasonable costs” for complainants but will not cover costs when “a complaint is seen to be ineligible”

- Notes that the Safeguards and Gender Manager, who is not mentioned in the funding proposal, will be involved in the GRM process which indicates that at least one official involved will have gender training
- Requires that information about the GRM is “placed at prominent places for the information of the key stakeholders” but does not clarify whether the information will be in an accessible format
- Does not clarify how the GRM accommodates for power relations between grievance officers and women complainants, which could be done by hiring women grievance officers
- Does not confirm in the ESMF whether translation services will be available to complainants
- Does not provide any explicitly gender-sensitive accommodations in the GRM design




INDICATOR 15: To what extent does the project provide compensation in case of harm that disproportionately impacts women and other marginalized gender groups, for example housing and land that is equal to or better than pre-settlement and compensating women and marginalized gender groups who are not legally recognized land owners?



PART C, PART F AND RELEVANT ANNEXES SUCH AS RESETTLEMENT PLANS: ADEQUATE

- Notes in the Social and Environmental Screening Template that the project does not involve physical and economic displacement
- Explains that if any resettlement did occur, the project must “restore or compensate for these impacts”

- Acknowledges that culturally-sensitive compensation is particularly necessary for Indigenous People who are more vulnerable to harm than other groups
- Does not acknowledge that women, particularly indigenous women, must also be targeted in any compensation efforts as they are also more vulnerable to harm than other groups and are often not legally recognized land owners



INDICATOR 16: To what extent does the project ensure full, effective and ongoing/sustained participation of gender groups throughout the project/program cycle?

- Comprehensive stakeholder engagement at the planning stage with documentation includes women’s groups and national gender

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



ADEQUATE

- Explains that the project conducted consultations with women's organizations to inform the GAP and Gender Assessment
- Includes women's groups in multiple project components and notes that "women's Groups will be heavily implicated in project decisions-making"
- Notes in the Gender Assessment that the General Commission for Solidarity and Gender Promotion is the primary national gender machinery in the Comoros but does not indicate that they will be involved in project planning
- Do the annexes include stakeholder engagement plans for project implementation that includes


women's groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annex)



ADEQUATE

- Assigns the National Commission for Gender (which may be the same entity as the General Commission for Solidarity and Gender Promotion) to oversee nearly every GAP output, suggesting that they will be involved in project implementation
- Does not mention the National Commission for Gender in the funding proposal, preventing a more complete analysis of their role in project implementation
- Includes women's groups in multiple project components, such as in reforming the Water Code and the Decentralization Strategy of the Comoros
- Includes "increased implication of local women's organizations

in water and climate-related projects" as a project outcome, suggesting that they will be involved throughout project implementation



INDICATOR 17: Is there gender-responsive governance of project management and implementation?

- Does the Accredited Entity's Project Management Unit include gender experts and operate to support and build gender expertise in-country (including providing gender capacity building and oversight to Executing Entities)?



PART C, GAP: WEAK

- Assigns a Gender Expert to oversee nearly every GAP activity

- Fails to mention the Gender Expert in the funding proposal whatsoever
- Provides no further description of the Gender Expert in the GAP or how this expert will be integrated in the project management structure
- Does not set a budget for the Gender Expert, explain whether they will be hired from within the Comoros Islands, or note their gender
- Is the national gender machinery involved in project implementation structures (as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures)?



PART C, GAP: WEAK

- Notes in the Gender Assessment that the General Commission for Solidarity and Gender Promotion is the primary national gender machinery in the Comoros

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Fails to mention whether the General Commission for Solidarity and Gender Promotion or any other national gender machinery will be included in the project in the funding proposal
- Assigns the National Commission for Gender (which may be the same entity as the General Commission for Solidarity and Gender Promotion) to oversee nearly every GAP output, suggesting that they will be involved in project implementation structures
- Makes no other mention of the National Commission for Gender in any other project documents outside of the GAP, preventing an analysis of their role in the project
- Does not mention whether the National Commission for Gender will be involved in project implementation structures


- Are civil society groups, particularly women's groups, Indigenous Peoples and local/community groups, and gender experts involved as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures?



PART C: ADEQUATE

- Includes women's groups in multiple project components and notes that "women's groups will be heavily implicated in project decisions-making"
- Includes "increased implication of local women's organizations in water and climate-related projects" as a project outcome
- Does not explicitly indicate that women's groups will be involved as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures
- Assigns a Gender Expert to oversee many GAP outputs but never clarifies who will fill this

position, how it will be funded, or where it will be integrated in the project management structure



INDICATOR 18: To what extent does the project provide complete available project information, including in national/local languages, to all project-affected persons including women and marginalized gender/social groups?




WEAK

- Mentions that the Comoros is home to an estimated 20 languages in the ESMF, indicating that dissemination of project information in multiple languages will be necessary
- Recommends in the ESMF that the project reach out to indig-

enous people about project information with the assistance of a translator but never confirms whether this will actually occur

- Gives a detailed description of the stakeholder engagement process and lists the questions and topics raised at each meeting but fails to provide gender breakdown of attendees
- Does not clarify what formats project information will be distributed in or whether marginalized groups, such as women and LGBTQ people who are more likely to be illiterate, will be able to access project information
- Threatens the project's ability to obtain consent from project affected people by failing to make project information fully accessible



Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 19: To what extent does the project have a gender-responsive monitoring process including collecting baseline and monitoring and evaluation gender-disaggregated data? To what extent are gendered indicators (quantitative and qualitative) reflected in the project/program results management framework?



PART H: STRONG

- Includes several gender-related indicators in the overall results monitoring framework described in Part H, such as “percentage of Water Management Committees with women leading discussions on the integration of climate-informed practices into water management”
- Does not include percentage of women Water Management Committee members as an indicator
- Specifies baseline and target data for this indicator and sets the target for percentage of Water Management Committees with women leading discussions at 100% by the end of the project
- Integrates gender in other project indicators, such as “design and conduct trainings on best practices and gender sensitive techniques of climate change adaptation”
- Does not include percentage of women trainees or trainers as an indicator
- Sets midterm and final target amounts for all indicators, suggesting that they will cover the complete project timeline

FP099

Climate Investor One

This [GCF project](#) sets up a blended finance facility with an estimated lifespan of 20 years with a focus on providing financing to develop renewable energy projects in regions with power deficits to reduce energy costs and CO2 emissions. The 18 countries identified as potential recipients of finance under this facility have in common sizable energy deficits while also being overly reliant on fossil fuels. A major constraint in clean energy investment is a lack of early-stage project financing, combined with insufficient domestic and overseas financing to support the creation of domestic renewable energy markets at scale. The first component of Climate Investor One is a development fund, which provides loans in the early stage of a project life cycle. The second component, a construction equity fund, will meet up to 75 percent of total construction costs in tandem with the project sponsor.

Assessment Grade

- WEAK
- ADEQUATE
- STRONG

Main Project/Program Characteristics

- Countries: Malawi; Nigeria, Uganda, Madagascar, Djibouti, Morocco, Kenya, Mongolia, Cameroon, Burundi, Indonesia, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Mauritius, Philippines, Senegal, Tunisia, Zambia
- Total value: US\$821.50 million
- GCF funding support: US\$100.00
- GCF financing instrument: grant
- Accredited Entity: Nederlandse Financierings-Maatschappij voor Ontwikkelingslanden (FMO), Dutch Development Bank
- International access (MIE)
- Financial intermediation (FI)
- Private sector (PR)
- Mitigation
- ESS risk categorization: Intermediation-1 (I-1)
- Regular approval process
- Under implementation: Yes, since June 2019
- Expected completion: June 2039

FP099

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 1: To what extent is there an integration of gender equality considerations in the narrative and the technical elaboration of the overall project/program proposal document and project description? To what extent does the project undertake a gender-responsive, transparent, collaborative cost-benefit analysis and seriously consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends? Does it contain elements of an ecofeminist cost-benefit analysis? And if so which?



PART A: WEAK

- Includes no gender description of project whatsoever
- Ignores how the transition to clean energy will disproportionately impact women and gender minorities
- Does not undertake a gender-responsive cost-benefit analysis or

consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends



PART C: ADEQUATE

- Mentions that the projects will “intentionally impact women as stakeholders, workers, and end-users by both identifying and mitigating potential risks as well as proactively enhancing their benefit from increased access to renewable energy” in the Key Objectives section
- Plans to employ women through project components
- Makes no other mentions of women or gender and fails to adequately integrate a gender lens into project description
- Ignores how women are disproportionately impacted by climate change and energy pollution

- Does not consider how further privatization of energy markets could disproportionately marginalize and harm women and LGBTQ people

- Does not undertake a gender-responsive cost-benefit analysis or consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends



INDICATOR 2: To what extent is there a specific gendered description, including provision of gender-disaggregated data (baseline and expected reach), of intended direct and indirect beneficiaries? Including targeting women and girls?



PART A: WEAK

- Provides no gender description of project beneficiaries

- Fails to mention women or gender whatsoever



PART C: WEAK

- Explains that the project will “intentionally impact women as stakeholders, workers, and end-users by both identifying and mitigating potential risks as well as proactively enhancing their benefit from increased access to renewable energy” in the Key Objectives section
- Plans to employ women through project components but does not specify the expected amount of beneficiaries
- Does not provide a concrete gender breakdown of beneficiaries or gender targeting strategies

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 3: To what extent are “gender co-benefits” elaborated against the GCF Investment Criteria?



PART E: WEAK

- Includes a section titled “Environmental, social and economic co-benefits, including gender-sensitive development impact” in Part E
- Recognizes that “energy shortfall in many developing countries is a gendered issue”
- Explains that the project will “help reduce the exposure that women have to energy poverty through the implementation of the Gender Integration Action Plan, which is designed to help benefit women as renewable energy stakeholders, workers, and end-users”

- Provides no other explanation of how the project will ensure gender co-benefits

INDICATOR 4: Is the project/program budget allocation gender-responsive? (“gender budgeting”)

- Are gender-related expenditures integrated in the overall project budget?



PART B: WEAK

- Makes no mention of women or gender in the project budget whatsoever
- Sets no budget for GAP
- Can women’s groups/local groups/grassroots women get access to project funding?



PART B AND PROJECT GAP: WEAK

- Fails to mention women’s groups or provide any opportunities for them to access project funding, although women’s organizations exist within the project areas and could assist the project in ensuring women benefit

- Does the Gender Action Plan (GAP) have its own budget? Is it adequate/ commensurate with overall budget and intent? What is the money spent on (gender consultants? Building local capacity for gender mainstreaming?)



PROJECT GAP: WEAK

- Includes no budget which threatens the implementation of any GAP activities, as many of them would require significant funding

INDICATOR 5: (To what extent) does the project/program acknowledge and discuss (implicitly or explicitly) an intersectional approach to gender?



WEAK

- Does not directly acknowledge how ethnicity, class, or sexuality may affect women’s ability to access project benefits
- Assumes women to be a homogenous group who will access project benefits evenly

INDICATOR 6: (To what extent) does the project/program (implicitly or explicitly) acknowledge and include people with marginalized gender and sexual identities?

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator



WEAK

- Includes no mention of people with marginalized gender and sexual identities in any project documents and makes no accommodations to ensure the inclusion of LGBTQ people

INDICATOR 7: To what extent does the project acknowledge and take into account potential impacts on sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) or sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment (SEAH)?



WEAK

- Does not mention SGBV or SEAH in any project documents
- Ignores how the project has the potential to decrease SGBV and

SEAH through increased electrification if implemented with adequate gender-sensitivity

- Ignores project potential to increase SGBV and SEAH, such as through influxes of construction workers
- Provides no safeguards against the increased risk of SGBV or SEAH

INDICATOR 8: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis assess the needs of women and other gender groups and current state of gender dynamics in the project-affected country/region/community prior to project inception, implementation, monitoring, and reporting?



ADEQUATE

- Conducted a literature review exploring women's access in the project-affected countries as well as challenges for women in the renewable energy sector
- Correctly notes that "financing that is not gender-sensitive has the potential to worsen gender disparities"
- Integrates GAP activities into the recommendations section, providing more detail for these activities than given in the GAP
- Fails to complete robust gender assessments for each project-affected country, instead assuming that women's access to energy is uniform across all areas

INDICATOR 9: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis predict and address potential harmful gendered impacts in order to prevent them?

- With recommendations and conclusions in the overall project design



WEAK

- Ignores gender in project Risk Assessment, even though the Gender Assessment notes that "financing that is not gender-sensitive has the potential to worsen gender disparities" by increasing their workload, further marginalizing women from decision-making and further excluding women from the formal economy
- Overlooks how the project could also harm LGBTQ people in similar ways
- Focuses the risk assessment primarily on financial risks that the project poses to the GCF
- Provides gender-sensitive safeguards in the funding proposal

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- With concrete actions in the project-specific gender action plan



WEAK

- Includes no mention of gender risks or safeguards in the GAP even though the project has the potential to disproportionately exclude and harm women and LGBTQ people

INDICATOR 10: To what extent does the project take into account potential impacts on the gender division of labor?



ADEQUATE

- Recognizes in the Gender Assessment that women are disproportionately responsible for domestic labor and therefore

are particularly impacted by energy-related projects

- Notes in the Gender Assessment that while the project has the opportunity to reduce women's domestic labor workloads, "financing that is not gender-sensitive" could increase these workloads by further limiting women's access to energy
- Does not integrate these insights into other project documents
- Fails to create safeguards to prevent increased domestic labor burdens for women

INDICATOR 11: To what extent does the project-specific gender action plan fully articulate and cover the project period (integrated activities vs "add-ons", define clear responsibilities/ accountability and meaningful gender indicators? Inclusion of an adequate, multi-year budget?)



WEAK

- Fails to include a timeframe for any GAP activity
- Provides no budget for the GAP in the funding proposal or GAP, threatening the implementation of GAP activities
- Fails to assign responsible entities to GAP activities

INDICATOR 12: To what extent does the project create safeguards to prevent potential harms, including those that will disproportionately impact women, men, sexual and gender minorities? To what extent is there a comprehensive and project-adequate elaboration on gender in the project/program risk assessment and monitoring frameworks and arrangements?



PART F: WEAK

- Notes that the project "is focused on aspects including gender equality"
- Plans to use the Climate Investor One (CIO) Gender Integration Action Plan which includes 'Do No Harm' and 'Do Good' as central pillars
- Explains that the project has a "gender-responsive grievance mechanism"
- Does not describe the CIO Gender Integration Action Plan or how the plan will prevent gender harms
- Ignores how the project could deepen gender inequities in energy access by further privatizing energy in project-affected countries
- Fails to consider equity-fund subprojects' lack of adherence

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- to gender, other social and environmental safeguards
- Describes no gender safeguards in the funding proposal

INDICATOR 13: To what extent does the project apply the principle of Free, Prior and Informed Consent and give project-affected persons (especially women and LGBTI people and Indigenous Peoples as well as other marginalized social groups) the right to accept or refuse? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



WEAK

- Only mentions consent once in the 2019 Annual Performance Report out of all project documents

- Notes that the project is compliant with FPIC standards in Djibouti and Uganda
- Does not explain how consent was obtained from project-affected people in these countries or whether the process was gender-inclusive
- Does not clarify whether consent has been or will be obtained in the other project-affected countries
- Risks harming marginalized groups, such as women and LGBTQ people, by failing to give them the opportunity to accept or refuse project participation

INDICATOR 14: Is there a fully articulated, gender-responsive redress mechanism available to women at the project /national level in addition to the GCF IRM?



PART C AND ANNEX REFERENCING ESIA OR ESMF: WEAK

- Notes multiple times in the founding proposal that the project includes a gender-responsive, project-level GRM
- Explains that information regarding the GRM will be available to project-affected people and the public
- Fails to provide working links to the ESMR, which contains a more detailed description of the GRM, on the GCF website
- Provides no further description of the GRM or complaints process in the finding proposal

INDICATOR 15: To what extent does the project provide compensation in case of harm that dispro-

portionately impacts women and other marginalized gender groups, for example housing and land that is equal to or better than pre-settlement and compensating women and marginalized gender groups who are not legally recognized land owners?



PART C, PART F AND RELEVANT ANNEXES SUCH AS RESETTLEMENT PLANS: WEAK

- Does not indicate that the project will cause involuntary economic displacement or physical resettlement, although does not explicitly confirm
- Fails to mention compensation in case of harm that disproportionately impacts women and other marginalized gender groups, even though the project has the potential to harm these communities

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Notes that the project will conduct a final evaluation that will give “special attention to unintended effects” such as resettlement
- Does not clarify whether this final evaluation process will involve compensation for harms

INDICATOR 16: To what extent does the project ensure full, effective and ongoing/sustained participation of gender groups throughout the project/program cycle?

- Comprehensive stakeholder engagement at the planning stage with documentation includes women’s groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



WEAK

- Fails to include any women’s organizations in project planning
- Fails to include any national gender machinery in project planning

- Do the annexes include stakeholder engagement plans for project implementation that includes women’s groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annex)



WEAK

- Fails to include any women’s organizations in project implementation, even though partnering with women’s organizations could enhance the efficacy and gender equity of many project components

- Fails to include any national gender machinery in project implementation

INDICATOR 17: Is there gender-responsive governance of project management and implementation?

- Does the Accredited Entity’s Project Management Unit include gender experts and operate to support and build gender expertise in-country (including providing gender capacity building and oversight to Executing Entities)?



PART C, GAP: WEAK

- Mentions a gender expert several times in the GAP
- Sets “establish network of gender experts to support in implementation of GAP” and “conduct mid-term audit by gen-

der expert” as indicators in the GAP

- Fails to include a timeline, target, or budget for these indicators which decreases the likelihood that they will occur
- Makes no mention of a gender expert in the funding proposal

- Is the national gender machinery involved in project implementation structures (as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures)?



PART C, GAP: WEAK

- Fails to include any national gender machinery in project implementation structures
- Are civil society groups, particularly women’s groups, Indigenous Peoples and local/community groups, and gender experts

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

involved as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures?



PART C: WEAK

- Indicates that the project will include a gender expert in project oversight and monitoring in the GAP but does not include a timeline, target, or budget for the gender expert
- Does not mention the inclusion of any women's groups, Indigenous Peoples, or local/community groups in the funding proposal or GAP

INDICATOR 18: To what extent does the project provide complete available project information, including in national/local languages, to all project-affected persons including women and marginalized gender/social groups?



WEAK

- Indicates in the 2019 Annual Performance Report that the "Project Disclosure Package," which includes general project information and the project ESMP, was provided in English and in local languages in Djibouti and Uganda
- Does not clarify whether that has occurred or will occur in the other project-affected countries
- Does not indicate that other gender-sensitive accommodations will be made to ensure women have access to project information

INDICATOR 19: To what extent does the project have a gender-responsive monitoring process including collecting baseline and monitoring and evaluation gender-disaggregated

data? To what extent are gendered indicators (quantitative and qualitative) reflected in the project/program results management framework?



GAP: WEAK

- Includes no target or baseline data for any gender indicators
- Fails to connect GAP and project targets in project design, which reduces the likelihood that GAP activities will be implemented
- Sets some strong indicators such as "stand-alone initiatives targeting women" and "gender-responsive grievance mechanism monitoring" but provides no targets, budget, timeline, or responsible entities for these indicators

FP100

REDD-PLUS results-based payments for results achieved by Brazil in the Amazon biome in 2014 and 2015

This [GCF project](#) is the first that has been approved under the GCF's REDD+ results-based payments pilot program to support efforts to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation, and foster conservation, sustainable management of forests, and enhancement of forest carbon stocks (REDD+) in Brazil. It provides payments for results derived from reducing emissions from deforestation in the Amazon region in 2014 and 2015. These results have subsequently been reported to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and undergone technical assessment and are fully compliant with UNFCCC requirements. Considering that Brazil will reinvest the proceeds received through this project in activities that are consistent with their Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) established under the UNFCCC Paris Agreement and national REDD+ strategy, Brazil will use the proceeds for (a) Development of a pilot of an Environmental Services Incentives Program for Conservation and Recovery of Native Vegetation (Floresta+); and (b) for Strengthening implementation of Brazil's REDD+ strategy.

Assessment Grade

- WEAK
- ADEQUATE
- STRONG

Main Project/Program Characteristics

- Country: Brazil
- Total value: US\$96.45 million
- GCF funding support: US\$96.45 million
- GCF financing instrument: results-based payment (RBP)
- Accredited Entity: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
- International access (MIE)
- Direct implementation (DI)
- Public sector (P)
- Mitigation
- ESS risk categorization: B
- Regular approval process
- Pilot program: REDD+ Results-based Payment Pilot Program
- Under implementation: Yes, since January 2020
- Expected completion: January 2026

FP100

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 1: To what extent is there an integration of gender equality considerations in the narrative and the technical elaboration of the overall project/program proposal document and project description? To what extent does the project undertake a gender-responsive, transparent, collaborative cost-benefit analysis and seriously consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends? Does it contain elements of an ecofeminist cost-benefit analysis? And if so which?



PART A: WEAK

- Fails to mention gender or women whatsoever in project description
- Overlooks how women are disproportionately harmed by climate change impacts and have the potential to be key beneficiaries of this project

- Fails to undertake a gender-responsive cost-benefit analysis or consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends



PART C: WEAK

- Makes no mention of women or gender in section project description
- Overlooks how efforts to end deforestation may harm rural women who rely on biomass for cooking and other household purposes
- Fails to note whether the project will engage women when “enhancing sustainable native forest management systems,” ignoring how women are often the stewards of environmental knowledge and sustainability practices
- Fails integrate an eco-feminist framework in project description

or undertake a gender-responsive cost-benefit analysis



INDICATOR 2: To what extent is there a specific gendered description, including provision of gender-disaggregated data (baseline and expected reach), of intended direct and indirect beneficiaries? Including targeting women and girls?



PART A: WEAK

- Includes no gender description of project beneficiaries, which threatens the project’s ability to benefit women and LGBTQ people
- Fails to provide gender-disaggregated data for baseline or expected reach of project beneficiaries

PART C: WEAK

- Includes a list of “target audience groups” for the project but excludes women from the list even though they will be deeply affected by project activities
- Does not indicate that the project attempts to benefit women or LGBTQ people in project description
- Fails to provide gender-disaggregated data for beneficiaries

INDICATOR 3: To what extent are “gender co-benefits” elaborated against the GCF Investment Criteria?



PART E: ADEQUATE

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Includes a section on Gender Considerations in Part E
- Describes the legislative context for gender equity in Brazil, noting that “gender equality has also been recognized as relevant to environmental and forest governance”
- Fails to reflect this sentiment in overall project design
- Explained that lessons learned from other projects which target women, such as Bolsa Familia, have been incorporated into the design of this project
- Acknowledges the importance of women’s organizations in fighting for gender equity, such as the Union of the Indigenous Women from the Legal Amazon and the Women’s Secretariat of Extractivist Communities
- Fails to include these organizations in project design or implementation

- Explains that most representatives in CONAREDD+ (the national REDD+ committee) are women and more than 50% of the representatives for the Thematic Advisory Board (which monitors how the Cancun safeguards are addressed by Brazil) are women
- Notes that the project will ensure proposed activities do not discriminate against women and will take affirmative steps to ensure women can participate meaningfully and equitably in the project
- Fails to specify exactly how the project will benefit women and LGBTQ people

INDICATOR 4: Is the project/program budget allocation gender-responsive? (“gender budgeting”)

- Are gender-related expenditures integrated in the overall project budget?



PART C: WEAK

- Allocates funding for project components that include women, such as operation of Floresta+ program
- Makes no direct mention of gender in project budget

- Can women’s groups/local groups/grassroots women get access to project funding?



PART B AND PROJECT GAP: ADEQUATE

- Acknowledges the importance of women’s organizations in the funding proposal but provides few opportunities for them to be involved in the project

- Notes in the GAP that “it will be critical to directly support women organizations” as they “lack technical skills and financial support” but never clarifies whether or how the project will support these organizations
- Sets a GAP target that one representative from a women’s organization should participate in the governance structure for the Floresta+ pilot program, which may provide an avenue for access to project funding
- Explains that the governance structure will include dozens of representatives from multiple ministries, which weakens the significance of the single women’s organization representative

- Does the Gender Action Plan (GAP) have its own budget? Is it adequate/ commensurate with overall budget and intent? What is the money spent on (gender consultants?)

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

Building local capacity for gender mainstreaming?)



PROJECT GAP: WEAK

- Provides no budget for GAP activities
- Includes the following sentences in the introduction to the GAP: "The gender budget assigned to each of the outputs below reflects the portion of the output and corresponding budget. For example, for Output 1, the overall budget is XX USD"
- Never actually provides this "gender budget," despite several references to it in the GAP introduction
- Mentions that "XX USD" has been assigned to other GAP activities in the introduction, which suggests that project personnel forgot to complete the GAP and points to overall negligence of GAP funding needs

INDICATOR 5: (To what extent) does the project/program acknowledge and discuss (implicitly or explicitly) an intersectional approach to gender?



WEAK

- Acknowledges that women are disproportionately harmed by climate risks and climate disasters
- Recommends in the GAP that the project "build capacity of women from local and indigenous communities on REDD+ and provide them with adequate resources"
- Notes that women in indigenous communities often do not have autonomous property rights and representation in forest management decision making due to "patriarchal values," overlooking how private property is a concept created by non-indig-

enous groups and therefore is often not integrated into indigenous communities

- Barely mentions indigenous women in project documents even though the project heavily impacts indigenous communities and instead primarily treats indigenous people and women as distinct groups
- Notes that poorer, less-educated women in rural areas have a more difficult time accessing public services but does not accommodate for this issue in project design
- Fails to acknowledge how other factors such as religion and sexuality affect women's experiences and their ability to access project benefits
- Fails to integrate an intersectional lens in project design

INDICATOR 6: (To what extent) does the project/program (implicitly or explicitly) acknowledge and include people with marginalized gender and sexual identities?



WEAK

- Notes in the Social and Environmental Risk Screening Checklist that the project risks discriminating against "affected populations, particularly people living in poverty or marginalized or excluded individuals" and includes LGBTQ people as a group at risk of discrimination
- Does not create mitigation measures to prevent discrimination against LGBTQ people
- Makes no mention of LGBTQ people in other project documents and fails to adequately

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

integrate the particular needs and vulnerabilities of this group in the project plan

INDICATOR 7: To what extent does the project acknowledge and take into account potential impacts on sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) or sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment (SEAH)?



WEAK

- Notes in the Social and Environmental Risk Screening Checklist that the project risks “exacerbating conflicts among and/or violence to project affected communities” but does not note how this risk disproportionately affects women and LGBTQ people

- References laws in Brazil that protect against SGBV and SEAH in the GAP but does not acknowledge that women and LGBTQ people are disproportionately at risk of SGBV or SEAH

- Does not explain whether the GRM can be used to report SGBV or SEAH and if so, how this process will be made safe and accessible to survivors

- Does not acknowledge that the LGBTQ community in Brazil faces more violence than nearly every other LGBTQ community in the world (<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2018/jan/22/brazil-lgbt-violence-deaths-all-time-high-new-research>)

INDICATOR 8: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis assess the needs of

women and other gender groups and current state of gender dynamics in the project-affected country/region/community prior to project inception, implementation, monitoring, and reporting?



ADEQUATE

- Used a desktop literature review, a summary of information learned from previous UN gender studies, and an analysis of national gender policies in Brazil to inform the Gender Assessment
- Provides an adequate analysis of gender in Brazil, exploring topics such as women’s access to income, education, and political decision making
- Makes some patronizing comments about indigenous communities, claiming that their “patriarchal cultural values” are the reason why many indigenous

women lack access to property rights, ignoring how private property is not historically part of many indigenous communities

- Fails to acknowledge the presence of LGBTQ people in Brazil, even though LGBTQ Brazilians face some of the highest levels of violence and discrimination in the world (<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2018/jan/22/brazil-lgbt-violence-deaths-all-time-high-new-research>)

INDICATOR 9: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis predict and address potential harmful gendered impacts in order to prevent them?

- With recommendations and conclusions in the overall project design



ADEQUATE

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Explains that the Thematic Advisory Board for Safeguards (also called CCT-Safeguards advisory board) oversees the implementation of REDD+ safeguards in Brazil and is made up of 50% women but does explain whether the CCT-Safeguards advisory board will be gender-sensitive in their monitoring practices
- Fails to include any mention of gender in project risks or mitigation measures in the funding proposal and ignores how the project has serious gender risks, such as penalizing women for biomass collection through the project's anti-deforestation efforts
- Notes in the ESMF that the project risks "excluding marginalized groups" in project implementation but will "engage women and other minority groups in decision-making and participation processes" to prevent this outcome

- Notes in the ESMF that the project "could potentially reproduce discrimination against women based on gender" and "could potentially limit women's ability to use, develop and protect natural resources"
- Provides an adequate list of mitigation measures to prevent this outcome, including collection of gender data, gender-sensitive consultations, prioritization of women in project implementation, and a gender-sensitive GRM

- With concrete actions in the project-specific gender action plan



WEAK

- Recommends that the project identify "challenges and risks faced by women and other marginalized groups in Brazil around thematic areas of rel-

evance to REDD+ action, such as decision-making processes, labor force participation, forest use, land tenure, safeguards, etc."

- Does not identify these risks in the GAP or provide any mitigation measures

INDICATOR 10: To what extent does the project take into account potential impacts on the gender division of labor?



ADEQUATE

- Notes that the project risks "potentially limiting women's ability to use, develop and protect natural resources" and provides adequate mitigation measures but does not acknowledge how this impact would

increase women's reproductive care burden

- Acknowledges that "differences in hours worked in paid work and domestic tasks are present between men and women" and that women tend to spend an average of 22.7 hours a week on domestic work while men spend 5.5 hours

- Notes that this discrepancy leads women to seek employment that has flexible or shorter hours, such as in the informal sector which has lower average pay and fewer protections

- Fails to include any safeguards that explicitly prevent increasing women's domestic labor burden in project design

INDICATOR 11: To what extent does the project-specific gender action plan fully articulate and cover the project period (integrated activities vs "add-ons", define

FP100

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

clear responsibilities/ accountability and meaningful gender indicators? Inclusion of an adequate, multi-year budget?)



WEAK

- Assigns the same two entities (the UNDP and the Ministry of the Environment of Brazil) to nearly every GAP activity
- Provides no budget or timeframe for GAP activities
- Includes the following sentences in the introduction to the GAP: "The gender budget assigned to each of the outputs below reflects the portion of the output and corresponding budget. For example, for Output 1, the overall budget is XX USD"
- Never actually provides this "gender budget," despite several references to it in the GAP introduction

- Mentions that "XX USD" has been assigned to other GAP activities in the introduction, which suggests that project personnel forgot to complete the GAP and points to overall negligence of GAP funding needs

INDICATOR 12: To what extent does the project create safeguards to prevent potential harms, including those that will disproportionately impact women, men, sexual and gender minorities? To what extent is there a comprehensive and project-adequate elaboration on gender in the project/program risk assessment and monitoring frameworks and arrangements?



PART F: WEAK

- Explains that the Thematic Advisory Board for Safeguards

(also called CCT-Safeguards advisory board) which oversees the implementation of REDD+ safeguards in Brazil is made up of 50% women

- Does not explain whether the CCT-Safeguards advisory board will be gender-sensitive in their monitoring practices
- Fails to include any mention of gender in project risks or mitigation measures
- Ignores how the project has serious gender risks, such as penalizing women for biomass collection through project deforestation efforts

INDICATOR 13: To what extent does the project apply the principle of Free, Prior and Informed Consent and give project-affected persons (especially women and LGBTI people and Indigenous Peoples as well as

other marginalized social groups) the right to accept or refuse? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



ADEQUATE

- Notes in the funding proposal that Brazil has a legislative framework to protect Free, Prior and Informed Consent for project-affected people and that consultations conducted with indigenous communities covered this concept
- Notes in the ESMF that the project has held multiple consultations with project-affected people to "strengthen their right to free, prior and informed consent"
- Notes that consultations will provide project information in languages applicable to the region and beneficiary group "whenever feasible"

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Implies but does not directly state that project-affected people will be able to accept or refuse the project
- Does not provide any accommodations to ensure that consent is given by LGBTQ people or women

INDICATOR 14: Is there a fully articulated, gender-responsive redress mechanism available to women at the project /national level in addition to the GCF IRM?

■ ■ ■

PART C AND ANNEX REFERENCING ESIA OR ESMF: ADEQUATE

- Explains that the project will have a Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) in addition to the GCF GRM

- Describes the GRM in the ESMF, noting the mechanism will be "gender and age inclusive and responsive and address potential access barriers to women, the elderly, the disabled, youth and other potentially marginalized groups"

- Requires that information about the GRM must be communicated during the stakeholder engagement process

- Notes that the GRM will be available to all free of cost
- Notes the following in the Social and Environmental Screening Template: "The GRM will be designed to accommodate for (1) language and literacy of stakeholders; (2) logistical feasibility of reporting structure; (3) power relations between stakeholders and grievance officers along gender and ethno-cultural lines"
- Does not clarify how the GRM accommodates for power relations between grievance officers

and women complainants, which could be done by hiring women grievance officers

- Does not confirm in the ESMF whether translation services or oral statements will be available to complainants

INDICATOR 15: To what extent does the project provide compensation in case of harm that disproportionately impacts women and other marginalized gender groups, for example housing and land that is equal to or better than pre-settlement and compensating women and marginalized gender groups who are not legally recognized land owners?

■ ■ ■

PART C, PART F AND RELEVANT ANNEXES SUCH AS RESETTLEMENT PLANS: WEAK

- Notes in the Social and Environmental Screening Template that the project could involve physical and economic displacement
- Includes an outline for a Livelihood Action Plan and Resettlement Action Plan in the ESMF but fails to complete the outlines
- Does not provide a Resettlement or Livelihood Action Plan in any other project documents
- Fails to mention that the project threatens to physically and economically displace people in the funding proposal or provide gender sensitive mitigation measures

INDICATOR 16: To what extent does the project ensure full, effective and ongoing/sustained participation of gender groups throughout the project/program cycle?

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

■ Comprehensive stakeholder engagement at the planning stage with documentation includes women's groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



WEAK

- Acknowledges the importance of women's organizations in the funding proposal but does not indicate that they will be included in project planning
- Fails to mention women's organizations whatsoever in the stakeholder engagement documents
- Does not indicate that any national gender machinery will be included in project planning
- Do the annexes include stakeholder engagement plans for project implementation that includes women's groups and national gender

machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annex)



ADEQUATE

- Acknowledges the importance of women's organizations in the funding proposal but provides few opportunities for their participation in project implementation
- Sets a GAP target that one representative from a women's organization participates in the governance structure for the Floresta+ pilot program
- Explains that the governance structure will include dozens of representatives from multiple ministries, which weakens the significance of the single women's organization representative
- Does not explicitly indicate that any national gender machinery will be included in project planning implementation but does assign MMA, which has a Gender

Committee, to oversee each GAP activity



INDICATOR 17: Is there gender-responsive governance of project management and implementation?

■ Does the Accredited Entity's Project Management Unit include gender experts and operate to support and build gender expertise in-country (including providing gender capacity building and oversight to Executing Entities)?



PART C, GAP: ADEQUATE

- Includes "hire a gender expert to support the mainstreaming of gender" as an action for the Project Management GAP output
- Notes in the GAP that there is no existing gender expert

supporting the mainstreaming of gender in REDD+ efforts in Brazil, making the hiring of a gender expert for the project cycle necessary

- Fails to include a budget for the gender expert in the GAP
- Includes no mention of a gender expert in the funding proposal

■ Is the national gender machinery involved in project implementation structures (as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures)?



PART C, GAP: ADEQUATE

- Does not explicitly indicate that any national gender machinery will be included in the project
- Explains that the National Designated Authority Ministry of the Environment of Brazil (MMA) has a Gender Committee "which

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

oversees discussing and proposing actions to ensure gender equality in programs and policies”

- Assigns the MMA to oversee every GAP activity, suggesting that the Gender Committee may be involved

- Are civil society groups, particularly women’s groups, Indigenous Peoples and local/community groups, and gender experts involved as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures?



PART C: ADEQUATE

- Notes the importance of women’s organizations in the funding proposal and GAP but does not indicate that they will be involved as Executing Entities
- Notes once in the GAP that the project will hire a gender expert to oversee gender mainstreaming

of REDD+ activities, suggesting that they will be involved in a project management structure

- Fails to mention the gender expert in the funding proposal or provide the gender expert with a budget

INDICATOR 18: To what extent does the project provide complete available project information, including in national/local languages, to all project-affected persons including women and marginalized gender/social groups?



ADEQUATE

- Notes that consultations will provide project information in languages applicable to the region and beneficiary group “whenever feasible”

- Explains that multiple consultations will be conducted with project-affected people to ensure they have full access to information about project information and the GRM
- Includes “information and lesson learnt materials produced in different languages” as a key project outcome
- Requires that all project information is “disclosed in a timely manner, in an accessible place, and in a form and language understandable to affected persons”
- Requires that project information is distributed through a variety of formats including “posting on websites, public meetings, local councils or organizations, newsprint, and radio reporting, flyers, or direct mail”
- Does not explicitly note whether the project will target women or LGBTQ people will be targeted in information dissemination



INDICATOR 19: To what extent does the project have a gender-responsive monitoring process including collecting baseline and monitoring and evaluation gender-disaggregated data? To what extent are gendered indicators (quantitative and qualitative) reflected in the project/program results management framework?



PART H/GAP: ADEQUATE

- Outlines detailed gender indicators for each GAP objective, including target data and baseline data
- Includes indicators that cover all aspects of the project, including consultations and implementation
- Sets some target proportions to include a minimum of 50% women but includes some more

FP100

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

disappointing targets such as
“40% of landowners and/or land
users under Floresta+ Pilot
Program rewarded are women”
and “10% of landowners and/
or land users under Floresta+
Pilot Program rewarded are
women from single-headed
households”

- Includes multiple indicators
on women’s satisfaction with
various project components

FP107

Supporting Climate Resilience and Transformational Change in the Agriculture Sector in Bhutan

This [GCF project](#) aims to address climate change challenges and enhance the resilience of smallholder farmers in eight districts of Bhutan through integrated climate-resilient agriculture. As a landlocked and mountainous Least Developed Country (LDC), Bhutan is highly vulnerable to climate change – with statistically significant increases recorded in both the length of the dry season and indices of extremes in daily rainfall. The project, with an estimated lifespan of 26 years, will promote climate resilient agricultural practices, integrate climate change risk data into water and land management to support smallholders, and reduce the risk and impact of climate change-induced landslides during extreme events that disrupt market access. The project will be implemented with the Kingdom of Bhutan acting through its Gross National Happiness Commission (GNHC) as the executing entity.

Assessment Grade

-  WEAK
-  ADEQUATE
-  STRONG

Main Project/Program Characteristics

- Country: Bhutan
- Total value: US\$58 million
- GCF funding support: US\$ 25.35 million
- GCF financing instrument: grants
- Accredited Entity: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
- International access (MIE)
- Direct implementation (DI)
- Public sector (P)
- Adaptation
- ESS risk categorization: B
- Regular approval process
- Under implementation: Yes, since November 2019
- Expected completion: November 2025

FP107

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 1: To what extent is there an integration of gender equality considerations in the narrative and the technical elaboration of the overall project/program proposal document and project description? To what extent does the project undertake a gender-responsive, transparent, collaborative cost-benefit analysis and seriously consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends? Does it contain elements of an ecofeminist cost-benefit analysis? And if so which?



PART A: WEAK

- Fails to mention gender or women whatsoever in project description
- Overlooks how women and LGBTQ people are disproportionately harmed by climate change impacts on agriculture and have the potential to be key project beneficiaries

- Fails to undertake a gender-responsive cost-benefit analysis or consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends




PART C: WEAK

- Acknowledges that “under nutrition among women and children is already a challenge to socio-economic development” and that climate impacts on agriculture will only amplify this issue
- Fails to acknowledge how women and LGBTQ people are disproportionately harmed by climate change impacts on agriculture outside of malnutrition
- Explains that the project will “consider the needs of recipients” in project implementation, such as low rates of literacy among rural women
- Fails to integrate a gender-sensitive approach into overall project

design, despite these brief mentions of women

- Mentions the inclusion of women in only one project component: “Ensure engagement of women” in sustainable agriculture trainings for farmers
- Fails to undertake a gender-responsive cost-benefit analysis



INDICATOR 2: To what extent is there a specific gendered description, including provision of gender-disaggregated data (baseline and expected reach), of intended direct and indirect beneficiaries? Including targeting women and girls?



PART A: WEAK

- Includes no gender description of project beneficiaries, which threatens the project’s ability

to benefit women and LGBTQ people

- Fails to provide gender-disaggregated data for baseline or expected reach of project beneficiaries



PART C: WEAK

- Implies that the project will benefit women by reducing the impact of climate change on agriculture as climate change will exacerbate undernutrition, which disproportionately impacts rural women
- Notes the explicit inclusion of women in only one project component: “ensure engagement of women” in sustainable agriculture trainings for farmers
- Does not otherwise describe whether or how the project will benefit women

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Fails to provide a gender breakdown of project beneficiaries

INDICATOR 3: To what extent are "gender co-benefits" elaborated against the GCF Investment Criteria?

PART E: ADEQUATE

- Notes that project benefits ("making farming less vulnerable to the impacts of climate change, improve productivity, increasing income of farmers") will especially benefit women as men are increasingly moving to cities, leaving women responsible for farms
- Promises that "project interventions were tailored to support women" and the project will collect sex-disaggregated data throughout to ensure that

the needs of women are accurately captured

- Describes the "special efforts made" to consult women during project design and describes how the project will work to address the issues raised by women during consultations
- Provides a gender breakdown of beneficiaries for each major project component
- Fails to provide a section on "gender co-benefits" unlike many other GCF funding proposals

INDICATOR 4: Is the project/program budget allocation gender-responsive? ("gender budgeting")

- Are gender-related expenditures integrated in the overall project budget?



PART B: WEAK

- Makes no mention of gender in project budget, which is particularly troubling given that the GAP calls for significant funding
- Does not mention the gender-sensitive subcomponents of project activities when allocating funding which may threaten the implementation of these activities
- Can women's groups/local groups/grassroots women get access to project funding?



PART B AND PROJECT GAP: WEAK

- Explains in the funding proposal that the project made "special efforts to consult with women's groups to collect information regarding the impacts of climate change on women"

- Makes no other mention of women's groups in the funding proposal
- Fails to mention women's groups whatsoever in the GAP or Gender Assessment
- Never indicates that women's groups will have access to project funding
- Does the Gender Action Plan (GAP) have its own budget? Is it adequate/ commensurate with overall budget and intent? What is the money spent on (gender consultants? Building local capacity for gender mainstreaming?)



PROJECT GAP: ADEQUATE

- Includes an adequate budget for each GAP activity and sub-activity and sets a total budget of \$1,495,000 USD which makes up just 2% of total project funding

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Fails to include the GAP budget in the overall project budget
- Identifies partner institutions for each GAP activity, suggesting that they will oversee how funds are allocated, but fails to provide a more detailed description for activity funding allocations

INDICATOR 5: (To what extent) does the project/program acknowledge and discuss (implicitly or explicitly) an intersectional approach to gender?



WEAK

- Acknowledges that “climate change and its impacts are not gender neutral” and that women are disproportionately harmed by climate impacts on agriculture

- Explains that the gender division of labor often varies by ethnicity but provides no other acknowledgement that ethnicity shapes women’s experiences and their ability to access project benefits, even though Bhutan is highly ethnically diverse
- References the inclusion of indigenous people repeatedly in the ESMF but never notes the gender makeup of this population or acknowledges how indigenous women face unique barriers in accessing project benefits
- Fails to acknowledge how other factors such as religion and class affect women’s experiences and their ability to access project benefits
- Fails to integrate an intersectional lens in project design

INDICATOR 6: (To what extent) does the project/program (implicitly or explicitly) acknowledge and include people with marginalized gender and sexual identities?



WEAK

- Explains in a footnote in the Social and Environmental Screening Template that “references to ‘women and men’ or similar is understood to include women and men, boys and girls, and other groups discriminated against based on their gender identities, such as transgender people and transsexual”
- Incorrectly assumes that the same actions identified to include women and men in the project will also serve to include LGBTQ people
- Makes no mention of LGBTQ people in other project documents and fails to adequately

integrate the particular needs and vulnerabilities of this group in the project plan

INDICATOR 7: To what extent does the project acknowledge and take into account potential impacts on sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) or sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment (SEAH)?



ADEQUATE

- Notes in the Gender Assessment that “domestic violence is more prevalent in rural areas and affects women’s economic activities as well as their quality of life”
- Provides a brief overview of SGBV in the Gender Assessment, citing a “recent national survey” which found that 26 per cent of rural women age 15 to 49 had

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- experienced domestic violence at some point in their lives
- Explains that Bhutan passed the Domestic Violence Prevention Act in 2013 but does not describe the legislation or its efficacy
- Notes in the Social and Environmental Risk Screening Checklist that the project does not expect to “exacerbate conflicts among and/or the risk of violence to project-affected communities and individuals”
- Makes no other mention of SGBV or SEAH in any project documents
- Ignores how the project risks exacerbating SGBV, such as by introducing construction workers into communities to complete infrastructure projects or by disrupting existing gender roles

- Does not acknowledge that LGBTQ people are also disproportionately at risk of SGBV

INDICATOR 8: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis assess the needs of women and other gender groups and current state of gender dynamics in the project-affected country/region/community prior to project inception, implementation, monitoring, and reporting?



ADEQUATE

- Conducted stakeholder consultations with potential women beneficiaries and undertook a desk review on Bhutan gender studies to inform the Gender Assessment
- Provides a strong analysis of gender in Bhutan, exploring

topics such as women’s access to resources, education, and political decision making

- Includes a detailed analysis of how climate change impacts women farmers in the GAP and integrates similar analyses in the funding proposal, Stakeholder Engagement plan, Social and Environmental Screening Template, and ESMF

- Gives an overview of gender policy and legal mechanisms available to address gender inequity in Bhutan in the Gender Assessment

- Makes no mention of LGBTQ people in Bhutan and ignores how LGBTQ people, including LGBTQ women, face unique discrimination compared to that experienced by cisgender and heterosexual women

INDICATOR 9: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis predict and address potential harmful gendered impacts in order to prevent them?

- With recommendations and conclusions in the overall project design



ADEQUATE

- Includes several questions about project impact on gender equality in the Social and Environmental Screening Template and notes that the project does not expect to harm or disempower women
- Explains in the ESMF that the project will “ensure women’s participation in identifying best practices in agro-productive activities” to ensure they are not excluded or harmed by project activities

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Identifies the following activities to prevent gendered harm: 1) Ensure the project has gender equality and women empowerment within all activities, 2) Ensure the project does not have any gender-based discrimination and/or inequalities, 3) Where practicable, preference should be given to women for any employment
- Makes no acknowledgement of gender risks posed by the project in the funding proposal
- Overlooks gender dimensions of project risks identified in the funding proposal, such as “crop loss due to climate factors,” “extreme weather events disrupts implementation or damages investments,” or “project interventions do not prevent the ongoing rural-urban migration in target communities, and declines in overall agriculture productivity continue”

■ With concrete actions in the project-specific gender action plan



WEAK

- Does not identify any gender risks posed by the project or provide any safeguards, which is troubling given that the project is not free of risks for women or LGBTQ people

INDICATOR 10: To what extent does the project take into account potential impacts on the gender division of labor?



ADEQUATE

- Gives a detailed description of the gender makeup of economic industries in Bhutan in the Gender Assessment, noting that

many women do unpaid farming activities and other domestic labor

- Recognizes how the feminization of farming in Bhutan makes women farmers key project beneficiaries multiple times throughout project documents
- Notes that the gender division of labor is not “fixed” and often varies by ethnicity but fails to explore these variations or explain how such variations could affect project impacts
- Provides a detailed description of the gender division of labor in agriculture, noting that women are usually responsible for unpaid activities that are “integral to the wellbeing of rural households”
- Plans to prioritize women in employment opportunities when possible
- Explains that the project may reduce women’s labor load

through “training on energy and labor saving technologies”

- Fails to include any safeguards that explicitly prevent increasing women’s domestic labor burden in project design

INDICATOR 11: To what extent does the project-specific gender action plan fully articulate and cover the project period (integrated activities vs “add-ons”, define clear responsibilities/ accountability and meaningful gender indicators? Inclusion of an adequate, multi-year budget?)



WEAK

- Includes a budget for each GAP activity and sets a total budget of \$1,495,000 USD, which makes up just 2% of total project funding

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Assigns the same three entities as Partner Institutions for every GAP activity, none of which are explicitly gender-focused
- Fails to include the Gender Specialist or any national gender machinery as Partner Institutions for GAP activities
- Provides no time frame or budget for GAP activities, threatening their implementation and therefore the inclusion of women in the project
- Does not include a budget for the GAP in the project budget

INDICATOR 12: To what extent does the project create safeguards to prevent potential harms, including those that will disproportionately impact women, men, sexual and gender minorities? To what extent is there a comprehensive and project-adequate elaboration on gender in the

project/program risk assessment and monitoring frameworks and arrangements?



PART G: WEAK

- Makes no acknowledgement of gender risks posed by the project whatsoever
- Overlooks gender dimensions of project risks, such as "crop loss due to climate factors," "extreme weather events disrupt implementation or damage investments," or "project interventions do not prevent the ongoing rural-urban migration in target communities, and declines in overall agriculture productivity continue"
- Provides no gender-sensitive mitigation measures to ensure the inclusion and benefit of women and LGBTQ people

INDICATOR 13: To what extent does the project apply the principle of Free, Prior and Informed Consent and give project-affected persons (especially women and LGBTI people and Indigenous Peoples as well as other marginalized social groups) the right to accept or refuse? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



WEAK

- Explains that the project will only undertake activities on private land after receiving "full consent" of landowners
- Does not explain how this consent will be obtained or whether the process will be gender-sensitive
- Does not explain whether informal landholders will be recognized as owners when asking for consent to use land for project activities

- Notes that "free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) is not deemed necessary for this project" due to the lack of resettlement but "principles for FPIC will be demonstrated through providing timely information, related to the risks and benefits of the proposed project intervention"
- Does not explain why FPIC is not required even though the project will take place in part on private land

INDICATOR 14: Is there a fully articulated, gender-responsive redress mechanism available to women at the project /national level in addition to the GCF IRM?



PART C AND ANNEX REFERENCING ESIA OR ESMF: ADEQUATE

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Notes in the funding proposal that the project has developed a Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) “to deal with any concerns or issues that may arise as a result of the project”
 - Provides a detailed description of a project-level GRM, separate from the GCF IRM, in the ESMF
 - Requires that the GRM provides equitable, fair, and respectful treatment to all complainants
 - Allows complainants to submit complaints either orally (to the field staff), by phone or in writing via a complaints box, which will improve accessibility for women and LGBTQ people
 - Notes that the GRM “will cover any reasonable costs” for complainants but will not cover costs when “a complaint is seen to be ineligible”
 - Requires that information about the GRM be placed “at prominent places for the information of key stakeholders” but never clarifies whether GRM information will be available in multiple languages or formats
 - Notes that the PMU Communications Specialist will be the key officer in charge of the GRM and will receive assistance from the Community Project Implementation Committee
 - Does not indicate whether the Communication Specialist will receive any gender training and fails to include a Gender Specialist or representative from a women’s organization in the Community Project Implementation Committee
 - Does not clarify how the GRM accommodates for power relations between grievance officers and women complainants, which could be done by hiring women grievance officers
 - Does not confirm in the ESMF whether translation services will be available to complainants
 - Does not provide any explicitly gender-sensitive accommodations in the GRM design
-
- INDICATOR 15:** To what extent does the project provide compensation in case of harm that disproportionately impacts women and other marginalized gender groups, for example housing and land that is equal to or better than pre-settlement and compensating women and marginalized gender groups who are not legally recognized land owners?
-
- PART C, PART F AND RELEVANT ANNEXES SUCH AS RESETTLEMENT PLANS: ADEQUATE**
- Explains that the project “does not require any land acquisition and/or resettlement” but “investments will be undertaken on private land”
 - Notes that the project will not cause any restrictions on private land use but may cause temporary restriction on the use of the “the irrigation channel during the construction phase to avoid damage and ensure quality”
 - Plans to “engage the communities to plan the activities so that there is minimal disruptions” and will only carry out activities on private land after receiving “full consent” from the landowners
 - Does not give an adequate description of how “full consent” will be obtained or describe whether project-affected people will be given full information how the project could benefit and/or harm them
 - Notes that “no compensation will be paid to any land holder”

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

under any circumstances which is troubling as the project has the potential to harm private land

- Explains in the GAP that 70% of land is owned by women in Bhutan but does not explain how the project will make sure to ask for consent in a gender-sensitive and non-coercive manner from women landowners
- Does not clarify whether the project will recognize informal land tenure when obtaining consent from landowners which could affect poor women and other marginalized groups
- Ignores how women and LGBTQ farmers are particularly at risk of any potential economic displacement or harm caused by the project

INDICATOR 16: To what extent does the project ensure full, effective and ongoing/sustained participation of gender groups throughout the project/program cycle?

- Comprehensive stakeholder engagement at the planning stage with documentation includes women's groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



STRONG

- Notes in the funding proposal that "project implementation will be in consultation with the National Commission of Women and Children (NCWC) and the gender focal points of the Gross National Happiness Commission (GNHC)"
- Explains in the funding proposal that the project made "special efforts to consult with women's groups to collect information

regarding the impacts of climate change on women"

- Includes women's organizations as stakeholders for multiple project activities in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan
- Indicates that women's organizations were included in multiple focus groups during the project consultation phase
- Do the annexes include stakeholder engagement plans for project implementation that includes women's groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annex)



WEAK

- Includes women's organizations in project consultations but does not indicate that they will be included in project implementation

- Notes in the funding proposal that "project implementation will be in consultation with the National Commission of Women and Children (NCWC) and the gender focal points of the Gross National Happiness Commission (GNHC)," indicating that these national gender machineries will be somewhat involved in project implementation but only as consultants
- Fails to further clarify the role of the NCWN and other national gender machineries in project implementation

INDICATOR 17: Is there gender-responsive governance of project management and implementation?

- Does the Accredited Entity's Project Management Unit include gender experts and operate to

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

support and build gender expertise in-country (including providing gender capacity building and oversight to Executing Entities)?



PART C, GAP: ADEQUATE

- Notes in the GAP and in the funding proposal that a project-level Gender Specialist will be hired to “ensure that implementation is gender-responsive” and provide “technical expertise” on survey design
- Notes that UNDP Gender Specialists located in the UNDP regional office “will provide guidance and support during implementation”
- Does not clarify whether the Gender Specialist will be hired from within Bhutan or internationally
- Does not explain whether the Gender Specialist will be part of the Project Management Unit

- Provides no budget for the Gender Specialist in the GAP or funding proposal

- Is the national gender machinery involved in project implementation structures (as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures)?



PART C, GAP: ADEQUATE

- Notes in the funding proposal that “project implementation will be in consultation with the National Commission of Women and Children (NCWC) and the gender focal points of the Gross National Happiness Commission (GNHC)”
- Explains in the GAP “the project team will work with the gender focal points within the IP [implementing partner] and RPs [regional partners], as well as with the NCWC”
- Suggests that the NCWC and gender offices within national

machineries will be involved in implementation structures but never explicitly explains whether they will be included as Executing Entities or on an Advisory Board

- Fails to assign the NCWC or other national gender machinery as a Partner Institution for any GAP activity

- Are civil society groups, particularly women’s groups, Indigenous Peoples and local/community groups, and gender experts involved as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures?



PART C: WEAK

- Explains in the funding proposal that the project made “special efforts to consult with women’s groups to collect information regarding the impacts of climate change on women”

- Makes no other mention of women’s groups in the funding proposal
- Does not clarify if this consultation effort was a singular event or whether the project will continue to consult women’s groups throughout implementation
- Does not mention whether women’s groups will be involved as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures
- Fails to mention women’s or indigenous people’s groups whatsoever in the GAP or Gender Assessment



INDICATOR 18: To what extent does the project provide complete available project information, including in national/local languages, to all project-affected persons including women and marginalized gender/social groups?

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator



ADEQUATE

- Notes that women and indigenous people were involved in stakeholder engagement meetings where project information was distributed
- States multiple times that “all project material must be published in English and Dzongkha, and any other language as appropriate” in the ESMF
- Explains that “the UNDP and GNHC will develop and release updates on the project on a regular basis to provide interested stakeholders with information on project status” and that “updates may be distributed via a range of media eg print, radio, social media or formal reports”

INDICATOR 19: To what extent does the project have a gen-

der-responsive monitoring process including collecting baseline and monitoring and evaluation gender-disaggregated data? To what extent are gendered indicators (quantitative and qualitative) reflected in the project/program results management framework?



PART H: ADEQUATE

- Does not set any project outcomes in the results management framework that focus solely on women but mentions the inclusion of women in four of the targets, such as “sustainable farming training delivered to farmers...ensuring engagement of women”
- Explains in the results management framework that “special consideration will be given” to ensure that climate information distributed by the projects is “packaged and disseminated

in a manner that will reach or resonate with women”

- Plans to collect gender-disaggregated baseline, mid-term, and final data for two of the 35+ fund-level impact outcomes and expects to benefit slightly more women than men due to the feminization of farming
- Includes “gender-disaggregated household surveys” as a “Means of Verification” for multiple project outcomes
- Does not include any indicators to measure inclusion of LGBTQ people
- Does not indicate that a Gender Expert or national gender machinery will be responsible for overseeing any of the project outcomes in the “Outcome Description” section

FP109

Safeguarding rural communities and their physical and economic assets from climate induced disasters in Timor-Leste

This [GCF project](#) seeks to address the underlying causes of vulnerability of social and physical rural infrastructure in Timor-Leste where socioeconomic and ecological systems are fragile. Extreme weather events cause severe damage to infrastructure, incurring yearly economic losses of around USD 250 million as a result of landslides, floods, erosion and drought. The project with a lifespan of six years aims to strengthen the capacity of institutions to assess and manage climate risks and to implement, finance and maintain local infrastructure services. Monitoring of climate risk information will be enhanced. In addition, climate resilient building measures will improve small-scale rural infrastructure in vulnerable areas.

Assessment Grade

- WEAK
- ADEQUATE
- STRONG

Main Project/Program Characteristics

- Country: Timor-Leste
- Total value: US\$59.40 million
- GCF funding support: US\$ 22.36 million
- GCF financing instrument: grants
- Accredited Entity: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
- International access (MIE)
- Direct implementation (DI)
- Public sector (P)
- Adaptation
- ESS risk categorization: B
- Regular approval process
- Under implementation: Yes, since March 2020
- Expected completion: March 2026

FP109

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 1: To what extent is there an integration of gender equality considerations in the narrative and the technical elaboration of the overall project/program proposal document and project description? To what extent does the project undertake a gender-responsive, transparent, collaborative cost-benefit analysis and seriously consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends? Does it contain elements of an ecofeminist cost-benefit analysis? And if so which?



PART A: WEAK

- Fails to mention gender or women whatsoever in project description
- Overlooks how women and LGBTQ people are disproportionately harmed by climate change impacts and climate disasters and have the potential to be key project beneficiaries

- Notes that the project projects 175,840 direct beneficiaries but does not provide a gender breakdown of this population
- Fails to undertake a gender-responsive cost-benefit analysis or consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends



PART C: WEAK

- Notes that based on the socio-economic profile of potential beneficiaries, "half of the beneficiaries consist of women and almost a quarter are families headed by them"
- Makes two brief mentions of gender in project components: 1) the project will improve availability and use of "gender responsive climate risk and vulnerability data" to inform "risk assessments and the prioritisation of

infrastructure" 2) the project will support farmers in identifying agroforestry opportunities by creating agriculture advisory associations which will include women's associations

- Fails to acknowledge how women and LGBTQ are disproportionately harmed by climate change impacts and climate disasters
- Makes no other mentions of gender in the project description and fails integrate an eco-feminist framework in project description or undertake a gender-responsive cost-benefit analysis

INDICATOR 2: To what extent is there a specific gendered description, including provision of gender-disaggregated data (baseline and expected reach), of intended direct and indirect beneficiaries? Including targeting women and girls?



PART A: WEAK

- Includes no gender description of project beneficiaries, which threatens the project's ability to benefit women and LGBTQ people
- Fails to provide gender-disaggregated data for baseline or expected reach of project beneficiaries



PART C: ADEQUATE

- Notes that based on the socio-economic profile of potential beneficiaries, "half of the beneficiaries consist of women and almost a quarter are families headed by them"
- Explains that because many of the projected beneficiary households are headed by women, they will "have a big role in running

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

the farm as an enterprise” as the project aims to support farmers in pursuing sustainable agroforestry opportunities

- Does not describe how the project will ensure that women-headed households will equally benefit from this component of the project, instead assuming that because women-headed households are in the project area, they will automatically benefit
- Does not provide a detailed gender breakdown of beneficiaries, instead offering rough estimates

INDICATOR 3: To what extent are “gender co-benefits” elaborated against the GCF Investment Criteria?



PART E: STRONG

- Explains that the project “will increase resilience and enhance livelihoods of the most vulnerable segments of population, particularly women”
- Notes that the GAP includes a detailed plan for how to ensure women are included in and benefit from all stages of the project
- Recognizes that women stand to benefit from this project as they are disproportionately impacted by climate change, especially climate impacts on water supply
- Promises that the project will “contribute to gender empowerment” by reducing time spent collecting water, improving food security, and increasing their role in building resilient infrastructure
- Explains that the project has thoroughly considered the unique needs of women and women farmers

- Notes that the project has the potential to reduce time women spend fetching and carrying water

INDICATOR 4: Is the project/program budget allocation gender-responsive? (“gender budgeting”)

- Are gender-related expenditures integrated in the overall project budget?



PART B: WEAK

- Makes no mention of gender in project budget, which is particularly troubling given that the GAP also fails to provide a budget
- Does not mention the gender-sensitive subcomponents of project activities when allocating funding which may threaten

the implementation of these activities

- Can women’s groups/local groups/grassroots women get access to project funding?



PART B AND PROJECT GAP: WEAK

- Explains that the project will support farmers in identifying agroforestry opportunities by creating agriculture advisory associations that include women’s associations, suggesting that these associations may have access to project funding
- Makes no other mention of women’s groups in funding proposal
- Identifies “support in establishing and consequently building capacity of women led community organizations” as a gender mainstreaming action in the GAP but does not mention

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

inclusion of women's organizations whatsoever

- Does the Gender Action Plan (GAP) have its own budget? Is it adequate/ commensurate with overall budget and intent? What is the money spent on (gender consultants? Building local capacity for gender mainstreaming?)



PROJECT GAP: WEAK

- Includes no budget whatsoever even though many of the identified gender mainstreaming activities would require significant funding, such as "undertake socio-economic risk and vulnerability assessment to fully map existing vulnerability within Timor-Leste using new gender mainstreaming survey techniques"
- Fails to set a budget for the GAP in the funding proposal as

well, threatening the implementation of all GAP activities

INDICATOR 5: (To what extent) does the project/program acknowledge and discuss (implicitly or explicitly) an intersectional approach to gender?



ADEQUATE

- Acknowledges that "climate change affects women and men differently" and that women and disproportionately harmed by climate disasters
- Explains in a Gender Assessment footnote that "while women are the largest vulnerable group that suffer from discrimination and exclusion, other minority groups such as disabled people, elderly, youth, LGBTI and ethnic minorities often suffer similar issues

and therefore actions described in the GAP may also be applicable to them"

- Never directly addresses how the needs of these other marginalized groups are often different from that of women and how women who hold some of these identities may face additional barriers in accessing project benefits
- References the inclusion of indigenous people repeatedly in the ESMF but never notes the gender makeup of this population nor acknowledges how indigenous women face unique barriers in accessing project benefits
- Fails to acknowledge how other factors such as religion and class affect women's experiences and their ability to access project benefits
- Fails to integrate an intersectional lens in project design

INDICATOR 6: (To what extent) does the project/program (implicitly or explicitly) acknowledge and include people with marginalized gender and sexual identities?



WEAK

- Explains in a footnote in the Gender Assessment that "while women are the largest vulnerable group that suffer from discrimination and exclusion, other minority groups such as disabled people, elderly, youth, LGBTI and ethnic minorities often suffer similar issues and therefore actions described in the GAP may also be applicable to them"
- Explains in a footnote in the Social and Environmental Screening Template that "references to 'women and men' or similar is understood to include women and men, boys and girls, and other groups discriminated

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- against based on their gender identities, such as transgender people and transsexual”
- Incorrectly assumes that actions identified to include women and men in the project will automatically include LGBTQ people
- Makes no mention of LGBTQ people in other project documents and fails to adequately integrate the particular needs and vulnerabilities of this group in the project plan

INDICATOR 7: To what extent does the project acknowledge and take into account potential impacts on sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) or sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment (SEAH)?



ADEQUATE

- Includes a brief section on Violence Against Women and Girls in the Gender Assessment, noting SGBV “is a widespread problem and has largely prevented women in participating actively in all aspects of development”
- Notes that SGBV often increases following climate disasters due to “disaster-induced stress and the temporary breakdown of law and order”
- Does not acknowledge vulnerability of women, girls, boys and LGBTQ people to SGBV and SEAH triggered by disaster-caused homelessness
- Indicates in the Checklist for Potential Social and Environmental Risks that the project does not expect to “exacerbate conflicts among and/or the risk of violence to project-affected communities and individuals”
- Fails to acknowledge that the project also risks exacerbating

SGBV, such as by introducing construction workers into communities to complete infrastructure projects

- Does not acknowledge that LGBTQ people are also disproportionately at risk of SGBV
- Does not mention SGBV or SEAH in any other project documents

INDICATOR 8: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis assess the needs of women and other gender groups and current state of gender dynamics in the project-affected country/region/community prior to project inception, implementation, monitoring, and reporting?



STRONG

- Used primary data collection through site visits, focus groups, and consultation workshops as well as a desk review to inform the Gender Assessment
- Provides a strong analysis of gender in Timor-Leste, exploring topics such as women’s access to resources, education, and political decision making
- Includes a detailed analysis of how climate change and climate disasters impact women in the GAP and integrates similar analyses in the funding proposal, Social and Environmental Screening Template, and ESMF
- Gives an overview of gender policy and legal mechanisms available to address gender inequity in Timor-Leste in the Gender Assessment
- Notes that “while women are the largest vulnerable group that suffer from discrimination and exclusion, other minority groups such as disabled people, elderly,

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

youth, LGBTI and ethnic minorities often suffer similar issues”

- Ignores how LGBTQ people, including LGBTQ women, face unique discrimination compared to that experienced by cisgender and heterosexual women

INDICATOR 9: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis predict and address potential harmful gendered impacts in order to prevent them?

- With recommendations and conclusions in the overall project design



STRONG

- Includes the following activities in the ESMF as mitigation measures to ensure inclusion of women and other vulnerable groups: “implement GAP,

ensure that needs of disabled people and other vulnerable groups is taken into account during project planning, design and execution, ensure adequate representation of vulnerable groups in stakeholder engagement activities, ensure compliance with the GRM”

- Notes in the funding proposal that the project has the potential for “exclusion of or adverse impacts to women and vulnerable groups” and plans to obtain consent from these groups as a mitigation measure
- Notes that “women in Timor Leste are particularly vulnerable and there is a risk that this is not adequately addressed”
- Plans to mitigate this risk by “incorporating measures to foster the empowerment of women through their inclusion, involvement and education” and “providing opportunities for livelihood enhancement”

- Indicates in the Checklist for Potential Social and Environmental Risks that the project does not expect to have adverse impacts on women and that women’s groups and leaders have not raised gender equality concerns during stakeholder engagement, which seems unrealistic
- Explains in a footnote below the Checklist for Potential Social and Environmental Risks that “references to ‘women and men’ or similar is understood to include women and men, boys and girls, and other groups discriminated against based on their gender identities, such as transgender people and transsexual”
- Incorrectly assumes that the same safeguards identified for women and men in the project will also protect LGBTQ people
- Overlooks how the project also risks exacerbating SGBV

through influxes of construction workers in communities

- With concrete actions in the project-specific gender action plan



WEAK

- Does not identify any gender risks posed by the project or provide any safeguards, which is troubling given that the project is not free of risks for women or LGBTQ people

INDICATOR 10: To what extent does the project take into account potential impacts on the gender division of labor?



ADEQUATE

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Gives a detailed description of the gender makeup of economic industries in Timor-Leste, noting that many women do unpaid farming activities and other domestic labor
- Notes that women's responsibility for domestic activities makes them especially vulnerable to climate impacts
- Explains that since women "spend on average 2-3 hours a day on fetching water either directly from the source or from the nearest communal tap," the project has the potential to improve gender equity by increasing access to water
- Includes "build climate proof infrastructure units prioritized by women such as water supply" as a project activity, which could decrease women's domestic labor burden
- Overlooks how other project activities, such as support for agroforestry, has the potential

to challenge the gender division of labor if women are adequately targeted

- Fails to include any safeguards that explicitly prevent increasing women's domestic labor burden in project design

INDICATOR 11: To what extent does the project-specific gender action plan fully articulate and cover the project period (integrated activities vs "add-ons", define clear responsibilities/ accountability and meaningful gender indicators? Inclusion of an adequate, multi-year budget?)



WEAK

- Provides no time frame or budget for GAP activities, threatening their implementation

and therefore the inclusion of women in the project

- Does not assign responsible entities for any of the GAP activities, further threatening the implementation of the GAP

INDICATOR 12: To what extent does the project create safeguards to prevent potential harms, including those that will disproportionately impact women, men, sexual and gender minorities? To what extent is there a comprehensive and project-adequate elaboration on gender in the project/program risk assessment and monitoring frameworks and arrangements?



PART G: ADEQUATE

- Notes that "women in Timor Leste are particularly vulnera-

ble and there is a risk that this is not adequately addressed"

- Plans to mitigate this risk by "incorporating measures to foster the empowerment of women through their inclusion, involvement and education" and "providing opportunities for livelihood enhancement"
- Includes no other mention of women in the risk assessment
- Overlooks how many project risks identified in the risk assessment could disproportionately harm women and LGBTQ people, such as "agro-forestry implemented on land previously used primarily for agriculture"
- Plans to "introduce agro-forestry as a means of safeguarding livelihoods" but agro-forestry is also a risky livelihood and could result in the economic displacement of vulnerable farmers, such as women and LGBTQ people

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 13: To what extent does the project apply the principle of Free, Prior and Informed Consent and give project-affected persons (especially women and LGBTI people and Indigenous Peoples as well as other marginalized social groups) the right to accept or refuse? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)

ADEQUATE

- Gives a detailed description of Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) in the ESMF, noting that FPIC must be ensured on “any matters that may affect the rights and interests, lands, resources, territories”
- Includes a section with guidelines on how an FPIC process should be conducted but does not clarify whether the project

will actually implement this process

- Includes the need to obtain consent as a mitigation measure for preventing the “disadvantaging women and vulnerable groups” in the ESMF
- Does not otherwise clarify what steps will be taken to obtain consent from all project affected people, including marginalized gender groups

INDICATOR 14: Is there a fully articulated, gender-responsive redress mechanism available to women at the project /national level in addition to the GCF IRM?

PART C AND ANNEX REFERENCING ESIA OR ESMF: ADEQUATE

- Makes no mention of a grievance redress mechanism (GRM) in the funding proposal
- Provides a detailed description of a project-level GRM, separate from the GCF IRM, in the ESMF
- Includes “grievance mechanism established” as an indicator in the GAP
- Provides a detailed description of the Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) in the ESMF
- Requires that the GRM provides equitable, fair, and respectful treatment to all complainants
- Allows complainants to submit complaints either orally (to the field staff), by phone or in complaints box or in writing, which will improve accessibility for women and LGBTQ people
- Notes that the GRM “will cover any reasonable costs” for complainants but will not cover

costs when “a complaint is seen to be ineligible”

- Notes that the Safeguards Manager will oversee the GRM but never clarifies if this manager has any gender training, which is particularly troubling since this manager will meet with complainants directly and will have the power to decide whether or not to accept complaints as well as remediation actions
- Later refers to the Safeguards Manager as the “social safeguard and gender manager” in the ESMF but does not explain this title change
- Plan to “create awareness of the Grievance Redress Mechanism” through “public awareness campaigns” but never clarifies how these campaigns will be conducted or whether GRM information will be available in multiple languages

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Does not clarify how the GRM accommodates for power relations between grievance officers and women complainants, which could be addressed by hiring women grievance officers
- Does not confirm in the ESMF whether translation services will be available to complainants
- Does not provide any explicitly gender-sensitive accommodations in the GRM design

INDICATOR 15: To what extent does the project provide compensation in case of harm that disproportionately impacts women and other marginalized gender groups, for example housing and land that is equal to or better than pre-settlement and compensating women and marginalized gender groups who are not legally recognized land owners?



PART C, PART F AND RELEVANT ANNEXES SUCH AS RESETTLEMENT PLANS: ADEQUATE

- Explains that the project does not anticipate any resettlement but that if any does occur, the project must provide just and fair compensation
- Sets the following performance criterion: "avoid adverse impacts to local community during construction and operations and where not possible, minimise, restore or compensate for these impacts"
- Only references compensation in reference to harms against "Indigenous Peoples/Ethnic Minorities," overlooking how women and LGBTQ people are also disproportionately at risk of harm



INDICATOR 16: To what extent does the project ensure full, effective and ongoing/sustained participation of gender groups throughout the project/program cycle?

- Comprehensive stakeholder engagement at the planning stage with documentation includes women's groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



WEAK

- Notes in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan that women were included in stakeholder meetings but does not indicate that women's organizations or national gender machineries were included
- Does not indicate in any other project documents that women's organizations or national gender

machineries will be included in project planning

- Do the annexes include stakeholder engagement plans for project implementation that includes women's groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annex)



WEAK

- Explains that the project will include women's groups in the agriculture advisory associations which will support farmers in identifying agroforestry opportunities
- Does not indicate that women's groups will be included in implementation of other project components
- Explains the Gender Assessment that in 2012, Timor Leste established "the National Gender Working Group in all

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- ministry/Secretary of State at the national and district level"
- Fails to include National Gender Working Group or any other national gender machinery in project implementation
- Does not include a budget for the GAP in the project budget

INDICATOR 17: Is there gender-responsive governance of project management and implementation?

- Does the Accredited Entity's Project Management Unit include gender experts and operate to support and build gender expertise in-country (including providing gender capacity building and oversight to Executing Entities)?



PART C, GAP: WEAK

- Plans to hire a variety of experts in the funding proposal, such as "climate change experts" and "safeguards experts," but fails to include a gender expert
- Makes no mention of a gender expert in the GAP, which is particularly troubling as many GAP activities (such as "develop and codify methods and tools for undertaking gender sensitive socio-economic surveys") require gender expertise

- Is the national gender machinery involved in project implementation structures (as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures)?



PART C, GAP: WEAK

- Explains in the Gender Assessment that in 2012, Timor Leste established "the National Gender Working Group in all ministry/ Secretary of State at the national and district level"

- Fails to mention inclusion of any National Gender Working Group or any other national gender machinery in the GAP or funding proposal

- Are civil society groups, particularly women's groups, Indigenous Peoples and local/community groups, and gender experts involved as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures?



PART C: WEAK

- Does not mention a gender expert in any of the project documents
- Explains that the project will support farmers in identifying agroforestry opportunities by creating agriculture advisory associations which will include women's associations
- Notes that these advisory associations will only serve to advise farmers on a local level, rather

than act as an advisory entity for the entire project

- Makes no other mention of the inclusion of women's or indigenous organizations
- Explains that the Project Management Unit will seek support from a Technical Committee comprised of "key relevant government departments and Civil Society Organizations, academia, interest groups and associations"
- Does not clarify whether women's or indigenous organizations will be included in the Technical Committee

INDICATOR 18: To what extent does the project provide complete available project information, including in national/local languages, to all project-affected persons including women and marginalized gender/ social groups?

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator



ADEQUATE

- Notes that women and indigenous people were involved in stakeholder engagement meetings where project information was distributed
- Explains that “Timor Leste has many spoken languages reflecting past migration, colonialism and other occupation,” highlighting the need for distribution of project information in multiple languages
- Recommends that the project distribute project information to vulnerable people in “the most appropriate language and medium” in the ESMF but never confirms that the project will actually do this
- States that “relevant analytical tools and frameworks must be simplified and made available in Tetun/other local languages” in the Gender Assessment but

does not clarify whether these “relevant analytical tools and frameworks” include general project information

- Plan to “create awareness of the Grievance Redress Mechanism” through “public awareness campaigns” but never clarifies how these campaigns will be conducted or whether GRM information will be available in multiple languages

INDICATOR 19: To what extent does the project have a gender-responsive monitoring process including collecting baseline and monitoring and evaluation gender-disaggregated data? To what extent are gendered indicators (quantitative and qualitative) reflected in the project/program results management framework?



PART H: ADEQUATE

- Notes in the results monitoring and reporting section that the project will undertake “gender-sensitive surveys” to evaluate the efficacy of infrastructure projects
- Includes “develop Gender Responsive Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan” as a project target
- Plans to collect gender disaggregated beneficiary data for evaluation of some of the project components, which may safeguard against exclusion of women
- Sets the gender targets for all of the project components at 49% women and 51% men as the project expects to benefit 89,643 men and 86,197 women
- Risks exacerbating gender inequality by mirroring the

beneficiary gender makeup in project targets rather than attempting to benefit equal proportions of women and men

- Does not include any indicators to measure inclusion of LGBTQ people
- Sets many targets for hiring of consultants and experts but does not specify the gender of these hired consultants and experts or set a target for hiring a gender expert

FP110

Ecuador REDD-plus RBP for results period 2014

This [GCF project](#) has been approved under the GCF's REDD+ results-based payments pilot program to support efforts to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation, and foster conservation, sustainable management of forests, and enhancement of forest carbon stocks (REDD+) in Ecuador. It acknowledges Ecuador's REDD+ 2014 results - a total volume of 4,831,679 tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (tCO₂eq) in emissions reductions - for GCF results-based payments (RBP). These results have been reported to the United Nations Framework on Climate Change Convention (UNFCCC) and have undergone technical assessment. They are now fully UNFCCC compliant. Ecuador aims to use the results-based payments to invest in additional activities that support the implementation of their national REDD+ action plan. This includes developing policies and institutional management for REDD+; transitioning to sustainable agricultural production systems; sustainable forest management, conservation and restoration; and managing a national REDD+ action plan.

Assessment Grade

- WEAK
- ADEQUATE
- STRONG

Main Project/Program Characteristics

- Country: Ecuador
- Total value: US\$18.57 million
- GCF funding support: US\$18.57 million
- GCF financing instrument: grants, results-based payment (RBP)
- Accredited Entity: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
- International access (MIE)
- Direct implementation (DI)
- Public sector (P)
- Mitigation
- ESS risk categorization: B
- Regular approval process
- Pilot program: REDD+ Results-based Payment
- Under implementation: Yes, since February 2020
- Expected completion: February 2026

FP110

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 1: To what extent is there an integration of gender equality considerations in the narrative and the technical elaboration of the overall project/program proposal document and project description? To what extent does the project undertake a gender-responsive, transparent, collaborative cost-benefit analysis and seriously consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends? Does it contain elements of an ecofeminist cost-benefit analysis? And if so which?



PART A: WEAK

- Fails to mention women or gender in Part A whatsoever
- Focuses Part A on CO2 emissions, overlooking how women and other marginalized gender groups are disproportionately impacted by climate change

caused by greenhouse gas emissions

- Does not undertake a gender-responsive cost-benefit analysis or consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends



PART C: ADEQUATE

- Notes that the UNDP completed several studies on gender in the project area "to increase the role of women in REDD+ programming going forward" as previous REDD+ programming in Ecuador failed to adequately include women
- Explains that women's groups participated in the Mesa de Trabajo REDD+ which will oversee potential project risks and create safeguards throughout project implementation

- Fails to acknowledge that women and other marginalized gender groups are disproportionately impacted by climate change caused by greenhouse gas emissions
- Does not incorporate the needs of women or gender equality considerations in overall project description

INDICATOR 2: To what extent is there a specific gendered description, including provision of gender-disaggregated data (baseline and expected reach), of intended direct and indirect beneficiaries? Including targeting women and girls?



PART A: WEAK

- Does not describe the gender makeup of project beneficiaries,

focusing entirely on projected CO₂ emission reductions

- Fails to mention gender or women whatsoever in project description



PART C: WEAK

- Notes the inclusion of women in outreach and consultation efforts but does not indicate that any project components will specifically target women or girls
- Fails to describe the gender makeup of project beneficiaries
- Does not indicate that the project will collect gender-disaggregated data of direct and indirect beneficiaries

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 3: To what extent are “gender co-benefits” elaborated against the GCF Investment Criteria?



PART E: ADEQUATE

- Includes a section on “Gender Considerations” which includes a description of Ecuador’s gender policy framework
- Promises that Ecuador’s legal structures, such as the National Councils for Equality, will help ensure that the project “does not discriminate against women or girls or reinforce gender-based discrimination”
- Ignores how gender inequality remains pervasive in Ecuador and that existing legal structures should not be relied upon to ensure equal inclusion of women
- Notes that the GAP includes a detailed plan for how the project

will “integrate a gender perspective and promote women’s empowerment” with actions such as developing a gender policy for all REDD+ projects and ensuring gender equity in the REDD+ Mesa de Trabajo



INDICATOR 4: Is the project/program budget allocation gender-responsive? (“gender budgeting”)

- Are gender-related expenditures integrated in the overall project budget?



PART B: WEAK

- Allocates funding for the implementation of the Stakeholder Consultation Plan and the Environmental and Social Manage-

ment Plan, which both include women

- Makes no direct mention of gender in project budget even though the GAP calls for funding

- Can women’s groups/local groups/grassroots women get access to project funding?



PART B AND PROJECT GAP: ADEQUATE

- Explains that the REDD+ Mesa de Trabajo, which includes one women’s organization, will oversee the project implementation, suggesting that this group may have some control over project funds
- Notes that women’s groups will be included on the Project Technical Committees which will “provide technical support to the Project Board, Project National Director, Project Technical

Experts and Project Manager for decision making”

- Makes no other mention of women’s organizations or whether they can get access to project funding

- Does the Gender Action Plan (GAP) have its own budget? Is it adequate/ commensurate with overall budget and intent? What is the money spent on (gender consultants? Building local capacity for gender mainstreaming?)



PROJECT GAP: ADEQUATE

- Includes budget allocations for each GAP sub-activity which together account for 27% of the total project budget
- Assigns no funding to the following indicator: “Integrate gender within studies on industrial uses of Non-Timber Forest Products and consult

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

with women, men and youth from communities during the development of the studies”

- Does not adequately explain how funds will be used within each sub-indicator, preventing a more complete evaluation of funding allocations
- Does not reflect GAP budget in overall project budget

INDICATOR 5: (To what extent does the project/program acknowledge and discuss (implicitly or explicitly) an intersectional approach to gender?)



ADEQUATE

- Notes in the Gender Assessment that indigenous women and Afro-Ecuadorian women are particularly vulnerable and have

higher rates of illiteracy, poverty, and health issues

- Notes in the Gender Assessment that lesbian and trans women are disproportionately at risk of sexual discrimination and violence
- Acknowledges in the Gender Assessment that poor, rural women are more at risk of health issues than wealthier women
- Fails to adequately integrate this strong intersectional framework into other project documents, instead treating women as a homogenous group that will be able to access project benefits evenly

INDICATOR 6: (To what extent does the project/program (implicitly or explicitly) acknowledge and include people with marginalized gender and sexual identities?)



WEAK

- Notes in the Gender Assessment that lesbian and trans women are disproportionately at risk of sexual discrimination and violence
- Makes no other mention of LGBTQ people in other project documents and fails to adequately integrate the particular needs and vulnerabilities of this group in the project plan

INDICATOR 7: To what extent does the project acknowledge and take into account potential impacts on sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) or sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment (SEAH)?



WEAK

- Includes a section on Health in the Gender Assessment which notes that women and LGBTQ people are disproportionately at risk of SGBV and SEAH
- Makes no other mention of SGBV or SEAH in any other project document
- Acknowledges that the project risks exacerbating “conflicts among project affected communities and individuals” but does not mention any project safeguards that specifically protect against violence and SGBV

INDICATOR 8: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis assess the needs of women and other gender groups and current state of gender dynamics in the project-affected country/region/community prior to project inception, implementation, monitoring, and reporting?

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator



STRONG

- Conducted a “desktop literature review” to inform the Gender Assessment
- Provides an analysis of gender in Ecuador, exploring topics such as women’s access to income, education, and healthcare
- Acknowledges the existence and struggles of LGBTQ people in Ecuador
- Gives a strong overview of women’s relationship to forests and REDD+
- Failed to conduct any original research to inform the Gender Assessment

INDICATOR 9: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis predict and address

potential harmful gendered impacts in order to prevent them?

- With recommendations and conclusions in the overall project design



WEAK

- Does not mention any gender-related risks in funding proposal
- Fails to include any gender-related risks in the ESMF risk matrix but notes in the Social and Environmental Checklist that the project may “have adverse impacts on gender equality and/or the situation of women and girls” and may “potentially limit women’s ability to use, develop and protect natural resources”
- Fails to provide gender-targeted safeguards to prevent these outcomes, instead assuming that the grievance mechanism (which is merely a referral mechanism) will provide sufficient protection

- With concrete actions in the project-specific gender action plan



WEAK

- Includes no mention of gender risks or safeguards in the GAP even though the ESMF acknowledges that the project has the potential to disproportionately exclude and harm women and LGBTQ people

INDICATOR 10: To what extent does the project take into account potential impacts on the gender division of labor?



ADEQUATE

- Notes that nationally, men spend 13.9% of their time on unpaid work and 86.1% on

paid work while women devote 40.4% to unpaid work and 59.6% to paid work

- Explains that rural women have even greater domestic labor burdens than urban women due to limited access to resources such as water and housing services
- Acknowledges that women in Ecuador are often responsible for reproductive tasks although in certain regions, this gender division of labor is somewhat less rigid
- Plans to promote the equal participation of women in management of forests, water, and sustainable agriculture, which may challenge the current gender division of labor
- Notes in the ESMF that the project may “potentially limit women’s ability to use, develop and protect natural resources,” which could exacerbate their reproductive labor burden

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Fails to provide adequate safeguards to prevent this outcome

INDICATOR 11: To what extent does the project-specific gender action plan fully articulate and cover the project period (integrated activities vs “add-ons”, define clear responsibilities/ accountability and meaningful gender indicators? Inclusion of an adequate, multi-year budget?)



STRONG

- Includes a timeframe for each GAP output and sub-output that span the length of project implementation and monitoring
- Allocates funding to each sub-output
- Assigns responsible entities to each sub-output

- Sets an overall budget that amounts to 27% of the total project budget

INDICATOR 12: To what extent does the project create safeguards to prevent potential harms, including those that will disproportionately impact women, men, sexual and gender minorities? To what extent is there a comprehensive and project-adequate elaboration on gender in the project/program risk assessment and monitoring frameworks and arrangements?



PART E: ADEQUATE

- Does not describe any potential risks the project poses against women and LGBTQ people, although the project has the potential to exclude these groups and exacerbate gender inequality

- Notes that the UNDP completed several studies on gender in the project area “to increase the role of women in REDD+ programming going forward” as previous REDD+ programming in Ecuador failed to adequately include women
- Includes no other explicit safeguards to prevent potential harms against marginalized gender groups in the funding proposal
- Explains that the GAP outlines measures to prevent “any possible adverse gender impacts”

INDICATOR 13: To what extent does the project apply the principle of Free, Prior and Informed Consent and give project-affected persons (especially women and LGBTI people and Indigenous Peoples as well as other marginalized social groups) the right to accept

or refuse? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



STRONG

- Explains that the project is voluntary and must obtain consent from project affected people, particularly indigenous people
- Notes that the Mesa de Trabajo REDD+ meetings, which included one women’s organization, also covered “consent mechanisms”
- Acknowledges that “it is an imperative to consult with and secure the consent of the affected peoples and communities”
- Includes steps for obtaining consent in the EMSF safeguards framework
- Plans to conduct “iterative consultation and consent” throughout the project, giving

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

project-affected people multiple opportunities to accept or reject the project

- Does not make explicit accommodations to ensure that consent is obtained from women or LGBTQ people, such as asking for consent in multiple languages or verbally

INDICATOR 14: Is there a fully articulated, gender-responsive redress mechanism available to women at the project /national level in addition to the GCF IRM?

■ ■ ■

PART C AND ANNEX REFERENCING ESIA OR ESMF: ADEQUATE

- Explains that Mesa de Trabajo REDD+ meetings, which

included a women's organization, discussed and developed a grievance mechanism plan

- Notes that the project currently has a mechanism that receives complaints, determines eligibility, and then refers complaints to a national grievance mechanism or a UNDP grievance mechanism
- Plans to "further consider" whether a complete project level grievance mechanism is also necessary
- Notes that if a project level grievance mechanism is adopted, it should be "gender-inclusive and address potential access barriers to women"
- Avoids taking full responsibility for project-related harms by referring all complaints to outside parties
- Does not outline any specific accommodations to ensure women and LGBTQ people can use the current mechanism, such

as women intake officers or a verbal intake process

- Requires that the mechanism is "well-publicized" but does not explain how the publicization will occur
- Includes the grievance mechanism in overall project budget

INDICATOR 15: To what extent does the project provide compensation in case of harm that disproportionately impacts women and other marginalized gender groups, for example housing and land that is equal to or better than pre-settlement and compensating women and marginalized gender groups who are not legally recognized land owners?

■ ■ ■

PART C, PART F AND RELEVANT ANNEXES SUCH AS RESETTLEMENT PLANS: ADEQUATE

- Explains that the project does not expect to cause involuntary resettlement but risks causing some economic displacement
- Notes that the project "could have inequitable or discriminatory adverse impacts on affected populations, particularly indigenous peoples with titled and untitled property rights in project areas" as well as "other marginalized groups"
- Addresses the need for adequate compensation in case of project-related economic harm in the ESMF
- Does not acknowledge that women are also a marginalized group with little access to formal land tenure who must be targeted in any compensation efforts

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 16: To what extent does the project ensure full, effective and ongoing/sustained participation of gender groups throughout the project/program cycle?

- Comprehensive stakeholder engagement at the planning stage with documentation includes women's groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



ADEQUATE

- Explains that a women's organization was included in the Mesa de Trabajo REDD+ meetings which contributed to project planning
- Does not indicate that any national gender machineries participated in project consultation meetings

- Do the annexes include stakeholder engagement plans for project implementation that includes women's groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annex)



ADEQUATE

- Explains that the REDD+ Mesa de Trabajo, which includes one women's organization, will oversee the project implementation
- Notes that women's groups will be included on the Project Technical Committees which will "provide technical support to the Project Board, Project National Director, Project Technical Experts and Project Manager for decision making"
- Does not indicate that any national gender machineries will be included in project implementation



INDICATOR 17: Is there gender-responsive governance of project management and implementation?

- Does the Accredited Entity's Project Management Unit include gender experts and operate to support and build gender expertise in-country (including providing gender capacity building and oversight to Executing Entities)?



PART C, GAP: ADEQUATE

- Plans to "create a specialized team composed of male and female experts focusing on supporting the mainstreaming of gender"
- Allocates \$95,311 in the GAP budget to building this gender expert team
- Provides no clarification on the gender makeup of the gender expert team

- Does not mention the gender expert team in the funding proposal

- Is the national gender machinery involved in project implementation structures (as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures)?



PART C, GAP: WEAK

- Does not indicate that any national gender machinery will be included in the project

- Are civil society groups, particularly women's groups, Indigenous Peoples and local/community groups, and gender experts involved as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures?



PART C: STRONG

FP110

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Explains that the REDD+ Mesa de Trabajo, which includes one women's organization, will oversee the project implementation
- Notes that women's groups will be included on the Project Technical Committees which will "provide technical support to the Project Board, Project National Director, Project Technical Experts and Project Manager for decision making"

INDICATOR 18: To what extent does the project provide complete available project information, including in national/local languages, to all project-affected persons including women and marginalized gender/social groups?



ADEQUATE

- Explains that project information must be disclosed in a timely manner and must be accessible to all stakeholders
- Recommends that project information be distributed through websites, public meetings, local councils or organizations, newsprint, and other mediums in the ESMF
- Requires that project information is "in a form and language that is readily understandable and tailored to the target stakeholder group
- Plans to conduct "iterative consultation and consent" throughout the project, granting project-affected people with multiple opportunities to access project information
- Does not note whether the project will do specific outreach to marginalized gender groups to ensure that they are able to access to project information

INDICATOR 19: To what extent does the project have a gender-responsive monitoring process including collecting baseline and monitoring and evaluation gender-disaggregated data? To what extent are gendered indicators (quantitative and qualitative) reflected in the project/program results management framework?



GAP: ADEQUATE

- Outlines detailed gender indicators for each GAP activity and sub-activity, including baseline and target data
- Connects all GAP sub-output targets to project level measures, integrating them into overall project design
- Sets the majority of target proportions to include a minimum of 50% women but includes

some more disappointing targets such as "40% participants of consultations on land use zoning are women" and "30% of business within each business cluster are women-owned"

- Focuses the majority of indicators on consultation participation rather than project outcomes

FP112

Addressing Climate Vulnerability in the Water Sector (ACWA) in the Marshall Islands

The population and infrastructure of the Marshall Islands are concentrated in small, low-lying islands and atolls, which are highly susceptible to sea level rise, changes in weather patterns, and extreme weather events. This [GCF project](#) will increase the resilience of water resources for drinking and hygiene in the Marshall Islands. Planned interventions include improving household and community rainwater harvesting and storage structures; and securing groundwater resources from seawater intrusion. The project with an estimated lifespan of 7 years will also strengthen the technical capacities of national and subnational institutions and key stakeholders to integrate climate change risks into water governance processes.

Assessment Grade

-  WEAK
-  ADEQUATE
-  STRONG

Main Project/Program Characteristics

- Country: Marshall Islands
- Total value: US\$24.7 million
- GCF funding support: US\$18.63 million
- GCF financing instrument: grants
- Accredited Entity: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
- International access (MIE)
- Direct implementation (DI)
- Public sector (P)
- Adaptation
- ESS risk categorization: B
- Regular approval process
- Under implementation: Yes, since February 2020
- Expected completion: February 2027

FP112

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 1: To what extent is there an integration of gender equality considerations in the narrative and the technical elaboration of the overall project/program proposal document and project description? To what extent does the project undertake a gender-responsive, transparent, collaborative cost-benefit analysis and seriously consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends? Does it contain elements of an ecofeminist cost-benefit analysis? And if so which?



PART A: WEAK

- Notes that 49% of the project area population are women but makes no other mention of women or project gender considerations
- Overlooks how women are disproportionately impacted by climate change, drought, and changes in water supply

- Does not undertake a gender-responsive cost-benefit analysis or consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends



PART C: STRONG

- Acknowledges that women are disproportionately responsible for water collection but are often excluded from water and sanitation decision-making
- Plans to increase women's leadership in water and sanitation decision-making through establishment of Community-based Water Committees (CWCs)
- Mentions inclusion of women in other project components, such as climate change awareness trainings, leadership development opportunities, and local contracting efforts

- Focuses one project output entirely on enhancing women's leadership



INDICATOR 2: To what extent is there a specific gendered description, including provision of gender-disaggregated data (baseline and expected reach), of intended direct and indirect beneficiaries? Including targeting women and girls?



PART A: ADEQUATE

- Explains that 49% of project affected people are women
- Does not explain whether women will be targeted in project implementation or how the project will ensure all women in the project affected area will benefit



PART C: STRONG

- Notes that 49% of project affected people are women and includes several other mentions of women as direct beneficiaries for various project components
- Focuses one project output entirely on enhancing women's leadership in water-related decision making
- Explains that women will be targeted through other project activities, such as climate change awareness trainings, leadership development opportunities, and local contracting efforts




INDICATOR 3: To what extent are "gender co-benefits" elaborated against the GCF Investment Criteria?

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator



PART E: STRONG

- Includes a section on “Gender/ social inclusion impact potential,” noting that the project will improve women’s involvement in water resource management and reduce their time collecting water during droughts
- Explains that the project will enhance “women’s direct engagement in a community decision-making process through their inclusion on Community-based Water Committees” which could eventually “lead to women’s increased engagement in broader political processes at community and island level”
- Notes that the project will provide women more opportunities to generate income by providing women with construction skill trainings



INDICATOR 4: Is the project/program budget allocation gender-responsive? (“gender budgeting”)

- Are gender-related expenditures integrated in the overall project budget?



PART B: WEAK

- Allocates \$1,468,881 for “enhancing women and youth’s leadership through best practices and community awareness,” which makes up just 5% of total project funding
- Makes no other mention of gender in project budget even though the GAP calls for funding
- Can women’s groups/local groups/grassroots women get access to project funding?



PART B AND PROJECT GAP: ADEQUATE

- Includes representatives from Women’s United Together Marshall Islands (WUTMI) on the Project Board, suggesting they may have some control over and access to project funding
- Does not directly note whether WUTMI can access project funds but indicates that the project will partner with WUTMI for multiple project components including consultations and Water Safety Plan trainings
- Does the Gender Action Plan (GAP) have its own budget? Is it adequate/ commensurate with overall budget and intent? What is the money spent on (gender consultants? Building local capacity for gender mainstreaming?)



PROJECT GAP: ADEQUATE

- Includes budget allocations for each project indicator and sub-indicator but assigns less than 5% of total project budget to GAP activities
- Does not fully explain how funds will be used within each sub-indicator, preventing a more complete evaluation of funding allocations
- Does not reflect GAP budget in overall project budget




INDICATOR 5: (To what extent) does the project/program acknowledge and discuss (implicitly or explicitly) an intersectional approach to gender?

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator



WEAK

- Does not directly acknowledge how ethnicity, class or sexuality may affect women’s ability to access to project benefits
- Assumes women to be a homogenous group who will access project benefits evenly



INDICATOR 6: (To what extent) does the project/program (implicitly or explicitly) acknowledge and include people with marginalized gender and sexual identities?



WEAK

- Includes no mention of people with marginalized gender and sexual identities in any project documents and makes no

accommodations to ensure the inclusion of LGBTQ people



INDICATOR 7: To what extent does the project acknowledge and take into account potential impacts on sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) or sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment (SEAH)?



WEAK

- Includes a section on Gender Violence in the Gender Assessment and describes the many forms of violence faced by women in the Marshall Islands as well as the country’s SGBV legal framework
- Plans to “implement and enforce a Code of Conduct for all project staff which includes a zero tolerance for violence of any kind” in the GAP

- Includes no acknowledgement of or protection against potential SGBV or SEAH project impacts in any project documents outside of the GAP
- Fails to prevent increased SGBV and SEAH due to influxes of construction workers



INDICATOR 8: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis assess the needs of women and other gender groups and current state of gender dynamics in the project-affected country/region/community prior to project inception, implementation, monitoring, and reporting?




STRONG

- Conducted a literature review, national and community-level

consultations, site visits, school consultations, and local research to inform the Gender Assessment

- Provides an analysis of gender in the Marshall Islands, exploring topics such as women’s access to income, education, and health-care
- Gives a strong overview of women’s relationship to water and sanitation facilities



INDICATOR 9: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis predict and address potential harmful gendered impacts in order to prevent them?

- With recommendations and conclusions in the overall project design



ADEQUATE

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Notes that the project risks “limited involvement and participation of women and other marginalized groups in project implementation” but marks the impact of this risk as “low,” even though the exclusion of marginalized gender groups could have extremely harmful impacts
- Details mitigation efforts to safeguard against this risk, including extensive consultations with women and members of other vulnerable groups as well as a GRM
- Includes no other safeguards to prevent potential harms against marginalized gender groups in funding proposal
- Overlooks how the project could harm women and LGBTQ people if FPIC is not obtained prior to project design

- With concrete actions in the project-specific gender action plan



WEAK

- Includes no mention of gender risks or safeguards in the GAP even though the project has the potential to disproportionately exclude and harm women and LGBTQ people

INDICATOR 10: To what extent does the project take into account potential impacts on the gender division of labor?



ADEQUATE

- Acknowledges that women “bear the double burden of productive and reproductive activities – all of which are sig-

nificantly impacted by climate change”

- Explains that women’s reproductive tasks will become more arduous as climate change forces women to travel further to collect water, food, and other resources
- Does not explore how the project may impact women’s reproductive labor responsibilities
- Fails to acknowledge how excluding women from project benefits that mitigate the impact of climate change on water access could lead to the long-term increase of women’s unpaid domestic labor burden

INDICATOR 11: To what extent does the project-specific gender action plan fully articulate and cover the project period (integrat-

ed activities vs “add-ons”, define clear responsibilities/ accountability and meaningful gender indicators? Inclusion of an adequate, multi-year budget?)



STRONG

- Includes a timeframe for each GAP output and sub-output that span the length of project implementation and monitoring
- Allocates funding to each sub-indicator
- Assigns responsible entities to each sub-output
- Sets an overall budget that amounts to less than 5% of total project funding

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 12: To what extent does the project create safeguards to prevent potential harms, including those that will disproportionately impact women, men, sexual and gender minorities? To what extent is there a comprehensive and project-adequate elaboration on gender in the project/program risk assessment and monitoring frameworks and arrangements?



PART F: ADEQUATE

- Includes "limited involvement and participation of women and other marginalized groups in project implementation" as a potential project risk but marks the level of impact of this risk as "low," even though the exclusion of marginalized gender groups could have extremely harmful impacts
- Details mitigation efforts to safeguard against this risk, including extensive consultations

with women and members of other vulnerable groups as well as a Grievance Redress Mechanism

- Includes no other safeguards to prevent potential harms against marginalized gender groups



INDICATOR 13: To what extent does the project apply the principle of Free, Prior and Informed Consent and give project-affected persons (especially women and LGBTI people and Indigenous Peoples as well as other marginalized social groups) the right to accept or refuse? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



WEAK

- Notes in the Stakeholder Consultation Report that the

project must submit "endorsed Free and Prior Informed Consent (FPIC) letters" and recommends that the project must take care to ensure that consent is established

- Does not include the FPIC letters in publicly available project documents
- Makes no other mention of the need to obtain consent from project affected people in project documents
- Does not clarify whether the project will seek consent from indigenous people exclusively or from other groups, such as non-indigenous women or LGBTQ people



INDICATOR 14: Is there a fully articulated, gender-responsive redress mechanism available to women at the project /national level in addition to the GCF IRM?



PART C AND ANNEX REFERENCING ESIA OR ESMF: ADEQUATE

- Plans to create a two-tiered Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) which will cover costs for "all legitimate complaints"
- Includes a detailed description of the GRM in the ESMP, noting that the GRM will ensure "equitable treatment to all concerned and aggrieved individuals and groups" and "provide adequate assistance for those that may have faced barriers in the past to be able to raise their concerns"
- Outlines the timeline for each step of the complaint process
- Explains that "during all stakeholder engagement activities, there will be a statement announcing the GRM where stakeholders can raise complaints and have them processed"

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Does not outline any specific accommodations to ensure women and LGBTQ people can use the GRM, such as women intake officers or a verbal intake process

INDICATOR 15: To what extent does the project provide compensation in case of harm that disproportionately impacts women and other marginalized gender groups, for example housing and land that is equal to or better than pre-settlement and compensating women and marginalized gender groups who are not legally recognized land owners?

PART C, PART F AND RELEVANT ANNEXES SUCH AS RESETTLEMENT PLANS: WEAK

- Explains that the project will take place primarily on privately owned land where “land use

agreements have been put in place” so there is no need for compensation

- Does not expand on the nature of these land agreements or whether they occurred without coercion
- Explains that the project does not require involuntary resettlement or acquisition of land “although the project may temporarily impact land during construction activities”
- Makes no mention of compensation for project-affected people whose livelihoods may be negatively affected by project construction activities
- Notes that if women or other marginalized groups are excluded from or harmed by the project, they can use the GRM but does not note whether they will be able to access compensation

INDICATOR 16: To what extent does the project ensure full, effective and ongoing/sustained participation of gender groups throughout the project/program cycle?

- Comprehensive stakeholder engagement at the planning stage with documentation includes women’s groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)

ADEQUATE

- Notes that WUTMI was included in project consultations and GAP consultations
- Involved the Ministry of Internal Affairs, which has a Gender and Development Office, in consultations for the Gender Assessment and GAP but does not explicitly indicate that any national gen-

der machineries participated in project consultation meetings

- Do the annexes include stakeholder engagement plans for project implementation that includes women’s groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annex)

ADEQUATE

- Explains that WUTMI and other “existing women’s networks” will assist with Water Safety Plan development and implementation
- Notes that representatives from WUTMI will sit on the project board which will oversee all project implementation
- Does not indicate that any national gender machineries will be included in project implementation

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 17: Is there gender-responsive governance of project management and implementation?

- Does the Accredited Entity's Project Management Unit include gender experts and operate to support and build gender expertise in-country (including providing gender capacity building and oversight to Executing Entities)?



PART C, GAP: STRONG

- Notes that the Project Management Unit (PMU) includes a Gender and Youth Specialist who will "ensure that gender and youth concerns are fully addressed by the project by working closely with all project staff and with communities as needed"
- Explains that the Gender and Youth Specialist "will be engaged

during implementation to build the capacity of project staff and stakeholders for gender mainstreaming and will assist with implementation as needed"

- Does not note whether the Gender and Youth Specialist will be from the Marshall Islands
- Explains that UNDP gender experts assisted in project design

- Is the national gender machinery involved in project implementation structures (as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures)?



PART C, GAP: WEAK

- Involved the Ministry of Internal Affairs, which has a Gender and Development Office, in consultations for the Gender Assessment and GAP

- Make no other mention of involvement of the Ministry of Internal Affairs' Gender and Development Office or other national gender machineries
- Does not include national gender machineries in project implementation structures

- Are civil society groups, particularly women's groups, Indigenous Peoples and local/community groups, and gender experts involved as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures?



PART C: STRONG

- Includes representatives from WUTMI on the Project Board, which will be "the highest decision-making and coordination body for the project"
- Plans to partner with WUTMI to implement several project outputs' consultations and Water Safety Plan trainings

- Assigns a Gender and Youth Specialist to the PMU

INDICATOR 18: To what extent does the project provide complete available project information, including in national/local languages, to all project-affected persons including women and marginalized gender/social groups?



ADEQUATE

- Explains that the consultation process included women's organizations, such as WUTMI
- Included 132 girl students during consultation process
- Held gender segregated consultations to "discuss and address gender related issues and proposed interventions"

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Includes detailed notes from the gender segregated consultations in publicly-released Stakeholder Consultation Plan
- Does not explain whether project information will be available in multiple languages or formats
- marginalized gender groups

INDICATOR 19: To what extent does the project have a gender-responsive monitoring process including collecting baseline and monitoring and evaluation gender-disaggregated data? To what extent are gendered indicators (quantitative and qualitative) reflected in the project/program results management framework?



GAP: STRONG

- Includes detailed gender indicators for each GAP sub-output, including baseline and target data
- Sets nearly every target population to include a minimum of 49% women, although some indicators set higher proportions
- Connects all GAP and project targets in project design, which increases the chances that GAP activities will be implemented
- Includes a list of overall quantitative and qualitative GAP indicators

FP114

Program on Affirmative Finance Action for Women in Africa (AFAWA): Financing Climate Resilient Agricultural Practices in Ghana

This [GCF program](#) has the goal to empower vulnerable women's groups in Ghana's most vulnerable agricultural zone by improving their participation in low-emission climate resilient agricultural practices. Although women carry out about 70 percent of agricultural activities in Ghana, they often do not have full control over incomes and agricultural products. They also lack access to formal, financing channels. With a focus on on-lending, this program provides credit lines to local commercial banks. These loans will exclusively target micro, small, and medium-sized enterprises (MSMEs) and farmer-based associations led by women to support low-emissions and climate-resilient agricultural practices. It seeks to empower women entrepreneurs through enhanced access to finance. This proposal, with an estimated lifespan of five years, was selected under the GCF MSME request for proposal pilot program.

Assessment Grade

-  WEAK
-  ADEQUATE
-  STRONG

Main Project/Program Characteristics

- Country: Ghana
- Total value: US\$25.6 million
- GCF funding support: US\$20 million (US\$18.5 million or 92.5% in loans; US\$1.5 million or 7.5% in grants)
- GCF financing instruments: loans and grants
- Accredited Entity: African Development Bank (AfDB)
- International access (MIE)
- Financial intermediation (FI)
- Private sector (PR)
- Cross-cutting
- ESS risk categorization: Intermediation-2 (I-2)
- Regular approval process
- Pilot program: Micro, small, medium-sized enterprises (MSME) pilot program
- Under implementation: No, approved in July 2019
- Expected completion: n/a

FP114

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 1: To what extent is there an integration of gender equality considerations in the narrative and the technical elaboration of the overall project/program proposal document and project description? To what extent does the project undertake a gender-responsive, transparent, collaborative cost-benefit analysis and seriously consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends? Does it contain elements of an ecofeminist cost-benefit analysis? And if so which?



PART A: ADEQUATE

- Explains that the project “will provide affordable loans to micro, small, medium-sized enterprises (MSMEs) and farmer based associations (FBAs) led by women who will adopt low-emissions and climate resilient agricultural practices in Ghana”

- Notes that the project is expected to benefit 400 women-led MSMEs and FBAs
- States that the project’s central objective “is to empower vulnerable women groups in this most vulnerable agro-ecological zone through Line of Credit (LoC) and through Technical Assistance (TA)”
- Explains that Ghana is particularly vulnerable to climate change impacts but does not directly acknowledge that women will be most harmed by climate change
- Does not consider how loans may drive some women business-owners and farmers, who already experience poverty at higher rates than men business-owners, deeper into cycles of debt and poverty
- Does not undertake a gender-responsive cost-benefit analysis or consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends



PART C: ADEQUATE

- Targets women in all project components by aiming to increase access to credit for women-led MSMEs and FBAs
- Includes a detailed framework on project outcomes and impacts that sets strong, gender-disaggregated targets for all project components
- Notes that the project area is particularly vulnerable to climate change and that agriculture in the region is dominated by women but fails to acknowledge women’s particular vulnerability to climate change
- Uses a patronizing tone at times and ignores the importance of sustainable farming practices indigenous to the region, noting instead that many “members of women-led FBAs use rudimentary processing methods”
- Defines a women-led MSME as the following: has either at least 51% women’s ownership, 30% women on Board of Directors, or 60% women employees
- Ignores how many companies that have 60% or more women employment are owned by men and perpetuate gender pay and wealth gaps as well as gender inequality
- Ignores how companies with 30% women on their Board of Directors are often still controlled and operated by men and may perpetuate gender inequality
- Ignores how companies with at least 51% women ownership can still be controlled by men and perpetuate gender inequality given that men often maintain power even when they are physically outnumbered

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Does not consider how loans may drive some women business-owners, who already experience poverty at higher rates than men business-owners, deeper into cycles of debt and poverty. Maybe this is not surprising since the Accredited Entity is the African Development Bank
- Does not undertake a gender-responsive cost-benefit analysis or consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends

INDICATOR 2: To what extent is there a specific gendered description, including provision of gender-disaggregated data (baseline and expected reach), of intended direct and indirect beneficiaries? Including targeting women and girls?



PART A: ADEQUATE

- Notes that the project will benefit 373,720 people and 400 women-led MSMEs and FBAs
- Does not disaggregated the overall number of direct and indirect beneficiaries by gender
- Targets women through all project components, suggesting many women will be direct beneficiaries



PART C: ADEQUATE

- Includes a detailed framework on project outcomes and impacts that sets strong, gender-disaggregated beneficiary targets for all project components
- Plans to benefit "more than 400 women-led MSMEs and

FBAs in 43 administrative districts" through multiple project components

- Defines women-led MSMEs as having either at least 51% women's ownership, 30% women on Board of Directors, or 60% women employees
- Ignores how many companies that have 60% or more women employment are owned by men and perpetuate gender pay and wealth gaps
- Ignores how women at businesses owned by men but with 60% women employment will not necessarily benefit from project loans
- Ignores how companies with 30% women on their Board of Directors are often still controlled and operated by men and may perpetuate gender inequality
- Ignores how companies with at least 51% women ownership

can still be controlled by men and perpetuate gender inequality given that men often maintain power even when they are physically outnumbered

INDICATOR 3: To what extent are "gender co-benefits" elaborated against the GCF Investment Criteria?



PART E: STRONG

- Includes many mentions of the project's gender co-benefits, noting that "providing women with access to finance has great potentials for ending poverty in all forms and ending gender inequality"
- Notes that the project will provide women with job creation, poverty alleviation, skills, and greater food security

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Sets “promotion of gender equality” and “improvement of women’s social capital” as key social benefits for the project

INDICATOR 4: Is the project/program budget allocation gender-responsive? (“gender budgeting”)

- Are gender-related expenditures integrated in the overall project budget?

PART B: ADEQUATE

- Allocates \$23.5 million to project component 1: Line of Credit (92% of total project funding) which involves providing the African Development Bank with funding to lend to women-led MSMEs and FBAs

- Does not directly mention women or gender in project budget

- Can women’s groups/local groups/grassroots women get access to project funding?

PART B AND PROJECT GAP: ADEQUATE

- Plans to provide funding to women-led FBAs
- Defines women-led FBAs as associations with at least 5 members that are at least 60% women
- Ignores how having a membership of 60% women does not guarantee that these FBAs are women-led or that women will be in control of credit provided to the association
- Ignores how loans have the potential to drive women members of FBAs into cycles of debt and poverty

- Does the Gender Action Plan (GAP) have its own budget? Is it adequate/ commensurate with overall budget and intent? What is the money spent on (gender consultants? Building local capacity for gender mainstreaming?)

PROJECT GAP: ADEQUATE

- Includes a budget section in the GAP and notes the funding source for each GAP activity, such as “covered under the Technical Assistance budget for regulatory strengthening” or “budgeted for in the Line of Credit Component”
- Does not provide a more detailed budget for the Technical Assistance or Line of Credit components which prevents verification of these budget allocations

INDICATOR 5: (To what extent) does the project/program acknowledge and discuss (implicitly or explicitly) an intersectional approach to gender?

WEAK

- Acknowledges in the Gender Assessment that low-income women face particular challenges in Ghana but barely mentions class in any project documents, which is troubling given that class will affect how the MSME loans impact recipients of all genders
- Does not acknowledge how ethnicity, class, religion or sexuality may affect women’s ability to access project benefits
- Assumes women to be a homogenous group who will access project benefits evenly

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 6: (To what extent) does the project/program (implicitly or explicitly) acknowledge and include people with marginalized gender and sexual identities?



WEAK

- Notes in the ESMF that “vulnerable status may stem from... sexual orientation” and suggests that LGBTQ people are included as a Vulnerable Group which receive special protections and accommodations in the ESMF
- Provides no specific accommodations for LGBT people in the ESMF
- Includes no other mention of people with marginalized gender and sexual identities in any project documents and takes no

steps to ensure the inclusion of LGBTQ people

INDICATOR 7: To what extent does the project acknowledge and take into account potential impacts on sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) or sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment (SEAH)?



WEAK

- Notes that “women are more vulnerable to exploitation, sexual harassment and sexual violence when it comes to cross border trade”
- Includes no other acknowledgment of or protection against potential SGBV or SEAH project impacts in any project documents

- Does not acknowledge how lending to women-led MSMEs could disrupt gender roles and make women more vulnerable to SGBV and SEAH
- Ignores how LGBTQ people are disproportionately at risk of SGBV and SEAH

INDICATOR 8: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis assess the needs of women and other gender groups and current state of gender dynamics in the project-affected country/region/community prior to project inception, implementation, monitoring, and reporting?



WEAK

- Conducted a literature review to inform the Gender Assessment

but did not complete any original research

- Provides an analysis of gender inequality in Ghana and relevant legal codes and structures
- Gives a strong gender analysis of agricultural finance in Ghana
- Does not provide much context on women’s relationship to climate change or the environment, focusing almost entirely on women’s access to finance
- Provides no recommendations for the project based off the Gender Assessment findings

INDICATOR 9: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis predict and address potential harmful gendered impacts in order to prevent them?

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- With recommendations and conclusions in the overall project design



WEAK

- Includes climate change as a risk factor in the funding proposal but fails to address the disproportionate impacts of climate change on women in mitigation measures
- Includes a risk factor in the funding proposal about loan defaults and includes some helpful mitigation measures to prevent missed loan payments but does not explain why the project does not provide grants (rather than loans) to these highly vulnerable populations
- Overlooks how the project could perpetuate gender inequality by financing more men-owned businesses than women-owned businesses, given the project's loose definition of "women-led"

- Describes the standard GCF and AfDB risk screening process in the ESMF but fails to specify any project-specific gender risks

- With concrete actions in the project-specific gender action plan



WEAK

- Includes no mention of gender risks or safeguards in the GAP even though the project has the potential to disproportionately exclude and harm women and LGBTQ people

INDICATOR 10: To what extent does the project take into account potential impacts on the gender division of labor?



ADEQUATE

- Notes in the Gender Assessment that "on average, women spend more than three times as many hours a week on domestic work than men, yet women spend virtually the same amount of time as men on productive work"
- Provides a detailed gender description of employment by sector in Ghana and explicitly acknowledges the gender division of labor, including within firms
- Does not explore potential project impacts on gender division of labor, which could be harmful towards women
- Does not acknowledge how the project has the potential to improve women's ability to access paid work by supporting women-led MSMEs but also has the potential to exacerbate women's workload if proper

steps are not taken to address women's existing reproductive labor burden

INDICATOR 11: To what extent does the project-specific gender action plan fully articulate and cover the project period (integrated activities vs "add-ons", define clear responsibilities/ accountability and meaningful gender indicators? Inclusion of an adequate, multi-year budget?)



ADEQUATE

- Provides clear targets for every GAP activity
- Assigns responsibility for all GAP activities to various organizations and entities, such as "Legislative assembly" and "Bank of Ghana and African Development Bank"

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Sets the timeframe for each GAP activity as “by year 5,” which is the entire project duration
- Includes a budget section in the GAP and notes the funding source for each GAP activity, such as “covered under the Technical Assistance budget for regulatory strengthening” or “budgeted for in the Line of Credit Component”
- Does not provide a more detailed budget for the Technical Assistance or Line of Credit components which prevents verification of these budget allocations

INDICATOR 12: To what extent does the project create safeguards to prevent potential harms, including those that will disproportionately impact women, men, sexual and gender minorities? To what extent is there

a comprehensive and project-adequate elaboration on gender in the project/program risk assessment and monitoring frameworks and arrangements?



PART F: WEAK

- Includes climate change as a risk factor but fails to address its disproportionate impacts on women in project mitigation measures
- Includes a risk factor about loan defaults and includes some helpful mitigation measures to prevent missed loan payments but does not explain why the project does not provide grants (rather than loans) to these highly vulnerable populations
- Overlooks how the project could perpetuate gender inequality by financing more men-owned businesses than women-owned businesses, given the loose

definition of “women-led” that the project uses



INDICATOR 13: To what extent does the project apply the principle of Free, Prior and Informed Consent and give project-affected persons (especially women and LGBTI people and Indigenous Peoples as well as other marginalized social groups) the right to accept or refuse? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



WEAK

- Mentions consent just once in project documents, noting that local leaders deemed to represent the views of vulnerable groups during project implementation must receive the explicit consent of these groups

- Notes in the ESMF that “the emphasis [during consultations] will be about whether the affected communities are ‘in support of the sub-project’ and not about whether there is a lack of opposition to a sub-project” but does not clarify whether this means these communities will have the opportunity to accept or reject the project
- Threatens to harm other marginalized groups, such as women and LGBTQ people, by potentially failing to give them the opportunity to accept or refuse project participation



INDICATOR 14: Is there a fully articulated, gender-responsive redress mechanism available to women at the project /national level in addition to the GCF IRM?

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator



PART C AND ANNEX REFERENCING ESIA OR ESMF: WEAK

- Includes a section on the Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) in the ESMF but provides suggestions for what the GRM should include rather than a concrete description, preventing a full evaluation
- Explains that project affected people should have access to a project-specific GRM as well as the AfDB's grievance mechanism
- Notes that GRM should "take account of the specific issues, cultural context, local customs, and project conditions"
- Explains that the GRM should "include a balanced group of representatives from the community, representing the range of constituencies and demo-

graphics that will be using the grievance mechanism"

- Notes that "it is also important to maintain a gender balance within the GRM" but does not commit to an equal gender balance in GRM staff
- Explains that "once the project specific locations for the program are identified, the GRM process will be communicated to the project areas through relevant media including displays in the community head's house or with the women groups engaged in the loan facility," which is misleading given that the project location has been chosen

INDICATOR 15: To what extent does the project provide compensation in case of harm that disproportionately impacts women and other marginalized gender groups,

for example housing and land that is equal to or better than pre-settlement and compensating women and marginalized gender groups who are not legally recognized land owners?



PART C, PART F AND RELEVANT ANNEXES SUCH AS RESETTLEMENT PLANS: ADEQUATE

- Notes in the ESMF that "proposed subproject activities being considered for the funding program...may result in local impacts associated with physical or economic displacement"
- Includes a Resettlement Policy Framework in the ESMF
- Includes some gender-sensitive accommodations in the Resettlement Policy Framework such as "provide livelihood restoration options that vary for women and men"

- Acknowledges that women farmers are particularly vulnerable to harm in cases of involuntary resettlement
- Plans to provide subsistence allowances and "needs based special assistance" to vulnerable populations who are displaced, such as women
- Notes that "women's and men's preferences in terms of compensation mechanisms, such as compensation in kind rather than in cash, should be explored" and "women's perspectives must be obtained during consultations and their interests must be factored in"
- Does not acknowledge or account for the fact that LGBTQ people are also disproportionately at risk of harm in cases of displacement

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 16: To what extent does the project ensure full, effective and ongoing/sustained participation of gender groups throughout the project/program cycle?

- Comprehensive stakeholder engagement at the planning stage with documentation includes women's groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



ADEQUATE

- Consulted with the Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Protection multiple times throughout project design
- Consulted with the Ghana Association of Women Entrepreneurs during project design but did not include any other women's organizations

- Do the annexes include stakeholder engagement plans for project implementation that includes women's groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annex)



ADEQUATE

- Notes that the Directorate for Women in Agricultural Development will oversee project component 2.1: Capacity building for climate resilient agriculture (CRA) interventions and technologies uptake
- Does not indicate that any national gender machineries will be involved in other aspects of project implementation
- Plans to include women-led FBAs as primary beneficiaries and Executing Entities
- Defines women-led FBAs as associations with at least 5 members that are at least 60% women

- Ignores how having a membership of 60% women does not guarantee that these FBAs are controlled and led by women



INDICATOR 17: Is there gender-responsive governance of project management and implementation?

- Does the Accredited Entity's Project Management Unit include gender experts and operate to support and build gender expertise in-country (including providing gender capacity building and oversight to Executing Entities)?



PART C, GAP: ADEQUATE

- Does not indicate that the Project Management Unit will include a gender expert
- Plans build gender expertise by providing training to at least 20 local financial institutions (LFI)

in Ghana on gender issues as well as 50 staff from the Ministry of Food and Agriculture and Ministry of Gender

- Is the national gender machinery involved in project implementation structures (as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures)?



PART C, GAP: ADEQUATE

- Involved the Ministry of Internal Affairs, which has a Gender and Development Office, in consultations for the Gender Assessment and GAP
- Make no other mention of involvement of the Ministry of Internal Affairs' Gender and Development Office or other national gender machineries
- Does not include national gender machineries in project implementation structures

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Are civil society groups, particularly women's groups, Indigenous Peoples and local/community groups, and gender experts involved as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures?



PART C: ADEQUATE

- Does not indicate that any gender experts will be involved as Executing Entities but plans to build gender expertise by providing training to at least 20 LFIs on gender issues as well as 50 staff from the Ministry of Food and Agriculture and Ministry of Gender
- Identifies women-led FBAs as both primary beneficiaries and Executing Entities for many project components, such as "sensitization of women in informal business on the benefits of SME registration" and "training for women on bankable proposals"

INDICATOR 18: To what extent does the project provide complete available project information, including in national/local languages, to all project-affected persons including women and marginalized gender/social groups?



STRONG

- Explains that Ghana has significant ethnic and linguistic diversity in the ESMF
- Notes in the ESMF that "the LFI shall disclose the project safeguards information in line with the disclosure requirements in English and the local language (if not English), in locations convenient to affected peoples, in advance of the LFIs decision confirming the commitment to fund the sub-project"
- Requires that "consultations are tailored to the language

preferences of the affected communities, their decision-making process, and the needs of disadvantaged or vulnerable individuals or groups"

- Does not specify if information about the GRM will be available in multiple languages and formats



INDICATOR 19: To what extent does the project have a gender-responsive monitoring process including collecting baseline and monitoring and evaluation gender-disaggregated data? To what extent are gendered indicators (quantitative and qualitative) reflected in the project/program results management framework?



GAP: STRONG

- Connects GAP and project targets in project design, which increases the likelihood that GAP activities will be implemented
- Identifies specific activities, indicators and targets for each GAP component
- Sets strong targets that will directly benefit women, such as "all 400 women-led MSMEs/FBAs are sensitized to enroll in the GIRSAL index-based agricultural schemes" and "train at least 50 female land reform legislators"
- Does not clarify the role of the female land reform legislators and overlooks how many of the MSMEs/FBAs that benefit from the GIRSAL index-based agricultural schemes may be owned and controlled by men, given the project's weak definition of "women-led"

FP115

Espejo de Tarapacá

This [GCF project](#), with an estimated lifespan of 35 years, has the goal to provide stable, 24-hour base-load energy and solving the intermittency of renewable energy through a combination of pumped storage hydroelectric energy and a solar power plant. This is meant to address problems in the Chilean energy market with volatile energy pricing throughout the day. Many renewable energy projects encounter intermittent issues where volatile pricing on the spot market can be a great disadvantage, particularly in solar power plants, which operate during the daytime only. The Espejo de Tarapacá project comprises two commercially-integrated power plants: (1) a 300 MW pumped storage hydroelectric plant using the Pacific Ocean as its lower reservoir; and (2) and a 561 MW photovoltaic solar plant. The cross-cutting project will set a precedent by providing a renewable base-load solution at a competitive price. It will also contribute to climate change adaptation by providing stable water supply from its own desalination plant to vulnerable local communities. A GCF anchor equity investment is supposed to help attract additional private sector debt and equity investors.

Assessment Grade

- WEAK
- ADEQUATE
- STRONG

Main Project/Program Characteristics

- Country: Chile
- Total value: US\$ 1.1 billion
- GCF funding support: US\$60 million
- GCF financial instrument: equity
- Accredited entity: MUFG Bank, Ltd
- International access (MIE)
- Financial intermediation (FI)
- Private sector (PR)
- Cross-cutting
- ESS risk categorization: A
- Regular Approval Process
- Pilot program: Mobilising Funds at Scale (MFS)
- Under implementation: Yes, since February 2020
- Estimated completion: February 2025

FP115

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator


INDICATOR 1: To what extent is there an integration of gender equality considerations in the narrative and the technical elaboration of the overall project/program proposal document and project description? To what extent does the project undertake a gender-responsive, transparent, collaborative cost-benefit analysis and seriously consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends? Does it contain elements of an ecofeminist cost-benefit analysis? And if so which?



PART A: ADEQUATE

- Notes that the project will “promote empowerment of women” by providing local communities with funds and training to diversify their community
- Makes no other mention of gender in the project description

- Does not clarify whether women will be targeted through the project to ensure that they benefit
- Does not undertake a gender-responsive cost-benefit analysis or consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends




PART C: ADEQUATE

- Sets “improvement in gender equality” and “Empowerment of women” as project objectives
- Integrates gender equality as an expected outcome throughout Part C
- Plans to target women in fishing villages where sea-related economic activities are dominated by men and provide women with education and skill-training opportunities
- Plans to create more economic opportunities for women to

diversify the local economy and promote gender equality

- Ignores how women’s domestic labor burden, not just lack of opportunity, prevents women from participating in the formal sector
- Plans to monitor the project impact on gender equality throughout implementation
- Does not undertake a gender-responsive cost-benefit analysis or consider multiple means towards improving renewable energy access



INDICATOR 2: To what extent is there a specific gendered description, including provision of gender-disaggregated data (baseline and expected reach), of intended direct and indirect beneficiaries? Including targeting women and girls?



PART A: WEAK

- Explains that the project will “promote empowerment of women” by providing local communities with funds and training to diversify their economies
- Does not provide a more exact gender description of project beneficiaries
- Does not set gender-disaggregated targets or explain how the project will ensure that women benefit



PART C: ADEQUATE

- Sets “improvement in gender equality” and “empowerment of women” as project objectives and integrates gender equality as an expected outcome throughout Part C

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Identifies multiple activities that will target and benefit women, such as providing education and skill-training opportunities
- Does not provide a more exact gender description of project beneficiaries or set gender-disaggregated targets

INDICATOR 3: To what extent are “gender co-benefits” elaborated against the GCF Investment Criteria?



PART E: ADEQUATE

- Includes a section titled “Gender-Sensitive Development Impact” in Part E
- Explains that the project will aim to empower women and will ensure that women and men

have equal access to project opportunities, benefits, and decision-making processes

- Plans to provide women with new economic opportunities and monitor for any “cultural frictions” that result from women’s increased participation in the formal sector
- Identifies several activities from the GAP that will promote gender equality including construction training and microcredit for women
- Ignores how microloans have often harmed poor women by driving them deeper into cycles of poverty and debt
- Notes that the primary direct beneficiaries are 59% male and 41% female, which indicates that the project could worsen gender inequality by benefitting more men than women

INDICATOR 4: Is the project/program budget allocation gender-responsive? (“gender budgeting”)

- Are gender-related expenditures integrated in the overall project budget?



PART B: WEAK

- Makes no mention of women or gender in the project budget whatsoever
- Can women’s groups/local groups/grassroots women get access to project funding?



PART B AND PROJECT GAP: WEAK

- Creates many project agreements with Caletto Rio Seco community organizations, such as

the Fisherman’s Union and Rural Water Council, but fails to do so with any women’s organizations

- Includes many project activities that provide ample opportunity to partner with women’s organizations, such as education and training opportunities, but fails to do so

- Does the Gender Action Plan (GAP) have its own budget? Is it adequate/ commensurate with overall budget and intent? What is the money spent on (gender consultants? Building local capacity for gender mainstreaming?)



PROJECT GAP: WEAK

- Sets a budget of \$230,000 which makes up just .02% of project funding
- Allocates the largest portion of funding to the microcredit program, ignoring how many

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

microcredit schemes have harmed poor women by exacerbating cycles of debt and poverty

- Makes no mention of the GAP budget in the overall project budget

INDICATOR 5: (To what extent) does the project/program acknowledge and discuss (implicitly or explicitly) an intersectional approach to gender?



WEAK

- Notes in the ESMF that the project area has some indigenous residents who participate in "different economic activities" than non-indigenous residents
- Ignores how indigenous women will have different barriers to

accessing project benefits than non-indigenous women, especially given that the project aims to diversity women's economic activities

- Does not acknowledge how religion, class, or sexuality may affect women's ability to access project benefits
- Assumes women to be a homogenous group who will access project benefits evenly

INDICATOR 6: (To what extent) does the project/program (implicitly or explicitly) acknowledge and include people with marginalized gender and sexual identities?



WEAK

- Includes no mention of people with marginalized gender and sexual identities in any project

documents and makes no accommodations to ensure the inclusion of LGBTQ people

INDICATOR 7: To what extent does the project acknowledge and take into account potential impacts on sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) or sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment (SEAH)?



ADEQUATE

- Sets "reduction in violence against women" as an outcome indicator in the GAP
- Plans to achieve this reduction through trainings on gender empowerment and sexual harassment management
- Notes in the Gender Assessment "one of every three women in

Chile have been affected by some type of domestic violence"

- Makes no other mention of SGBV or SEAH in the funding proposal
- Fails to prevent increased SGBV and SEAH due to influxes of construction workers
- Fails to create a gender-sensitive, project

INDICATOR 8: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis assess the needs of women and other gender groups and current state of gender dynamics in the project-affected country/region/community prior to project inception, implementation, monitoring, and reporting?



ADEQUATE

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Conducted a baseline study in 2016 that measured “variables associated with education, work, income, and expectations for the future”
- Conducted a brief literature and policy review to inform the Gender Assessment
- Provides a mediocre analysis of gender in Chile, specifically the San Marcos region, and provides some details on women’s access to the formal sector and education
- Gives no overview of gender policy in Chile or the San Marcos region
- Provides very little analysis of women’s relationship to climate change and agriculture

INDICATOR 9: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis predict and address

potential harmful gendered impacts in order to prevent them?

- With recommendations and conclusions in the overall project design

WEAK

- Focuses primarily on financial risks that the project poses to the GCF
- Notes that “adverse unforeseen environmental impacts” are a risk and designs adequate mitigation measures but ignores how such impacts would disproportionately harm women and LGBTQ people
- Notes that “adverse unforeseen social impacts” are a risk and explains how the project has conducted ongoing engagement and evaluation throughout the project
- Ignores how “adverse unforeseen social impacts” would

likely be gendered and disproportionately harm women

- Ignores how the project threatens to worsen gender inequality by directly benefiting a population that is 59% men

- With concrete actions in the project-specific gender action plan

WEAK

- Includes no mention of gender risks or safeguards in the GAP even though the project has the potential to disproportionately exclude and harm women and LGBTQ people

INDICATOR 10: To what extent does the project take into account potential impacts on the gender division of labor?



WEAK

- Does not acknowledge that women are disproportionately responsible for reproductive activities
- Assumes that women do not participate in the formal sector due to lack of confidence and knowledge, rather than their reproductive labor burdens which often consume their available time
- Ignores how water and energy access have dramatic impacts on women’s reproductive labor burden
- Misses an opportunity to reduce women’s reproductive labor burden by failing to focus on this inequity in project design
- Fails to set mitigation measures against project impacts that could increase women’s reproductive labor burden

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 11: To what extent does the project-specific gender action plan fully articulate and cover the project period (integrated activities vs “add-ons”, define clear responsibilities/ accountability and meaningful gender indicators? Inclusion of an adequate, multi-year budget?)



ADEQUATE

- Includes a timeframe, budget, responsible entity, targets, and outcomes for each GAP activity
- Sets a budget of \$230,000 which makes up just .02% of project funding
- Allocates the largest portion of funding to the microcredit program, ignoring how many microcredit schemes have harmed poor women by exacerbating cycles of debt and poverty

- Assigns the same responsible entity (Espejo de Tarapacá NGO) to every GAP activity

INDICATOR 12: To what extent does the project create safeguards to prevent potential harms, including those that will disproportionately impact women, men, sexual and gender minorities? To what extent is there a comprehensive and project-adequate elaboration on gender in the project/program risk assessment and monitoring frameworks and arrangements?



PART F: WEAK

- Includes a section titled “Gender Assessment” in Part F which summarizes findings from the Gender Assessment and explains that the project aims to promote gender equality

- Plans to provide women with new economic opportunities and monitor for any “cultural frictions” that result from women’s increased participation in the formal sector
- Does not note other risks posed by the project or include adequate safeguards
- Ignores how the project threatens to worsen gender inequality by directly benefiting a population that is 59% men
- Ignores how microloans can often harm poor women by driving them deeper into cycles of poverty and debt

INDICATOR 13: To what extent does the project apply the principle of Free, Prior and Informed Consent and give project-affected persons (especially women and LGBTI people and Indigenous Peoples as well

as other marginalized social groups) the right to accept or refuse? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



ADEQUATE

- Explains that the project “has followed a comprehensive stakeholders’ and community engagement process with prior informed consent and meaningful participation”
- Promises in the ESMF that the process of obtaining consent will be “culturally appropriate,” “inclusive and gender-sensitive” and “free of coercion”
- Does not provide more details on the consent process, preventing a more complete evaluation

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 14: Is there a fully articulated, gender-responsive redress mechanism available to women at the project /national level in addition to the GCF IRM?



PART C AND ANNEX REFERENCING ESIA OR ESMF:
WEAK

- Explains that the Executing Entity, MUFG Bank, has a phone line for receiving complaints and that the Japanese Bankers Association, which MUFG Bank is a member of, provides alternative dispute resolution that project-affected people can use
- Does not explain whether the MUFG Bank phone line or Japanese Bankers Association dispute resolution process will be gender-sensitive
- Does not indicate that a project-level GRM will be created



INDICATOR 15: To what extent does the project provide compensation in case of harm that disproportionately impacts women and other marginalized gender groups, for example housing and land that is equal to or better than pre-settlement and compensating women and marginalized gender groups who are not legally recognized land owners?



PART C, PART F AND RELEVANT ANNEXES SUCH AS RESETTLEMENT PLANS: ADEQUATE

- Notes in the ESMF that the project “will not generate physical resettlement of local communities nor should it generate direct economic displacement in any of its components or stages”
- Mentions once that in the ESMF that compensation for

harm may be given on a case by case basis

- Plans to create a “Mitigation, Repair and Compensation Measures Plan” as part of the Environmental Impact Assessments
- Does not include the Plan in publicly available documents



INDICATOR 16: To what extent does the project ensure full, effective and ongoing/sustained participation of gender groups throughout the project/program cycle?

- Comprehensive stakeholder engagement at the planning stage with documentation includes women’s groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



WEAK

- Fails to any women’s organizations in project planning, even though the project partnered with seven civil society organizations
- Fails to include any national gender machinery in project planning, even though Chile has a Ministry of Women and Gender Equity

- Do the annexes include stakeholder engagement plans for project implementation that includes women’s groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annex)



WEAK

- Fails to include any women’s organizations in project implementation, even though the project partnered with seven civil society organizations

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Fails to include any national gender machinery in project implementation, even though Chile has a Ministry of Women and Gender Equity

INDICATOR 17: Is there gender-responsive governance of project management and implementation?

- Does the Accredited Entity's Project Management Unit include gender experts and operate to support and build gender expertise in-country (including providing gender capacity building and oversight to Executing Entities)?

PART C, GAP: WEAK

- Includes an extensive list of expert advisors who will work with the PMU, including multiple Environmental and Stakeholder Engagement experts

- Does not indicate that a gender expert will be included in the funding proposal or GAP

- Is the national gender machinery involved in project implementation structures (as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures)?

PART C, GAP: WEAK

- Fails to include any national gender machinery in project implementation structures, even though Chile has a Ministry of Women and Gender Equity

- Are civil society groups, particularly women's groups, Indigenous Peoples and local/community groups, and gender experts involved as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures?

PART C: ADEQUATE

- Partners with seven civil society groups in project implementation, including the Fisherman's Union and Kelp Harvesters, who will have access to project funding
- Notes that these civil society groups will work to "diversify the coastal economies" and "support gender equality and the empowerment of women"
- Does not clarify the gender makeup of these civil society groups or whether any of them have expertise in gender issues
- Does not partner directly with any women's organizations

INDICATOR 18: To what extent does the project provide complete available project information, including in national/local languages, to all project-affected persons including women and marginalized gender/social groups?



ADEQUATE

- Explains in the ESMF that project information will be "culturally appropriate," "inclusive and gender-sensitive," and "based on information provided and disclosed in a timely manner and in an understandable format"
- Describes the Stakeholder Engagement process in detail in the funding proposal, noting that the project held many national and community-level meetings to disseminate project information and receive feedback
- Does not specify gender makeup of consultations or whether women were targeted
- Does not specify how the project will ensure that information dissemination is gender-sensitive

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 19: To what extent does the project have a gender-responsive monitoring process including collecting baseline and monitoring and evaluation gender-disaggregated data? To what extent are gendered indicators (quantitative and qualitative) reflected in the project/program results management framework?



GAP: ADEQUATE

- Includes targets, timelines, responsible organizations, and budgets for each GAP activity
- Identifies some helpful activities, such as SGBV and SEAH trainings for all project construction workers
- Includes many activities that involve "counseling women" to improve their participation in the formal sector, assuming that gender inequities in the formal labor market are due to women's lack of confidence and knowledge rather than other constraints on their time (ie domestic labor burdens)
- Assigns the largest budget out of all GAP activities to the microcredit program, ignoring how microloans often harm poor women
- Leaves targets for other indicators open-ended such as "special efforts are made to ensure participation of women and marginalized communities" but fails to set requirements for how many "special efforts" must be made or how often they must occur
- Sets few targets that measure direct benefits for women, instead focusing on how many times gender-empowerment counseling and training are held per year

FP116

Carbon Sequestration through Climate Investment in Forests and Rangelands in Kyrgyz Republic (CS-FOR)

In Kyrgyzstan, livestock is the most important source of income, the primary source of nutrition, and a financial safety net for the rural poor. Climate change and the poor management of natural resources has led to overgrazing, increased forest degradation, and the unsustainable harvesting of timber from mountain slopes. This [GCF project](#) focuses on increasing carbon sequestration in Kyrgyzstan by supporting climate investments in forests and rangelands. It aims to reduce the drivers of land degradation and the emissions this causes by supporting national institutions, the participatory and ecosystem-based sustainable management of natural resources and green growth investments. This will include introducing integrated rangeland and forestry resource planning - which sequesters carbon and supports the diversification of activities generating household incomes.

Assessment Grade

- WEAK
- ADEQUATE
- STRONG

Main Project/Program Characteristics

- Country: Kyrgyzstan
- Total value: US\$50 million
- GCF funding support: US\$29.98 million
- GCF financing instrument: grant
- Accredited Entity: United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)
- International access (MIE)
- Direct implementation (DI)
- Public sector (P)
- Cross-cutting
- ESS risk categorization: B
- Regular approval process
- Under implementation: No (approved November 2019)
- Expected completion: January 2026

FP116

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 1: To what extent is there an integration of gender equality considerations in the narrative and the technical elaboration of the overall project/program proposal document and project description? To what extent does the project undertake a gender-responsive, transparent, collaborative cost-benefit analysis and seriously consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends? Does it contain elements of an ecofeminist cost-benefit analysis? And if so which?



PART A: WEAK

- Notes that the project will “diversify livelihood opportunities for women and men”
- Makes no other mention of women or gender
- Overlooks how women are disproportionately impacted

by climate change and environmental degradation

- Does not undertake a gender-responsive cost-benefit analysis or consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends



PART C: ADEQUATE

- Explains that as part of the first component, the project will conduct “special assessments” on how existing legislation impacts livelihoods for women and men and gender equality
- Plans to use assessment findings to identify natural resource management policy that will benefit both men and women
- Expects to include representatives from women’s committees in Community Landscape Management Groups (CLMGs)

- Provides opportunities for women to participate in multiple project sub-components, such as financial literacy trainings and employment opportunities
- Plans to provide training sessions for women on leadership, decision-making, and participation to encourage their engagement in community resource user groups
- Overlooks how women’s lack of participation in community resource user groups is likely not due to lack of “leadership” or “decision-making” skills but experiences of sexism and violence
- Fails to recognize women’s unique role in agriculture and forest preservation
- Does not fully integrate gender equality considerations throughout the project narrative



INDICATOR 2: To what extent is there a specific gendered description, including provision of gender-disaggregated data (baseline and expected reach), of intended direct and indirect beneficiaries? Including targeting women and girls?



PART A: ADEQUATE

- Explains that the project expects to directly benefit 432,450 individuals of which 246,497 are women
- Does not explain how the project will ensure that the amount of women in the project area will actually equal the amount of women beneficiaries



PART B: WEAK

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Expects to benefit “women and men farmers”
- Plans to target women through multiple project activities, such as through financial literacy and business trainings, employment opportunities, and inclusions in CLMGs
- Does not explicitly note gender makeup of project beneficiaries or include gender-disaggregated data

INDICATOR 3: To what extent are “gender co-benefits” elaborated against the GCF Investment Criteria?



PART E: ADEQUATE

- Notes that half of all project direct and indirect beneficiaries will be women

- Explains that the project will expand women’s access to livelihood and business opportunities as well as improved natural resources
- Does not further describe how the project will ensure that women benefit from project activities

INDICATOR 4: Is the project/program budget allocation gender-responsive? (“gender budgeting”)

- Are gender-related expenditures integrated in the overall project budget?



PART B: WEAK

- Allocates funding to some project components that include gender-related activities but

allocates no funds for explicitly gender-focused activities, despite the fact that the GAP activities call for significant funding

- Can women’s groups/local groups/grassroots women get access to project funding?



PART B AND PROJECT GAP: ADEQUATE

- Notes that the Community Landscape Management Groups (CLMGs), which are responsible for developing “integrated natural resources management and climate resilient plans” for their community area, will each include a representative from a women’s council
- Does not specify the size of the CLMG membership, preventing a full evaluation of women’s representation

- Includes women’s councils as a beneficiary institution, suggesting they will have access to project funding
- Does not mention the inclusion of women’s groups in other project components

■ Does the Gender Action Plan (GAP) have its own budget? Is it adequate/ commensurate with overall budget and intent? What is the money spent on (gender consultants? Building local capacity for gender mainstreaming?)



PROJECT GAP: ADEQUATE

- Includes strong budget allocations for all of the proposed activities and notes that 39% of the total project budget is “gender focused,” but does not reflect this figure in the overall budget

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Does not fully explain how funds will be used within each GAP activity, preventing a more complete evaluation of funding allocations

INDICATOR 5: (To what extent) does the project/program acknowledge and discuss (implicitly or explicitly) an intersectional approach to gender?



WEAK

- Does not acknowledge challenges faced by women ethnic minorities, even though the Gender Assessment notes that the project area is not mono-ethnic
- Does not directly acknowledge how class or sexuality may affect women's ability to access to project benefits

INDICATOR 6: (To what extent) does the project/program (implicitly or explicitly) acknowledge and include people with marginalized gender and sexual identities?



WEAK

- Includes no direct mention of people with marginalized gender and sexual identities in any project documents and makes no accommodations to ensure the inclusion of LGBTQ people

INDICATOR 7: To what extent does the project acknowledge and take into account potential impacts on sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) or sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment (SEAH)?



WEAK

- Acknowledges that violence against women in Kyrgyzstan is widespread
- Makes no other mention of SGBV or SEAH
- Fails to take into account or protect against potential project impacts on SGBV or SEAH

INDICATOR 8: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis assess the needs of women and other gender groups and current state of gender dynamics in the project-affected country/region/community prior to project inception, implementation, monitoring, and reporting?



ADEQUATE

- Provides a brief literature review of existing scholarship on gender in Kyrgyzstan and the project-affected region, exploring topics such as women's access to income, education, and political decision making
- Did not conduct independent research for this specific project but draws on a 2016 gender profile for Kyrgyzstan written by the project Accredited Entity
- Does not acknowledge the existence of LGBTQ people or their needs

INDICATOR 9: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis predict and address potential harmful gendered impacts in order to prevent them?

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- With recommendations and conclusions in the overall project design



WEAK


- Does not integrate any gender-specific risks in overall risk assessment and management framework
- Fails to recognize how the project poses specific gender risks, such as SGBV against women due to disruption of gender roles and declines in income for female-headed households due to disrupted land use practices

- With concrete actions in the project-specific gender action plan



WEAK

- Includes no mention of gender risks or safeguards in the GAP even though project has the potential to disproportionately harm women and LGBTQ people



INDICATOR 10: To what extent does the project take into account potential impacts on the gender division of labor?



ADEQUATE

- Acknowledges that while livestock and pastoral management is dominated by men, women assist with these tasks in addition to their “domestic tasks”
- Cites a report in the Gender Assessment that explains rural women spend roughly 303 minutes per day on domestic labor which is 3.5 times more than men
- Does not consider how the project may exacerbate the gender division of labor or increase women’s work loads, such as by disrupting land use practices

and excluding women in hiring initiatives




INDICATOR 11: To what extent does the project-specific gender action plan fully articulate and cover the project period (integrated activities vs “add-ons”, define clear responsibilities/ accountability and meaningful gender indicators? Inclusion of an adequate, multi-year budget?)



ADEQUATE

- Includes a timeframe for each GAP activity but does not indicate that any activity needs to be completed until Project year 7, implying that gender activities may not occur until the end of the project cycle
- Sets an adequate budget for each gender activity



INDICATOR 12: To what extent does the project create safeguards to prevent potential harms, including those that will disproportionately impact women, men, sexual and gender minorities? To what extent is there a comprehensive and project-adequate elaboration on gender in the project/program risk assessment and monitoring frameworks and arrangements?



PART G: WEAK

- Overlooks significant gender risks and potential mitigation measures



INDICATOR 13: To what extent does the project apply the principle of Free, Prior and Informed Consent and give project-affected persons (especially women and

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

LGBTI people and Indigenous Peoples as well as other marginalized social groups) the right to accept or refuse? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



WEAK

- Does not require that the project obtain free, prior, and informed consent from all project-affected persons
- Mentions consent only once in reference to obtaining consent for the use of pesticides
- Risks subjecting women and other vulnerable populations to project components against their will

INDICATOR 14: Is there a fully articulated, gender-responsive redress mechanism available to

women at the project /national level in addition to the GCF IRM?



PART C AND ANNEX REFERENCING ESIA OR ESMF: ADEQUATE

- Notes that the project will have a project-level grievance redress mechanism (GRM) in the ESMP
- Explains that complaints may be filed orally or in writing
- Plans to inform participants of the GRM at all meetings and workshops and will also distribute "awareness raising material" with "necessary information regarding the contacts and the process for filing grievances"
- Does not specify whether this information will be distributed in multiple languages or in accessible formats
- Does not specify gender-responsive accommodations (besides

allowing complaints to be filed orally or in writing) to ensure that women and LGBTQ people can access the GRM, such as women intake officers for those filing gender-sensitive grievances

INDICATOR 15: To what extent does the project provide compensation in case of harm that disproportionately impacts women and other marginalized gender groups, for example housing and land that is equal to or better than pre-settlement and compensating women and marginalized gender groups who are not legally recognized land owners?



PART C, PART F AND RELEVANT ANNEXES SUCH AS RESETTLEMENT PLANS: WEAK

- Explains that the project does not expect to result in involuntary resettlement and therefore does not have a Resettlement Action Plan

- Includes no mention of compensation for those harmed by the project, even though one of the potential risks includes "introducing temporary restricted access to certain land areas," which would affect pastoralists' income

INDICATOR 16: To what extent does the project ensure full, effective and ongoing/sustained participation of gender groups throughout the project/program cycle?

- Comprehensive stakeholder engagement at the planning stage with documentation includes women's groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



ADEQUATE

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Notes that consultations included representatives from women's councils but notes in the Gender Assessment that "many women's councils are not strong"
- Makes no mention of national gender machineries and does not indicate they will be included in project implementation structures

■ Do the annexes include stakeholder engagement plans for project implementation that includes women's groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annex)



WEAK

- Plans to include a representative from a women's council on the CLMGs, which are responsible for developing "integrated natural resources management

and climate resilient plans" for their community area

- Does not specify the size of the CLMG membership, preventing a full evaluation of whether women will have decision-making power in project implementation
- Does not mention inclusion of national gender machineries or women's groups in other aspects of project implementation

INDICATOR 17: Is there gender-responsive governance of project management and implementation?

- Does the Accredited Entity's Project Management Unit include gender experts and operate to support and build gender expertise in-country (including providing gender capacity building and oversight to Executing Entities)?



PART C, GAP: ADEQUATE

- Explains that the PMU will include an "Expert Group" which will have a Gender and Social Expert
- Calls for the Gender and Social Expert to help strengthen the national Pasture Department by improving their "gender-responsive monitoring capacities"
- Does not further explain what role the Gender and Social Expert will play
- Does not clarify how the Gender and Social Expert will divide their time to ensure that gender issues receive adequate attention

- Is the national gender machinery involved in project implementation structures (as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures)?



PART C, GAP: WEAK

- Makes no mention of national gender machineries and does not indicate they will be included in project implementation structures
- Are civil society groups, particularly women's groups, Indigenous Peoples and local/community groups, and gender experts involved as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures?



PART C: ADEQUATE

- Notes that women's collectives will be included in project components such as in leading the CLMGs but does not indicate that any women's groups will be included as Executing Entity or Advisory Board members

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Explains that the PMU will include an "Expert Group" which will have a Gender and Social Expert

INDICATOR 18: To what extent does the project provide complete available project information, including in national/local languages, to all project-affected persons including women and marginalized gender/social groups?

ADEQUATE

- Promises that the project will "disclose project information in a manner that is accessible and culturally appropriate" and will pay attention to "literacy needs and gender differences in language"

- Notes that "attention will be paid to vulnerable groups" during information dissemination
- Does not further expand on how the project will 'pay attention' to these groups or ensure that they are able to access project information, such as the grievance redress mechanism

INDICATOR 19: To what extent does the project have a gender-responsive monitoring process including collecting baseline and monitoring and evaluation gender-disaggregated data? To what extent are gendered indicators (quantitative and qualitative) reflected in the project/program results management framework?

GAP: ADEQUATE

- Includes detailed, gender-disaggregated baseline and target data for each component and sub-activity
- Focuses indicators on activities that do not directly benefit project-affected women, such as percentage of project materials that mainstream gender and number of attendees at gender sensitization trainings
- Does not provide many indicators that allow women to directly access project funds

FP117

Implementation of the Lao PDR Emission Reductions Programme through improved governance and sustainable forest landscape management

As a landlocked Least Developed Country, the Lao People's Democratic Republic is highly vulnerable to climate change. Its economy is dependent on natural resources, especially forestry, agriculture, electricity generation and mining. Agriculture, forestry and fisheries account for 16 percent of its Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and employs 64 percent of the Lao workforce. This [GCF project](#) focuses on improving forest and land-use management in order to support Lao PDR's implementation of an ambitious REDD+- emission reductions program after decades of losing tropical forest cover. It will strengthen an enabling environment for REDD+ by enhancing the availability of finance and strengthening the forestry sector's legal and regulatory framework. It will also encourage deforestation-free agriculture and agroforestry by enhancing agricultural productivity.

Assessment Grade

- WEAK
- ADEQUATE
- STRONG

Main Project/Program Characteristics

- Country: Lao PDR
- Total value: US\$75.3 million
- GCF funding support: US\$17.63 million
- GCF financing instrument: grant
- Accredited Entity: Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)
- International access (MIE)
- Direct implementation (DI)
- Public sector (P)
- Mitigation
- ESS risk categorization: B
- Regular approval process
- Under implementation: Yes, since May 2020
- Expected completion: June 2024

FP117

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 1: To what extent is there an integration of gender equality considerations in the narrative and the technical elaboration of the overall project/program proposal document and project description? To what extent does the project undertake a gender-responsive, transparent, collaborative cost-benefit analysis and seriously consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends? Does it contain elements of an ecofeminist cost-benefit analysis? And if so which?



PART A: WEAK

- Notes that the project will have “significant socio-economic and gender-positive co-benefits”
- Makes no other mention of women or gender
- Overlooks how women are disproportionately impacted

by climate change and environmental degradation

- Does not undertake a gender-responsive cost-benefit analysis or consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends



PART B: ADEQUATE

- Plans to assess the role of women in agriculture production and trade to “enhance their participation”
- Plans to provide microcredit to small and medium enterprises (SMEs) to boost anti-deforestation agriculture and will target women-led SMEs
- Overlooks how microloans could lead women business-owners to become more indebted and impoverished

- Notes that other project components, such as agriculture trainings and business plan development trainings, will target women
- Fails to recognize women’s unique role in agriculture and forest preservation
- Does not fully integrate gender equality considerations throughout the project narrative
- Adopts a patronizing tone towards Laotian farmers of all genders, noting that they “lack knowledge and expertise” for sustainable farming

INDICATOR 2: To what extent is there a specific gendered description, including provision of gender-disaggregated data (baseline and expected reach), of intended direct and indirect beneficiaries? Including targeting women and girls?



PART A: ADEQUATE

- Notes that the project will have “significant socio-economic and gender-positive co-benefits”
- Explains that half of direct and indirect beneficiaries will be women for both the Programme and Project 1 (in which the Programme is embedded) but does not provide rationale for this expected outcome



PART B: WEAK

- Plans to target women in multiple project components, such as agriculture and business plan development trainings
- Plans to target women-owned SMEs in provision of “green credit”

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Does not explicitly note gender makeup of project beneficiaries or include gender-disaggregated data

INDICATOR 3: To what extent are “gender co-benefits” elaborated against the GCF Investment Criteria?



PART E: ADEQUATE

- Includes gender-sensitive project targets such as equal participation of men and women in Village Fund decisions and “65% of targeted village forest management committees consist of at least 30% women”
- Notes that half of all project direct and indirect beneficiaries will be women

- Does not describe how the project will benefit women and ensure they benefit for the majority of project activities

INDICATOR 4: Is the project/program budget allocation gender-responsive? (“gender budgeting”)

- Are gender-related expenditures integrated in the overall project budget?



PART B: WEAK

- Allocates funding to some project components that include gender-related activities but allocates no funds for specific gender-related activities, despite the fact that the GAP activities call for significant funding

- Can women’s groups/local groups/grassroots women get access to project funding?



PART B AND PROJECT GAP: ADEQUATE

- Plans to engage with local women’s organizations to encourage women’s participation in community meetings
- Explains that women’s collectives will be targeted for agricultural capacity building activities, which consists primarily of trainings but may involve some access to project funding
- Plans to include Lao Women’s Union members in District Nutrition Teams which will help villages improve nutrition, suggesting that they may be able to access project funding

- Does the Gender Action Plan (GAP) have its own budget? Is it adequate/ commensurate with overall budget and intent? What is the money spent on (gender consultants? Building local capacity for gender mainstreaming?)



PROJECT GAP: ADEQUATE

- Includes strong budget allocations for about half of the proposed activities
- Does not fully explain how funds will be used within each activity, preventing a more complete evaluation of funding allocations

INDICATOR 5: (To what extent) does the project/program acknowledge and discuss (implicitly or explicitly) an intersectional approach to gender?

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator



ADEQUATE

- Mentions how the project will work to meet the needs of indigenous people and marginalized ethnic groups multiple times throughout project documents as the project area contains people of non-Lao-Tai ethnic groups
- Recommends that the project works to “foster the meaningful inclusion and participation of indigenous women and other marginalized groups”
- Calls attention to the gender roles and expectations of indigenous women and girls in ESMF, noting that “ethnic women have greater need for common property rights, especially related to forest”
- Requires that all project information is available in local languages and orally to ensure “ethnic women” are included

- Does not directly acknowledge how class or sexuality may affect women’s ability to access to project benefits

INDICATOR 6: (To what extent) does the project/program (implicitly or explicitly) acknowledge and include people with marginalized gender and sexual identities?



WEAK

- Includes no direct mention of people with marginalized gender and sexual identities in any project documents and makes no accommodations to ensure the inclusion of LGBTQ people

INDICATOR 7: To what extent does the project acknowledge and take into account potential impacts on sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) or sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment (SEAH)?



ADEQUATE

- Includes data on rates of SGBV and SEAH against women in Laos as well as the national SGBV policy landscape in the Gender Assessment
- Describe cultural attitudes towards violence against women and women’s ability to report and seek justice after instances of violence
- Acknowledges that project disruption of the gender division of labor may increase SGBV and recommends the project create trainings that empower women and change men’s attitudes towards gender equality, although

does not confirm whether these trainings will actually occur

- Plans to undertake a gender assessment to gauge the risk of increased domestic violence

INDICATOR 8: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis assess the needs of women and other gender groups and current state of gender dynamics in the project-affected country/region/community prior to project inception, implementation, monitoring, and reporting?




ADEQUATE

- Provides a literature review of existing scholarship on gender in Laos and the project-affected region, exploring topics such as women’s access to income,

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- education, and political decision making,
- Did not conduct extensive independent research but “consulted with relevant local government authorities and villagers in three villages in two of the target Provinces”
- Adopts a paternalistic tone at points, arguing that the reason why women in the region own less businesses and off-farm jobs is because they are “intimidated” and “afraid,” overlooking the threats of violence and social stigma that prevent women from disrupting the gender division of labor
- Cites outdated studies about the benefits of microfinance for women from 1999 in defense of the lending aspect of the project, despite the fact that more recent studies show that microfinance causes cycles of indebtedness, particularly for women



INDICATOR 9: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis predict and address potential harmful gendered impacts in order to prevent them?

- With recommendations and conclusions in the overall project design



WEAK

- Does not integrate any gender-specific risks in overall risk assessment and management framework, instead explaining that these risks are considered in the Gender Assessment and GAP
- Fails to recognize how certain project risks, such as harming poor households’ livelihoods by asking them to change their land use, could disproportionately harm women and LGBTQ people

- With concrete actions in the project-specific gender action plan



WEAK

- Includes no mention of gender risks or safeguards in the GAP even though project has the potential to disproportionately harm women and LGBTQ people



INDICATOR 10: To what extent does the project take into account potential impacts on the gender division of labor?



ADEQUATE

- Explains that women and men agreed in interviews that “women work longer hours in a day while men do less and/or focus more on physically-demand-

ing tasks” that produce more “tangible results”

- Acknowledges that women make up the majority of “unpaid workers for the family” and disproportionately hold low-wage jobs
- Acknowledges that women are often “the key knowledge carriers regarding the status of community forests and its resources”
- Plans to address these inequities by improving women’s representation in forest management positions from the national to the local level and giving women-owned SMEs access to microloans
- Does not consider how the project may exacerbate the gender division of labor or increase women’s workload, such as by disrupting land use practices and excluding women in hiring initiatives

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 11: To what extent does the project-specific gender action plan fully articulate and cover the project period (integrated activities vs “add-ons”, define clear responsibilities/ accountability and meaningful gender indicators? Inclusion of an adequate, multi-year budget?)



STRONG

- Includes a timeframe for each GAP activity that spans the timeframe of project implementation and monitoring
- Allocated adequate funding to almost every activity

INDICATOR 12: To what extent does the project create safeguards to prevent potential harms, including

those that will disproportionately impact women, men, sexual and gender minorities? To what extent is there a comprehensive and project-adequate elaboration on gender in the project/program risk assessment and monitoring frameworks and arrangements?



PART F: WEAK

- Does not integrate any gender-specific risks in overall risk assessment and management framework, instead explaining that gender risks are considered in the Gender Assessment and GAP
- Fails to recognize how certain project risks, such as harming poor households’ livelihoods by asking them to change their land use, could disproportionately harm women and LGBTQ people

INDICATOR 13: To what extent does the project apply the principle of Free, Prior and Informed Consent and give project-affected persons (especially women and LGBTI people and Indigenous Peoples as well as other marginalized social groups) the right to accept or refuse? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



STRONG

- Requires that the project obtain free, prior, and informed consent from all project-affected persons in “languages and formats that are easy to understand and acceptable by many stakeholders in the community”
- Plans to create a Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) team tasked with asking for consent and will train the team on “gender and social inclusion” to ensure women and other marginalized stakeholders are reached

- Requires the FPIC team include two women and two men
- Notes that consent must be obtained from both project-affected men and women

INDICATOR 14: Is there a fully articulated, gender-responsive redress mechanism available to women at the project /national level in addition to the GCF IRM?



PART C AND ANNEX REFERENCING ESIA OR ESMF: STRONG

- Conducts a thoughtful analysis of grievance redress mechanisms (GRMs) used in Laos, noting how certain mechanisms create perverse incentives that prevent justice

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Explains that the safeguard officers who will oversee the collection of grievances at the district-level will be trained in “best practices to promote gender equality”
- Notes that GRM is “designed to ensure that no individual or group are financially impacted by making a grievance or complaint,” which will allow women and LGBTQ people to better participate
- Promises that “special efforts” will be made to ensure that women and other vulnerable groups can access the GRM
- Designates CSOs, such as Laos Women’s Union, to assist with raising awareness about the GRM
- Notes that complaints can be made in written or oral formats, which will reduce barriers to filing for women and LGBTQ people

INDICATOR 15: To what extent does the project provide compensation in case of harm that disproportionately impacts women and other marginalized gender groups, for example housing and land that is equal to or better than pre-settlement and compensating women and marginalized gender groups who are not legally recognized land owners?



PART C, PART F AND RELEVANT ANNEXES SUCH AS RESETTLEMENT PLANS: ADEQUATE

- Explains that the project may result in involuntary resettlement but does not anticipate this outcome
- Indicates that the project may disrupt livelihoods through the Land Use Plans component
- Plans to “ensure that land access considerations – including gender-, ethnic- and income-differentiated risks –

are fully incorporated into the Participatory Land Use Plans” but does not further explain how the project will take these gender-differentiated risks into account

- Focuses majority of the project displacement response on indigenous communities
- Requires that the resettlement safeguard include “compensation for limiting access to forest resources”
- Gives a detailed and somewhat gender-sensitive description of entitlements for each type of potential displacement

INDICATOR 16: To what extent does the project ensure full, effective and ongoing/sustained participation of gender groups throughout the project/program cycle?

■ Comprehensive stakeholder engagement at the planning stage with documentation includes women’s groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



ADEQUATE

- Notes that the Lao Women’s Union was consulted during project design and plans to “work closely with Lao Women’s Union to ensure the effective engagement of women” during continued project consultation phases
- Notes that the project interviewed Provincial and District Lao Women’s Union offices during project design
- Does not mention inclusion of any national gender machineries or other women’s groups in project planning

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Do the annexes include stakeholder engagement plans for project implementation that includes women's groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annex)



ADEQUATE

- Plans to continue to include Lao Women's Union in multiple aspects of project implementation, such as the District Nutrition Teams
- Includes Lao Women's Union in the PMU
- Plans to work with Lao Women's Union to disseminate project information
- Does not mention inclusion of any national gender machineries or other women's groups in project consultations

INDICATOR 17: Is there gender-responsive governance of project management and implementation?

- Does the Accredited Entity's Project Management Unit include gender experts and operate to support and build gender expertise in-country (including providing gender capacity building and oversight to Executing Entities)?



PART C, GAP: ADEQUATE

- Notes in the GAP that the Project Management Unit (PMU) will include a "safeguard, gender, and M&E specialist" who will consult with a gender specialist "if necessary"
- Does not describe how or who will decide whether this consultation is necessary

- Requires that a gender expert "reviews all training modules" for women's sustainable agriculture trainings in the GAP
- Makes no mention of a gender expert in the funding proposal

- Is the national gender machinery involved in project implementation structures (as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures)?



PART C, GAP: WEAK

- Makes no mention of national gender machineries and does not indicate they will be included in the PMU
- Are civil society groups, particularly women's groups, Indigenous Peoples and local/community groups, and gender experts involved as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures?



PART C: STRONG

- Includes the National REDD+ Task Force, which includes the Laos Women's Union, on the PMU
- Plans to include Lao Women's Union members in District Nutrition Teams which will help villages improve nutrition
- Consulted with Lao Women's Union during project design
- Plans to "work closely with Lao Women's Union to ensure the effective engagement of women" during the project consultation and implementation phases

INDICATOR 18: To what extent does the project provide complete available project information, including in national/local languages, to all project-affected persons

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

including women and marginalized gender/social groups?



PART C: STRONG

- Requires that the project obtain free, prior, and informed consent from all project-affected persons in “languages and formats that are easy to understand and acceptable by many stakeholders in the community”
- Assigns Lao Women’s Union to assist in dissemination of project information
- Explains that “all information on Programme activities will be made easily accessible, and in appropriate ethnic languages”



INDICATOR 19: To what extent does the project have a gender-responsive monitoring process including collecting baseline and monitoring and evaluation gender-disaggregated data? To what extent are gendered indicators (quantitative and qualitative) reflected in the project/program results management framework?



GAP: ADEQUATE

- Includes detailed gender indicators for many project components along with target proportions
- Sets some target proportion at disappointingly low rates, such as “40% participation of women in community meetings” and “at least t 70% of all villagers state that they felt actively included in the land use planning processes”
- Fails to include baseline data

FP118

Building a Resilient Churia Region in Nepal (BRCRN)

The Churia region of Nepal has a vital role in maintaining the ecosystem of the heavily populated Terai plains. For decades, the region's natural resources have been managed unsustainably, leading to land degradation and, now, exacerbated by the effects of climate change. This [GCF project](#) with a focus on enhancing the resilience of ecosystems and vulnerable communities by adopting climate-resilient land-use practices takes an integrated approach in restoring ecosystems, including forests, while taking into account land use needs. It includes an element of strong stakeholder engagement, including with all levels of government and community-based organizations.

Assessment Grade

- WEAK
- ADEQUATE
- STRONG

Main Project/Program Characteristics

- Country: Nepal
- Total value: US\$47.3 million
- GCF funding support: US\$39.29 million
- GCF financing instrument: grant
- Accredited Entity: United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)
- International access (MIE)
- Direct implementation (DI)
- Public sector (P)
- Cross-cutting
- ESS risk categorization: B
- Regular approval process
- Under implementation: Yes, since May 2020
- Expected completion: May 2027

FP118

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 1: To what extent is there an integration of gender equality considerations in the narrative and the technical elaboration of the overall project/program proposal document and project description? To what extent does the project undertake a gender-responsive, transparent, collaborative cost-benefit analysis and seriously consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends? Does it contain elements of an ecofeminist cost-benefit analysis? And if so which?



PART A: WEAK

- Makes no mention of gender in project description whatsoever
- Overlooks how women are disproportionately impacted by climate change and environmental degradation

- Does not undertake a gender-responsive cost-benefit analysis or consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends



PART C: ADEQUATE

- Notes that 51% of project beneficiaries are women and includes several other mentions of women as direct beneficiaries
- Acknowledges that “women and marginalized groups experience additional barriers to access trainings due to various factors” but does not provide a direct solution to overcome this issue
- Does not fully integrate gender equality considerations throughout the project narrative



INDICATOR 2: To what extent is there a specific gendered description, including provision of gender-disaggregated data (baseline and expected reach), of intended direct and indirect beneficiaries? Including targeting women and girls?



PART A: WEAK

- Makes no mention of gender or whether gender-disaggregated data will be collected for project beneficiaries



PART C: ADEQUATE

- Notes that 51% of project beneficiaries are women and includes several other mentions of women as direct beneficiaries for various project components

- Plans to “strive for” equal representation of women when recruiting and hiring local laborers to support tree planting
- Requires that sustainable management trainings include at least 30% women
- Does not specify whether gender-disaggregated data will be collected for all project components



INDICATOR 3: To what extent are “gender co-benefits” elaborated against the GCF Investment Criteria?



PART E: ADEQUATE

- Notes that women make up 50% of direct project beneficiaries and 51% of indirect beneficiaries but later notes

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

that these proportions are based off population data rather than expected project impacts

- Explains that the project will provide “targeted support for women and excluded/ marginalized groups”
- Mentions that the project will benefit women by reducing time required to collect fuelwood and water which “may have the added benefit of indirectly enabling girls to allocate more time to their education”
- Notes that the project will hold trainings on business literacy for women’s groups and ensure representation of women trainers

INDICATOR 4: Is the project/program budget allocation gender-responsive? (“gender budgeting”)

■ Are gender-related expenditures integrated in the overall project budget?



PART B: WEAK

- Includes no budget for gender-related activities, despite the fact that the GAP requires significant funding to carry out proposed activities

■ Can women’s groups/local groups/grassroots women get access to project funding?



PART B AND PROJECT GAP: ADEQUATE

- Includes women’s organizations/ CSOs along with the Project Management Unit (PMU) gender specialist as entities responsible for a variety of GAP gender indicators, which suggests these groups may be able to access project funding

■ Requires participation of women’s organizations in project trainings and other capacity building activities

■ Does the Gender Action Plan (GAP) have its own budget? Is it adequate/ commensurate with overall budget and intent? What is the money spent on (gender consultants? Building local capacity for gender mainstreaming?)



PROJECT GAP: ADEQUATE

- Includes strong budget allocations for each project indicator and sub-indicator
- Does not fully explain how funds will be used within each sub-indicator, preventing a more complete evaluation of funding allocations

INDICATOR 5: (To what extent) does the project/program acknowledge and discuss (implicitly or explicitly) an intersectional approach to gender?



ADEQUATE

- Mentions how the project will work to meet the needs of indigenous women multiple times throughout project documents
- Notes that indigenous women and indigenous women’s groups participated in stakeholder consultations
- Explains that “women are not a homogenous group” in the GAP and that women from indigenous nationalities, Dalit caste and other marginalized groups face additional challenges
- Does not directly acknowledge how class or sexuality may affect women’s ability to access to project benefits

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 6: (To what extent) does the project/program (implicitly or explicitly) acknowledge and include people with marginalized gender and sexual identities?



WEAK

- Notes that the project must include “excluded communities” and defines these communities as groups who have experienced inter-generational discrimination and have been systematically excluded due to sexual orientation and/or other identities
- Includes no other direct mention of people with marginalized gender and sexual identities in any project documents and makes no accommodations to ensure the inclusion of LGBTQ people

INDICATOR 7: To what extent does the project acknowledge and take into account potential impacts on sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) or sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment (SEAH)?



WEAK

- Includes a section on Gender Violence in the Gender Assessment and describes the many forms of violence faced by women in Nepal as well as the country’s SGBV legal framework
- Includes no other acknowledgment of or protection against potential SGBV or SEAH project impacts

INDICATOR 8: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis assess the needs of

women and other gender groups and current state of gender dynamics in the project-affected country/region/community prior to project inception, implementation, monitoring, and reporting?



STRONG

- Provides a literature review of existing scholarship on gender in Nepal and the Churia region, exploring topics such as women’s access to income, education, and political decision making
- Did not conduct independent research but held a targeted gender workshop with “key actors” to discuss consultation findings and develop the Gender Action Plan
- Gives a strong overview of women’s relationship to land and forests in Nepal

INDICATOR 9: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis predict and address potential harmful gendered impacts in order to prevent them?

- With recommendations and conclusions in the overall project design



ADEQUATE

- Notes that the project risks excluding women, indigenous peoples, Dalits and other marginalized groups from project activities in Part G of the funding proposal
- Fails to explain why the level of impact for this risk factor is ranked as “low (<5% of project value)”
- Requires all project management to undergo gender trainings to ensure they are “aware

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

of potential barriers, differentiated vulnerabilities and opportunities within the project to empower and engage" women beneficiaries

- Conducted consultations with women's organizations and indigenous women's organizations which informed project design
- With concrete actions in the project-specific gender action plan



WEAK

- Includes no mention of gender risks or safeguards in the GAP even though the project has the potential to disproportionately harm women and LGBTQ people

INDICATOR 10: To what extent does the project take into account


potential impacts on the gender division of labor?



ADEQUATE

- Explains that "women are often in charge of domestic tasks" and are often "time poor" due to their burden of unpaid labor
- Includes a section on gender roles in the Gender Assessment and notes that the gender division of labor has led to unequal control of and access to water
- Describes women's labor roles in agriculture and land use in detail and acknowledges that women often have less access to formal land tenure
- Includes mitigation measures to ensure that women and other marginalized groups are not harmed by the project but does not include specific measures to

prevent negative impacts on the gender division of labor



INDICATOR 11: To what extent does the project-specific gender action plan fully articulate and cover the project period (integrated activities vs "add-ons", define clear responsibilities/ accountability and meaningful gender indicators? Inclusion of an adequate, multi-year budget?)



STRONG

- Includes a timeframe for each GAP gender indicator and sub-indicator that span the timeframe of project implementation and monitoring
- Allocated adequate funding to each sub-indicator



INDICATOR 12: To what extent does the project create safeguards to prevent potential harms, including those that will disproportionately impact women, men, sexual and gender minorities? To what extent is there a comprehensive and project-adequate elaboration on gender in the project/program risk assessment and monitoring frameworks and arrangements?



PART F: ADEQUATE

- Includes a section on Gender Equality in the Project Impacts and Risks section but does not identify any specific gender risks posed by the project in Part F, instead implying that all project risks will affect men and women equally
- Notes that the project risks excluding women and other marginalized groups in Part G

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

but places the level of impact of this risk at “low (<5% of project value)”

- Requires all project management to undergo gender trainings to ensure they are “aware of potential barriers, differentiated vulnerabilities and opportunities within the project to empower and engage women beneficiaries”
- Conducted consultations with women’s organizations and indigenous women’s organizations which informed project design

INDICATOR 13: To what extent does the project apply the principle of Free, Prior and Informed Consent and give project-affected persons (especially women and LGBTI people and Indigenous Peoples as well as other marginalized social groups) the right to accept or refuse? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



STRONG

- Calls for project to obtain the free, prior and informed consent of excluded and vulnerable groups in the Gender Assessment and provides a gender-sensitive description of how to obtain consent
- Notes that participation in project components is voluntary and that “indigenous peoples have the right to withdraw consent”
- Focuses primarily on the need to obtain consent from indigenous people in the ESMP but also mentions the need to obtain consent from other members of marginalized groups, such as women
- Provides a detailed and gender-sensitive description of consent in the ESMP

INDICATOR 14: Is there a fully articulated, gender-responsive redress mechanism available to women at the project /national level in addition to the GCF IRM?



PART C AND ANNEX REFERENCING ESIA OR ESMF: STRONG

- Explains that “special efforts will be made to ensure the grievance redress mechanism is available for all people”
- Describes in the Gender Assessment how the grievance redress mechanism will be communicated to women and other vulnerable groups through a variety of stakeholder meetings and outreach efforts that will include both written and orally-delivered information
- Notes in the Gender Assessment that the grievance redress mechanism “has been designed

to ensure that no individual or group is financially impacted by making a grievance or a complaint”

- Creates grievance redress mechanisms at multiple levels which will improve accessibility for marginalized gender populations

INDICATOR 15: To what extent does the project provide compensation in case of harm that disproportionately impacts women and other marginalized gender groups, for example housing and land that is equal to or better than pre-settlement and compensating women and marginalized gender groups who are not legally recognized land owners?



PART C, PART F AND RELEVANT ANNEXES SUCH AS RESETTLEMENT PLANS: STRONG

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Plans to prevent any involuntary resettlement or displacement
- Explains that “project activities are unlikely to influence local people’s access to forest resources on private land” and that any project investment measures in public land forests will be “decided based on participatory processes”
- Provides a lengthy, gender-sensitive description of mitigation measures to prevent changes in land use that harm vulnerable populations

INDICATOR 16: To what extent does the project ensure full, effective and ongoing/sustained participation of gender groups throughout the project/program cycle?

- Comprehensive stakeholder engagement at the planning stage with documentation includes women’s groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



ADEQUATE

- Notes that women’s organizations, including indigenous women’s organizations, participated in project consultation meetings
- Does not indicate that any national gender machineries participated in project consultation meetings

- Do the annexes include stakeholder engagement plans for project implementation that includes women’s groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annex)



ADEQUATE

- Plans to include CSOs, which include women’s organizations, in various components of project implementation
- Does not indicate that any national gender machineries will be included in project implementation

INDICATOR 17: Is there gender-responsive governance of project management and implementation?

- Does the Accredited Entity’s Project Management Unit include gender experts and operate to support and build gender expertise in-country (including providing gender capacity building and oversight to Executing Entities)?



PART C, GAP: ADEQUATE

- Does not indicate that a gender expert will be in the PMU
- Explains, however, that the FAO Technical Capacity Development Team, which is a co-Executing Entity, will include gender and safeguard specialists who will ensure that gender, indigenous peoples and Dalits concerns are adequately addressed
- Plans to work with women’s CSOs for project implementation
- Notes that the project worked with “key experts working on gender empowerment in the Churia region of Nepal” to develop the GAP

- Is the national gender machinery involved in project implementation structures (as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures)?



PART C, GAP: WEAK

FP118

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Makes no mention of any gender machineries in project documents
- Are civil society groups, particularly women's groups, Indigenous Peoples and local/community groups, and gender experts involved as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures?



PART C: ADEQUATE

- Notes that CSOs, which include women's organizations, will assist with project implementation and that the project will give women's groups business trainings
- Does not indicate that women's groups will be included as an Executing Entity
- Explains that the FAO Technical Capacity Development Team, which is a co-Executing Entity, will include gender and safeguard specialists

INDICATOR 18: To what extent does the project provide complete available project information, including in national/local languages, to all project-affected persons including women and marginalized gender/social groups?



PART C: STRONG

- Explains that the consultation process included both women's organizations and indigenous women's organizations
- Notes in the description of consent that project participation is voluntary and all project information must be communicated in a format understandable and culturally sensitive to all project-affected persons
- Notes that dissemination of project information "is not a one-time transfer of communication"

but rather "an ongoing relationship between communities and project implementers/ practitioners"

INDICATOR 19: To what extent does the project have a gender-responsive monitoring process including collecting baseline and monitoring and evaluation gender-disaggregated data? To what extent are gendered indicators (quantitative and qualitative) reflected in the project/program results management framework?



GAP: STRONG

- Includes detailed gender indicators for each project component, including target proportions

- Sets nearly every target proportion at a minimum of 50% women
- Fails to include baseline data

FP119

Water Banking and Adaptation of Agriculture to Climate Change in Northern Gaza

The water level of the coastal aquifer in Gaza, the region's only freshwater resource, is declining rapidly, resulting in the intrusion of seawater. Agricultural inefficiencies lead to the overuse of water and high evaporation. This [GCF project](#) focuses on developing a low-carbon water management scheme and increasing water availability for sustainable agriculture in the West Bank and Gaza. It creates a closed cycle of reusing treated wastewater for irrigated agriculture. This multiplier effect will alleviate pressure on the coastal aquifer and improve the climate resilience of local populations. It will also enhance the institutional and operational capabilities for integrated water management.

Assessment Grade

-  WEAK
-  ADEQUATE
-  STRONG

Main Project/Program Characteristics

- Country: West Bank and Gaza (Palestine)
- Total value: US\$52 million
- GCF funding support: US\$27.57 million
- GCF financing instrument: grant
- Accredited Entity: Agence Française de Développement (AFD)
- International access (MIE)
- Direct implementation (DI)
- Public sector (P)
- Cross-cutting
- ESS risk categorization: A
- Regular approval process
- Under implementation: Yes, since September 2020
- Expected completion: September 2025

FP119

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 1: To what extent is there an integration of gender equality considerations in the narrative and the technical elaboration of the overall project/program proposal document and project description? To what extent does the project undertake a gender-responsive, transparent, collaborative cost-benefit analysis and seriously consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends? Does it contain elements of an ecofeminist cost-benefit analysis? And if so which?



PART A: ADEQUATE

- Explains that the project will improve livelihoods for 23,553 people, half of whom will be women
- Does not describe how the project will be designed to ensure that this actually occurs, given that women and men often have

very different livelihoods due to gender division of labor

- Makes no other mention of gender



PART C: STRONG

- Includes a section on gender and irrigation which references gender disparities in land tenure
- Plans to investigate opportunities for women to gain access to land tenure and water services for their land
- Explains that if “possible/needed/wished,” the project will support groups of women to form cooperatives “in order to market their products or create food banks for their families”
- Does not further elaborate on how this decision to create women cooperatives will be made

- Notes that the project aims to transfer hydraulic infrastructure to communities and will employ “a particular set of services and activities” to “target women and their position within the family”
- Promises to “ensure that women are represented” and have the ability to make decisions in the Water Users Associations (WUAs), which will jointly manage hydraulic infrastructure with the government



INDICATOR 2: To what extent is there a specific gendered description, including provision of gender-disaggregated data (baseline and expected reach), of intended direct and indirect beneficiaries? Including targeting women and girls?



PART A: ADEQUATE

- States the intended number of women beneficiaries, which is exactly half of the number of total beneficiaries
- Does not describe collection of gender-disaggregated baseline or monitoring data



PART C: ADEQUATE

- Includes a section on gender and irrigation which describes in detail how the project will ensure women are direct beneficiaries
- Does not specify whether the project will collect gender-disaggregated baseline or monitoring data



Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 3: To what extent are “gender co-benefits” elaborated against the GCF Investment Criteria?



PART E: STRONG

- Includes multiple mentions of women beneficiaries in description of impact potential and consistently sets the proportion of women beneficiaries to at least 50%
- Indicates that creating more equitable and gender-balanced access to water distribution is a project goal
- Contains a section on gender empowerment that further details how the GAP, ESMF and funding proposal include activities to ensure women benefit

INDICATOR 4: Is the project/program budget allocation gender-responsive? (“gender budgeting”)

- Are gender-related expenditures integrated in the overall project budget?



PART B: STRONG

- Includes a budget of 187,000 EUR for project input titled “a Gender responsive approach to agricultural resilience to climate change”
- Assigns 100,000 EUR of this budget to construction and 87,000 EUR to “local consultants”
- Includes a 94,000 EUR budget for integration of women in the governance bodies of the WUA, all of which will go to local consultants

- Can women’s groups/local groups/grassroots women get access to project funding?



PART B AND PROJECT GAP: ADEQUATE

- Indicates that project funding for gender components will go to “local consultants” but fails to further describe who these consultants are and whether they will be women
- Explains that “if possible/needed/wished,” the project will help women’s groups form cooperatives “in order to market their products or create food banks for their families,” suggesting that these possible groups may have access to some project funding
- Notes that women NGOs will oversee these cooperatives, if formed
- Does not elaborate on how the decision to create women cooperatives will be made

- Does the Gender Action Plan (GAP) have its own budget? Is it adequate/ commensurate with overall budget and intent? What is the money spent on (gender consultants? Building local capacity for gender mainstreaming?)



PROJECT GAP: ADEQUATE

- Includes strong budget allocations for each project indicator and sub-indicator
- Does not fully explain how funds will be used within each sub-indicator, preventing a more complete evaluation of funding allocations

INDICATOR 5: (To what extent) does the project/program acknowledge and discuss (implicitly or explicitly) an intersectional approach to gender?

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator



WEAK

- Includes a socio-economic analysis of Palestine, noting poverty rates in different parts of the country, but addresses women as a singular group who face uniform challenge
- Fails to consider how sexuality, class, ethnicity, and religion will affect women's ability to access project components

INDICATOR 6: (To what extent) does the project/program (implicitly or explicitly) acknowledge and include people with marginalized gender and sexual identities?



WEAK

- Includes no direct mention of people with marginalized gender and sexual identities in any project documents
- Contains a transphobic definition of "sex" in the Gender Assessment that equates gender and sex

INDICATOR 7: To what extent does the project acknowledge and take into account potential impacts on sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) or sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment (SEAH)?



WEAK

- Notes that the project "prohibits harassment of any kind, including sexual harassment and inappropriate sexual conduct" in the ESMP Worker Code of Conduct

- Does not clarify how the project will prevent SGBV or SEAH in the workplace
- Includes no other acknowledgement of or protection against potential SGBV or SEAH project impacts

INDICATOR 8: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis assess the needs of women and other gender groups and current state of gender dynamics in the project-affected country/region/community prior to project inception, implementation, monitoring, and reporting?



STRONG

- Provides a literature review of existing scholarship on gender in Palestine and also conducts

an independent survey of gender roles

- Gives a strong overview of women's relationship to water and irrigation in Palestine

INDICATOR 9: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis predict and address potential harmful gendered impacts in order to prevent them?

- With recommendations and conclusions in the overall project design



WEAK

- Does not include a gender analysis whatsoever in Part G, which outlines project risk assessment and management
- Overlooks how certain risks, such as "water in aquifer is not

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

depolluted fast enough" could disproportionately harm women as they would likely be responsible for finding a new water source in case of pollution which is widespread in Gaza

- Overlooks other gender risks posed by the project, such as increased SGBV due to disruption of gender roles or influxes of construction workers
- Ignores the many gender risks posed by involuntary resettlement in funding proposal
- With concrete actions in the project-specific gender action plan



WEAK

- Includes no mention of gender risks or safeguards in the GAP even though the project has the potential to disproportionately harm women and LGBTQ people

INDICATOR 10: To what extent does the project take into account potential impacts on the gender division of labor?



WEAK

- Defines gender division of labor in Gender Assessment
- Includes a section on gender roles and notes that the gender division of labor has led to unequal control and access to water
- Overlooks women's role in collecting water for domestic activities
- Does not consider how the project could impact the gender division of labor, such as increasing women's unpaid work by reducing water sources

INDICATOR 11: To what extent does the project-specific gender action plan fully articulate and cover the project period (integrated activities vs "add-ons", define clear responsibilities/ accountability and meaningful gender indicators? Inclusion of an adequate, multi-year budget?)



STRONG

- Does not specify when each gender indicator will apply during the project cycle but includes gender indicators for five outputs, ranging from production to management, which suggests these activities will cover the project cycle
- Includes a budget for each activity within the five outputs
- Contains a budget for monitoring and evaluation of gender indicators

INDICATOR 12: To what extent does the project create safeguards to prevent potential harms, including those that will disproportionately impact women, men, sexual and gender minorities? To what extent is there a comprehensive and project-adequate elaboration on gender in the project/program risk assessment and monitoring frameworks and arrangements?



PART F: ADEQUATE

- Explains that the project has adopted "multi-dimensional consultation activities" including field visits, meetings, and questionnaires to specific groups, which have "enabled the marginalized, voiceless, youth and women to gain information about the project"
- Notes that the project must continue to engage stakeholders,

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

communicate and implement the grievance mechanism, and handle land acquisition “appropriately”

- Provides no further description of these activities, which is troubling given their complicated and sensitive nature

INDICATOR 13: To what extent does the project apply the principle of Free, Prior and Informed Consent and give project-affected persons (especially women and LGBTI people and Indigenous Peoples as well as other marginalized social groups) the right to accept or refuse? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



WEAK

- Mentions consent just once, noting that in the case of property seizure, “the owner/user’s consent should not influence the

court in estimating the value of compensation”

- Does not mention the need to obtain the free, prior and informed consent from project-affected persons in any project documents, which is particularly troubling given that the project will likely result in resettlement
- Does not explicitly note the right of stakeholders, especially women and LGBTQ people, to refuse the project

INDICATOR 14: Is there a fully articulated, gender-responsive redress mechanism available to women at the project /national level in addition to the GCF IRM?



PART C AND ANNEX REFERENCING ESIA OR ESMF: ADEQUATE

- Explains that “communicating and implementing a viable community grievance mechanism” is a key recommendation from stakeholder consultations
- Provides a detailed description of the Grievance and Redress Mechanism in the ESMP and assigns a timeline and responsible party to each step of the process
- Does not make specific gender accommodations but allows for grievances to be submitted verbally and requires that the grievance mechanism is available to all local residents through “proper communication channels”

INDICATOR 15: To what extent does the project provide compensation in case of harm that disproportionately impacts women and other marginalized gender groups,

for example housing and land that is equal to or better than pre-settlement and compensating women and marginalized gender groups who are not legally recognized land owners?



PART C, PART F AND RELEVANT ANNEXES SUCH AS RESETTLEMENT PLANS: ADEQUATE

- Notes that the project will result in “isolated cases of expropriation”
- Includes a Resettlement Action Plan which has a detailed section on compensation
- Explains that those who do not have formal land tenure but “have a claim to such land” recognized under the law of the country or by another “process” are eligible for compensation

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Does not clarify what “processes” will qualify for this eligibility requirement or whether women with informal land tenure will be eligible
- Does not recognize how restricted use of wells, which is a potential project impact, will disproportionately harm women
- Fails to create gender-sensitive compensation for this loss

INDICATOR 16: To what extent does the project ensure full, effective and ongoing/sustained participation of gender groups throughout the project/program cycle?

- Comprehensive stakeholder engagement at the planning stage with documentation includes women’s groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



WEAK

- Does not indicate that women’s groups or national gender machinery will be involved in project planning
- Do the annexes include stakeholder engagement plans for project implementation that includes women’s groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annex)



ADEQUATE

- Plans to create WUAs, which will assist with project implementation, and will “ensure that women are represented”
- Sets target for WUA membership at a minimum of 90 female and 450 male farmers, suggesting that women may be underrepresented in these groups

- Explains in the GAP that the project may also create or support existing women’s groups that will work with WUAs, if “possible/needed/wished”
- Includes “capacity building for Ministry of Women’s Affairs (MoWA) activities on inclusion of gender issues in project activities” as a project indicator in the GAP but does not clarify whether MoWA or other national gender machinery will be involved in project implementation

INDICATOR 17: Is there gender-responsive governance of project management and implementation?

- Does the Accredited Entity’s Project Management Unit include gender experts and operate to support and build gender expertise in-country (including providing gen-

der capacity building and oversight to Executing Entities)?



PART C, GAP: ADEQUATE

- Explains that Agence Française de Développement (AFD) will provide a GAP Coordinator who will be part of the Project Management Unit (PMU)
- Requires that all members of the Palestinian Water Authority (PWA), including members of the PMU, undergo training for gender mainstreaming
- Notes in the GAP that the PWA will have a Gender Expert, suggesting that they are Palestinian, but does not clarify whether this expert will be part of the PMU
- Is the national gender machinery involved in project implementation structures (as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures)?

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator



PART C, GAP: ADEQUATE

- Includes “capacity building for Ministry of Women’s Affairs (MoWA) activities on inclusion of gender issues in project activities” as a project indicator in the GAP
- Includes no other mention of MoWA or other national gender machinery in project documents and fails to clarify whether MoWA will be involved in project implementation structures
- Are civil society groups, particularly women’s groups, Indigenous Peoples and local/community groups, and gender experts involved as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures?



PART C: WEAK

- Notes that the formation of women cooperatives, which will occur

“if possible/needed/wished,” will be overseen by women NGOs

- Makes no other significant mention of women’s groups or their involvement in Executing Entities or project implementation

INDICATOR 18: To what extent does the project provide complete available project information, including in national/local languages, to all project-affected persons including women and marginalized gender/social groups?



ADEQUATE

- Explains that the project “undertook multi-dimensional consultation activities that included an exchange of information, providing the marginalized, voiceless,

youth and women with information about the project”

- Provides a detailed overview of this stakeholder engagement process which includes multiple checkpoints for the project team to provide stakeholders with project information
- Requires that the PWA’s Social Development Office “raise people’s awareness about grievance mechanisms”
- Does not explain how they will “raise awareness” and whether these activities will be gender-inclusive

INDICATOR 19: To what extent does the project have a gender-responsive monitoring process including collecting baseline and monitoring and evaluation gender-disaggregated data? To what extent are gendered indicators

(quantitative and qualitative) reflected in the project/program results management framework?



PART H: ADEQUATE

- Includes detailed gender indicators for each project component, including baseline data and targets
- Sets targets for gender indicators at disappointingly low rates, such as “at least 30% of job opportunities created under the project are for women” and “at least 90 female and 450 male farmers have a membership at the WUA”
- Suggests that the project may fail to equally benefit women as many of the gender indicators do not aim for gender equity in project outcomes

FP120

Chile REDD-plus results-based payments for results period 2014-2016

This [GCF project](#) has been approved under the GCF's REDD+ results-based payments pilot program to support efforts to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation, and foster conservation, sustainable management of forests, and enhancement of forest carbon stocks (REDD+) in Chile. It recognizes Chile's REDD+ results for the years 2014, 2015 and 2016, during which Chile has reduced a total volume of 18.4 million tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MtCO₂eq) of which 14.53 MtCO₂eq were offered to GCF for results-based payments. The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) has assessed these results as being fully compliant with its REDD+ stipulations. The payment will be reinvested to deepen the implementation of the country's National Strategy on Climate Change and Vegetation Resources.

Assessment Grade

- WEAK
- ADEQUATE
- STRONG

Main Project/Program Characteristics

- Country: Chile
- Total value: US\$63.61 million
- GCF funding support: US\$63.61 million
- GCF financing instrument: grants, results-based payment (RBP)
- Accredited Entity: United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)
- International access (MIE)
- Direct implementation (DI)
- Public sector (P)
- Mitigation
- ESS risk categorization: B
- Regular approval process
- Pilot program: REDD+ Results-based Payment
- Under implementation: Yes, since August 2020
- Expected completion: August 2026

FP120

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 1: To what extent is there an integration of gender equality considerations in the narrative and the technical elaboration of the overall project/program proposal document and project description? To what extent does the project undertake a gender-responsive, transparent, collaborative cost-benefit analysis and seriously consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends? Does it contain elements of an ecofeminist cost-benefit analysis? And if so which?



PART C: WEAK

- Includes no mention of women or gender in project description
- Overlooks women's role in forest preservation and climate stewardship
- Does not acknowledge how many of the proposed Results Based Payments projects, such

as "wood energy programs" and "forest management, have significant gender implications

INDICATOR 2: To what extent is there a specific gendered description, including provision of gender-disaggregated data (baseline and expected reach), of intended direct and indirect beneficiaries? Including targeting women and girls?



PART C: WEAK

- Identifies "small forest landowners" as principal beneficiaries overlooking women living in forested areas who are less often recognized as legal landowners
- Fails to identify other beneficiaries, such as women or LGBTQ people who do not own but work on forest land

INDICATOR 3: To what extent are "gender co-benefits" elaborated against the GCF Investment Criteria?



PART D: ADEQUATE

- Includes section on "impact on development with a gender perspective" in Investment Criteria
- Notes that gender-sensitive safeguards will be included to ensure that women are able to access benefits and to prevent the project from "replicating, deepening or creating new forms of discrimination against women"
- Contains no further information on how gender considerations will be integrated into project components to ensure that benefits are equally shared

INDICATOR 4: Is the project/program budget allocation gender-responsive? ("gender budgeting")

- Are gender-related expenditures integrated in the overall project budget?



PART C: ADEQUATE

- States in a footnote that "40% of the [overall project] budget will be used to comply with the indicators of the Gender Action Plan"
- Does not include GAP indicators in overall budget or otherwise reference the promised 40% of funding
- Can women's groups/local groups/grassroots women get access to project funding?

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator



PART B AND PROJECT GAP: WEAK

- Indicates that Chile's National Forestry Corporation (CONAF) and Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations will be responsible for implementing each gender indicator, suggesting they will have primary access to GAP funding
- Does not include any gender indicators that explicitly provide opportunities for women's/local groups to access funding, instead focusing on how many Results Based Payment projects have "gender inclusive language"
- Does the Gender Action Plan (GAP) have its own budget? Is it adequate/ commensurate with overall budget and intent? What is the money spent on (gender consultants? Building local capacity for gender mainstreaming?)



PROJECT GAP: STRONG

- States in a footnote in the Funding Proposal that "40% of the [overall project] budget will be used to comply with the indicators of the Gender Action Plan" but does not otherwise mention this significant funding allocation in the budget
- Includes strong budget allocations for all four objective areas in the GAP
- Identifies CONAF and Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations as the Responsible Institutions for each gender indicator, suggesting that they will have primary access to funding
- Does not otherwise clarify how funds will be allocated within each objective area




INDICATOR 5: (To what extent) does the project/program acknowledge and discuss (implicitly or explicitly) an intersectional approach to gender?



ADEQUATE

- Notes multiple times the need to target indigenous women when working with women in project design and implementation
- Explains that while all indigenous people are among the most vulnerable groups in the country, indigenous women are particularly vulnerable
- Included indigenous women in stakeholder consultations
- Fails to consider how sexuality and class will affect women's ability to access project components




INDICATOR 6: (To what extent) does the project/program (implicitly or explicitly) acknowledge and include people with marginalized gender and sexual identities?



WEAK

- Includes no direct mention of people with marginalized gender and sexual identities in any project documents



INDICATOR 7: To what extent does the project acknowledge and take into account potential impacts on sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) or sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment (SEAH)?



WEAK

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Notes that the project poses a risk of “social violence in the project area” which will be safeguarded against through “violence prevention training”
- Does not specify whether this social violence will disproportionately impact women or if the violence prevention training will be gender sensitive
- Includes no other acknowledgment of or protection against potential SGBV or SEAH project impacts

INDICATOR 8: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis assess the needs of women and other gender groups and current state of gender dynamics in the project-affected country/region/community prior to project inception, implementation, monitoring, and reporting?



ADEQUATE

- Provides a detailed overview of gender context in Chile in areas such as education, labor force participation, political participation, and health
- Includes key data points describing the experiences of women in Chile, such as average income and illiteracy rates
- Gives a strong analysis of specific barriers women face in accessing land, political power, and paid work but does not address these inequities in overall project design

INDICATOR 9: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis predict and address potential harmful gendered impacts in order to prevent them?

- With recommendations and conclusions in the overall project design



ADEQUATE

- Notes that the project triggers the GCF’s safeguard policy for Gender Equality as the project “might potentially result in discrimination against women, especially regarding participation in the design and implementation or access to opportunities and benefits” and “could potentially limit women’s ability to use, develop and protect natural resources”
- Attempts to account for these risks primarily through the Gender Action Plan and not through the overall project design
- Overlooks other gender risks posed by the project, such as increased SGBV due to disruption of gender roles or influxes of construction workers

- With concrete actions in the project-specific gender action plan



ADEQUATE

- Plans to monitor the amount of results-based payment projects that integrate gender considerations and are designed to allow women to “derive value from the forest”
- Does not specify other gender risks or safeguards against project risks, outside of unequal participation

INDICATOR 10: To what extent does the project take into account potential impacts on the gender division of labor?



ADEQUATE

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Includes a section on unpaid domestic work in the Gender Assessment and explains that this burden contributes to income inequality between men and women
- Does not acknowledge how women’s unpaid domestic care burden intersects with forest management or consider how the project may affect this burden
- Fails to mention the gender division of labor in any other project documents outside of the Gender Assessment
- Does not specify other safeguards meant to prevent negative impacts on gender division of labor or work to diminish women’s unpaid care burden

INDICATOR 11: To what extent does the project-specific gender

action plan fully articulate and cover the project period (integrated activities vs “add-ons”, define clear responsibilities/ accountability and meaningful gender indicators? Inclusion of an adequate, multi-year budget?)



ADEQUATE

- Indicates that \$1,061,402 of the GAP’s total \$26,255,905 will be used in the first two years of project implementation while the remaining funds will be used for years 3-6
- Focuses indicators on measuring the amount of Results Based Payment projects that are designed to include and benefit women rather than more direct measures such as the proportion of women who benefit from the projects



INDICATOR 12: To what extent does the project create safeguards to prevent potential harms, including those that will disproportionately impact women, men, sexual and gender minorities? To what extent is there a comprehensive and project-adequate elaboration on gender in the project/program risk assessment and monitoring frameworks and arrangements?



PART E: WEAK

- Ignores how the risk of social violence posed by the project would disproportionately harm women and other gender minorities



INDICATOR 13: To what extent does the project apply the principle of Free, Prior and Informed Consent and give project-affected persons

(especially women and LGBTI people and Indigenous Peoples as well as other marginalized social groups) the right to accept or refuse? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



ADEQUATE

- Requires that the project obtain the free, prior and informed consent of indigenous communities in project activities design, implementation and monitoring
- Focuses need for consent primarily on indigenous peoples and makes no mention of the need to obtain consent from women or LGBTQ people
- Does not explicitly note the right for stakeholders to refuse the project in description of consent



Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator


INDICATOR 14: Is there a fully articulated, gender-responsive redress mechanism available to women at the project /national level in addition to the GCF IRM?



PART C AND ANNEX REFERENCING ESIA OR ESMF: WEAK

- Explains that Chile has its own Grievance and Redress Mechanism (MRS) in place and can be used by “citizens to register their claims/grievances and suggestions related to the implementation of the action measures of the National Climate Change and Vegetation Resources Strategy (ENCCRV),” including this project
- Suggests that the project will not create a Grievance Redress Mechanism of their own and will instead rely on the MRS

- Does not clarify whether the MRS is gender-responsive



INDICATOR 15: To what extent does the project provide compensation in case of harm that disproportionately impacts women and other marginalized gender groups, for example housing and land that is equal to or better than pre-settlement and compensating women and marginalized gender groups who are not legally recognized land owners?



PART C, PART F AND RELEVANT ANNEXES SUCH AS RESETTLEMENT PLANS: ADEQUATE

- Explains that this project triggered the GCF policy for protection of Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage and will produce a report in the

next year that outlines potential harms and compensation options, although the project does not expect to cause involuntary resettlement

- Does not clarify whether this report will be gender-sensitive
- Contains no other mention of compensation as a safeguard for potential project harms against women and marginalized groups outside of Indigenous peoples (see next set of bullets)



INDICATOR 16: To what extent does the project ensure full, effective and ongoing/sustained participation of gender groups throughout the project/program cycle?

- Comprehensive stakeholder engagement at the planning stage with documentation includes women’s groups and national gender ma-

chineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



ADEQUATE

- Notes that women’s organizations were included in the five stakeholder consultations and workshops which informed project design
- Lists “Government Sector (Other than CONAF)” as a participant for the stakeholder consultations and workshops but does not clarify which aspects of the government sector were included
- Makes no other indication that national gender machinery was included in project planning
- Do the annexes include stakeholder engagement plans for project implementation that includes women’s groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annex)

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator



ADEQUATE

- Explains that the PMU will consult with CONAF's Unit for Gender Equality for gender-related activities throughout project implementation
- Does not indicate that women's groups will be included in project implementation



INDICATOR 17: Is there gender-responsive governance of project management and implementation?

- Does the Accredited Entity's Project Management Unit include gender experts and operate to support and build gender expertise in-country (including providing gender capacity building and oversight to Executing Entities)?



PART C, GAP: ADEQUATE

- Notes that the PMU will include a Safeguards Specialist who must complete a "Environmental and Social Risk Management Training Module" and will then oversee the implementation of the GAP
- Does not clarify whether the Safeguards Specialist will have a background in gender equity work or whether the Training Module will be gender-sensitive
- Explains that the PMU will also consult with CONAF's Unit for Gender Equality for "gender-related work"
- Is the national gender machinery involved in project implementation structures (as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures)?



PART C, GAP: STRONG

- Notes that CONAF, a state agency, has a Unit for Gender Equality which will help oversee implementation of gender-related activities
- Explains that the PMU will also consult with the Unit for Gender Equality for certain project activities
- Are civil society groups, particularly women's groups, Indigenous Peoples and local/community groups, and gender experts involved as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures?
- Notes that women's organizations were included in stakeholder consultations
- Makes no other mention of women's groups or their inclusion in

PART C: WEAK

project execution in the funding proposal



INDICATOR 18: To what extent does the project provide complete available project information, including in national/local languages, to all project-affected persons including women and marginalized gender/social groups?




WEAK

- Details the need to give stakeholders, particularly indigenous people, full project information when obtaining consent
- Does not describe specific actions to ensure that women are able to access all project information including the grievance redress mechanism

FP120

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator



INDICATOR 19: To what extent does the project have a gender-responsive monitoring process including collecting baseline and monitoring and evaluation gender-disaggregated data? To what extent are gendered indicators (quantitative and qualitative) reflected in the project/program results management framework?

allow women derive value from the forest”

- Fails to set any of the women beneficiary targets at or above 50%, suggesting that the project will not work to fully overcome existing gender inequities in Chile



GAP: ADEQUATE

- Includes detailed gender indicators for each project component, including baseline data and targets
- Sets targets for gender indicators at disappointingly low rates, such as “40% of people who are involved in activities and outputs associated with these projects are women” and “30% of projects are designed to

FP121

Recognising Paraguay's REDD+ results for the years 2015-2017

This [GCF project](#) has been approved under the GCF's REDD+ results-based payments pilot program to support efforts to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation, and foster conservation, sustainable management of forests, and enhancement of forest carbon stocks (REDD+) in Paraguay. It recognizes Paraguay's REDD+ results for the years 2015-2017. During these years, Paraguay has reduced a total volume 23 million tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (tCO₂eq) in emissions from reducing deforestation, forest degradation, enhancement of forest stocks and conservation (REDD+). The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) has assessed these results as being fully compliant with its REDD+ stipulations. Paraguay will use the payment to invest in implementing its National Strategy for Forests and Sustainable Growth, which is aligned with its Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC).

Assessment Grade

- WEAK
- ADEQUATE
- STRONG

Main Project/Program Characteristics

- Country: Paraguay
- Total value: US\$50 million
- GCF funding support: US\$50 million
- GCF financing instrument: grants, results-based payment (RBP)
- Accredited Entity: United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)
- International access (MIE)
- Direct implementation (DI)
- Public sector (P)
- Mitigation
- ESS risk categorization: B
- Regular approval process
- Pilot program: REDD+ Results-based Payment
- Under implementation: Yes, since November 2020
- Expected completion: November 2026

FP121

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 1: To what extent is there an integration of gender equality considerations in the narrative and the technical elaboration of the overall project/program proposal document and project description? To what extent does the project undertake a gender-responsive, transparent, collaborative cost-benefit analysis and seriously consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends? Does it contain elements of an ecofeminist cost-benefit analysis? And if so which?



PART C: WEAK

- Notes that the project will “mainstream gender issues” and that all Results-Based Payments (RBPs) will be made in line with “gender equality”
- Does not integrate other gender equity considerations, such as the role of women in forest management and preservation

and barriers they may face in accessing the Payments for Environmental Services meant to incentivize conservation

- Does not undertake a cost-benefits analysis or consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends




INDICATOR 2: To what extent is there a specific gendered description, including provision of gender-disaggregated data (baseline and expected reach), of intended direct and indirect beneficiaries? Including targeting women and girls?



PART C: WEAK

- Fails to note the gender makeup of intended beneficiaries whatsoever
- Explains that women compose 46% of key stakeholder consul-

tation participants but does not describe what percentage of the RBPs are expected to reach women



INDICATOR 3: To what extent are “gender co-benefits” elaborated against the GCF Investment Criteria?



PART D: ADEQUATE

- Describes how the project will “contribute to addressing gender gaps in the environmental and rural sectors” by “ensuring the participation of women in all the spheres of decision making related to forests” and “aiming to ensure equal access to services like forest related education, credit and also to land”

- Does not clarify if and how women’s participation in decision making will lead to gender equal accrual of project benefits
- Does not clarify whether the project’s “aim” to ensure equal access to project benefits is mandated or optional
- Contains no other mention of gender co benefits



INDICATOR 4: Is the project/program budget allocation gender-responsive? (“gender budgeting”)

- Are gender-related expenditures integrated in the overall project budget?



PART C: ADEQUATE

- Includes a couple mentions of gender in project budget, such

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- as “encouraging gender balance” when implementing sustainable production action plans and “implementing, monitoring, and reporting gender actions”
- Assigns a budget to each sub-output in which these actions are nested
- Does not assign a specific budget to the Gender Specialist who “will help to ensure gender mainstreaming throughout the design and implementation of project activities” although does assign a budget to the Project Management Unit which includes the Gender Specialist
- Can women’s groups/local groups/grassroots women get access to project funding?
- Notes that the RBPs will be used for activities such as facilitating access “to formal credit systems” for women’s groups
- Does not acknowledge that “formal credit systems,” rather than community-based lending programs, often lead to cycles of indebtedness that disproportionately harm poor women
- Includes the percentage of women’s groups in workshops “associated with the design of the fund” as a project indicator in the GAP which suggests that these groups may be able to advocate for access to funding
- Does the Gender Action Plan (GAP) have its own budget? Is it adequate/ commensurate with overall budget and intent? What is the money spent on (gender consultants? Building local capacity for gender mainstreaming?)



PART B AND PROJECT GAP: ADEQUATE



PROJECT GAP: ADEQUATE

- Includes a detailed budget with funding for gender, safeguards, communications, and finance specialists as well as gender workshops and assessments
- Gives the majority of the funding (\$288,400 out of \$588,600) to the Gender Specialist rather than to actions that will more directly benefit project-affected women

INDICATOR 5: (To what extent) does the project/program acknowledge and discuss (implicitly or explicitly) an intersectional approach to gender?



ADEQUATE

- Notes how women in rural areas are particularly vulnerable to poverty and that all women in Paraguay “face limited choices in terms of sexuality,” suggesting some acknowledgment of barriers faced by queer women
- Explains that indigenous women face even more discrimination than non-indigenous women in the Gender Assessment
- Does not integrate this intersectional approach throughout project documents, instead assuming that women will be able to access project components equally regardless of race, class or sexuality

INDICATOR 6: (To what extent) does the project/program (implicitly or explicitly) acknowledge and include people with marginalized gender and sexual identities?

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator



WEAK

- Notes that all women in Paraguay “face limited choices in terms of sexuality,” suggesting some acknowledgement of barriers faced by queer women
- Includes no other direct mention of people with marginalized gender and sexual identities in any project documents

INDICATOR 7: To what extent does the project acknowledge and take into account potential impacts on sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) or sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment (SEAH)?



WEAK

- Acknowledges that the “physical autonomy of women is affected by violence both inside and outside of the family”
- Makes no other mention of SGBV of SEAH except in relation to national anti-sexual violence laws
- Does not acknowledge or protect against potential SGBV or SEAH risks posed by the project

INDICATOR 8: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis assess the needs of women and other gender groups and current state of gender dynamics in the project-affected country/region/community prior to project inception, implementation, monitoring, and reporting?



ADEQUATE

- Provides a detailed overview of gender context in Paraguay in areas such as education, labor force participation, political participation, and sexual self-determination
- Includes key data points describing the experiences of women in Paraguay, such as the employment rate and life expectancy
- Gives a strong analysis of specific barriers women face in accessing land, political power, and paid work but does not account for these inequities in overall project design

INDICATOR 9: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis predict and address potential harmful gendered impacts in order to prevent them?

- With recommendations and conclusions in the overall project design



STRONG

- Provides detailed overview of risk assessment process in ESMF, noting that many civil society groups and local stakeholders were included in the process
- Explains that “risks associated with gender were widely recognized” during this project, including barriers women and other vulnerable groups face in accessing project benefits or participating in decision-making
- Notes that the Gender Specialist will be responsible for ensuring that women and girls are protected from project risks
- Plans to undertake a gender assessment for each RBP activity to prevent gendered harm

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- With concrete actions in the project-specific gender action plan



ADEQUATE

- Requires that gender disaggregated data is included in reporting of safeguards and plans to measure the percentage of safeguard reports that include gender disaggregated data
- Does not specify gender risks or particular safeguards against project risks that disproportionately impact women or LGBTQ people

INDICATOR 10: To what extent does the project take into account potential impacts on the gender division of labor?



ADEQUATE

- Notes multiple times that women are disproportionately responsible for domestic labor that relates to forests, such as collection of firewood

- Acknowledges that women “have greater restrictions than men in participating in the formal labour force” due to their domestic labor burden

- Plans to “highlight women’s domestic role” in collecting firewood when promoting energy efficiency programs

- Does not specify other safeguards meant to prevent negative impacts on gender division of labor or work to diminish women’s unpaid care burden

INDICATOR 11: To what extent does the project-specific gender action plan fully articulate and cover the project period (integrat-

ed activities vs “add-ons”, define clear responsibilities/ accountability and meaningful gender indicators? Inclusion of an adequate, multi-year budget?)



ADEQUATE

- Designs majority of GAP around “gender trainings” which occur near the beginning of the project cycle

- Allocates \$80,000 (out of \$588,600 in GAP funding) to “gender assessments and analyses” which will occur throughout the project cycle but gives the rest of the GAP funding to workshops that occur at the beginning of the project and specialists

INDICATOR 12: To what extent does the project create safeguards to prevent potential harms, including those that will disproportionately impact women, men, sexual and gender minorities? To what extent is there a comprehensive and project-adequate elaboration on gender in the project/program risk assessment and monitoring frameworks and arrangements?



PART E: WEAK

- Overlooks significant gender risks and potential mitigation measures

INDICATOR 13: To what extent does the project apply the principle of Free, Prior and Informed Consent and give project-affected persons (especially women and LGBTI people and Indigenous Peoples as well as

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

other marginalized social groups) the right to accept or refuse? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



ADEQUATE

- Requires that the project obtain the free, prior and informed consent of stakeholders, particularly indigenous communities, in project activities design, implementation and monitoring
- Focuses need for consent primarily of indigenous peoples and makes no mention of the need to obtain consent from women or LGBTQ people
- Does not explicitly note the right for stakeholders to refuse the project in description of consent

INDICATOR 14: Is there a fully articulated, gender-responsive redress

mechanism available to women at the project /national level in addition to the GCF IRM?



PART B AND ANNEX REFERENCING ESIA OR ESMF: STRONG

- Requires that the Gender Specialist design project-level grievance redress procedures and processes that are overseen by an independent office which provides project-affected people with access to “appropriate and flexible dispute resolution procedures”
- Mandates the “equitable treatment of all aggrieved individuals and groups”
- Requires that the grievance redress mechanism is “culturally appropriate and readily accessible, at no cost to the affected communities”

- Plans to take language barriers into account and provide translation services when possible
- Ensures confidentiality in grievance redress process
- Explains that the grievance redress mechanism’s “design, access, and operations will be communicated during the stakeholder engagement process”

INDICATOR 15: To what extent does the project provide compensation in case of harm that disproportionately impacts women and other marginalized gender groups, for example housing and land that is equal to or better than pre-settlement and compensating women and marginalized gender groups who are not legally recognized land owners?



PART C, PART F AND RELEVANT ANNEXES SUCH AS RESETTLEMENT PLANS: ADEQUATE

- Notes that involuntary resettlement is not expected to be a project outcome but that the project still has the potential to “result in full or partial displacement”
- Explains that in case of displacement, the project will develop a resettlement plan and “compensate losses, and provide benefits to persons and communities voluntarily resettling as a consequence of the project’s activities”
- Describes the compensation process, noting that the project will inform displaced persons of their rights, provide them with housing and livelihood alternatives and provide support throughout the transitional period

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Fails to recognize the disproportionate impact of displacement on women and LGBTQ people or integrate a gender-sensitive response to involuntary resettlement in case the project does result in displacement

INDICATOR 16: To what extent does the project ensure full, effective and ongoing/sustained participation of gender groups throughout the project/program cycle?

- Comprehensive stakeholder engagement at the planning stage with documentation includes women's groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



ADEQUATE

- Notes that women's groups should be included in stakehold-

er consultations and workshops "associated with the design of the fund"

- Explains that consultations included women's groups and that 46% of total participants were women
- Makes no mention of national gender machineries in project planning
- Assigns task of gender mainstreaming of the subprojects to a Gender Specialist rather than local women's groups or national gender machineries

- Do the annexes include stakeholder engagement plans for project implementation that includes women's groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annex)



WEAK

- Requires that the project strengthen women's groups' access to formal credit systems
- Does not acknowledge that "formal credit systems," rather than community-based lending programs, often lead to cycles of indebtedness that disproportionately harm women
- Makes no mention of national gender machineries in project implementation

INDICATOR 17: Is there gender-responsive governance of project management and implementation?

- Does the Accredited Entity's Project Management Unit include gender experts and operate to support and build gender expertise in-country (including providing gender capacity building and oversight to Executing Entities)?



PART C, GAP: STRONG

- Requires that UNEP hire a Gender Specialist for the Project Management Unit who will be responsible for designing and implementing the project's gender strategy and identifying actions to reduce gender gaps in all project interventions
- Explains that "the project will support South-South exchanges as much as possible," suggesting that the specialist may be from Paraguay or another country in the Global South but does not further clarify
- Assigns a budget for the Gender Specialist in the GAP
- Is the national gender machinery involved in project implementation structures (as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures)?

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator



PART C, GAP: WEAK

- Explains that government departments will be included in stakeholder consultations but does not specify which departments
- Includes no direct mention of national gender machinery or whether they will be involved in project implementation structures
- Are civil society groups, particularly women's groups, Indigenous Peoples and local/community groups, and gender experts involved as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures?



PART C: WEAK

- Notes that women's groups should be included in stakeholder consultations and workshops "associated with the design of the fund"

- Does not include women's groups, Indigenous Peoples and local/community groups, or other gender experts on permanent entities such as Executing Entities or Advisory Boards

INDICATOR 18: To what extent does the project provide complete available project information, including in national/local languages, to all project-affected persons including women and marginalized gender/social groups?



ADEQUATE

- Details the need to give stakeholders, particularly indigenous people, full project information when obtaining consent
- Requires that project information is given to stakeholders in a

format and language understandable to the actors involved

- Explains the grievance redress mechanism will take language barriers into account and provide interpretation when possible
- Does not describe specific actions to ensure that women are able to access all project information

INDICATOR 19: To what extent does the project have a gender-responsive monitoring process including collecting baseline and monitoring and evaluation gender-disaggregated data? To what extent are gendered indicators (quantitative and qualitative) reflected in the project/program results management framework?



GAP: ADEQUATE

- Includes detailed gender indicators for each project component and requires data collection for some key indicators, such as number of participants in gender workshops and the percentage of women staff that participate in environmental trainings
- Fails to require that projects achieve a certain percentage of women for any project indicator, such as requiring that at least 50% of environmental training participants are women
- Focuses nearly every indicator on gender workshop participation rather than direct benefits gained from RBPs

FP122

Blue Action Fund (BAF): GCF Ecosystem Based Adaptation Programme in the Western Indian Ocean

The western Indian Ocean region is undergoing rapid climate change. Mozambique was hit by two major cyclones in 2019, while other countries in the region are facing similarly increasing threats of cyclones and tropical storms, exacerbated by climate change. This [GCF program](#) in the Western Indian Ocean region with a focus on reducing or avoiding climate change impacts through ecosystem-based adaptation for vulnerable coastal populations will pool adaptation sub-projects by non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to be implemented in Tanzania, Mozambique, South Africa and Madagascar under the Blue Action Fund to improve climate-resilient coastal zone management in this diverse region. The program will leverage additional co-financing from NGOs, while grant recipients are required to provide 25 percent of the budget of their projects.

Assessment Grade

- WEAK
- ADEQUATE
- STRONG

Main Project/Program Characteristics

- Countries: Tanzania, South Africa, Mozambique and Madagascar
- Total value: US\$64 million
- GCF funding support: US\$34.88 million
- GCF financing instrument: grant
- Accredited Entity: Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau (KfW, German development bank)
- International access (MIE)
- Financial intermediation (FI)
- Public sector (P)
- Adaptation
- ESS risk categorization: Intermediation 2
- Regular approval process
- Under implementation: Yes, since April 2021
- Expected completion: April 2028

FP122

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 1: To what extent is there an integration of gender equality considerations in the narrative and the technical elaboration of the overall project/program proposal document and project description? To what extent does the project undertake a gender-responsive, transparent, collaborative cost-benefit analysis and seriously consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends? Does it contain elements of an ecofeminist cost-benefit analysis? And if so which?



PART A: WEAK

- Includes no mention of women or gender whatsoever
- Overlooks how coastal women are disproportionately impacted by disruption of marine ecosystem services and other climate change harms
- Does not explain whether women will be prioritized in


efforts to “increase health and well-being and food security” or “enhance livelihood of the most vulnerable people, communities and regions”



PART B: ADEQUATE

- Does not integrate gender equality considerations throughout the project description and fails to mention women’s particular role in coastal ecosystem stewardship
- Limits mention of gender to a section on “gender strengthening” that explains how a gender consultant will be hired to advise all NGO applicants on how to mainstream gender in their proposals
- Notes that the financing for these consultation fees will change depending on the NGO proposals, suggesting that some proposals will have weaker sup-

port for gender mainstreaming than others



INDICATOR 2: To what extent is there a specific gendered description, including provision of gender-disaggregated data (baseline and expected reach), of intended direct and indirect beneficiaries? Including targeting women and girls?



PART A: WEAK

- Does not explicitly state that women and girls are target beneficiaries
- Contains no mention of gender-disaggregated baseline or target data



PART B: ADEQUATE

- Notes that sub-projects must demonstrate how women will benefit and that the sub-projects are “invited” to “design women-specific measures” that mainly benefit women
- Requires that NGO applicants work with a gender consultant to ensure women share in project benefits
- Includes no mention of gender-disaggregated beneficiary data



INDICATOR 3: To what extent are “gender co-benefits” elaborated against the GCF Investment Criteria?



PART D: ADEQUATE

- Notes that 50% of the 340,000 direct beneficiaries are expect-

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

ed to be women but notes that women “represent the majority of the workforce in fish processing” and marine fishery marketing operations which suggests they should make up more than 50% of direct beneficiaries

- Requires NGO applicants include “gender-sensitive” proposals that “promote the participation of women in decision-making processes” but does not include further specification for this requirement
- Fails to adequately integrate gender considerations or co-benefits throughout the GCF Investment criteria, overlooking how women’s fishery livelihoods in coastal areas are disproportionately harmed by climate change and how they must be prioritized throughout climate adaptation projects



INDICATOR 4: Is the project/program budget allocation gender-responsive? (“gender budgeting”)

- Are gender-related expenditures integrated in the overall project budget?



PART C: WEAK

- Does not include direct funding for any gender-related expenditure, such as the gender consultants who will be hired to develop the “Guide to Gender Mainstreaming”

- Can women’s groups/local groups/grassroots women get access to project funding?



PART B AND PROJECT GAP: ADEQUATE

- Indicates that funding for gender-related expenditures will mainly go towards the consultants who will develop the “Guide to Gender Mainstreaming”
- Notes that the project will form “self-help groups” for women to “increase their voice” in project planning by year four of the project
- Plans to provide “direct support” (such as savings clubs, business plan development, or seed funding) to women to increase their role in management of marine areas by year seven of the project
- Does not otherwise indicate that local women’s groups will be able to access project funding

- Does the Gender Action Plan (GAP) have its own budget? Is it adequate/ commensurate with overall budget and intent? What is

the money spent on (gender consultants? Building local capacity for gender mainstreaming?)



PROJECT GAP: WEAK

- Makes no indication that the GAP has an independent budget but does note that gender consultants will be hired to develop the “Guide to Gender Mainstreaming”
- Does not outline the budget for these consultants



INDICATOR 5: (To what extent) does the project/program acknowledge and discuss (implicitly or explicitly) an intersectional approach to gender?



WEAK

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Makes no acknowledgement of how women’s experiences differ due to class status or racial and sexual identities, instead assuming that all women will be affected by subprojects in the same way




INDICATOR 6: (To what extent) does the project/program (implicitly or explicitly) acknowledge and include people with marginalized gender and sexual identities?



WEAK

- Includes no mention of people with marginalized gender and sexual identities in any project documents



INDICATOR 7: To what extent does the project acknowledge and take into account potential impacts on sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) or sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment (SEAH)?



WEAK

- Requires that subprojects integrate SGBV and SEAH into trainings for “law enforcement staff” but does not otherwise clarify the role of law enforcement staff in project implementation
- Does not acknowledge that LGBTQ people are highly at risk for SGBV and SEAH
- Includes no other mention of or safeguards to prevent SGBV or SEAH risks posed by the project




INDICATOR 8: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis assess the needs of women and other gender groups and current state of gender dynamics in the project-affected country/region/community prior to project inception, implementation, monitoring, and reporting?



ADEQUATE

- Provides an overview of gender context in all four project-affected countries by extracting excerpts from select gender policies rather than conducting original research
- Acknowledges that in each country, women’s role in fisheries and marine preservation is overlooked and that coastal women are disproportionately impacted by climate change

- Requires that each subproject undertake an analysis of underlying causes for less attention to women’s coastal management/use



INDICATOR 9: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis predict and address potential harmful gendered impacts in order to prevent them?

- With recommendations and conclusions in the overall project design



WEAK

- Includes no mention of gender in funding proposal’s risk assessment section
- Overlooks how women and LGBTQ are disproportionately vulnerable to risks posed by the

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

project such as loss of access to project benefits due to fraud and misuse of funds or limited stakeholder capacity because when project benefits become limited, women and LGBTQ people are likely the first populations to miss out on project benefits as they are most marginalized

- Fails to integrate gender-sensitive safeguards to project risks
- With concrete actions in the project-specific gender action plan



WEAK

- Contains no mention of gender-specific risks posed by the project or gender-sensitive safeguards to ensure women are not disproportionately harmed by any project failures



INDICATOR 10: To what extent does the project take into account potential impacts on the gender division of labor?



ADEQUATE

- Notes in the Gender Assessment that women's roles in fisheries and marine preservation are often treated as unpaid domestic duties while the same roles performed by men are treated as paid work
- Attempts to correct this inequity by requiring subprojects to conduct gender assessments analyzing the country-specific roles of women in fisheries and marine preservation which will then inform the Gender Action Plan
- Fails to take into account how subprojects may inadvertently increase women's unpaid domes-

tic labor or provide safeguards to prevent this outcome




INDICATOR 11: To what extent does the project-specific gender action plan fully articulate and cover the project period (integrated activities vs "add-ons", define clear responsibilities/ accountability and meaningful gender indicators? Inclusion of an adequate, multi-year budget?)



WEAK

- Requires that all gender indicators noted in the GAP are met by project year 4-7, suggesting that no gender requirements must be met for the first 3 project years
- Provides no budget for the GAP or any gender requirement

- Does not specify whether the consultants charged with gender mainstreaming of subprojects will stay on throughout the project cycle



INDICATOR 12: To what extent does the project create safeguards to prevent potential harms, including those that will disproportionately impact women, men, sexual and gender minorities? To what extent is there a comprehensive and project-adequate elaboration on gender in the project/program risk assessment and monitoring frameworks and arrangements?



PART F: WEAK

- Includes no mention of women or gender whatsoever
- Fails to note or provide safeguards against project risks

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

that disproportionately harm women and LGBTQ people, such as displacement due to extreme weather events in project-affected areas or environmental harm due to destructive fishing methods

INDICATOR 13: To what extent does the project apply the principle of Free, Prior and Informed Consent and give project-affected persons (especially women and LGBTI people and Indigenous Peoples as well as other marginalized social groups) the right to accept or refuse? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



WEAK

- Notes that NGO applicants must have the endorsement of the authorized body of the country, with a signed letter of consent, in their proposal

- Requires that NGO proposals reflect concepts derived from a broad range of stakeholder consultations with national and international key marine experts and the “local population”
- Makes no mention of direct consent from project-affected people, particularly marginalized groups whose interests are often overlooked by government offices and whose consent therefore may not be reflected by a government offices’ consent

INDICATOR 14: Is there a fully articulated, gender-responsive redress mechanism available to women at the project /national level in addition to the GCF IRM?



PART B AND ANNEX REFERENCING ESIA OR ESMF:
WEAK

- Provides no description of a redress mechanism in publicly available documents, which is particularly troubling given that the project is not free of risk and has the potential to disproportionately harm women and LGBTQ people

INDICATOR 15: To what extent does the project provide compensation in case of harm that disproportionately impacts women and other marginalized gender groups, for example housing and land that is equal to or better than pre-settlement and compensating women and marginalized gender groups who are not legally recognized land owners?



PART C, PART F AND RELEVANT ANNEXES SUCH AS RESETTLEMENT PLANS:
WEAK

- Provides no description of gender-sensitive project safeguards although subprojects have the potential to disproportionately harm women and LGBTQ people such as by excluding them from project benefits
- Includes no mention of compensation for harmed people

INDICATOR 16: To what extent does the project ensure full, effective and ongoing/sustained participation of gender groups throughout the project/program cycle?

- Comprehensive stakeholder engagement at the planning stage with documentation includes women’s groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



WEAK

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Notes that the project will create women's self-help groups to inform project planning, including suitable project sites and rehabilitation activities
- Requires that NGO applicants provide information on how they ensure that relevant institutions, groups and local communities are involved in planning and implementation but does not specify whether these include women's groups
- Makes no mention of national gender machineries
- Assigns task of subproject gender mainstreaming to a team of consultants rather than local women's groups or national gender machineries
- Do the annexes include stakeholder engagement plans for project implementation that includes women's groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annex)



ADEQUATE

- Plans to form women's self-help groups which will be involved in project planning as well as implementation such as trainings on marine and resource management
- Includes no other mention of national gender machinery in project implementation

INDICATOR 17: Is there gender-responsive governance of project management and implementation?

- Does the Accredited Entity's Project Management Unit include gender experts and operate to support and build gender expertise in-country (including providing gender capacity building and oversight to Executing Entities)?



PART C, GAP: ADEQUATE

- Notes that BAF will hire gender consultants to develop the "Guide to Gender Mainstreaming" and will monitor the quality of their outputs
- Requires that the "Guide to Gender Mainstreaming" integrates existing gender legislation and create specific action plans for target countries but includes no mention local gender experts' inclusion

■ Is the national gender machinery involved in project implementation structures (as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures)?



PART C, GAP: WEAK

- Includes no mention of national gender machinery or whether

they will be involved in project implementation structures

- Are civil society groups, particularly women's groups, Indigenous Peoples and local/community groups, and gender experts involved as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures?



PART C: WEAK

- Does not include any civil society groups, such as women's or Indigenous Peoples' groups, in project implementation structures

INDICATOR 18: To what extent does the project provide complete available project information, including in national/local languages, to all project-affected persons including women and marginalized gender/social groups?

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator



WEAK

- Does not specify how project information is made available to women and other marginalized groups whatsoever and fails to mention whether the information will be made accessible to those with different language needs

INDICATOR 19: To what extent does the project have a gender-responsive monitoring process including collecting baseline and monitoring and evaluation gender-disaggregated data? To what extent are gendered indicators (quantitative and qualitative) reflected in the project/program results management framework?



GAP: ADEQUATE

- Explains that the project will develop a "Guide to Gender Mainstreaming" which will include guidance on how sub-projects can collect "gender-disaggregated baseline data" and "gender sensitive indicators for monitoring and evaluation"
- Plans to use the Guide to "inform gender considerations for the overall global BAF funding portfolio" and eventually intends to apply "the provisions of the Guide to the entire BAF portfolio"
- Indicates that the Guide has a somewhat weak mandate and includes no other guarantee that a gender-responsive monitoring process will be implemented for the project or subprojects

FP127

Building Climate Resilience of Vulnerable Agricultural Livelihoods in Southern Zimbabwe

This [GCF project](#) aims build the resilience of smallholder farmers to observed and expected climate change impacts in three semi-arid agroecological regions of southern Zimbabwe. Southern Zimbabwe has experienced increasing temperatures since the 1950s with a decline in total annual precipitation and an increase in mid-season dry spells coupled with extreme weather events in the form of droughts and floods. These changes in climate have reduced water availability and increased soil aridity, resulting in declining agricultural yields and impacting the livelihoods of smallholder farmers in this region. In Southern Zimbabwe, rainfall is predicted to decrease by 15 per cent and runoff by 20 per cent in provinces of Manicaland, Masvingo and Matabeleland South, leading to higher food deficits and higher food prices, as well as higher number of drought-related livestock deaths. This grant-financed adaptation project proposes to address these observed and projected climate impacts working with local communities.

Assessment Grade

-  WEAK
-  ADEQUATE
-  STRONG

Main Project/Program Characteristics

- Country: Zimbabwe
- Total value: US\$47.8 million
- GCF funding support: US\$26.57 million
- GCF financing instrument: grant
- Accredited Entity: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
- International access (MIE)
- Direct implementation (DI)
- Public sector (P)
- Adaptation
- ESS risk categorization: B
- Regular approval process
- Under implementation: Yes, since June 2020
- Expected completion: June 2027

FP127

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 1: To what extent is there an integration of gender equality considerations in the narrative and the technical elaboration of the overall project/program proposal document and project description? To what extent does the project undertake a gender-responsive, transparent, collaborative cost-benefit analysis and seriously consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends? Does it contain elements of an ecofeminist cost-benefit analysis? And if so which?



PART A: ADEQUATE

- Notes that the goal of the project is “strengthening the resilience of agricultural livelihoods of vulnerable communities, particularly women, in southern Zimbabwe to increasing climate risks and impacts”

- Mentions women as a key beneficiary throughout project summary
- Does not consider multiple means towards strengthening women’s resilience to these climate risks, such as considering how moving women farmers away from subsistence farming and towards market-oriented farming may have negative environmental, economic, and cultural impacts



PART C: ADEQUATE

- Continues to identify women farmers as target beneficiaries throughout project description
- Includes section on women’s particular needs and vulnerabilities, noting that they are disproportionately affected by climate change and face barriers to productive assets and information

- Does not integrate women’s particular vulnerability to climate change throughout description of the project’s context in Zimbabwe and instead includes this acknowledgement at the very end of the section
- Does not consider multiple means towards strengthening women’s resilience to these climate risks, such as considering how moving women farmers away from subsistence farming and towards market-oriented farming may have negative environmental, economic, and cultural impacts

INDICATOR 2: To what extent is there a specific gendered description, including provision of gender-disaggregated data (baseline and expected reach), of intended direct and indirect beneficiaries? Including targeting women and girls?



PART A: ADEQUATE

- Identifies women as target beneficiaries and notes that increasing gender empowerment is also a key project outcome
- Does not provide gender disaggregated data for beneficiaries



PART C: STRONG

- Identifies women as target beneficiaries and notes that they make up the majority of subsistence farmers in the project region
- Indicates that women farmers are direct beneficiaries for almost every project component
- Includes gender disaggregated data for consultations but not for project beneficiaries, besides noting that women will make up the “majority”

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 3: To what extent are “gender co-benefits” elaborated against the GCF Investment Criteria?



PART E: STRONG

- Considers gender co-benefits of project by setting gender targets for almost every project component for at least 50% women
- Includes a section detailing gender co-benefits for the project, noting that the project expects to “transform existing gender norms around women’s capacity to manage soil, water, and biomass resources” as well as increasing their income and political power

INDICATOR 4: Is the project/program budget allocation gender-responsive? (“gender budgeting”)

- Are gender-related expenditures integrated in the overall project budget?



PART B: ADEQUATE

- Provides no direct mention of budget for gender-related expenditures but integrates women-focused activities throughout the project components which have allocated funding

- Can women’s groups/local groups/grassroots women get access to project funding?



PART B AND PROJECT GAP: WEAK

- Indicates that national-level entities such as the Ministry of Women’s Affairs and the Gender Committee for Irrigation will be involved in project implementation and will be allocated a budget
- Notes that the project will “empower existing women’s groups in the development of small businesses” but does not explicitly indicate that local-level women’s groups will be able to access project funding

- Does the Gender Action Plan (GAP) have its own budget? Is it adequate/ commensurate with overall budget and intent? What is the money spent on (gender consultants? Building local capacity for gender mainstreaming?)



PART GAP: STRONG

- Includes a detailed budget for each GAP indicator
- Allocates money somewhat evenly across all indicators, with the most amount of funding directed towards “developing crop-specific production and market strategies for use by all relevant value chain actors for climate- smart production and market access”

INDICATOR 5: (To what extent) does the project/program acknowledge and discuss (implicitly or explicitly) an intersectional approach to gender?



WEAK

- Acknowledges that women farmers are more likely to experience poverty but does not consider how shifting women

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

subsistence farmers to market-oriented farming may inadvertently harm poor women by making their sustenance subject to market forces

INDICATOR 6: (To what extent) does the project/program (implicitly or explicitly) acknowledge and include people with marginalized gender and sexual identities?

WEAK

- Includes no mention of people with marginalized gender and sexual identities in any project documents

INDICATOR 7: To what extent does the project acknowledge and take into account potential impacts on

sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) or sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment (SEAH)?



ADEQUATE

- Explains that the project has the potential to increase community conflict and SGBV by challenging community gender norms and targeting women as equal beneficiaries
- Accounts for this risk by developing a “solid, gender sensitive grievance mechanism” but provides little mention of gender needs in the description of the Grievance Redress Mechanism
- Plans to also “incorporate men and women dialogues on GBV” and raise awareness about the issue with beneficiaries but does not further clarify what these activities will include
- Does not acknowledge LGBTQ people’s vulnerability to SGBV



INDICATOR 8: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis assess the needs of women and other gender groups and current state of gender dynamics in the project-affected country/region/community prior to project inception, implementation, monitoring, and reporting?



STRONG

- Provides detailed description of and data on women’s experiences in Zimbabwe, including the barriers they face in agriculture, land ownership, education and legal rights
- Includes a section on the gender policy context in Zimbabwe



INDICATOR 9: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis predict and address potential harmful gendered impacts in order to prevent them?

- With recommendations and conclusions in the overall project design



ADEQUATE

- Gives a detailed list of potential risks posed by the project as well as mitigation measures
- Notes that the project could increase SGBV by challenging community gender norms and targeting women as project beneficiaries
- Provides strong mitigation measures to prevent increased SGBV
- Does not adequately acknowledge the economic and environmental risks, particularly

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

for women, posed by replacing subsistence with market-based farming or how making an entire region into market-oriented farming may exacerbate the environmental degradation that the project attempts to overcome


- With concrete actions in the project-specific gender action plan



ADEQUATE

- Provides an extensive list of potential risks faced by the project and concrete mitigation measures, such as continuous stakeholder consultations with women to ensure that they are not restricted from participating fully in agricultural production, market linkages and value chain development
- Does not adequately acknowledge that poor women may be

harmed by becoming market-oriented farmers or provide necessary safeguards to prevent this outcome




INDICATOR 10: To what extent does the project take into account potential impacts on the gender division of labor?



ADEQUATE

- Notes that the project may face challenges in engaging women farmers as their agriculture work is often relegated to the domestic, unpaid sphere
- Attempts to account for this barrier by giving women training in Farmer Field Schools in negotiation skills, financial management and access to markets

- Does not acknowledge how marketizing women's subsistence farms may push some women deeper into poverty



INDICATOR 11: To what extent does the project-specific gender action plan fully articulate and cover the project period (integrated activities vs "add-ons", define clear responsibilities/ accountability and meaningful gender indicators? Inclusion of an adequate, multi-year budget?)



STRONG

- Integrates gender-specific targets throughout the project cycle and in each project component



INDICATOR 12: To what extent does the project create safeguards to prevent potential harms, including those that will disproportionately impact women, men, sexual and gender minorities? To what extent is there a comprehensive and project-adequate elaboration on gender in the project/program risk assessment and monitoring frameworks and arrangements?



PART G: ADEQUATE

- Provides a table of risks posed by the project and corresponding mitigation measures, including that elite farmers could capture the benefits of partnerships with the private sector, which would particularly harm women
- Notes that the project could increase SGBV by challenging community gender norms and targeting women as equal beneficiaries of project interventions

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Provides strong mitigation measures to prevent increased SGBV, including a “gender-sensitive grievance mechanism”
- Does not adequately acknowledge the economic and environmental risks, particularly for women, posed by replacing subsistence with market-based farming or how making an entire region into market-oriented farming may exacerbate the environmental degradation that the project attempts to overcome

INDICATOR 13: To what extent does the project apply the principle of Free, Prior and Informed Consent and give project-affected persons (especially women and LGBTI people and Indigenous Peoples as well as other marginalized social groups) the right to accept or refuse? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



WEAK


- Gives an adequate description of the consultation process in the Feasibility Study but focuses heavily on consultations with international NGOs and national government machineries
- Makes no direct mention of consent in publicly available project documents

INDICATOR 14: Is there a fully articulated, gender-responsive redress mechanism available to women at the project /national level in addition to the GCF IRM?



PART B AND G ANNEX REFERENCING ESIA OR ESMF: ADEQUATE

- Covers the cost for “legitimate complaints or grievances” so that individuals and/or groups are not disadvantaged by bringing complaints, which will improve access for poor women
- Does not explain the conditions for a complaint to qualify as legitimate
- Allows for grievances to be made either verbally or in writing which will enable more access for women who are illiterate
- Requires that information for the Grievance Redress Mechanism “must be placed at prominent places for the information of the key stakeholders” but does not clarify if the information will also be made available verbally for those who are illiterate
- Does not include any specific mention of women or their accommodation needs in description of Grievance Redress Mechanism



INDICATOR 15: To what extent does the project provide compensation in case of harm that disproportionately impacts women and other marginalized gender groups, for example housing and land that is equal to or better than pre-settlement and compensating women and marginalized gender groups who are not legally recognized land owners?



PART C, PART F AND RELEVANT ANNEXES SUCH AS RESETTLEMENT PLANS: WEAK

- Makes no mention of compensation for those harmed by project except one brief sentence in the ESMF which notes that “GCF-financed activities will avoid adverse impacts on indigenous peoples, and when avoidance is not possible, will minimize, mitigate and/or compensate appropriately”

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Provides many mitigation and redress measures for potential risks the project poses but does include compensation for those harmed at any point

INDICATOR 16: To what extent does the project ensure full, effective and ongoing/sustained participation of gender groups throughout the project/program cycle?

- Comprehensive stakeholder engagement at the planning stage with documentation includes women's groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



ADEQUATE

- Notes that 196 farmers, 97 of whom were women, were included in consultations

- Indicates that "National Gender Machineries" were included in consultation for the GAP but does not indicate these machineries were included in broader project consultation

- Do the annexes include stakeholder engagement plans for project implementation that includes women's groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annex)



ADEQUATE

- Mentions that the Ministry of Women Affairs will be one of the entities responsible for implementing field-based training and technology investments for farmers on rain fed farmlands as well as establishing transformative multi-stakeholder innovation platforms for diversified climate resilient agriculture and markets

- Notes that the "women's empowerment agenda for the proposed project will be anchored in working through already existing women's groups"

INDICATOR 17: Is there gender-responsive governance of project management and implementation?

- Does the Accredited Entity's Project Management Unit include gender experts and operate to support and build gender expertise in-country (including providing gender capacity building and oversight to Executing Entities)?



PART C, GAP: ADEQUATE

- Notes that the project will "use gender expertise in the roll-out of the project, including through

expert consultancy services" in Part F

- Mentions that a UNDP Country Office "gender specialist (working part-time at 40 per cent) will provide capacity support to the development of annual plans and a detailed monitoring and evaluation plan and implementation support"
- Does not include funding for the gender specialist in any project budgeting

- Is the national gender machinery involved in project implementation structures (as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures)?



PART C, GAP: ADEQUATE

- Mentions that the Ministry of Women Affairs will be one of the entities responsible for implementing "field-based training and technology investments for

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

farmers on rain fed farmlands” as well as establishing “innovation platforms for diversified climate resilient agriculture and markets”


- Does not indicate other involvement
- Are civil society groups, particularly women’s groups, Indigenous Peoples and local/community groups, and gender experts involved as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures?



PART C: ADEQUATE

- Notes that the “women’s empowerment agenda for the proposed project will be anchored in working through already existing women’s groups” and that these groups will be consulted for certain project components and will receive training in business development

- Does not further clarify how women’s groups will be integrated or indicate that any local gender experts will be consulted



INDICATOR 18: To what extent does the project provide complete available project information, including in national/local languages, to all project-affected persons including women and marginalized gender/social groups?



ADEQUATE

- Explains that project information and materials will be translated into understandable and accessible languages for farmers and vulnerable communities
- Publishes all environmental and social safeguard reports in only English, noting that stakeholders “will be able to understand and provide any feedback in English”

despite previous indications that vulnerable communities may not be able to read English

- Sets gender requirements for each indicator at or above 50% women



INDICATOR 19: To what extent does the project have a gender-responsive monitoring process including collecting baseline and monitoring and evaluation gender-disaggregated data? To what extent are gendered indicators (quantitative and qualitative) reflected in the project/program results management framework?



GAP: STRONG

- Requires collection of gender disaggregated data for all project indicators in both GAP and main project documentation

FP128

Arbaro Fund – Sustainable Forestry Fund

This [GCF program](#) aims to provide effective climate change mitigation outcome through investing in sustainable plantation forestry projects in emerging forestry markets of Latin America and Sub Saharan Africa, while also bringing adaptation co-benefits. This investment approach provides developing countries and their rural communities with a solution to increase carbon sinks by producing wood in a sustainable manner and conserving natural forests, whilst contributing to reduction of illegal logging.

Assessment Grade

-  WEAK
-  ADEQUATE
-  STRONG

Main Project/Program Characteristics

- Countries: Paraguay, Ghana, Sierra Leone, Uganda, Ecuador, Peru, Ethiopia
- Total value: US\$200 million
- GCF funding support: US\$25 million
- GCF financial Instrument: Equity (E)
- Accredited entity: MUFG Bank, Ltd
- International access (MIE)
- Financial intermediation (FI)
- Private sector (PR)
- Mitigation (M)
- ESS risk categorization: A
- Regular approval process
- Pilot program: Mobilising Funds at Scale (MFS)
- Under implementation: Yes, since October 2020
- Expected completion: October 2034

FP128

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 1: To what extent is there an integration of gender equality considerations in the narrative and the technical elaboration of the overall project/program proposal document and project description? To what extent does the project undertake a gender-responsive, transparent, collaborative cost-benefit analysis and seriously consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends? Does it contain elements of an ecofeminist cost-benefit analysis? And if so which?



PART A: WEAK

- Makes no mention of women or gender and fails to adequately integrate a gender lens into the project description
- Ignores how climate mitigation and forest conservation are highly gendered issues and disproportionately impact women

- Does not undertake a gender-responsive cost-benefit analysis or consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends



PART B/C: WEAK

- Only mentions gender once in Part B, noting that MUFG Bank (the Accredited Entity) "will monitor the project compliance with gender development"
- Makes no other mention of women or gender and fails to adequately integrate a gender lens into the project description
- Ignores how climate mitigation and forest conservation are highly gendered issues and disproportionately impact women
- Does not undertake a gender-responsive cost-benefit analysis or consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends



INDICATOR 2: To what extent is there a specific gendered description, including provision of gender-disaggregated data (baseline and expected reach), of intended direct and indirect beneficiaries? Including targeting women and girls?



PART A: WEAK


- Sets no gender description of project beneficiaries
- Includes no gender-disaggregated data on project beneficiaries



PART B/C: WEAK

- Sets no gender description of project beneficiaries
- Includes no gender-disaggregated data on project beneficiaries
- Does not explain whether or how women will be targeted in any project components or how the project will ensure all wom-

en in the project affected area will benefit



INDICATOR 3: To what extent are "gender co-benefits" elaborated against the GCF Investment Criteria?



PART D: WEAK

- Includes a section titled "Gender-sensitive development impact" in Part D
- Explains that the project will try to ensure that the project equally benefits different gender groups
- Notes that "forestry projects generally have certain areas of operation which are well suited and liked by female employees" and that "nursery operations typically attract female employees," ignoring how sexism and

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

harassment often shape women's employment preferences

- Expects to attract a workforce that is 15-30% female which will "reduce gender inequality in the project regions" as many women lack employment opportunities
- Does not indicate that the project will target women in hiring efforts and rather plans to let women's 'preferences' shape the workforce
- Does not clarify whether the nursery positions or other positions disproportionately held by women will be paid at the same rate as positions disproportionately held by men
- Ignores how having a workforce that is just 15-30% women will not necessarily lead to gender equality and could even worsen gender inequality

INDICATOR 4: Is the project/program budget allocation gender-responsive? ("gender budgeting")

- Are gender-related expenditures integrated in the overall project budget?



PART B: WEAK

- Makes no mention of women or gender in the project budget whatsoever
- Can women's groups/local groups/grassroots women get access to project funding?



PART B AND PROJECT GAP: WEAK

- Fails to mention women's groups or provide any opportunities for them to access project funding, although women's organizations

likely exist within the project areas and could assist the project in ensuring women benefit

- Does the Gender Action Plan (GAP) have its own budget? Is it adequate/ commensurate with overall budget and intent? What is the money spent on (gender consultants? Building local capacity for gender mainstreaming?)



PROJECT GAP: WEAK

- Fails to include any budget in the GAP, instead noting "budget is included in the investee company level" and "this is part of the Executing Agency's reporting budget and investee companies' budgets"
- Does not make the investee companies' budgets publicly available
- Prevents a full gender analysis as well as accountability by failing to provide a budget in the GAP

INDICATOR 5: (To what extent) does the project/program acknowledge and discuss (implicitly or explicitly) an intersectional approach to gender?



WEAK

- Does not directly acknowledge how ethnicity, class, or sexuality may affect women's ability to access project benefits
- Includes a section on indigenous people in the ESMS but ignores how indigenous women face unique challenges in accessing project benefits
- Assumes women to be a homogenous group who will access project benefits evenly

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 6: (To what extent) does the project/program (implicitly or explicitly) acknowledge and include people with marginalized gender and sexual identities?



WEAK

- Includes no mention of people with marginalized gender and sexual identities in any project documents and makes no accommodations to ensure the inclusion of LGBTQ people

INDICATOR 7: To what extent does the project acknowledge and take into account potential impacts on sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) or sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment (SEAH)?



WEAK

- Notes in the Gender Assessment that “women working in the forestry sector sometimes suffer from sexual harassment” throughout project-affected countries
- Sets no safeguards to prevent this outcome in any employment opportunities created through the project
- Provides no other mentions of SGBV or SEAH in any project documents
- Includes no acknowledgment of or protection against potential SGBV or SEAH project impacts in any project documents
- Fails to prevent increased SGBV and SEAH due to influxes of construction workers

INDICATOR 8: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis assess the needs of women and other gender groups and current state of gender dynamics in the project-affected country/region/community prior to project inception, implementation, monitoring, and reporting?



ADEQUATE

- Conducted an extensive literature review to inform the Gender Assessment
- Provides an adequate analysis of gender issues in project-affected countries, particularly women’s relationship to forestry
- Conducts a country-specific gender analysis in project-affected regions that have publicly available gender data

- Fails to conduct any original data collection which limits the scope of the Gender Assessment

INDICATOR 9: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis predict and address potential harmful gendered impacts in order to prevent them?

- With recommendations and conclusions in the overall project design



WEAK

- Includes no gender-related risks or safeguards in the funding proposal
- Includes “Social and Environmental Risks” as a Selected Risk Factor but includes no mention of potential gender risks posed by the project

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Notes that the project risks “poor communications with project-affected people,” ignoring how women are most often excluded from stakeholder consultations and therefore are most at risk
- Ignores how women are disproportionately at risk of being excluded from project benefits and even harmed by project activities
- Overlooks how the project could harm women and LGBTQ people if their consent is not obtained during project design
- With concrete actions in the project-specific gender action plan



WEAK

- Includes no mention of gender risks or safeguards in the GAP even though the project has the potential to disproportionately

exclude and harm women and LGBTQ people




INDICATOR 10: To what extent does the project take into account potential impacts on the gender division of labor?



ADEQUATE

- Notes throughout the Gender Assessment that women are disproportionately responsible for unpaid domestic labor tasks, which often prevents their participation in the formal sector and political decision-making
- Includes a strong description of the division of labor in the ESMS, noting that women are concentrated in especially precarious sectors like domestic workers

- Requires in the GAP that investee companies “respect the working needs of women,” which could include scheduling adjustments due to domestic labor duties
- Provides no clear activity or outcome target to ensure that this is achieved
- Does not explore how the project may impact women’s reproductive labor responsibilities
- Ignores how neglecting to target women in project activities that impact forestry could lead to the long-term increase of women’s unpaid domestic labor burden



INDICATOR 11: To what extent does the project-specific gender action plan fully articulate and cover the project period (integrated activities vs “add-ons”, define clear responsibilities/ accountability

and meaningful gender indicators? Inclusion of an adequate, multi-year budget?)



WEAK

- Includes gender indicators and targets for each GAP sub-output but includes no baseline data
- Fails to include any budget in the GAP, instead noting “budget is included in the investee company level” and “this is part of the Executing Agency’s reporting budget and investee companies’ budgets”
- Does not make the investee companies’ budgets publicly available
- Sets weak timelines for many indicators, such as “3 years after investment of the Arbaro Fund”

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Vaguely assigns "Executing Agency and investee companies" to all GAP activities

INDICATOR 12: To what extent does the project create safeguards to prevent potential harms, including those that will disproportionately impact women, men, sexual and gender minorities? To what extent is there a comprehensive and project-adequate elaboration on gender in the project/program risk assessment and monitoring frameworks and arrangements?



PART F/G: WEAK

- Includes no gender-related safeguards in the funding proposal
- Includes "Social and Environmental Risks" as a Selected Risk Factor but includes no mention

of potential gender risks posed by the project

- Ignores how women are disproportionately at risk of being excluded from project benefits

INDICATOR 13: To what extent does the project apply the principle of Free, Prior and Informed Consent and give project-affected persons (especially women and LGBTI people and Indigenous Peoples as well as other marginalized social groups) the right to accept or refuse? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



WEAK

- Notes in the ESMS that consent should be obtained from indigenous peoples
- Requires that the FPIC process takes into consideration the

"preferred and traditional practices of indigenous communities impacted by the project"

- Mentions in the Gender Assessment that the "consent clause" of Uganda's Land Law has often been used to expose women to further violence but does not indicate that the project will work to avoid worsening these impacts or prevent similar impacts through its FPIC process
- Does not indicate that the project will obtain consent from non-indigenous people, including non-indigenous women
- Risks harming marginalized groups, such as women and LGBTQ people, by failing to give them the opportunity to accept or refuse the project

INDICATOR 14: Is there a fully articulated, gender-responsive redress

mechanism available to women at the project /national level in addition to the GCF IRM?



PART C AND ANNEX REFERENCING ESIA OR ESMF: ADEQUATE

- Requires that all projects develop a GRM "irrespective of other complementary linkages or access to existing public grievance channels in the country concerned"
- Describes a project-level GRM in both publicly available ESS reports for sub-projects in Paraguay and Chile
- Requires that project-level GRMs are "tailored to all potentially-affected persons and communities and other interested parties, irrespective of their literacy and administrative capacity," which may improve access for women

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Requires that project-level GRMs are GRM is free of cost and anonymous, which may improve access for women
- Does not make any explicitly gender-sensitive accommodations, such as requiring women intake officers

INDICATOR 15: To what extent does the project provide compensation in case of harm that disproportionately impacts women and other marginalized gender groups, for example housing and land that is equal to or better than pre-settlement and compensating women and marginalized gender groups who are not legally recognized land owners?



PART C, PART F AND RELEVANT ANNEXES SUCH AS RESETTLEMENT PLANS:
WEAK

- Includes "If displacement is unavoidable, are resettlement or livelihood restoration plans in place? Is the process participative and does the company offer appropriate compensation?" as a question in the ESMS risk assessment survey
- Includes a Land Acquisition and Resettlement Framework in the ESMS which "defines the process for screening, assessing, compensating and managing potential risks and impacts from land acquisition and resettlement"
- Describes the framework for compensation, noting that compensation must be transparent and fair and should apply to forest residents without formal tenure (who may be disproportionately women as women are more likely to lack formal land tenure)

- Does not make any explicit gender-accommodations in the compensation framework



INDICATOR 16: To what extent does the project ensure full, effective and ongoing/sustained participation of gender groups throughout the project/program cycle?

- Comprehensive stakeholder engagement at the planning stage with documentation includes women's groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



ADEQUATE

- Explains in the ESS sub-project report for Paraguay that one consultation meeting included representatives from a "women's committee"

- Does not indicate that any women's groups were included in stakeholder consultations for the sub-project in Chile
- Does not indicate that inclusion of women's groups will be required across all sub-projects
- Fails to include any national gender machinery in project planning, even though many of the project-affected countries have gender offices
- Do the annexes include stakeholder engagement plans for project implementation that includes women's groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annex)



WEAK

- Fails to include any women's organizations in project implementation

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Fails to include any national gender machinery in project implementation



INDICATOR 17: Is there gender-responsive governance of project management and implementation?

- Does the Accredited Entity's Project Management Unit include gender experts and operate to support and build gender expertise in-country (including providing gender capacity building and oversight to Executing Entities)?



PART C, GAP: WEAK

- Notes that the project will include an "Environmental and Social Safeguard Expert" who will oversee monitoring and evaluation and later refers to them as an "ESS & Gender Specialist"

- Does not clarify this specialist's experience in gender work or whether they will be hired from within the project-affected countries

- Includes "appoint gender and social mainstreaming specialist to serve on the Project Steering Committee" as an indicator in the GAP but never references this specialist in the funding proposal

- Fails to include a budget for this GAP indicator, reducing the likelihood that the specialist will be hired

- Is the national gender machinery involved in project implementation structures (as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures)?



PART C, GAP: WEAK


- Fails to include any national gender machinery in project implementation structures

- Are civil society groups, particularly women's groups, Indigenous Peoples and local/community groups, and gender experts involved as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures?



PART C: WEAK

- Notes in the ESMS that the project will have an Environmental, Social, and Governance Expert but does not clarify if they will have a gender background
- Explains in the ESS sub-project report for Paraguay that one consultation meeting included representatives from a "women's committee" but does not indicate that they will be involved on an ongoing basis
- Does not mention the inclusion of civil society groups or gender experts in the funding proposal



INDICATOR 18: To what extent does the project provide complete available project information, including in national/local languages, to all project-affected persons including women and marginalized gender/social groups?



ADEQUATE

- Notes in the GAP that investee companies must address potential barriers to project information dissemination and engagement, such as language barriers
- Sets weak targets for these GAP activities such as "at least one community development programme of each investee company is implemented in gender-responsive manner" by year 3 of the project
- Requires that the project disclose project information, including the ESIA and ESMS, in both English

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

and local languages and in locations “convenient to project-affected people”

- Includes robust disclosure requirements for instances of land acquisition and displacement
- Plans to make all Annual Sustainability Reports publicly available
- Does not indicate that project information will be distributed orally, which may prevent some women (who disproportionately face illiteracy) from accessing project information

INDICATOR 19: To what extent does the project have a gender-responsive monitoring process including collecting baseline and monitoring and evaluation gender-disaggregated data? To what extent are gendered indicators (quantitative and qualita-

tive) reflected in the project/program results management framework?



GAP: WEAK

- Includes gender indicators and targets for each GAP sub-output but includes no baseline data
- Sets many weak indicators, such as “30% of outgrowers (forestry producers) are women” and “at least 30% of community members present at consultations are women”
- Fails to connect GAP and project targets in project design, which reduces the likelihood that GAP activities will be implemented
- Sets weak timelines for many indicators, such as “3 years after investment of the Arbaro Fund”

SAP007

Integrated Climate Risk Management for Food Security and Livelihoods in Zimbabwe focusing on Masvingo and Rushinga Districts

This [GCF project](#) under the Fund's Simplified Approval Process (SAP) aims to support the long-term adaptation of vulnerable and food-insecure Zimbabwean households, comprising 50,000 people, of whom 66 percent are women. While 70 percent of Zimbabwe's population relies on rain-fed agriculture, climate change and variability have decreased cultivable lands across the country. This project will strengthen national and community adaptation based on climate forecasts and information. It will increase the adaptive capacity of food-insecure households through community-based asset creation and risk transfer through weather- index insurance. Subsequently, the investment capacity of smallholder farmers to sustain climate resilient development gains will be enhanced. This GCF adaptation project has an estimated lifespan of 10 years.

Assessment Grade

- WEAK
- ADEQUATE
- STRONG

Main Project/Program Characteristics

- Country: Zimbabwe
- Total value: US\$10 million
- GCF funding support: US\$8.86 million
- GCF financing instrument: grant
- Accredited Entity: World Food Programme (WFP)
- International access (MIE)
- Direct implementation (DI)
- Public sector (P)
- Adaptation
- ESS risk categorization: C
- Simplified approval process
- Under implementation: Yes, since February 2021
- Expected completion: February 2025

SAP007

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 1: To what extent is there an integration of gender equality considerations in the narrative and the technical elaboration of the overall project/program proposal document and project description? To what extent does the project undertake a gender-responsive, transparent, collaborative cost-benefit analysis and seriously consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends? Does it contain elements of an ecofeminist cost-benefit analysis? And if so which?



PART A: ADEQUATE

- Explains that the project will support climate adaptation efforts for 50,000 people, 66% of which will be women
- Makes no other mention of gender or how women will be included in project efforts
- Does not consider multiple means towards building climate resili-

ence for food insecure households




PART B: STRONG

- Acknowledges that climate change will disproportionately hurt women, “who represent 59% of the smallholders in communal lands and rely on rainfall for their livelihoods and domestic use”
- Plans to “enhance the adaptive capacity of the populations most at risk from these changes in climate,” including women
- Explains that women’s ability to recover from climate shocks has eroded in Zimbabwe
- Acknowledges indigenous environmental knowledge, noting that while “traditional practices and knowledge” have allowed Zimbabweans to thrive in their environment in the past, these

tools alone are now proving insufficient in the face of climate change

- Mentions the inclusion of women in several project outputs, such as ensuring the inclusion of women’s inputs when creating climate information products
- Plans to use a variety of communication channels to disseminate project information to ensure the inclusion of women



INDICATOR 2: To what extent is there a specific gendered description, including provision of gender-disaggregated data (baseline and expected reach), of intended direct and indirect beneficiaries? Including targeting women and girls?



PART A: ADEQUATE

- Explains that the project will support climate adaptation efforts for 50,000 people, 66% of which will be women
- Does not further explain how the project will ensure this gender makeup for beneficiaries



PART B: ADEQUATE

- Does not give any gender-disaggregated data for project beneficiaries, only noting that 50,000 people are expected to benefit
- Notes that women are particularly harmed by climate change and therefore will be a primary target group
- Mentions the targeting and inclusion of women in multiple project outputs, such as ensuring the inclusion of women’s inputs when creating climate information products

SAP007

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 3: To what extent are “gender co-benefits” elaborated against the GCF Investment Criteria?



PART E: STRONG

- Notes that 66% of the direct and indirect project beneficiaries will be women
- Explains that project gender co-benefits include gender-sensitive, participatory approaches for resilience building interventions
- Includes a section on “Gender-sensitive development impact” in the GCF Investment Criteria
- Explains that project activities such as “improved access to information in anticipation of climate shocks, agricultural

insurance, and engagement in climate adaptation asset creation activities” will benefit women farmers

- Notes that sustainable natural resource management trainings and agro-ecological trainings may benefit women by reducing their workload

INDICATOR 4: Is the project/program budget allocation gender-responsive? (“gender budgeting”)

- Are gender-related expenditures integrated in the overall project budget?



PART C: ADEQUATE

- Makes no direct mention of gender in overall project budget but allocates funding to project components that are required

to include at least 50% women, such as financial literacy trainings and Asset Management Committees

- Does not indicate any funding for the GAP in the main project budget, although the GAP activities require significant funding

- Can women’s groups/local groups/grassroots women get access to project funding?



PART B AND PROJECT GAP: WEAK

- Does not mention the inclusion of women’s groups/local groups/grassroots women in the funding proposal or GAP
- Notes that local civil society organizations were included in project consultations but does not clarify whether women’s organizations were included

- Plans to form Asset Management Committees that must include at least 50% women members rather than working through pre-existing women’s groups to strengthen financial literacy

- Does the Gender Action Plan (GAP) have its own budget? Is it adequate/ commensurate with overall budget and intent? What is the money spent on (gender consultants? Building local capacity for gender mainstreaming?)



PROJECT GAP: ADEQUATE

- Makes no mention of the GAP funding allocations in the funding proposal budget but includes a robust budget in the GAP
- Requires that at least half of the funding allocations for each GAP output goes to women (ie

SAP007

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

“Total Output: USD 3,500,568 (of which USD 2,310,375 for women”)

- Fails to break down funding allocations for GAP sub-activities, preventing a more complete analysis

INDICATOR 5: (To what extent) does the project/program acknowledge and discuss (implicitly or explicitly) an intersectional approach to gender?



ADEQUATE

- Targets poor women farmers rather than all women in Zimbabwe, increasing the chances that the project will reach poor women
- Does not consider how women’s ethnicity, religion, and sexual-

ity may affect their ability to access project benefits

- Acknowledges the existence of environmental knowledge but fails to note that women are often the stewards of this knowledge

INDICATOR 6: (To what extent) does the project/program (implicitly or explicitly) acknowledge and include people with marginalized gender and sexual identities?



WEAK

- Includes no mention of people with marginalized gender and sexual identities in any project documents

INDICATOR 7: To what extent does the project acknowledge and take into account potential impacts on sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) or sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment (SEAH)?



STRONG

- Includes a section on SGBV and SEAH in the Gender Assessment, noting that 42% of Zimbabwean women experienced SGBV or SEAH in 2011
- Explains that the project will “include moments dedicated to raise awareness around the roles of women and men at home and in the community activities, creating a space where beneficiaries can talk about difficulties faced and find solutions together”
- Notes that these discussions will also be used to raise awareness about SGBV

- Plans to conduct “careful assessments to ensure that no protection issues arise from the empowerment of women that result in gender-based violence”
- Plans to hold trainings on gender equality for men during project implementation

INDICATOR 8: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis assess the needs of women and other gender groups and current state of gender dynamics in the project-affected country/region/community prior to project inception, implementation, monitoring, and reporting?



STRONG

- Provides an analysis of gender dynamics in Zimbabwe, including women’s socio-economic

SAP007

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

status, access to education, health vulnerabilities, and decision-making abilities

- Explains that the Gender Assessment relied on a literature review for national-level gender information and conducted gender segregated consultations to inform the local-level gender information
- Plans to conduct a secondary survey of gender dynamics during project implementation

INDICATOR 9: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis predict and address potential harmful gendered impacts in order to prevent them?

- With recommendations and conclusions in the overall project design



WEAK

- Gives a strong overview of current gender inequities and barriers faced by women but does not adequately consider how the project may have negative, unintended impacts on women
- Fails to consider how the project could harm marginalized gender groups, such as by excluding them from climate information systems or disrupting subsistence farming practices

- With concrete actions in the project-specific gender action plan



WEAK

- Gives a strong overview of current gender inequities and barriers faced by women but includes mechanisms to prevent unintended, negative impacts on women caused by the project



INDICATOR 10: To what extent does the project take into account potential impacts on the gender division of labor?



STRONG

- Includes a section on the gender division of labor in the Gender Assessment, noting that women are disproportionately responsible for domestic tasks which contributes to their marginalization in labor markets and other areas of public life
- Explains that the project attempts to overcome some of the disparities created by the gender division of labor by “actively promoting women in leadership positions” and “enhancing their leadership skills through relevant trainings”
- Plans to ensure “equal participation of both men and women in

agriculture economic activities and in the decision making and resource management bodies related to these activities”

INDICATOR 11: To what extent does the project-specific gender action plan fully articulate and cover the project period (integrated activities vs “add-ons”, define clear responsibilities/ accountability and meaningful gender indicators? Inclusion of an adequate, multi-year budget?)



STRONG

- Sets gender disaggregated targets for each GAP sub-activity (all of which require beneficiaries are comprised of 50% women or higher)

SAP007

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Includes a timeline for each GAP sub-activity that span the project duration
- Allocates specific funding amounts to each GAP output, and includes requirements that at least 50% of the funds go to women

INDICATOR 12: To what extent does the project create safeguards to prevent potential harms, including those that will disproportionately impact women, men, sexual and gender minorities? To what extent is there a comprehensive and project-adequate elaboration on gender in the project/program risk assessment and monitoring frameworks and arrangements?



ANNEX 7: WEAK

- Includes no gender-related safeguards in the funding proposal

INDICATOR 13: To what extent does the project apply the principle of Free, Prior and Informed Consent and give project-affected persons (especially women and LGBTI people and Indigenous Peoples as well as other marginalized social groups) the right to accept or refuse? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



ADEQUATE

- Includes no mention of consent in project documents
- Does not explicitly note that project affected people have the right to accept or refuse the project

- Plans to conduct extensive consultations, including gender segregated consultations

INDICATOR 14: Is there a fully articulated, gender-responsive redress mechanism available to women at the project /national level in addition to the GCF IRM?



PART B AND G ANNEX REFERENCING ESIA OR ESMF: WEAK

- Fails to include a grievance redress mechanism in project design, even though the project is not free of risks
- Fails to provide project affected people with an accessible mechanism to file a complaint against the project or seek compensation

INDICATOR 15: To what extent does the project provide compensation in case of harm that disproportionately impacts women and other marginalized gender groups, for example housing and land that is equal to or better than pre-settlement and compensating women and marginalized gender groups who are not legally recognized land owners?



PART C, PART F AND RELEVANT ANNEXES SUCH AS RESETTLEMENT PLANS: WEAK

- Explains that the project will provide small holder farmers with agricultural microinsurance, allowing them to receive compensation in case of weather shocks (dry spells, droughts, etc.)
- Notes that the farmers will have to pay for this insurance

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

coverage, ignoring how this may prevent especially poor farmers (such as women) from accessing the insurance

- Does not mention whether the project will provide project affected people with compensation in case of harm

INDICATOR 16: To what extent does the project ensure full, effective and ongoing/sustained participation of gender groups throughout the project/program cycle?

- Comprehensive stakeholder engagement at the planning stage with documentation includes women's groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



ADEQUATE

- Explains that the project held Community-Based Participatory Planning sessions during the consultation period which included representatives from the Ministry of Women Affairs
- Notes that local civil society organizations were included in project consultations but fails to mention whether women's organizations were included

- Do the annexes include stakeholder engagement plans for project implementation that includes women's groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annex)



WEAK

- Explains that the project held Community-Based Participatory Planning sessions which included representatives from the Ministry of Women Affairs but fails to

include the Ministry in project implementation structures

- Makes no other mention of national gender machineries or their inclusion in project implementation
- Fails to include any women's organizations in project implementation

INDICATOR 17: Is there gender-responsive governance of project management and implementation?

- Does the Accredited Entity's Project Management Unit include gender experts and operate to support and build gender expertise in-country (including providing gender capacity building and oversight to Executing Entities)?



PART C, GAP: ADEQUATE

- Notes in the Gender Assessment that the project coordinator will receive support from "a regional Gender expert at the Regional Bureau in Johannesburg, as well as a back-up gender expert at World Food Programme Headquarters" but does not directly reference these experts in the funding proposal

- Does not allocate funding for these gender experts in the funding proposal budget

- Explains in the funding proposal that the Project Management Unit will include "Gender Analysis staff support as and when needed," suggesting that these staff will not be permanently included

- Is the national gender machinery involved in project implementation structures (as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures)?

SAP007

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator



PART C, GAP: ADEQUATE

- Explains that representatives from the Ministry of Women Affairs will participate in the Community-Based Participatory Planning sessions, which will lead to the design of climate adaptation interventions
- Notes that the project will offer trainings on gender equality and gender protection in partnership with the Ministry of Women Affairs
- Does not indicate that any national gender machinery, including the Ministry of Women Affairs, will be permanently involved in project implementation structures
- Are civil society groups, particularly women's groups, Indigenous Peoples and local/community groups, and gender experts involved as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures?



PART C: WEAK

- Makes no mention of involvement of women's groups, Indigenous Peoples or local/community groups in description of Executing Entities

INDICATOR 18: To what extent does the project provide complete available project information, including in national/local languages, to all project-affected persons including women and marginalized gender/social groups?



STRONG

- Plans to hold extensive consultations, at least 50% of which will be women only, suggesting that women will have adequate access to project information during the planning stage

- Plans to consult with project affected people about their information needs and will provide material in "local languages if necessary"
- Plans to set up information dissemination channels to ensure that both women and men are reached
- Plans to create "at least 1 channel of information intended specifically for women"

INDICATOR 19: To what extent does the project have a gender-responsive monitoring process including collecting baseline and monitoring and evaluation gender-disaggregated data? To what extent are gendered indicators (quantitative and qualitative) reflected in the project/program results management framework?



GAP: STRONG

- Disaggregates beneficiary baseline and target numbers by gender for all GAP sub-activities
- Sets the target for percentage of women beneficiaries at 50% or above for all GAP sub-activities
- Sets funding allocations for each GAP output and requires that at least half of the funding allocations for each activity goes to women

SAP008

Extended Community Climate Change Project-Flood (ECCCP-Flood) – Bangladesh

This [GCF project](#) under the Fund's Simplified Approval Process (SAP) aims to increase the resilience of poor, marginalized and climate-vulnerable communities in flood-prone areas of Bangladesh. Flooding in Bangladesh, while common and seasonal, is projected to increase in both frequency and intensity resulting from climate change. Increased flooding will require additional investments to reduce the impacts of climate variability and extreme events. This GCF adaptation project focuses on community-led and gender-sensitive adaptation. Based in five flood-prone districts, it will prioritize female-led households. It is based on consultative adaptation models which have already proved to be successful.

Assessment Grade

-  WEAK
-  ADEQUATE
-  STRONG

Main Project/Program Characteristics

- Country: Bangladesh
- Total value: US\$13.3 million
- GCF funding support: US\$9.68 million
- GCF financing instrument: grant
- Accredited Entity: Palli Karma-Sahayak Foundation Bangladesh (PKSF)
- Direct access (NIE)
- Direct implementation (DI)
- Public sector (P)
- Adaptation
- ESS risk categorization: C
- Simplified approval process
- Under implementation: Yes, since May 2020
- Expected completion: May 2024

SAP008

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 1: To what extent is there an integration of gender equality considerations in the narrative and the technical elaboration of the overall project/program proposal document and project description? To what extent does the project undertake a gender-responsive, transparent, collaborative cost-benefit analysis and seriously consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends? Does it contain elements of an ecofeminist cost-benefit analysis? And if so which?



PART A: STRONG

- Notes that women in project-affected areas are particularly vulnerable to flooding due to their domestic labor burden
- Explains that flooding makes women and girls more vulnerable to sexual harassment “because they have to stay on the embankments or flood shelters”

- Requires that women headed households and other disadvantaged groups are prioritized in beneficiary selection
- Does not consider multiple means towards reducing vulnerability caused by flooding and instead replicates the design of a previous, smaller scale initiative



PART B: STRONG

- Highlights how floods increase women’s vulnerability to violence, injury, and economic loss
- Compares scenarios with and without the project and includes specific outcomes for women and girls
- Does not acknowledge how floods also increase the vulnerability of LGBTQ people to violence by forcing them to shelter outside of their homes



INDICATOR 2: To what extent is there a specific gendered description, including provision of gender-disaggregated data (baseline and expected reach), of intended direct and indirect beneficiaries? Including targeting women and girls?



PART A: STRONG

- Includes gender disaggregated data of the target population and notes that women will comprise roughly 50% of direct beneficiaries
- Requires that women headed households are prioritized in beneficiary selection process



PART C: STRONG

- Explains that the project will reduce women’s and girls’

vulnerability to sexual harassment

- Reiterates that women headed households will be prioritized in beneficiary selection for all project activities and will comprise 50% of project beneficiaries
- Sets a gender disaggregated target for participation in Climate Change Adaptation Group



PART E: STRONG

- Includes a section on “Gender-sensitive development impact” which includes target benefits such as increasing women’s economic empowerment, leadership and skills, and decision making within the family as well as stopping violence against women



SAP008

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 3: To what extent are “gender co-benefits” elaborated against the GCF Investment Criteria?



PART E: STRONG

- Includes a section on “Gender-sensitive development impact” which includes target benefits such as increasing women’s economic empowerment, leadership and skills, and decision making within the family as well as stopping violence against women

INDICATOR 4: Is the project/program budget allocation gender-responsive? (“gender budgeting”)

- Are gender-related expenditures integrated in the overall project budget?



PART C: ADEQUATE

- Makes no direct mention of gender in overall project budget but
- Allocates \$212,000 (of the total \$13.32 million in project funding) to development of Climate change adaptation groups which will be comprised of 80% women
- States, “Allocated budget for female beneficiaries also very high which is estimated US\$9.33 million”
- Does not specify where this figure of \$9.33 million comes from or include the figure in the overall project budget

- Can women’s groups/local groups/grassroots women get access to project funding?



PART B AND PROJECT GAP: WEAK

- Notes that a representative from the Ministry of Women and Children Affairs will be included in project workshops which will cover topics such as “project inception, project closing, quarterly progress review, annual learning sharing, and training”
- Does not specify gender-disaggregated percent of female and male project workshop participants, only mentioning one MWCA participant who might be female or male
- Does not indicate whether the Ministry or other preexisting women’s groups will be able to access project funding

- Does the Gender Action Plan (GAP) have its own budget? Is it adequate/ commensurate with overall budget and intent? What is the money spent on (gender consultants? Building local capacity for gender mainstreaming?)



PROJECT GAP: ADEQUATE

- Makes no direct mention of a GAP budget but does outline funding allocations for each project activity, suggesting that all project components will have adequate funding to reach women and men beneficiaries
- States, “Allocated budget for female beneficiaries also very high which is estimated US\$9.33 million” in Part C but does not specify where this figure comes from or include the figure in the overall project budget

INDICATOR 5: (To what extent) does the project/program acknowledge and discuss (implicitly or explicitly) an intersectional approach to gender?


SAP008

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator



ADEQUATE

- Does not explicitly note the particular barriers faced by women who experience other forms of marginalization, such as class, ethnicity, or religious marginalization but does include protections for ethnic minorities and indigenous groups and prioritizes poor households throughout the project



INDICATOR 6: (To what extent) does the project/program (implicitly or explicitly) acknowledge and include people with marginalized gender and sexual identities?



WEAK

- Includes no mention of people with marginalized gender and

sexual identities in any project documents



INDICATOR 7: To what extent does the project acknowledge and take into account potential impacts on sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) or sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment (SEAH)?



ADEQUATE

- Outlines the reduction of SGBV and SEAH as key goals of the project
- Does not acknowledge how the influx of construction workers to remodel homes, build latrines, and complete other project components could increase women's and LGBTQ people's vulnerability to SGBV and SEAH



INDICATOR 8: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis assess the needs of women and other gender groups and current state of gender dynamics in the project-affected country/region/community prior to project inception, implementation, monitoring, and reporting?



STRONG

- Provides an extremely in-depth analysis of country gender dynamics, including women's role in decision making, vulnerability to climate change and flooding, and social position in Bangladesh



INDICATOR 9: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis predict and address potential

harmful gendered impacts in order to prevent them?

- With recommendations and conclusions in the overall project design



WEAK

- Gives a strong overview of current gender inequities and barriers faced by women but does not adequately consider how the project may have negative, unintended impacts on women
- With concrete actions in the project-specific gender action plan



WEAK

- Gives a strong overview of current gender inequities and barriers faced by women but does not provide mechanisms to prevent unintended, negative impacts on women caused by the project

SAP008

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 10: To what extent does the project take into account potential impacts on the gender division of labor?



STRONG

- Notes that “most household activities are done by women, with the highest participation in activities such as house cleaning, child care, cooking and meal preparation” and explains that women are also more vulnerable to flooding due to this domestic labor burden
- Prioritizes women headed households in beneficiary selection as their income sources are often “very limited” due to workplace discrimination
- Includes multiple means to increase women’s leadership and decision making in order to prevent gendered harms

INDICATOR 11: To what extent does the project-specific gender action plan fully articulate and cover the project period (integrated activities vs “add-ons”, define clear responsibilities/ accountability and meaningful gender indicators? Inclusion of an adequate, multi-year budget?)



STRONG

- Sets gender disaggregated targets for each project activity (all of which require beneficiaries are comprised of 50% women or higher) which suggests that implementation of the GAP will continue throughout the duration of the project
- Allocates specific funding amounts to each project activity, suggesting that funds will be available to ensure that the tar-

get amount of women beneficiaries are met

INDICATOR 12: To what extent does the project create safeguards to prevent potential harms, including those that will disproportionately impact women, men, sexual and gender minorities? To what extent is there a comprehensive and project-adequate elaboration on gender in the project/program risk assessment and monitoring frameworks and arrangements?



ANNEX 7: WEAK

- Ignores how women would be disproportionately harmed by water pollution, acknowledges that the project risks gender discrimination but does not provide adequate mitigation measures

INDICATOR 13: To what extent does the project apply the principle of Free, Prior and Informed Consent and give project-affected persons (especially women and LGBTI people and Indigenous Peoples as well as other marginalized social groups) the right to accept or refuse? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



WEAK

- Includes no mention of consent in any project document except to note that “the project did not receive free, prior consent from the indigenous community because there are no indigenous people in the proposed project areas”

SAP008

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 14: Is there a fully articulated, gender-responsive redress mechanism available to women at the project /national level in addition to the GCF IRM?



PART B AND G ANNEX REFERENCING ESIA OR ESMF: ADEQUATE

- Outlines the Grievance Redress Mechanism in Part C and explains how complaints will be submitted in a sealed envelope to ensure privacy which may enable more women and other vulnerable groups to more safely file complaints
- Requires that if the aggrieved person is a woman, she will be assisted by a woman Union Parishad (rural council) member in the complaint hearing
- Does not explain how the grievance will proceed if a woman Union Parishad member

is unavailable, as some Union Parishads lack women participants

- Similarly mandates that if the aggrieved person is from a tribal community, they will be assisted by a tribal representative in the complaint hearing
- Notes that the Grievance Redress Mechanism is for grievances about “environmental issues” which suggests that social including gender and/ or economic issues may not be eligible
- Does not describe how project affected persons will be made aware of the Grievance Redress Mechanism

INDICATOR 15: To what extent does the project provide compensation in case of harm that disproportionately impacts women and

other marginalized gender groups, for example housing and land that is equal to or better than pre-settlement and compensating women and marginalized gender groups who are not legally recognized land owners?



PART C, PART F AND RELEVANT ANNEXES SUCH AS RESETTLEMENT PLANS: ADEQUATE

- Does not indicate that the project will cause resettlement but does outline gender risks in the “Risk Assessment” Annex and includes mitigation measures, such as including women and people of other marginalized identities in the beneficiary selection committee
- Attempts to design a gender-sensitive Grievance Response Mechanism to further address potential gendered harm

- Does not otherwise specify compensation or other forms of redress in case of gendered harm which is especially concerning for possibly resettled poor women since Bangladeshi law does not protect non-owner involuntarily resettled farmers

INDICATOR 16: To what extent does the project ensure full, effective and ongoing/sustained participation of gender groups throughout the project/program cycle?

- Comprehensive stakeholder engagement at the planning stage with documentation includes women's groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



ADEQUATE

SAP008

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Notes that “consultations with women were carried out during proposal designing stage” and that women staff were hired at the field level to enable women to express their opinions during consultations
- Describes how the project will carry out additional consultation processes with each selected community to identify their specific climate adaptation needs and will integrate gender issues into this process
- Does not include gender disaggregated data on consulted participants or explain how consultations will be made accessible to women and LGBTQ people
- Do the annexes include stakeholder engagement plans for project implementation that includes women’s groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annex)



ADEQUATE

- Plans to create Climate Change Adaptation Groups which will be comprised of 80% women that will participate in project implementation
- Notes that a representative from the Ministry of Women and Children Affairs will be included in project workshops that include “project inception, project closing, quarterly progress review workshops, annual learning sharing workshop, and training workshops” but does not specify the gender of the MWCA representative or whether gender disaggregated data for workshop participants will be collected
- Includes no other mention of preexisting women’s groups or national gender machineries



INDICATOR 17: Is there gender-responsive governance of project management and implementation?

- Does the Accredited Entity’s Project Management Unit include gender experts and operate to support and build gender expertise in-country (including providing gender capacity building and oversight to Executing Entities)?



PART C, GAP: WEAK

- Encourages but does not require that local-level institutions involved with the project recruit female consultants to provide training on how to mainstream gender in addressing climate change
- Includes no other mention of gender experts
- Is the national gender machinery involved in project implementation

structures (as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures)?



PART C, GAP: ADEQUATE

- Notes that a representative from the Ministry of Women and Children Affairs will be included in project workshops that cover topics such as “project inception, project closing, quarterly progress review, annual learning sharing, and training”
- Are civil society groups, particularly women’s groups, Indigenous Peoples and local/community groups, and gender experts involved as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures?



PART C: WEAK

- Makes no mention of involvement of women’s groups,

SAP008

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

Indigenous Peoples or local/
community groups in descrip-
tion of Executing Entities

INDICATOR 18: To what extent
does the project provide complete
available project information,
including in national/local languag-
es, to all project-affected persons
including women and marginalized
gender/social groups?



WEAK

- Outlines no language require-
ments for distribution of project
information to ensure all proj-
ect affected people are able to
access the information
- Does not specify whether project
information will be made avail-
able in an alternative format for
those who are illiterate

- Fails to include how information
about the Grievance Redress
Mechanism will be distributed to
project affected people

INDICATOR 19: To what extent
does the project have a gen-
der-responsive monitoring process
including collecting baseline and
monitoring and evaluation gen-
der-disaggregated data? To what
extent are gendered indicators
(quantitative and qualitative)
reflected in the project/program
results management framework?



GAP: STRONG

- Disaggregates beneficiary
baseline and target numbers by
gender for all project activities
- Sets the target for percentage
of women beneficiaries at 50%

- or above for all project activi-
ties
- Breaks down funding alloca-
tions for each project activity,
suggesting that all project
components will have adequate
funding to reach women and
men beneficiaries

SAP009

Building resilience of urban populations with ecosystem-based solutions in Lao PDR

This [GCF project](#) under the Fund's Simplified Approval Process (SAP) aims to strengthen the natural capacity of ecosystems to regulate water flows and limiting the exposure of local populations in vulnerable urban areas in Lao People's Democratic Republic (Lao PDR) to climate effects. Cities in Lao PDR are among the most vulnerable areas to flooding in South-East Asia, causing annual economic losses of around 3 percent of gross domestic product (GDP). Much of the cost of flood recovery is borne by households, constituting a large percentage of their disposable incomes. This GCF adaptation project aims to test an alternative approach to flood control in urban Laos, moving away from a traditional focus on grey infrastructure, such as dams and concrete drainage systems. It will implement ecosystem-based adaptation in urban areas. One of the first examples of this adaptation approach in developing countries, it could serve as a model for other nations facing similar climate challenges.

Assessment Grade

- WEAK
- ADEQUATE
- STRONG

Main Project/Program Characteristics

- Country: Lao People's Democratic Republic
- Total value: US\$11.5 million
- GCF funding support: US\$10 million
- GCF financing instrument: grant
- Accredited Entity: United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)
- International access (MIE)
- Direct implementation (DI)
- Public sector (P)
- Adaptation
- ESS risk categorization: C
- Simplified approval process
- Under implementation: Yes, since June 2020
- Expected completion: June 2025

SAP009

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 1: To what extent is there an integration of gender equality considerations in the narrative and the technical elaboration of the overall project/program proposal document and project description? To what extent does the project undertake a gender-responsive, transparent, collaborative cost-benefit analysis and seriously consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends? Does it contain elements of an ecofeminist cost-benefit analysis? And if so which?



PART A: WEAK

- Includes no mention of women or other marginalized gender groups in project description
- Fails to consider how women and girls are disproportionately harmed by flooding
- Does not explain whether or how women will be included in project activities such as “empowering

communities to engage with city level planning and management processes” and “developing champions in Government for ecosystem-based adaptation (EbA)”

- Does not undertake a gender sensitive cost-benefit analysis of EbA activities or multiple means towards reaching the same ends



PART B: ADEQUATE

- Plans to work with the National Women’s Union to conduct awareness-raising campaigns about “urban EbA and flood management” and to manage the Nong Peung Wetland in Paksan
- Plans to investigate the impact of flooding on women when developing national urban EbA guidelines
- Includes no other mention of women or gender in project

description, ignoring how women are disproportionately at risk of harm due to flooding and that legal reforms often exclude women unless they are explicitly gender-sensitive



INDICATOR 2: To what extent is there a specific gendered description, including provision of gender-disaggregated data (baseline and expected reach), of intended direct and indirect beneficiaries? Including targeting women and girls?



PART A: WEAK

- Does not provide a gender description of project beneficiaries or consider the project’s gendered impacts
- Fails to include gender-disaggregated data for the direct or indirect beneficiary targets



PART B: WEAK

- Does not provide a gendered description of project beneficiaries or consider the project’s gendered impacts
- Fails to disaggregate the direct or indirect beneficiary targets by gender



INDICATOR 3: To what extent are “gender co-benefits” elaborated against the GCF Investment Criteria?



PART E: ADEQUATE

- Notes the project will benefit 74,600 people directly, half of whom will be women
- Explains that women “are particularly vulnerable to flood impacts,

SAP009

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

considering their role as primary caregivers”

- Insists that the “project activities will be undertaken in a gender-sensitive manner and will directly contribute to alleviating existing gender inequalities” by ensuring women are hired by project contractors and working with the National Women’s Union to raise women’s awareness about climate change and help them diversify their livelihoods
- Assumes that women are ignorant about climate change, rather than recognizing that women are often stewards of environmental knowledge
- Assumes that women’s reliance on rice agriculture drives economic gender inequality, overlooking how women are often prevented from participating in more lucrative sectors due to sexism and the gender division of labor



INDICATOR 4: Is the project/program budget allocation gender-responsive? (“gender budgeting”)

- Are gender-related expenditures integrated in the overall project budget?



PART C: WEAK

- Makes no mention of gender in overall project budget but allocates funds to project elements that promise to be “gender-sensitive” at other points in the funding proposal

- Can women’s groups/local groups/grassroots women get access to project funding?



PART B AND PROJECT GAP: STRONG

- Notes that the National Women’s Union will be a key project partner and will assist with multiple project components, suggesting that the organization will have access to project funding
- Explains that village-level Women’s Unions will also be included in project information

- Does the Gender Action Plan (GAP) have its own budget? Is it adequate/ commensurate with overall budget and intent? What is the money spent on (gender consultants? Building local capacity for gender mainstreaming?)




PROJECT GAP: ADEQUATE

- Includes a detailed budget for each GAP output and sub-activity
- Describes how the funding will be allocated within each sub-activity, for example: “30% of the

community engagement workshop budget will be allocated to including women fully in restoration activities”

- Provides multiple opportunities for project-affected women to directly access project funds
- Sets a total GAP budget of US\$462,738, which makes up just 4% of total project funding



INDICATOR 5: (To what extent) does the project/program acknowledge and discuss (implicitly or explicitly) an intersectional approach to gender?



ADEQUATE

- Explains that project-affected people are not mono-ethnic but none of the project-affected groups consider themselves to

SAP009

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- be indigenous people or ethnic minorities
- Notes that all project-affected groups belong to the Lao-Tai ethnolinguistic family and practice similar farming activities
- Assumes in funding proposal that project affected people lack adequate information about the climate, disregarding the environmental knowledge that many of these communities hold
- Warns in the Gender Assessment that “problems arise when outside values are applied to indigenous knowledge systems and when indigenous knowledge system are not understood in sufficient detail to allow for equal inclusion of women and men”
- Explains in the Gender Assessment that “consultation frameworks that take into consideration differences in language and culture are es-

- pecially important” for project success but does not describe whether or how the project’s consultation process will take these factors into consideration
- Overlooks how class, religion, and sexuality may affect women’s ability to access project benefits

INDICATOR 6: (To what extent) does the project/program (implicitly or explicitly) acknowledge and include people with marginalized gender and sexual identities?



WEAK

- Includes no mention of people with marginalized gender and sexual identities in any project documents

INDICATOR 7: To what extent does the project acknowledge and take into account potential impacts on sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) or sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment (SEAH)?



WEAK

- Does not acknowledge that women and LGBTQ people are disproportionately at risk of SGBV and SEAH, particularly following climate disasters that disrupt homes and livelihoods
- Does not consider how the project may impact SGBV, such as by introducing construction workers tasked with EbA interventions into communities which could increase SGBV
- Does not provide adequate safeguards against SGBV and SEAH

INDICATOR 8: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis assess the needs of women and other gender groups and current state of gender dynamics in the project-affected country/region/community prior to project inception, implementation, monitoring, and reporting?



STRONG

- Conducts a strong literature review and independent research on gender dynamics and the experiences of women in Laos and in the project area
- Includes strong gender theory about the exclusion and oppression of women in Laos
- Explains gender dynamics within each ethnic group included in the project area

SAP009

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Notes that women are disproportionately affected by flooding and climate disasters
- Sets clear action items in the Gender Assessment which are then incorporated in the GAP
- Does not acknowledge the existence of LGBTQ people in Laos

INDICATOR 9: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis predict and address potential harmful gendered impacts in order to prevent them?

- With recommendations and conclusions in the overall project design



WEAK

- Focuses entirely on risks posed by flooding rather than risks posed by the project,

even though the project has the potential to exacerbate existing gender, ethnic, and class inequalities by excluding vulnerable people from EbA interventions

- Notes that international civil engineering experts will be contracted and will conduct an environmental and social safeguards and risk assessment but never elaborates on the contents of this assessment
- Includes an Environmental and Social Safeguards Officer in the PMU but never describes their role
- Fails to include any safeguards against potential project risks
- Provides no mention of gender risks posed by the project or gender sensitive safeguards to prevent against them

- With concrete actions in the project-specific gender action plan



WEAK

- Does not directly mention any gender risks posed by the project or identify any safeguards, which is particularly troubling given that the project is not risk-free for marginalized gender groups

INDICATOR 10: To what extent does the project take into account potential impacts on the gender division of labor?



ADEQUATE

- Explains that unlike other regions, women in South East Asia often dominate farm management systems and that "provision of food" is a "source of status and power" for women

- Does not acknowledge that women are also disproportionately responsible for unpaid domestic tasks such as cleaning and cooking
- Provides many opportunities for women's employment in the GAP
- Notes that achieving gender parity in hiring for "highly technical roles" is unlikely given that women "traditionally shown little interest in these jobs"
- Ignores that women's exclusion from engineering and technical roles is not due to lack of interest but rather sexism and gender norms
- Does not consider how the project may impact the division of labor, such as by increasing single women household's unpaid labor by excluding them from EbA interventions and therefore placing their homes and farms at risk of flooding

SAP009

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 11: To what extent does the project-specific gender action plan fully articulate and cover the project period (integrated activities vs “add-ons”, define clear responsibilities/ accountability and meaningful gender indicators? Inclusion of an adequate, multi-year budget?)



STRONG

- Includes a timeline for each GAP sub-output that together span the duration of the project
- Provides a detailed budget for each GAP outputs and sub-activity, including a description of how funds will be allocated
- Assigns a responsible entity for each GAP activity

INDICATOR 12: To what extent does the project create safeguards to prevent potential harms, including those that will disproportionately impact women, men, sexual and gender minorities? To what extent is there a comprehensive and project-adequate elaboration on gender in the project/program risk assessment and monitoring frameworks and arrangements?



ANNEX 7: ADEQUATE

- Includes some safeguards to prevent exclusion of women but overlooks gender dimensions of other project risks

INDICATOR 13: To what extent does the project apply the principle of Free, Prior and Informed Consent and give project-affected persons (especially women and

LGBTI people and Indigenous Peoples as well as other marginalized social groups) the right to accept or refuse? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



WEAK

- Includes no mention of consent in any project documents whatsoever
- Includes a sub-activity in the GAP to disseminate information on EbA interventions and aims to “map out the different needs and preferred information channels of both women and men” and “design messages in plain language and images”
- Does not indicate that project-affected people will have the chance to accept or reject the project

INDICATOR 14: Is there a fully articulated, gender-responsive redress mechanism available to women at the project /national level in addition to the GCF IRM?



PART B AND ANNEX REFERENCING ESIA OR ESMF (LISTED THERE): WEAK

- Makes no mention of a grievance redress mechanism, which is particularly troubling given that the project has the potential to exclude and/or harm women and other marginalized gender groups

INDICATOR 15: To what extent does the project provide compensation in case of harm that disproportionately impacts women and other marginalized gender groups, for example housing and land that is equal to or better than pre-set-

SAP009

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

tlement and compensating women and marginalized gender groups who are not legally recognized land owners?



PART C, PART F AND RELEVANT ANNEXES SUCH AS RESETTLEMENT PLANS: WEAK

- Indicates that the project will not cause involuntary resettlement
- Notes that the project will undertake an economic valuation of urban ecosystem services in the project area which will assess “people’s willingness to accept compensation for losses” to climate events but does not indicate that the project will actually provide compensation
- Explains that women in the project area have repeatedly lost their livelihoods to flooding but that compensation for these

losses is “outside of the project scope”

- Makes no mention of compensation in case of harm that disproportionately impacts women and other marginalized gender groups, such as exclusion from ecosystem-based adaptation activities which would increase their vulnerability to flooding
- Makes no mention of the need for project safeguards to prevent harm against marginalized groups such as women and LGBTQ people

INDICATOR 16: To what extent does the project ensure full, effective and ongoing/sustained participation of gender groups throughout the project/program cycle?

- Comprehensive stakeholder engagement at the planning stage with documentation includes wom-

en’s groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



ADEQUATE

- Explains that representatives from the National Women’s Union will serve on the National Project Steering Committee and will provide advisory support during project planning
- Makes no mention of involvement of women’s groups in project stakeholder engagement

■ Do the annexes include stakeholder engagement plans for project implementation that includes women’s groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annex)



ADEQUATE

- Explains that representatives from the National Women’s Union will serve on the National Project Steering Committee and will oversee project implementation
- Assigns local chapters of the National Women’s Union to implement various project activities, such as engaging community members to develop a wetland management plan
- Makes no mention of involvement of women’s groups in project implementation

INDICATOR 17: Is there gender-responsive governance of project management and implementation?

- Does the Accredited Entity’s Project Management Unit include gender experts and operate to support and build gender expertise in-country

SAP009

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

(including providing gender capacity building and oversight to Executing Entities)?



PART C, GAP: STRONG

- Notes that a “full-time Monitoring and Gender Officer will be employed to conduct and coordinate the M&E of the project and ensure that gender targets are met”
- Explains that the Gender Officer will be part of the Project Management Unit (PMU)
- Assigns the Gender Officer to oversee implementation of all GAP activities
- Does not explain whether the Gender Officer will be hired within or outside of Laos
- Is the national gender machinery involved in project implementation structures (as Executing Entities, in

Advisory Boards or similar structures)?



PART C, GAP: WEAK

- Involves many government structures in the National Steering Committee, such as the Ministry of Public Works and the Ministry of Forestry, but fails to include national gender machineries
- Are civil society groups, particularly women’s groups, Indigenous Peoples and local/community groups, and gender experts involved as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures?



PART C: STRONG

- Explains that the National Women’s Union will be a primary project partner

- Includes representatives from National Women’s Union on the National Project Steering Committee which will “will provide project oversight and advisory support”
- Assigns local chapters of the National Women’s Union to carry out multiple project components

INDICATOR 18: To what extent does the project provide complete available project information, including in national/local languages, to all project-affected persons including women and marginalized gender/social groups?



STRONG

- Includes a sub-activity in the GAP to disseminate information

on EbA interventions and aims to “map out the different needs and preferred information channels of both women and men” and “design messages in plain language and images”

- Plans to “use multiple channels to disseminate project information, including those that can reach out to both women and men”
- Includes another sub-activity in the GAP to “conduct awareness raising campaigns” on EbA interventions and project management
- Sets similar gender-sensitive activities (such as mapping out the different needs and preferred information channels of both women and men) as targets for this sub-activity

SAP009

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 19: To what extent does the project have a gender-responsive monitoring process including collecting baseline and monitoring and evaluation gender-disaggregated data? To what extent are gendered indicators (quantitative and qualitative) reflected in the project/program results management framework?



GAP: ADEQUATE

- Sets “outputs” for each GAP component that includes an indicator, target amount, action plan, timeline and responsible agency
- Includes some strong gender indicators, such as “women make up 50% of surveyed populations during the project’s economic valuation of urban ecosystem services”
- Explains that “women’s preferences and availability should be considered when setting and assessing all these gender inclusion targets,” suggesting that project-affected women will have some say over the GAP monitoring framework
- Includes some weak gender indicators with low targets and non-committal language, such as “women make up 30% of enumerators and researchers contracted” and “consultations will aim to include at least 30% women”
- Notes that achieving gender parity in hiring for “highly technical roles” is unlikely given that women “traditionally shown little interest in these jobs”
- Ignores that women’s exclusion from engineering and technical roles is not due to lack of interest but rather sexism and gender norms

SAP010

Multi-Hazard Impact-Based Forecasting and Early Warning System for the Philippines

This [GCF project](#) under the Fund's Simplified Approval Process (SAP) aims to scale up current initiatives on disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation in the Philippines. The Philippines is one of the world's most vulnerable countries to climate hazards, experiencing an average of 19 tropical cyclones annually. Studies project an increase in the intensity of cyclones, along with an increase in the vulnerability of physical and social infrastructure. This GCF adaptation project will strengthen the Philippines' ability to adjust to climate impacts, and implement long-term climate risk reduction and adaptation measures. It will build on best practice in multi-hazard early warning systems and link with forecast-based action to maximize impacts on the ground. This includes climate-resilient development planning and investment.

Assessment Grade

- WEAK
- ADEQUATE
- STRONG

Main Project/Program Characteristics

- Country: Philippines
- Total value: US\$20.2 million
- GCF funding support: US\$10 million
- GCF financing instrument: grant
- Accredited Entity: Landbank of the Philippines
- Direct access (NIE)
- Direct implementation (DI)
- Public sector (P)
- Adaptation
- ESS risk categorization: C
- Simplified approval process
- Under implementation: No, (approved in November 2019)
- Expected completion: n/a

SAP010

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 1: To what extent is there an integration of gender equality considerations in the narrative and the technical elaboration of the overall project/program proposal document and project description? To what extent does the project undertake a gender-responsive, transparent, collaborative cost-benefit analysis and seriously consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends? Does it contain elements of an ecofeminist cost-benefit analysis? And if so which?



PART A: WEAK

- Includes no mention of women or other marginalized gender groups in project description
- Fails to consider how women and girls are disproportionately harmed by climate events such as cyclones or integrate gender equality considerations into project narrative

- Does not consider multiple means towards achieving increased protection against climate events



PART B: WEAK

- Plans to “build gender-sensitive institutional and technical capacities to implement the multi-hazard impact-based forecasting and early warning system (MH-IBF-EWS)” and assess potential gender and socio-economic vulnerabilities to extreme weather events
- Does not describe how the MH-IBF-EWS will be made gender sensitive or how the project will assess gender impacts of climate events
- Includes no other mention of women or gender in project description, ignoring how women are disproportionately at risk of

harm due to extreme weather events

- Does not explain how women will be integrated in project structures or outputs
- Fails to clarify how the MH-IBF-EWS will ensure that the needs of vulnerable groups, such as women and LGBTQ people, are prioritized in climate crisis risk assessments



INDICATOR 2: To what extent is there a specific gendered description, including provision of gender-disaggregated data (baseline and expected reach), of intended direct and indirect beneficiaries? Including targeting women and girls?



PART A: WEAK

- Does not provide a gendered description of project beneficiaries, instead assuming that the gender of project-affected people is irrelevant
- Fails to include gender-disaggregated data for the direct or indirect beneficiary targets



PART B: WEAK

- Does not provide a gendered description of project beneficiaries, instead assuming that the gender of project-affected people is irrelevant
- Fails to disaggregate the direct or indirect beneficiary targets by gender



SAP010

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 3: To what extent are “gender co-benefits” elaborated against the GCF Investment Criteria?



PART E: WEAK

- Notes the project will benefit 467,919 people directly, half of whom will be women
- Makes no other mention of gender in description of project expected performance against GCF Investment Criteria
- Provides no explanation as to how the project will ensure benefits reach women and that the number of direct women beneficiaries is equal to the number of men beneficiaries



INDICATOR 4: Is the project/program budget allocation gender-responsive? (“gender budgeting”)

- Are gender-related expenditures integrated in the overall project budget?



PART C: WEAK

- Makes no mention of gender in overall project budget but allocates funds to project elements that promise to be “gender-sensitive” at other points in the funding proposal

- Can women’s groups/local groups/grassroots women get access to project funding?



PART B AND PROJECT GAP: WEAK

- Makes no mention of women’s organizations in GAP or funding proposal whatsoever
- Plans to engage civil society organizations when building the MH-IBF-EWS but does not specify whether women’s groups will be included

- Does the Gender Action Plan (GAP) have its own budget? Is it adequate/ commensurate with overall budget and intent? What is the money spent on (gender consultants? Building local capacity for gender mainstreaming?)



PROJECT GAP: WEAK

- Includes no budget for any GAP outputs or sub-activities, even though many activities (such as “develop a risk analysis that incorporates gender to identify vulnerability to extreme weather

events”) would likely require significant funding

- Notes that “the actions of the gender action plan are totally integrated into the project activities so they are not budgeted separately” but does not include any of the GAP activities in the overall project budget
- Prevents an accurate analysis of budget allocations by failing to provide a more detailed budget breakdown



INDICATOR 5: (To what extent) does the project/program acknowledge and discuss (implicitly or explicitly) an intersectional approach to gender?



WEAK

SAP010

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Acknowledges the existence of indigenous climate knowledge and the need to engage with indigenous people during the project cycle
- Does not acknowledge that indigenous women face particular barriers to access project benefits and are particularly at risk of experiencing harm
- Fails to consider how factors such as sexuality, religion, or class may affect women's ability to access project benefits

INDICATOR 6: (To what extent) does the project/program (implicitly or explicitly) acknowledge and include people with marginalized gender and sexual identities?



WEAK

- Includes no mention of people with marginalized gender and sexual identities in any project documents

INDICATOR 7: To what extent does the project acknowledge and take into account potential impacts on sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) or sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment (SEAH)?



WEAK

- References anti-SGBV and anti-SEAH policy passed in the Philippines in the Gender Assessment
- Does not acknowledge that women and LGBTQ people are disproportionately at risk of SGBV and SEAH, particularly following climate disasters that disrupt homes and livelihoods

- Does not consider how the project may impact SGBV, such as by failing to provide women and LGBTQ people with adequate access to climate information systems which may exacerbate their risk to climate disaster

- Does not provide adequate safeguards against SGBV and SEAH

INDICATOR 8: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis assess the needs of women and other gender groups and current state of gender dynamics in the project-affected country/region/community prior to project inception, implementation, monitoring, and reporting?



ADEQUATE

- Conducts a strong literature review on gender dynamics and

the experiences of women in the Philippines and in the project area

- Recognizes that women in the Philippines are disproportionately at risk for climate change related disasters
- Overlooks that women often carry intergenerational environmental knowledge and instead assumes that women are in need of more climate information
- Does not acknowledge the existence of LGBTQ people in the Philippines

INDICATOR 9: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis predict and address potential harmful gendered impacts in order to prevent them?

- With recommendations and conclusions in the overall project design

SAP010

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator



WEAK

- Focuses entirely on risks posed by climate change rather than risks posed by the project, even though the project has the potential to exacerbate existing gender, ethnic, and class inequalities by excluding vulnerable people from climate and weather information systems
- Fails to include any safeguards against potential project risks
- Provides no mention of gender risks posed by the project or gender sensitive safeguards to prevent them

- With concrete actions in the project-specific gender action plan



WEAK

- Does not directly mention any gender risks posed by the proj-

ect or identify any safeguards, which is particularly troubling given that the project is not risk-free for marginalized gender groups

- Plans to undertake a “risk analysis that assesses socio-economic and gender vulnerability to extreme weather events” which may mitigate some of the gender risks posed by the project

INDICATOR 10: To what extent does the project take into account potential impacts on the gender division of labor?



ADEQUATE

- Notes that women in the Philippines are disproportionately responsible for unpaid domestic labor

- Plans to conduct a gender-sensitive vulnerability assessment in the project sites, including information on unpaid domestic work, using 2015 census data
- Does not consider how the project may impact the division of labor, such as by increasing single women households’ unpaid labor by excluding them from climate information systems and therefore placing their homes at risk of climate disasters

INDICATOR 11: To what extent does the project-specific gender action plan fully articulate and cover the project period (integrated activities vs “add-ons”, define clear responsibilities/ accountability and meaningful gender indicators? Inclusion of an adequate, multi-year budget?)



WEAK

- Includes a timeline for each GAP sub-output that together span the duration of the project
- Fails to provide a budget for any of the GAP outputs or sub-outputs
- Includes broad timelines for some of the GAP objectives that span almost the entirety of the project duration which somewhat obscures when many GAP activities will occur
- Includes GAP sub-outputs that do not have a specific gender focus, such as “strengthen national inter-agency operational coordination mechanisms at the national level to implement MH-IBFEWS”
- Assigns five entities (the Department of Science and Technology, Department of the Interior and Local Government, Office of Civil Defense,

SAP010

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

Department of Environment and Natural Resources, World Food Programme) to each GAP sub-output which prevents a coordinated analysis of who is responsible for each sub-output

- Assigns GAP sub-outputs to entities that are responsible for many other project activities, which may result in poor implementation of GAP activities

INDICATOR 12: To what extent does the project create safeguards to prevent potential harms, including those that will disproportionately impact women, men, sexual and gender minorities? To what extent is there a comprehensive and project-adequate elaboration on gender in the project/program risk assessment and monitoring frameworks and arrangements?



ANNEX 7: WEAK

- Includes no gender-related safeguards in the funding proposal

INDICATOR 13: To what extent does the project apply the principle of Free, Prior and Informed Consent and give project-affected persons (especially women and LGBTI people and Indigenous Peoples as well as other marginalized social groups) the right to accept or refuse? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



WEAK

- Includes no mention of consent in any project documents whatsoever

- Aims to improve access to climate and weather information so includes detailed actions for this type of information dissemination but provides little information on how overall project information will be disseminated
- Does not indicate that project-affected people will have the chance to accept or reject the project

INDICATOR 14: Is there a fully articulated, gender-responsive redress mechanism available to women at the project /national level in addition to the GCF IRM?



PART B AND ANNEX REFERENCING ESIA OR ESMF (LISTED THERE): WEAK

- Notes that LANDMARKBANK, the project's Accredited Entity,

will have its own Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM)

- Requires that the GRM adheres to LANDMARKBANK's customer complaint policies rather than the GCF's grievance policies
- Uses corporate language to describe the GRM, noting that the mechanism supports "customer assistance management," which by mischaracterizing harmfully-impacted project-affected people as customers, risks undermining robust GRM responses to people's complaints
- Does not explain the complaint process or clarify whether the GRM will be gender-sensitive
- Mentions that the project's Executing Entity, the Philippine Department of Science and Technology, set up a Grievance Committee but does not clarify how project-affected people can access the committee

SAP010

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 15: To what extent does the project provide compensation in case of harm that disproportionately impacts women and other marginalized gender groups, for example housing and land that is equal to or better than pre-settlement and compensating women and marginalized gender groups who are not legally recognized land owners?



PART C, PART F AND RELEVANT ANNEXES SUCH AS RESETTLEMENT PLANS:
WEAK

- Makes no mention of compensation in case of harm that disproportionately impacts women and other marginalized gender groups
- Makes no mention of the need for project safeguards to prevent harm against marginal-

ized groups such as women and LGBTQ people

INDICATOR 16: To what extent does the project ensure full, effective and ongoing/sustained participation of gender groups throughout the project/program cycle?

- Comprehensive stakeholder engagement at the planning stage with documentation includes women's groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



WEAK

- Makes no mention of involvement of women's groups in project stakeholder engagement
- Makes no mention of involvement of national gender ma-

chineries in project stakeholder engagement

- Do the annexes include stakeholder engagement plans for project implementation that includes women's groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annex)



WEAK

- Makes no mention of involvement of women's groups in project implementation
- Makes no mention of involvement of national gender machineries in project implementation

INDICATOR 17: Is there gender-responsive governance of project management and implementation?

- Does the Accredited Entity's Project Management Unit include gender experts and operate to support and build gender expertise in-country (including providing gender capacity building and oversight to Executing Entities)?



PART C, GAP: ADEQUATE

- Makes no mention of a gender expert in the funding proposal and does not note that a gender expert will be part of the Project Management Unit
- Notes in the GAP that a "gender expert / consultant" will help staff of partner agencies and local governments build their gender-sensitive institutional capacity
- Explains in the Gender Assessment that the project "shall enlist the services of qualified gender expert/ consultant...to better guide the team in addressing the social vulnerability issues in the project sites"

SAP010

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Fails to confirm whether gender experts will be hired in the funding proposal

- Is the national gender machinery involved in project implementation structures (as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures)?



PART C, GAP: WEAK

- Plans to assist government agencies in mainstreaming gender in climate resilience activities but makes no mention of involvement of national gender machineries in project implementation structures

- Are civil society groups, particularly women's groups, Indigenous Peoples and local/community groups, and gender experts involved as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures?



PART C: WEAK

- Makes no mention of involvement of civil society groups or women's groups in project implementation structures



INDICATOR 18: To what extent does the project provide complete available project information, including in national/local languages, to all project-affected persons including women and marginalized gender/social groups?



ADEQUATE

- Provides dissemination strategies for climate and weather information but fails to clarify how information about project activities will be disseminated

- Requires that project-related "knowledge products and education and communication materials shall be in easy-to-understand, gender neutral language/s understood and accessible to the end-users"

- Requires that these project information products undergo "testing and evaluation... to evaluate their effectiveness" and plans to "update or enhance them as needed"

- Notes that these project information products will be created in consultation with stakeholders, but does not include the gender-makeup of these stakeholders



INDICATOR 19: To what extent does the project have a gender-responsive monitoring process including collecting baseline and monitoring and evaluation gen-

der-disaggregated data? To what extent are gendered indicators (quantitative and qualitative) reflected in the project/program results management framework?



GAP: WEAK

- Sets "deliverables" for each GAP activity that includes a timeline and a responsible agency
- Includes many deliverables that are not gender-sensitive, such as "create impact-based early warning protocols"
- Fails to include gender disaggregated baseline and annual target data for each GAP target which prevents future evaluation of the project's gender impact

SAP011

Climate-resilient food security for women and men smallholders in Mozambique through integrated risk management

This [GCF project](#) under the Fund's Simplified Approval Process (SAP) aims to improve the resilience and livelihoods of some of the most vulnerable groups in Mozambique, particularly poor and food-insecure households. People's livelihoods in Mozambique are highly vulnerable to disaster risk from climate change, greatly impeding the achievement of greater food security. This is compounded by little information and awareness about climate change. Focusing on semi-arid areas, this GCF adaptation project will adopt a community-based approach to enhance the climate-resilient food security and livelihoods of smallholders. It will enhance adaptation for climate risks in households and communities. It will incorporate a rural resilience approach which Accredited Entity World Food Programme (WFP) has implemented successfully in other African countries.

Assessment Grade

- WEAK
- ADEQUATE
- STRONG

Main Project/Program Characteristics

- Country: Mozambique
- Total value: US\$10 million
- GCF funding support: US\$9.25 million
- GCF financing instrument: grant
- Accredited Entity: World Food Programme (WFP)
- International access (MIE)
- Direct implementation (DI)
- Public sector (P)
- Adaptation
- ESS risk categorization: C
- Simplified approval process
- Under implementation: Yes, since February 2021
- Expected completion: February 2026

SAP011

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 1: To what extent is there an integration of gender equality considerations in the narrative and the technical elaboration of the overall project/program proposal document and project description? To what extent does the project undertake a gender-responsive, transparent, collaborative cost-benefit analysis and seriously consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends? Does it contain elements of an ecofeminist cost-benefit analysis? And if so which?



PART A: ADEQUATE

- Does not explicitly mention that women are disproportionately impacted by climate change but includes women as direct beneficiaries for two of the three project components
- Aims to “reduce vulnerability to climate risks for food insecure smallholder women and men” as

well as “enhance and sustain adaptive capacity of smallholder women and men”

- Plans to use “market-based opportunities” to improve capacity for smallholder women, suggesting that the project may involve privatizing subsistence farms
- Ignores how privatization of subsistence farms risks exacerbating food insecurity for vulnerable farmers, particularly women (see [here](#))



PART B: WEAK

- Adopts a somewhat paternalistic tone, noting that women often lack “understanding of climate change, risks, and drivers of vulnerability” as well as weather information, ignoring the intergenerational environmental

knowledge and practices that women often carry

- Includes women farmers as a target for one of the project components but fails to mention gender or how women will be targeted in the component description
- Makes no other mention of women or gender
- Plans to give farmers access to loans through village lending groups and formal financial institutions to further privatize their farms, overlooking how microloans have often pushed poor women and other marginalized groups further into debt and poverty (see [here](#))



INDICATOR 2: To what extent is there a specific gendered description, including provision of gender-disaggregated data (baseline

and expected reach), of intended direct and indirect beneficiaries? Including targeting women and girls?



PART A: ADEQUATE

- Includes a gender-sensitive description of project beneficiaries, noting that the project aims to “reduce vulnerability to climate risk for food insecure smallholder women and men” as well as “enhance and sustain adaptive capacity of smallholder women and men”
- Fails to include gender-disaggregated data for the direct or indirect beneficiary targets



PART B: WEAK

- Notes that project will attempt to decrease food insecurity for

SAP011

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

“women and men farmers” but does not mention women as beneficiaries in any other project component description

- Fails to disaggregate the direct or indirect beneficiary targets by gender

INDICATOR 3: To what extent are “gender co-benefits” elaborated against the GCF Investment Criteria?



PART E: STRONG

- Notes the project aims to reduce gender inequality by diversifying sources of income, increasing access to financial services, and challenging the gender division of labor
- Explain repeatedly that women make up the majority of small-

holder farmers in the project area

- Projects that 51% of project direct and indirect beneficiaries will be women, as they make up 51% of the population in the project area
- Fails to consider how microloans for poor women farmers may only worsen poverty

INDICATOR 4: Is the project/program budget allocation gender-responsive? (“gender budgeting”)

- Are gender-related expenditures integrated in the overall project budget?



PART C: WEAK

- Makes no direct mention of gender in overall project budget but allocates funding to project

components that will target women, such as provision of credit to village lending institutions and formal financial institutions that will give loans to women farmers

- Does not include funding allocations for any of the activities outlined in the GAP, even though they require significant funding

- Can women’s groups/local groups/grassroots women get access to project funding?



PART B AND PROJECT GAP: WEAK

- Makes no mention of women’s organizations in GAP or funding proposal
- Notes that the project will give funding to pre-existing village saving and loans groups when possible rather than creating new ones but does not specify

whether women’s savings groups will be targeted

- Does the Gender Action Plan (GAP) have its own budget? Is it adequate/ commensurate with overall budget and intent? What is the money spent on (gender consultants? Building local capacity for gender mainstreaming?)



PROJECT GAP: ADEQUATE

- Includes a budget for three objectives in the GAP but makes no direct mention of a GAP budget in funding proposal
- Fails to break down budget allocations for the GAP activities that make up the overall objectives, noting that “the actions of the gender action plan are totally integrated into the project activities so they are not budgeted separately”

SAP011

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Prevents an accurate analysis of budget allocations by failing to provide a more detailed budget breakdown

INDICATOR 5: (To what extent) does the project/program acknowledge and discuss (implicitly or explicitly) an intersectional approach to gender?



WEAK

- Notes once in funding proposal that women in rural regions disproportionately suffer from poverty
- Does not tailor project activities to ensure that the most marginalized women are reached
- Fails to consider how factors such as sexuality, religion, or

ethnicity may affect women's ability to access project benefits

- Fails to adequately consider intersections between environmental issues and the experience of women farmers

INDICATOR 6: (To what extent) does the project/program (implicitly or explicitly) acknowledge and include people with marginalized gender and sexual identities?



WEAK

- Includes no mention of people with marginalized gender and sexual identities in any project documents

INDICATOR 7: To what extent does the project acknowledge and take into account potential impacts on sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) or sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment (SEAH)?



WEAK

- Notes that violence against women and girls is widespread and that "more than one in three women (37.2%) have experienced physical or sexual violence at some point in their lifetime"
- Overlooks how LGBTQ people are also disproportionately impacted by SGBV
- Does not consider how the project may impact SGBV, such as by disrupting gender roles and causing increased domestic violence, or provide adequate safeguards

INDICATOR 8: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis assess the needs of women and other gender groups and current state of gender dynamics in the project-affected country/region/community prior to project inception, implementation, monitoring, and reporting?



ADEQUATE

- Provides an analysis of gender dynamics in Mozambique based on a literature review and consultations with "targeted communities, community leaders, and local institutions"
- Held gender segregated consultations for the Gender Assessment "to allow women and men the opportunity to speak freely about the gender issues in their communities"

SAP011

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Fails to include a history of Mozambican women's experiences with microcredit or note that microcredit has repeatedly failed to help poor women around the world
- Overlooks the intergenerational environmental knowledge that women carry, instead assuming that project affected populations lack 'information' about their environment

INDICATOR 9: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis predict and address potential harmful gendered impacts in order to prevent them?

- With recommendations and conclusions in the overall project design



WEAK

- Provides no mention of gender risks posed by the project or gender sensitive safeguards to prevent against them even though the project involves microcredit which historically has harmed many poor women
- Explains that WFP engaged all stakeholders, including a sample of project affected people, to jointly identify project risk level
- Notes that to prevent risk, the project will allow communities to select certain community-level activities from a predefined list then will screen chosen activities and eliminate any that are medium/high risk

- With concrete actions in the project-specific gender action plan



WEAK

- Includes no mention of project risks in GAP whatsoever, which is

particularly troubling given that the project is not risk-free for marginalized gender groups

INDICATOR 10: To what extent does the project take into account potential impacts on the gender division of labor?



ADEQUATE

- Acknowledges that "women and girls are responsible for the household wellbeing, including care work, but also activities related to meeting basic needs, such as food, fuel, and water" which "skews the balance of labor burden in favor of men" in the Gender Assessment

- Includes a detailed breakdown of gender roles and responsibilities

- Outlines a vision for a new gender division of labor in the Gender Assessment, including that "distribution of resources is prioritized towards women"

- Explains that the project will "encourage both women and men to take on roles and responsibility that are traditionally seen as not gender appropriate" but does not how the project will achieve this goal

- Plans to equally target men and women in majority of project activities outlined in the GAP, which may fail to challenge the gender distribution of labor, resources, and power

INDICATOR 11: To what extent does the project-specific gender action plan fully articulate and cover the project period (integrated activities vs "add-ons", define clear responsibilities/ accountability and meaningful gender indicators?

SAP011

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

Inclusion of an adequate, multi-year budget?)



ADEQUATE

- Allocates funding amounts to each GAP objective but fails to breakdown funding allocations for project subcomponents
- Includes broad timelines for some of the GAP objectives that span almost the entirety of the project duration which somewhat obscures when many of the GAP activities will actually occur
- Assigns the WFP project coordinator to oversee all GAP activities, which is worrisome as the WFP project coordinator has many other responsibilities and therefore may overlook GAP activities
- Includes specific, gender-disaggregated targets for each GAP activity



INDICATOR 12: To what extent does the project create safeguards to prevent potential harms, including those that will disproportionately impact women, men, sexual and gender minorities? To what extent is there a comprehensive and project-adequate elaboration on gender in the project/program risk assessment and monitoring frameworks and arrangements?

NONE



INDICATOR 13: To what extent does the project apply the principle of Free, Prior and Informed Consent and give project-affected persons (especially women and LGBTI people and Indigenous Peoples as well as other marginalized social groups) the right to accept or refuse? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



WEAK

- Includes no mention of consent in any project documents whatsoever
- Provides no details on how project information will be disseminated or whether project-affected people will have the chance to accept or reject the project



INDICATOR 14: Is there a fully articulated, gender-responsive redress mechanism available to women at the project /national level in addition to the GCF IRM?



PART B AND ANNEX REFERENCING ESIA OR ESMF (LISTED THERE): WEAK

- Fails to mention a grievance redress mechanism in the funding proposal, which is particularly troubling given that the project could push women farmers deeper into poverty and could lead to predatory lending practices against women and other marginalized gender groups



INDICATOR 15: To what extent does the project provide compensation in case of harm that disproportionately impacts women and other marginalized gender groups, for example housing and land that is equal to or better than pre-settlement and compensating women and marginalized gender groups who are not legally recognized land owners?



PART C, PART F AND RELEVANT ANNEXES SUCH AS RESETTLEMENT PLANS: WEAK

SAP011

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Makes no mention of compensation in case of harm that disproportionately impacts women and other marginalized gender groups
- Mentions no mention of the need for project safeguards to prevent harm against marginalized groups such as women and LGBTQ people

INDICATOR 16: To what extent does the project ensure full, effective and ongoing/sustained participation of gender groups throughout the project/program cycle?

- Comprehensive stakeholder engagement at the planning stage with documentation includes women's groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



WEAK

- Notes that "local and national women's organizations will be involved as key stakeholders" and that the project will "partner with women's rights and gender equality organization" in the Gender Assessment but makes no other mention of their involvement in any other project documents
- Explains that this project proposal was developed in consultations with multiple government ministries but fails to include any gender ministry
- Makes no mention of national gender machineries in project documents even though Mozambique has a gender ministry
- Do the annexes include stakeholder engagement plans for project implementation that includes

women's groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annex)



WEAK

- Notes that "local and national women's organizations will be involved as key stakeholders" and the project will "partner with women's rights and gender equality organization" in the Gender Assessment but makes no mention of their involvement in any other project documents
- Explains that the project will give funding to pre-existing village saving and loans groups when possible rather than creating new ones but does not specify whether women's savings groups will be targeted
- Includes no mention of national gender machineries



INDICATOR 17: Is there gender-responsive governance of project management and implementation?

- Does the Accredited Entity's Project Management Unit include gender experts and operate to support and build gender expertise in-country (including providing gender capacity building and oversight to Executing Entities)?



PART C, GAP: ADEQUATE

- Explains that the Project Coordinator will work with a Gender and Protection Advisor in the GAP
- Notes that "a Gender Expert is also available in the World Food Programme (WFP) Regional Bureau in Johannesburg" but does not explain how this gender expert will be used by the project

SAP011

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Explains that a Regional Gender Advisor will oversee GAP implementation and monitoring
- Does not mention any of these gender experts in the funding proposal description of the Project Coordination Committee or any other project management structure

■ Is the national gender machinery involved in project implementation structures (as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures)?



PART C, GAP: WEAK

- Makes no mention of involvement of national gender machineries in project implementation structures
- Are civil society groups, particularly women's groups, Indigenous Peoples and local/community

groups, and gender experts involved as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures?



PART C: WEAK

- Makes no mention of involvement of civil society groups or women's groups in project implementation structures

INDICATOR 18: To what extent does the project provide complete available project information, including in national/local languages, to all project-affected persons including women and marginalized gender/social groups?



WEAK

- Focuses information dissemination measures on ensuring

women have better access to climate/weather information, overlooking the intergenerational environmental knowledge that women often carry

- Provides no details on how project information will be disseminated or whether the information will be accessible to women and LGBTQ people

INDICATOR 19: To what extent does the project have a gender-responsive monitoring process including collecting baseline and monitoring and evaluation gender-disaggregated data? To what extent are gendered indicators (quantitative and qualitative) reflected in the project/program results management framework?



GAP: STRONG

- Includes gender disaggregated baseline and annual target data for each GAP target
- Sets all indicators for at least 50% women and sets some indicators at higher rates, such as "60% of project assets integrate the particular roles, responsibilities, needs and priorities of women"

SAP012

Inclusive Green Financing for Climate Resilient and Low Emission Smallholder Agriculture [Niger]

This [GCF project](#) under the Fund's Simplified Approval Process (SAP) aims to improve access to credit for smallholder farmers in Niger to implement climate-resilient and low-emission agriculture. Current predictions show that agricultural production in Niger is estimated to drop by 20 percent, threatening the livelihoods of 85 percent of Nigeriens whose employment depends on agriculture. Investments in climate-resilient and low-emission agriculture are perceived as high risk, especially by the local financial sector. This GCF cross-cutting project incentivizes the participation of the private sector by engaging with commercial banks and microfinance institutions. It will provide much desired financial support to smallholder farmers by increasing access to credit in tandem with technical assistance and capacity building.

Assessment Grade

- WEAK
- ADEQUATE
- STRONG

Main Project/Program Characteristics

- Country: Niger
- Total value: US\$13.3 million
- GCF funding support: US\$9.88 million
- GCF financing instrument: grant (US\$2.97 million); loan (US\$6.92 million)
- Accredited Entity: International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)
- International access (MIE)
- Financial intermediation (FI)
- Public sector (P)
- Cross-cutting
- ESS risk categorization: C
- Simplified approval process
- Under implementation: Yes, since December 2020
- Expected completion: December 2025

SAP012

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 1: To what extent is there an integration of gender equality considerations in the narrative and the technical elaboration of the overall project/program proposal document and project description? To what extent does the project undertake a gender-responsive, transparent, collaborative cost-benefit analysis and seriously consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends? Does it contain elements of an ecofeminist cost-benefit analysis? And if so which?



PART A: ADEQUATE

- Explains that a key project activity is increasing “resilience and adaptive capacity of rural communities and farmer’s organizations” including women’s organizations, cooperatives and Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs)

- Aims to reduce the impact of climate change on the food security of smallholder farmers, particularly women
- Does not acknowledge that many microcredit schemes that target women have historically lead to cycles of indebtedness, further poverty, and even suicide (see [here](#))



PART B: ADEQUATE

- Explains that a key project goal is reforming financial services to benefit rural women
- Acknowledges existing gender inequities in Niger, particularly regarding land tenure and access to credit
- Plans to extend credit to women farmers to improve climate-smart agricultural activities and “address women’s unequal

access to productive resources in the agriculture sector”

- Assumes that the key to improving gender equity is providing rural women with more access to credit, rather than considering other more effective methods to empower women such as grants



INDICATOR 2: To what extent is there a specific gendered description, including provision of gender-disaggregated data (baseline and expected reach), of intended direct and indirect beneficiaries? Including targeting women and girls?



PART A: ADEQUATE

- Includes a gender-sensitive description of project beneficiaries, noting that women will be targeted in efforts to reduce the impact of climate change on

the food security of smallholder farmers

- Fails to disaggregate the direct or indirect beneficiary targets by gender



PART B: ADEQUATE

- Notes that project activities will particularly target women and will attempt to overcome current gender inequities in access to financial systems
- Plans to provide women’s organizations and cooperatives with access to credit and business trainings
- Includes rural women as a “target group” repeatedly in breakdown of project components
- Fails to disaggregate the direct or indirect beneficiary targets by gender

SAP012

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 3: To what extent are “gender co-benefits” elaborated against the GCF Investment Criteria?



PART E: STRONG

- Includes a section on “Gender considerations” which notes that 45% of loans will be granted to women-led MSMEs, cooperatives and farmer organizations
- Explains that gender-disaggregated data will be assessed to measure women’s access to loans
- Plans to improve the “technical and managerial capacities of women” by providing them with tools to develop “bankable business plans” and “improve their financial education”
- Notes that the project intends to “close the gender gap” but

fails to consider how extension of credit to women often worsens poverty

INDICATOR 4: Is the project/program budget allocation gender-responsive? (“gender budgeting”)



PART C: ADEQUATE

- Are gender-related expenditures integrated in the overall project budget?
- Makes no direct mention of gender in overall project budget but allocates funding to project components that will target women, such as provision of credit to microfinance institutions that will give loans to farmers and MSMEs
- Does not include funding allocations for any of the activities

outlined in the GAP, even though they require significant funding

■ Can women’s groups/local groups/grassroots women get access to project funding?



PART B AND PROJECT GAP: ADEQUATE

- Identifies provision of credit to women’s organizations, cooperatives, and MSMEs as a key project goal
- Hopes to increase smallholder farmers investment in climate-sensitive practices through this provision of credit
- Fails to clarify why the project will provide these groups with credit rather than grants, as they are already economically vulnerable and loans could push them further into poverty

■ Does the Gender Action Plan (GAP) have its own budget? Is it adequate/ commensurate with overall budget and intent? What is the money spent on (gender consultants? Building local capacity for gender mainstreaming?)



PROJECT GAP: ADEQUATE

- Makes no direct mention of a GAP budget in funding proposal but outlines costs for each GAP activity
- Calls for \$431,000 USD in funding for all GAP activities, which represents just 3% of total project funding
- Assigns the majority of GAP activities to the Project Management Unit (PMU) and “consultants,” suggesting that these two groups will receive and control most of the GAP funding

SAP012

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 5: (To what extent) does the project/program acknowledge and discuss (implicitly or explicitly) an intersectional approach to gender?



WEAK

- Recognizes that women in rural regions disproportionately suffer from poverty and notes that existing financial services rarely benefit rural women
- Attempts to target rural women through the project but fails to consider how provision of credit rather than grants may drive these women deeper into poverty
- Overlooks how project components that target women-led MSMEs and women's organizations may exclude poorer, marginalized women who are

disenfranchised from these structures

- Fails to consider how factors such as sexuality, religion, or ethnicity may affect women's ability to access project benefits
- Fails to adequately consider the intersections between environmental issues and the experience of women farmers

INDICATOR 6: (To what extent) does the project/program (implicitly or explicitly) acknowledge and include people with marginalized gender and sexual identities?



WEAK

- Includes no mention of people with marginalized gender and sexual identities in any project documents

INDICATOR 7: To what extent does the project acknowledge and take into account potential impacts on sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) or sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment (SEAH)?



WEAK

- Notes that Niger has high rates of SGBV that disproportionately impacts women
- Overlooks how LGBTQ people are also disproportionately impacted by SGBV
- Includes establishing one Grievance Mechanism that incorporates GBV safeguards but provides no further mention of what the Mechanism or safeguards entail
- Does not consider how the project may impact SGBV, such

as by disrupting gender roles and causing increased domestic violence, or provide adequate safeguards

INDICATOR 8: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis assess the needs of women and other gender groups and current state of gender dynamics in the project-affected country/region/community prior to project inception, implementation, monitoring, and reporting?



ADEQUATE

- Provides an in-depth analysis of gender dynamics in Niger, including women's access to education, income, and political power
- Fails to include a history of Nigerian women's experiences with microcredit or note that micro-

SAP012

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

credit has repeatedly failed to help poor women around the world

INDICATOR 9: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis predict and address potential harmful gendered impacts in order to prevent them?

■ With recommendations and conclusions in the overall project design

WEAK

- Focuses entirely on potential risk for project lenders, rather than risks for project-affected people
- Fails to consider or provide safeguards against the many gender risks posed by the project, such as driving women

and LGBTQ people further into poverty

■ With concrete actions in the project-specific gender action plan

WEAK

- Includes no mention of project risks in GAP whatsoever, which is particularly troubling given that the project is not risk-free for marginalized gender groups

INDICATOR 10: To what extent does the project take into account potential impacts on the gender division of labor?

ADEQUATE

- Acknowledges that “women and girls bear the main burden of collecting biomass fuels” which

“has negative effects on their health and their well-being” in the Gender Assessment

- Notes that the project may improve women’s access to renewable energy which could reduce their unpaid labor burden
- Fails to consider that by providing women with credit so they can turn their farms into businesses, the project may disrupt the gender division of labor which could result in heightened domestic violence against women

INDICATOR 11: To what extent does the project-specific gender action plan fully articulate and cover the project period (integrated activities vs “add-ons”, define clear responsibilities/ accountability and meaningful gender indicators? Inclusion of an adequate, multi-year budget?)

STRONG

- Allocates specific funding amounts to each GAP activity
- Includes broad timelines for each GAP activity that span almost the entirety of the project duration which somewhat obscures when many of the GAP activities will actually occur
- Assigns a responsible entity for each GAP activity
- Includes specific, gender-disaggregated targets for each GAP activity

INDICATOR 12: To what extent does the project create safeguards to prevent potential harms, including those that will disproportionately impact women, men, sexual and gender minorities? To what extent

SAP012

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

is there a comprehensive and project-adequate elaboration on gender in the project/program risk assessment and monitoring frameworks and arrangements?

NONE

INDICATOR 13: To what extent does the project apply the principle of Free, Prior and Informed Consent and give project-affected persons (especially women and LGBTI people and Indigenous Peoples as well as other marginalized social groups) the right to accept or refuse? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



WEAK

- Includes no mention of consent in any project documents whatsoever

- Does not include clear plans to inform project-affected people of project activities
- Fails to provide project-affected people with the opportunity to accept or reject the project

INDICATOR 14: Is there a fully articulated, gender-responsive redress mechanism available to women at the project /national level in addition to the GCF IRM?



PART B AND ANNEX REFERENCING ESIA OR ESMF (LISTED THERE): WEAK

- Fails to mention a grievance redress mechanism in the funding proposal
- Includes establishing one Grievance Mechanism that incorporates GBV safeguards as a target in the GAP

- Makes no other mention of a grievance redress mechanism and fails to explain how the Grievance Mechanism mentioned in the GAP will be structured
- Does not adequately address the need for a grievance redress mechanism, which is particularly troubling given that the project may result in predatory lending practices against women and other marginalized gender groups

INDICATOR 15: To what extent does the project provide compensation in case of harm that disproportionately impacts women and other marginalized gender groups, for example housing and land that is equal to or better than pre-settlement and compensating women and marginalized gender groups who are not legally recognized land owners?



PART C, PART F AND RELEVANT ANNEXES SUCH AS RESETTLEMENT PLANS: WEAK

- Makes no mention of compensation in case of harm that disproportionately impacts women and other marginalized gender groups
- Mentions the need for project safeguards to prevent harm against the environment but fails to recognize how the project must also provide safeguards and compensation measures for vulnerable groups who are harmed, such as women and LGBTQ people

INDICATOR 16: To what extent does the project ensure full, effective and ongoing/sustained participation of gender groups throughout the project/program cycle?

SAP012

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Comprehensive stakeholder engagement at the planning stage with documentation includes women's groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



WEAK

- Notes that "consultations were held with potential beneficiaries," which include women's organizations
- Fails to describe the gender makeup of these consultations or provide further details about their frequency, accessibility, or content
- Explains that this project proposal was developed in consultations with multiple government ministries but fails to include any gender ministry
- Includes no mention of national gender machineries whatsoever

- Do the annexes include stakeholder engagement plans for project implementation that includes women's groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annex)



ADEQUATE

- Targets women's groups in multiple project components and plans to provide women's cooperatives and organizations with credit
- Notes that women's groups will also receive trainings on business practices and financial literacy
- Includes no mention of national gender machineries

INDICATOR 17: Is there gender-responsive governance of project management and implementation?

- Does the Accredited Entity's Project Management Unit include gender experts and operate to support and build gender expertise in-country (including providing gender capacity building and oversight to Executing Entities)?



PART C, GAP: ADEQUATE

- Explains that the PMU will be headed by a Project Manager who will be supported by a gender and youth specialist as well as a Finance Manager, Environmental and Gender Specialist
- Does not clarify whether these specialists will be from Niger or from outside the country
- Is the national gender machinery involved in project implementation structures (as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures)?



PART C, GAP: WEAK

- Makes no mention of involvement of national gender machineries in project implementation structures
- Are civil society groups, particularly women's groups, Indigenous Peoples and local/community groups, and gender experts involved as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures?
- Notes repeatedly that women's groups will be a primary project target but does not indicate that they will be included in the Executing Entity or Advisory Board
- Identifies the Niger Ministry of Finance as the sole Executing Entity

SAP012

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Explains that “women will be included into the National Steering Committee” which “provides strategic guidance on project progress and challenges as well as inputs for management’s response”
- Includes two gender experts in the PMU

INDICATOR 18: To what extent does the project provide complete available project information, including in national/local languages, to all project-affected persons including women and marginalized gender/social groups?



WEAK

- Does not include clear plans to disseminate project information to all project-affected people

- Plans to “disseminate information” by organizing “round tables and events with special emphasis on the specific issues that women and youth face” but does not clarify whether these events will also be used to disseminate project information
- Provides no further details on how project information will be disseminated or whether the information will be accessible to women and LGBTQ people

INDICATOR 19: To what extent does the project have a gender-responsive monitoring process including collecting baseline and monitoring and evaluation gender-disaggregated data? To what extent are gendered indicators (quantitative and qualitative) reflected in the project/program results management framework?



GAP: WEAK

- Fails to include gender disaggregated baseline data for any GAP target
- Sets many indicators as absolute numbers rather than percentages (ie “develop 7 reports displaying gender disaggregated data”), making it difficult to assess how large this figure is in comparison to total project outputs

SAP013

Scaling Smart, Solar, Energy Access Microgrids in Haiti

This [GCF project](#) under the Fund's Simplified Approval Process (SAP) aims to develop 22 community-scale solar plus battery storage micro-grids in southern Haiti in communities where currently no grid power exists. This is a private sector program under the GCF's Mobilizing Funds for Scale (MFS) pilot program. Its goal is to provide affordable and reliable 24/7 access to modern energy services in communities previously identified through extensive market scoping in this region of the country. This will be accompanied by technical assistance to build capacity for microgrid deployment and operation. The project incorporates a battery storage solution, thus offering 24-hour service and a 100 per cent renewable energy- based viable economic alternative to diesel generators.

Assessment Grade

- WEAK
- ADEQUATE
- STRONG

Main Project/Program Characteristics

- Country: Haiti
- Total value: US\$45.7 million
- GCF funding support: US\$9.9 million
- GCF financing instrument: grant (US\$1.5 million); loan (US\$8.4 million)
- Accredited Entity: Nordic Environment Finance Corporation (NEFCO)
- International access (MIE)
- Financial intermediation (FI)
- Private sector (PS)
- Cross-cutting
- ESS risk categorization: C/Intermediation 3
- Simplified approval process
- Pilot program: Mobilizing Funds for Scale (MFS)
- Under implementation: No (approved March 2020)
- Expected completion: January 2023

SAP013

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 1: To what extent is there an integration of gender equality considerations in the narrative and the technical elaboration of the overall project/program proposal document and project description? To what extent does the project undertake a gender-responsive, transparent, collaborative cost-benefit analysis and seriously consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends? Does it contain elements of an ecofeminist cost-benefit analysis? And if so which?



PART A: ADEQUATE

- Notes the project will take an “overarching gender inclusive approach”
- Includes no other mention of gender in brief summary



PART B: ADEQUATE

- Explains that poor women are disproportionately vulnerable to climate change impacts and includes “Feminist Electrification” as a platform for the project to address “the power dynamics and inequity of opportunities that persist as key underlying drivers for vulnerability to climate change”
- Promotes gender mainstreaming across all aspects of project
- Notes that women’s particular energy needs will be taken into account when building micro-grids and that the project will create opportunities for women’s employment in technical and leadership roles
- Describes ‘energy poverty’ as a motivation for the project but does not mention how energy poverty disproportionately impacts women and girls as they

are responsible for most domestic labor

- Does not explicitly undertake a cost-benefits analysis of the project or consider multiple means towards reaching the same ends
- Does not consider potential gender costs of further privatizing the energy grid, which may perpetuate the disenfranchisement poor and marginalized people who are disproportionately women and LGBTQ people



INDICATOR 2: To what extent is there a specific gendered description, including provision of gender-disaggregated data (baseline and expected reach), of intended direct and indirect beneficiaries? Including targeting women and girls?



PART A: WEAK

- Does not explicitly state that women and girls are target beneficiaries
- Contains no mention of gender-disaggregated baseline or target data



PART B: STRONG

- Names women as key beneficiaries through the “Feminist Electrification” component of the project
- Requires that Energy Committees have equal representation of women and men
- Plans to collect gender-disaggregated survey data “to better understand key priorities and needs for women with respect to energy” and will utilize this data to better tailor microgrid design and operations

SAP013

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Notes the project will “ensure effective representation of women in Enèji Pwòp (the executing entity’s field partner) leadership and staffing and in staffing of other partners”
- Plans to support women-led SMEs “by increasing training and capacity building, developing pathways for improving profits, and expanding opportunities for access to finance through micro-loans”
- Does not acknowledge that multiple studies have shown micro-loans to increase indebtedness and even suicide among vulnerable populations like poor women

INDICATOR 3: To what extent are “gender co-benefits” elaborated against the GCF Investment Criteria?



PART E: ADEQUATE

- Expects that at least 50% of direct and indirect beneficiaries are women even though the project description describes a component with an exclusive focus on women, suggesting that these percentages should be higher

INDICATOR 4: Is the project/program budget allocation gender-responsive? (“gender budgeting”)

- Are gender-related expenditures integrated in the overall project budget?



PART C: ADEQUATE

- Allocates \$368,036 USD to the “Feminist Electrification” project component, which makes up the bulk of the women-targeted project actions

- Allocates just 0.8% of total project funding (\$45,748,434) to the explicitly women-focused aspect of the project
- Can women’s groups/local groups/grassroots women get access to project funding?



PART B AND PROJECT GAP: WEAK

- Aims to conduct surveys in each project-affected town with local women’s groups but does not set a target for number of groups consulted
- Does not specify whether local women’s groups will be compensated for their consultation or can otherwise access project funds
- Includes no other mention of women’s groups/local groups/grassroots women

- Does the Gender Action Plan (GAP) have its own budget? Is it adequate/ commensurate with overall budget and intent? What is the money spent on (gender consultants? Building local capacity for gender mainstreaming?)



PROJECT GAP: WEAK

- Does not explicitly state GAP budget and instead notes that the budget for each Feminist Electrification Indicator will be “proportional to grid size,” giving no clarification of what this proportion will be or whether some indicators will receive more funding than others
- Notes in overall project budget that the Feminist Electrification component, which makes up the majority of GAP actions, has a budget of \$368,036 USD (just 0.8% of total project funding)

SAP013

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 5: (To what extent) does the project/program acknowledge and discuss (implicitly or explicitly) an intersectional approach to gender?



ADEQUATE

- Acknowledges that poor women are particularly vulnerable to climate change
- Makes no other acknowledgement of how women's experiences differ due to class status or racial and sexual identities, instead assuming that all women will be affected by this project in the same way

INDICATOR 6: (To what extent) does the project/program (implicitly or explicitly) acknowledge and include people with marginalized

gender and sexual identities?



WEAK

- Includes no mention of people with marginalized gender and sexual identities in any project documents

INDICATOR 7: To what extent does the project acknowledge and take into account potential impacts on sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) or sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment (SEAH)?



ADEQUATE

- Includes the increased safety of women due to street lighting as a project goal, thereby acknowl-

edging the SGBV and SEAH risks women face

- Does not acknowledge how construction projects may increase risk of SGBV and SEAH for women and LGBTQ people or provide adequate safeguards
- Does not include LGBTQ people as a group that is highly at risk for SGBV and SEAH

INDICATOR 8: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis assess the needs of women and other gender groups and current state of gender dynamics in the project-affected country/region/community prior to project inception, implementation, monitoring, and reporting?



STRONG

- Provides a strong gender analysis of the overall state of women in Haiti and their specific needs and vulnerabilities regarding climate change and electrification
- Includes detailed gender background for each of the project's components
- Does not acknowledge the presence of LGBTQ people in Haiti, despite the fact that this community is both present and faces tremendous violence

INDICATOR 9: To what extent does the mandatory initial gender impact analysis predict and address potential harmful gendered impacts in order to prevent them?

- With recommendations and conclusions in the overall project design

SAP013

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator



WEAK

- Does not adequately consider or provide protections against any potentially harmful project impacts
- Primarily mentions the 'risk' of the project in terms of the financial risk that project financiers may face
- Notes that the Executing Entity is "managing project risks effectively" and that further information on risk mitigation measures can be found in Annex 20 but does not make Annex publicly available
- Includes no mention of specific gender risks
- With concrete actions in the project-specific gender action plan



WEAK

- Does not consider or provide protections against any potentially harmful project impacts on marginalized gender groups whatsoever

INDICATOR 10: To what extent does the project take into account potential impacts on the gender division of labor?



ADEQUATE

- Notes multiple times that women are disproportionately responsible for domestic work and that electrification could reduce this burden
- Does not acknowledge how further privatization of energy could increase costs for poor women and lead to their disenfranchisement which would prevent them from reducing

their domestic burden and may even exacerbate this burden

INDICATOR 11: To what extent does the project-specific gender action plan fully articulate and cover the project period (integrated activities vs "add-ons", define clear responsibilities/ accountability and meaningful gender indicators? Inclusion of an adequate, multi-year budget?)



STRONG

- Integrates gender-specific targets throughout the project cycle and in each project component

INDICATOR 12: To what extent does the project create safeguards to prevent potential harms, includ-

ing those that will disproportionately impact women, men, sexual and gender minorities? To what extent is there a comprehensive and project-adequate elaboration on gender in the project/program risk assessment and monitoring frameworks and arrangements?

NONE

- Rated risk category C/Intermediation 3 (low to no risk) and therefore includes no section on safeguards assessment
- Includes no other explicit mention of safeguards despite the fact that construction projects always raise the possibility of SGBV risk for women and LGBTQ people
- Does not acknowledge or protect against how the project may have other inadvertent impacts such as raising energy prices for some poor households, which may disproportionately impact women

SAP013

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

INDICATOR 13: To what extent does the project apply the principle of Free, Prior and Informed Consent and give project-affected persons (especially women and LGBTI people and Indigenous Peoples as well as other marginalized social groups) the right to accept or refuse? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



WEAK

- Makes no direct mention of consent in publicly available project documents
- Notes the project undertook consultations with “mayors and communities to identify municipally owned land that would be appropriate for the power generation site” and that further information can be found in Annex 20 but does not make Annex publicly available, as this is a private sector program.

INDICATOR 14: Is there a fully articulated, gender-responsive redress mechanism available to women at the project /national level in addition to the GCF IRM?



PART B AND ANNEX REFERENCING ESIA OR ESMF: WEAK

- Provides no description of a redress mechanism in publicly available documents, which is particularly troubling given that the project is not free of risk and has the potential to disproportionately harm women and LGBTQ people

INDICATOR 15: To what extent does the project provide compensation in case of harm that disproportionately impacts women and other marginalized gender groups,

for example housing and land that is equal to or better than pre-settlement and compensating women and marginalized gender groups who are not legally recognized land owners?



PART C, PART F AND RELEVANT ANNEXES SUCH AS RESETTLEMENT PLANS: WEAK

- Provides no description of project safeguards in project documents even though the project has the potential for unintended gendered harms such as increased energy costs or increased SGBV due to construction
- Includes no description of how potentially harmed people will be compensated

INDICATOR 16: To what extent does the project ensure full, effective and ongoing/sustained participation of gender groups throughout the project/program cycle?

for example housing and land that is equal to or better than pre-settlement and compensating women and marginalized gender groups who are not legally recognized land owners?

- Comprehensive stakeholder engagement at the planning stage with documentation includes women’s groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annexes)



WEAK

- Notes that consultation involved “mayors and communities to identify municipally owned land that would be appropriate for the power generation site” but does not specify the gender makeup of these consultations
- Explains that “multiple levels of local governance” and “relevant ministries” will be included in ongoing consultations but does not clarify what these levels of governance or local ministries will be and whether they will in-

SAP013

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

clude women or LGBTQ people in the main project document, even though Haitian ministries have expressed interest in working towards more gender-sensitivity

- Indicates that more information can be found in Annex 20 but does not make Annex available to public, as this is a private sector program

- Do the annexes include stakeholder engagement plans for project implementation that includes women's groups and national gender machineries? (Main document and/or specialized Annex)



WEAK

- Includes no direct mention of women's groups and national gender machineries in publicly available documents



INDICATOR 17: Is there gender-responsive governance of project management and implementation?

- Does the Accredited Entity's Project Management Unit include gender experts and operate to support and build gender expertise in-country (including providing gender capacity building and oversight to Executing Entities)?



PART C, GAP: ADEQUATE

- Explains that a NEFCO (the executing entity) gender specialist will support implementation of the gender action plan and oversee gender mainstreaming
- Does not mention that the local gender expert will work with the PMU or indicate that the project will otherwise attempt to build gender expertise in the country

- Is the national gender machinery involved in project implementation structures (as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures)?



PART C, GAP: WEAK

- Includes no mention of the involvement of national gender machinery in project implementation structures except that local women's groups will be consulted in project-selected towns during project design, even though Haitian ministries have expressed interest in working towards more gender-sensitivity

- Are civil society groups, particularly women's groups, Indigenous Peoples and local/community groups, and gender experts involved as Executing Entities, in Advisory Boards or similar structures?



PART C: WEAK

- Notes that a gender expert from NEFCO (the executing entity) will support the implementation of the GAP but provides no other description of who else or what other entities will offer support or consultation on gender-sensitive project components



INDICATOR 18: To what extent does the project provide complete available project information, including in national/local languages, to all project-affected persons including women and marginalized gender/social groups?



WEAK

SAP013

Ecofeminist Indicator Framework Assessment Results by Indicator/Sub-Indicator

- Does not specify how project information is made available to women and other marginalized groups whatsoever and fails to mention whether the information will be made accessible to those with different language needs

INDICATOR 19: To what extent does the project have a gender-responsive monitoring process including collecting baseline and monitoring and evaluation gender-disaggregated data? To what extent are gendered indicators (quantitative and qualitative) reflected in the project/program results management framework?



GAP: STRONG

- Notes that although little to no gender-related data exists

specific to each beneficiary town, the project will conduct in-depth stakeholder consultation during each town's pre-development survey to ensure data collected is disaggregated by gender and is both localized and representative

- Plans to disaggregate all project indicators by gender and also provide "supplementary M+E verification" by including specific M+E for each of the 'feminist electrification' pillars
- Outlines the specific M+E for the 'feminist electrification' pillars which include gender specific indicators for areas like infrastructure planning, training and employment, and domestic energy use
- Sets some indicator targets at disappointingly low levels, such as "women make up at least 40% of EP employees" and "at least 25% of partner employees"

■■ HEINRICH BÖLL STIFTUNG
WASHINGTON, DC

Heinrich Böll Stiftung Washington, DC

1432 K Street, NW, Suite 500
Washington, DC 20005, USA

<https://us.boell.org>



Gender Action

925 H St NW
Suite 410
Washington DC 20001-4978, USA

<https://genderaction.org/>

Layout and illustrations:

Pia Danner, p*zwe, Hannover/Germany

License

This publication as a whole or selected parts may be used free of charge for the purposes of advocacy, campaigning, education, and research, provided that the source is acknowledged in full. We request that all such use be registered with us for impact assessment purposes.

[CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)

