

29 August 2016

Submission by the Heinrich Böll Stiftung North America

Views on Possible Elements and Guiding Principles for Continuing and Enhancing the Lima Work Programme on Gender

1. Introduction

At the 20th Conference of the Parties (COP 20), Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) adopted the Lima Work Programme on Gender (Decision 18/CP.20)¹, which aims to further advance the implementation of existing gender equality mandates across all areas of climate negotiations. Since COP 20, the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) during its 42nd session in June 2015 and its 44th session in May 2016 held two in-session workshops, one on gender-responsive climate policy with a focus on mitigation action and technology development and transfer, and one on adaptation and capacity-building and training for delegates on gender issues, respectively. The SBI 44 draft conclusions on gender and climate change proposed by the chair² expressed the SBI's support for the continuation and enhancement of the Lima Work Programme on Gender (LWPG). The SBI also invited "Parties and observer organizations to submit their views on possible elements and guiding principles for continuing and enhancing the work programme" (FCCC/SBI/2016/L.16, paras. 4 & 5).

The Heinrich Böll Stiftung North America welcomes the opportunity to share our views on these issues. Our submission focuses on three key guiding principles and core elements we feel are essential for continuing and enhancing the LWPG:

- **Human rights and women's rights' framing:** The LWPG's continued work must aim at strengthening the integration of Parties existing human rights, gender equality and women's rights obligations in all climate actions under the UNFCCC.
- **Inclusivity:** The LWPG must be better integrated into and impact all UNFCCC activities for a true mainstreaming of gender and climate change considerations within all thematic areas of the UNFCCC.
- **MOI for gender-responsive climate actions, in particular finance:** An enhanced and continued LWPG must focus priority attention on core Means of Implementation (MOI) for gender-responsive climate actions, in particular the role of finance and adequate resource allocation.

2. Human and Women's Rights Framing of a Continued and Enhanced Lima Work Programme

The Cancun Agreements and other UNFCCC decisions (f.ex. 1/CP.16, 2/CP.17, 15/CP.18, 2/CP.20) have reiterated the central importance of advancing gender equality and women's rights for effective climate policies. In the preamble to both the Paris Agreement and decision 1/CP.21, adopted at COP 21 in Paris in December 2015, Parties acknowledge that in their actions to address climate change they should respect, promote and consider their respective obligations in relation to, *inter alia*, human rights (and thus implicitly women's rights as

¹ Text of the Lima Work Programme on Gender available at:

https://unfccc.int/files/meetings/lima_dec_2014/decisions/application/pdf/auv_cop20_gender.pdf.

² <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2016/sbi/eng/l16.pdf>.

inalienable human rights³), gender equality and women's empowerment.⁴ The Lima Work Programme itself in its chapeau underscores the importance of coherence between gender-responsive climate policies and balanced participation of women and men in Convention processes and the provisions of international instruments for the strengthening and protection of women's human rights, gender equality and the empowerment of women such as the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) and the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action. Conversely, many existing human rights bodies, including the CEDAW Committee, the UN Rights Council or the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights have emphasized the obligation to respect and protect women's rights when responding to climate change. Extensive research and most recently the UN special rapporteurs for human rights⁵ have confirmed the compatibility of parties' climate change and human rights obligations and the responding mandate to act. Country parties to the UNFCCC are with a few exceptions also signatories to CEDAW⁶ and other relevant human rights covenants, for example on economic, social and cultural rights⁷ or on civil and political rights⁸.

Nevertheless, the human rights' context of efforts for gender-responsive climate policy was only touched upon in the two mandated SBI in-session workshops under the Lima Work Programme on Gender⁹; it was *neither an explicit element nor a guiding principle* for activities formally undertaken under the existing LWPG. This has to be remedied in the continuation and advancement of the LWPG. It should focus in its activities in much more detail on the integration of obligations under CEDAW and other relevant human rights treaties in the design, planning, and implementation of climate actions and the value of recognizing these existing human rights standards under the UNFCCC.

The human rights dimension of gender-responsive policies should be added formally as the framing principle for the continued and expanded LWPG, including guiding the activities in any possible related action plan with enforceable targets, which might be decided by a COP decision at COP 22 in Marrakesh. Such a human rights-centered approach should guide all concrete gender-responsive activities and advancements in specific issue areas under a continued LWPG and related action plan (such as mitigation, adaptation, technology development and transfer, finance, capacity-building, communication and reporting).

Any future SBI in-session workshops under a continued and enhanced LWPG should include discussions on the intersection of climate actions and human and women's rights, f.ex. by regularly inviting civil society women's and human rights advocates with on-the-ground experience and representatives from the CEDAW Committee or the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR). The UNFCCC Secretariat more generally could also explore options for joint capacity-building sessions with those and other UN bodies on the human rights dimension of climate change. Such learning opportunities could be offered for UNFCCC delegates more broadly (not just to those Party delegates attending in-session workshops on gender and climate change) and also be extended to technical committees and bodies under the UNFCCC, such as the in-session thematic Technical Expert Meetings (TEMs), the Climate Technology Centre & Network (CTCN) or the GEF and the GCF as

³ UN OHCHR (2014), Gender Rights as Human Rights; available at: <http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/HR-PUB-14-2.pdf>

⁴ Text of the Paris Agreement available at: https://unfccc.int/files/meetings/paris_nov_2015/application/pdf/paris_agreement_english_.pdf.

⁵ http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/HRBodies/SP/SP_To_UNFCCC.pdf.

⁶ All 187 parties that are signatories to CEDAW are also without exception parties to the UNFCCC, although not all 196 parties to the UNFCCC have ratified CEDAW (with the United States, Iran, Somalia, Sudan and South Sudan being among the exceptions).

⁷ <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/CESCR.aspx>.

⁸ <http://www.ohchr.org/en/professionalinterest/pages/ccpr.aspx>.

⁹ There is little mention of human rights in the Secretariat reports of the two in-session SBI workshops mandated by the Lima Work Programme (see documents FCCC/SBI/2015/12 and FCC/SBI/2016/10), reflecting the fact that the human rights context of gender-responsive climate policies was not formally addressed as overarching framework for the workshop discussions.

operating entities of the UNFCCC financial mechanism. Parties to the UNFCCC, as well as technical committees and bodies, can also draw on existing guidelines or recommendations by human and women's rights' bodies on how to ensure full compliance with their obligations to respect, protect, and fulfill women's human rights in the context of climate change.¹⁰

3. Inclusivity via Thematically Focused “Gender plus” Efforts for Mainstreaming Gender and Climate Change Activities Throughout the UNFCCC

While over the past 15 years, since a first mention on gender equality and women's participation in COP7 decisions in Marrakesh, noteworthy progress has been made in mainstreaming gender within the UNFCCC (as a compilation of relevant decision texts over the years indicates)¹¹, certain gaps and a lack of inclusivity and comprehensiveness of UNFCCC processes remain – and are in danger of being carried forward with the new Paris Agreement post 2020. This can be illustrated by the fact that the Paris agreement anchors women's rights, gender equality and the empowerment of women in its preamble (as overarching guiding recommendation), but then does not take up the mandate for gender-responsiveness of climate policies in the sections of the agreement dealing with mitigation (Article 4), REDD+ (Article 5); loss & damage (Article 8), finance (Article 9), or technology (Article 10) respectively¹². A mention for the need for gender-responsive action in relation to adaptation (Article 7) and capacity-building (Article 11) is helpful, but not enough to ensure future gender mainstreaming in the implementation of the Paris Agreement without further focused COP decisions and targeted actions.

The LWPG was undoubtedly successful in addressing some existing gender mainstreaming shortcomings, including by enhancing gender expertise and building knowledge for Parties and observers in a range of focus areas, especially through the two SBI in-session workshops and related submissions and engagement processes. Commendable in particular is that mitigation and technology transfer and development were among the thematic areas explicitly addressed in SBI 42, as they usually receive less attention in a mostly adaptation-focused discussion of gender and climate change. However, the establishment of a separate LWPG, while giving visibility and legitimacy to the importance of gender-responsive climate policies, carries also the danger of sidelining and isolating the gender discourse as an add-on – especially without improved efforts to integrate its work into the wider UNFCCC process. A possible UNFCCC Gender Action Plan (GAP) as part of an enhanced LWPG needs to tackle this challenge as a priority, including by setting targets and recommended actions for gender-integration into the work programs of all other thematic areas and their respective bodies under the UNFCCC.

A primary activity under a multi-year GAP could be to establish detailed thematic area sub-programs to integrate gender-responsiveness into the ongoing work flow for example on mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology, capacity-building and transparency efforts pre-2020 and including it in the work of the Ad hoc Working Group on the Paris Agreement (APA). The primary goal of thematic area sub-programs under a GAP would be to enhance the gender-awareness, and gender capacity and understanding of thematic experts and negotiators, instead of segregating discussion on gender and climate change within a narrow sub-group of

¹⁰ See for example work by OHCHR on climate change (<http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/HRAndClimateChange/Pages/HRCAction.aspx>), including analysis on “The Effects of Climate Change on the Full Enjoyment of Human Rights”; available at: <http://www.thevcf.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/humanrightsSRHRE.pdf>; or CEDAW's “General Recommendations for gender-related dimensions of disaster risk reduction and climate change”; available at: <http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/HRBodies/CEDAW/ClimateChange/ConceptNote.pdf>

¹¹ WEDO (2013), Gender Equality and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change: A Compilation of Decision Texts; available at: <http://www.wedo.org/wp-content/uploads/united-nations-web.pdf>.

¹² Text of the Paris Agreement available at: https://unfccc.int/files/meetings/paris_nov_2015/application/pdf/paris_agreement_english_.pdf.

gender experts separated from other technical negotiators, as it is currently largely the case. This will build specialized technical “gender plus [insert specific UNFCCC thematic area here] capacity” to allow a gender equality and women’s rights perspective to inform COP decisions on climate actions and their implementation throughout the UNFCCC process.

If the LWPG were to continue in its current configuration, Parties will remain content to just send some designated delegates to deal with gender (often less senior negotiators with little clout within their country delegations) and leave it up to those few to “gender-mainstream” their delegations’ work throughout the UNFCCC negotiations, while ticking off the issue of “gender and climate change” as being dealt with. A thematic “gender plus” focus, by contrast, anchors gender-responsive climate policies as a principle and goal in all thematic areas and raises the gender-awareness of all delegates. The latter will also be helped by accelerated progress in advancing the gender balance of bodies established under the convention and the improved gender composition of Party delegations mandated by decision 23/CP.18. An enhanced LWPG must set clear targets on gender balance and women’s participation and leadership and measure their progress toward their achievement to address persistent gaps. The latest report on gender composition by the UNFCCC Secretariat, demonstrates gender deficiencies in participation and leadership, including in particular in bodies and boards related to technology and finance.¹³

There are many existing and many potentially new entry points for the integration of gender considerations for the formulation and implementation of strategies to address climate change under specific UNFCCC thematic areas and bodies, as a recent UNFCCC Secretariat technical paper illustrates.¹⁴ These should be elaborated in a potential GAP, and could include, *inter alia*:

- **National Communications (NCs):** Capacity-building for Parties to prepare and submit gender-responsive NCs, for example by utilizing existing resources and methodologies such as UNDP’s “Gender Responsive National Communications Toolkit,” could be one important element of a future LWPG and GAP.¹⁵ As NCs for many parties function both as reporting and as a planning tool for effective implementation of climate action, the gender-responsiveness of NCs submitted is on key indication of successful gender mainstreaming of climate policies and actions on the national level. It should therefore be regularly monitored and reported to the COP by the UNFCCC Secretariat, including by showcasing best practice examples and encouraging peer-to-peer support from Parties with success in engendering their own NCs.
- **Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs):** Since NAMAs are voluntary actions taken by developing countries, there are currently no requirements for how they should be established and implemented. However, lessons learned from some first case studies could be abstracted, and approaches and training formats used in some first efforts replicated.¹⁶ Many countries would be interested in including gender considerations, especially if they can receive capacity –building support (including by CSOs) and adequate resources for the development of gender-informed NAMAs. Existing NAMA financial support structures include the operating entities of the UNFCCC financial mechanisms, the GCF and the GEF. Both have gender equality and gender-mainstreaming mandates that should translate into mandating that their financial support is used for gender-responsive NAMA development and implementation. Some of the developed country-owned NAMA support structures, such as the

¹³ UNFCCC (2015), Report on gender composition. Note by the Secretariat, document FCCC/CP/2015/6.

¹⁴ UNFCCC (2016), Guidelines or other tools for integrating gender considerations into climate change related activities under the Convention. Technical paper by the Secretariat, document FCCC/TP/2016/2.

¹⁵ UNDP (2015), Gender Responsive National Communications Toolkit. Available at: <http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/gender/UNDP%20Gender%20Responsive%20National%20Communications%20Toolkit.pdf?download>.

¹⁶ UNFCCC (2016), Technical Paper.

German International Climate Initiative or the UK/Germany NAMA Facility, could likewise include gender integration as one of their assessment criteria for providing NAMA development support.

- **National Adaptation Plans (NAPs):** The Cancun Adaptation Frameworks calls for Parties to follow a country-driven, gender-sensitive, participatory and fully transparent approach in formulating and implementing NAPs. Capacity-building for Parties to prepare and implement gender-responsive NAPs, for example by utilizing existing resources and methodologies such as IUCN’s guidelines on mainstreaming gender considerations into NAPs¹⁷, could be included in a future LWPG and GAP. Under the UNFCCC Financial Mechanism, both the GCF and the GEF are tasked with supporting the development and implementation of NAPs. Both have gender mainstreaming mandates and the requirement to consider gender equality outcomes in their funding decisions.
- **Climate Technology Centre & Network (CTCN) and Technology Needs Assessments (TNAs):** Technology development and transfer is a key means of implementation (MOI) for gender-responsive climate actions and one which requires focused attention in a future LWPG and GAP. However, too often the inclusion of gender-considerations in the assessment of climate change related technology needs in developing countries is lacking. A joint expert group meeting by UNFCCC, UN Women and UN DESA with the support of CSO gender and technology experts elaborated a set of recommendations for improving the gender capacity of the CTCN (its own staff and the experts in its network) and for helping national TNA teams to integrate gender considerations throughout the TNA process.¹⁸ In that context, it is also crucially important to improve gender balance in the Advisory Board of the CTCN. According to the 2015 stocktaking on gender composition by the UNFCCC Secretariat, this UNFCCC body is dead last with only one of its 16 members (or 6%) being female.¹⁹
- **(Intended) Nationally Determined Contributions (INDCs or NDCs):** Under the Paris Agreement, each Party is required to prepare and communicate every five years NDCs that it commits to achieving. For COP22, Parties submitted INDCs, with many of developing country INDCs’ ambition conditional on financial support. Recent analysis by IUCN and WEDO shows that of 189 countries having submitted 162 INDCs (including one for the EU on behalf of 28 member states)²⁰, only 65 (40%) explicitly mention “gender” or “women”, and all mentions are in non-Annex I countries – highlighting that industrial countries are approaching mitigation ambition commitments under the Paris Agreement currently largely gender-blind.²¹ Providing the expertise, capacity-building and support for turning the majority of currently gender-blind INDCs into gender-responsive NDCs should be a primary task for any UNFCCC GAP under an enhanced LWPG. One concrete action by the UNFCCC Secretariat, in cooperation with UN and other partners, including from CSOs, could be the development of specific tools and guidelines for the preparation of gender-responsive NDCs. This would also be the single most important step in ensuring success in a gender-responsive implementation of the Paris Agreement on the global level.

¹⁷ IUCN (2011), Draft Guidelines to Mainstreaming Gender in the Development of National Adaptation Plans (NAPs). Available at: <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2011/smsn/ngo/306.pdf>.

¹⁸ UN Women (2015), Implementation of Gender-Responsive Climate Action in the Context of Sustainable Development: Report of the Expert Group Meeting. Available at: https://unfccc.int/files/gender_and_climate_change/application/pdf/egmreport_bonn_final_25_november_2015.pdf.

¹⁹ UNFCCC (2015), Note on Gender Composition.

²⁰ <http://www4.unfccc.int/submissions/indc/Submission%20Pages/submissions.aspx>.

²¹ https://www.climatelinks.org/sites/default/files/asset/document/Gender%20In%20Mitigation%20Actions_April%202016.pdf.

4. Finance as Key Means of Implementation for Gender-Responsive Climate Actions

An enhanced and continued LWPG must focus priority attention on core means of implementation (MOI) for gender-responsive climate actions, in particular the role of finance and adequate resource allocation.

This has two main components:

- Adequate, sustainable, predictable and additional **resource allocation within the UNFCCC** (the UNFCCC's Secretariat "means of implementation") to provide the technical staff capacity and financial support to Parties in all thematic areas under the convention in making gender-responsive COP decisions. The UNFCCC Secretariat also needs the staff and financial resources to monitor and regularly report on the system-wide implementation of gender-responsive climate actions; and
- Adequate, sustainable, predictable and additional **provision of public climate finance as the core means of implementation (MOI) for gender-responsive implementation** of all developing countries' needs-based climate actions.

Resource allocation for gender mainstreaming efforts within the UNFCCC Secretariat

The current two-year LWPG is plagued by the fact that its implementation, and additional staff and capacity support by the UNFCCC Secretariat beyond the mandated appointment of a senior gender focal point, is essentially conditional on the availability of extra funding made available by "Parties and relevant organizations" (paras. 17-20). Thus, the ambition and the implementation of the current LWPG stands and falls with the willingness of Parties to provide additional financing for that specific purpose. This underscores the treatment of the current LWPG as an "add-on", and as a disposable one as such, instead of treating it as the core task under the UNFCCC Secretariat's core administrative budget, which it is. Within the UNFCCC, nobody would make the Secretariat's and Parties' ongoing technical work on the mitigation, adaptation, finance or technology aspects of implementation subject to the availability of Parties providing extra financial resources to the UNFCCC Secretariat. Of course not: these are after all the core tasks under the convention.

A continued and enhanced LWPG and a possible GAP can only be successful, if they and the actions they propose are likewise understood to be core tasks for the fulfillment of the UNFCCC mandate and financed in the same way, i.e. as part of the UNFCCC's core budget for which *all* Parties to the UNFCCC are assessed indicative contributions in line with their "common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities," the founding principle of actions under the UNFCCC.²² This would also ensure the "buy-in", literally, of all UNFCCC Parties to the UNFCCC gender-mainstreaming efforts. Lastly, this would also result in truly gender-responsive budgeting *within* the UNFCCC Secretariat core budget approved for two years, as it would translate gender commitments under a continued LWPG and possible GAP into fiscal commitments for the work streams of all thematic areas.

Provision of public climate finance as the core means of implementation (MOI) for gender-responsive implementation of developing country Parties' need-based climate actions

The provision of scaled-up public finance that is predictable, adequate, sustainable and additional to developed countries' official development assistance as core means of implementation (MOI) for developing country Parties' climate actions pre- and post-2020 is indispensable for advancing gender mainstreaming in the UNFCCC. Many of the gender-responsive climate actions that need to be financed and implemented in developing countries (based on their own needs' assessment and country-owned fully participatory climate

²² For the current assessment scales of UNFCCC Parties to the UNFCCC Secretariat's Administrative Budget, see: http://unfccc.int/files/parties_and_observers/application/pdf/scale.pdf.

strategies and plans) might not guarantee a sizable “return-on-investment,” which most private sector investors (maybe with the exception of a growing number of social impact investors) prioritize. Thus, the role of gender-responsive public finance provision through the two operating entities of the UNFCCC financial mechanism, which will also serve as the financial mechanism of the Paris Agreement²³, cannot be overstated. The GCF and the GEF are both accountable to and function under the guidance of the COP. The COP, as part of an enhanced LPWG, should demand through its annual guidance to the GCF and the GEF that both bodies provide annual updates on progress made towards more effective climate change financing approaches that address the needs of women and men equally as part of their regular reporting duties to the COP.

Regarding gender mainstreaming, the UNFCCC as a whole is lagging behind the two operating entities of its own financial mechanism. Both the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and the Green Climate Fund (GCF) have an explicit gender (mainstreaming) policy as well as elaborated multi-year gender action plans on how to implement a gender mainstreaming focus. In both financial entities, gender considerations have also been integrated in core operational policies.²⁴ For example, the GEF and the GCF require that implementing agencies working with them have an organizational gender policy. In the GCF, this translates additionally into requiring private sector actors such as commercial banks, with which it partners, to build up an institutional gender framework as a prerequisite for receiving GCF funding. Both funds take gender into account in the consideration of project proposals as part of their wider set of investment criteria for mitigation as well as adaptation support. In both institutions, the management of results looks at gender-specific and gender-responsive indicators requiring sex-disaggregated data, both at the individual project and at the fund portfolio level.

Also under the UNFCCC, the Kyoto Protocol Adaptation Fund (AF) has recently adopted a principles- and human rights-based gender equality policy with a corresponding action plan applicable to all its funded projects.²⁵ The GCF and the AF both offer accredited national institutions direct access to their funding as national implementing entities (NIEs). National Designated Authorities (NDA) are supposed to coordinate national funding priorities by involving all relevant stakeholders, including women. The GCF and the AF already support the capacity of NDAs and NIEs, including their ability to design and implement gender-responsive projects and programs, via their readiness and preparatory support programs, although this could and must be undoubtedly strengthened and expanded. Both organizations also see readiness support, including on NIE gender capabilities and NDA inclusive country coordination involving women as key stakeholder group, as an iterative, ongoing process, not a one-time activity – a core principle also for an enhanced LPWG.

Ironically, while the existing multilateral climate funds under the UNFCCC over the past few years have made welcome strides in integrating gender-considerations in their operational policies and project/program funding, their respective decision-making bodies still lack significantly behind in achieving gender-balance (in line with the COP recommendations of decision 23/CP.18), despite for example the GCF’s mandate under its Governing Instrument to strive for gender-balance for its Board as well as Secretariat staff.²⁶ Gender-balance among fund decision-makers and administrative staff is of course no guarantee for gender-responsive actions by either. And while gender balance can serve as an important indicator of advances towards gender equality in international climate policy, it is in itself not sufficient. Gender balance alone does not address the social, political, legal and institutional disparities that are the root cause of gender inequality. Nevertheless, gender balance in the

²³ Paris Agreement, Article 9, para. 8.

²⁴ GCF Gender Policy and Action Plan available at:

https://www.greenclimate.fund/documents/20182/24946/GCF_B.08_19_-_Gender_Policy_and_Action_Plan.pdf/afd29fd9-3efa-41c3-8318-7d86587c7701?version=1.1.

²⁵ AF Gender Policy available at: https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/OPG-ANNEX-4_Gender-Policies_approved-in-March-2016.pdf.

²⁶ GCF Governing Instrument, paras. 11 and 21; available at:

http://www.greenclimate.fund/documents/20182/56440/Governing_Instrument.pdf/caa6ce45-cd54-4ab0-9e37-fb637a9c6235.

governance of climate finance bodies under the UNFCCC changes the quality of the discourse and the diversity of perspectives brought to bear, particularly when coupled with the implementation of inclusive and participatory processes that improve the involvement of women as important stakeholders from recipient countries in these climate funds.

Currently, all UNFCCC climate funds fail to achieve the goal of gender-balance in their governing bodies to varying degrees. Among the 24 members of the Board of the GCF, as of August 2016 only 3 are women (with another 6 among the 24 alternate GCF Board members).²⁷ The composition of both the Adaptation Fund Board and the GEF Council is not gender-balanced either. In the AF, 4 of its current 16 Board members are women, with 7 women among the 16 current alternate Board members.²⁸ In the GEF Council, of the current 32 Council members, only 8 are women (with 8 women among the 30 alternate Council members currently serving).²⁹ Likewise, the Standing Committee of Finance (SCF), which is tasked with assisting the COP in exercising its functions in relation to the UNFCCC financial mechanism, is failing its own mandate to consider the gender balance of its composition with only 6 of its current 19 members women (contrary to the requirement of decision 2/CP.17 Annex VI).³⁰

TABLE: Gender Composition of UNFCCC and Kyoto Protocol Climate Finance Bodies as of 8/28/2016

| Climate Finance Body | Members (M)/ Alternate (AM) | Women Members/ Women Alternates | Percentage | COP Gender Balance Mandate |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|--|----------------------------|
| SCF | 19 M | 6 M | Total: 31.6% | Decision 2/CP.17 Annex VI |
| GCF | 24 M 24 AM | 3M 6 AM | 12.5% 25.0% Total: 18.8 % | Decision 3/CP.17 Annex |
| GEF | 32 M 32 AM | 7 M 9 AM | 21.9 % 28.1 % Total: 25.0 % | No |
| AF | 16 M 16 AM | 4 M 7 AM | 25.0% 43.8 % Total: 34.3 % | No |

Especially the GCF Board is thus missing the critical mass of women in decision-making necessary to affect a difference in outcome by a wide margin. This is particularly worrisome since the Governing Instrument of the GCF in paragraph 3 stipulates a gender-sensitive approach to GCF funding as an objective and guiding principle for the GCF, making it the first international climate fund to incorporate a mandate for gender sensitivity from the outset in its operations.

UNFCCC Parties must therefore pay particular attention to improving the gender balance in these bodies by giving preference to nominating qualified women as representatives for the respective regional and country constituencies in these fora in cases where the “critical mass” of at least one-third of women representatives is not yet reached. Especially important is hereby the role of those Parties (for example the United States, the UK, Germany, France and Japan) which hold both a principal and alternate member position and can nominate two representatives to serve in the governing bodies of the GEF or the GCF. These countries should commit

²⁷ <http://www.greenclimate.fund/boardroom/the-board#members>; accessed on 8/28/2016.

²⁸ <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/about/governance/board/>; accessed on 8/28/2016.

²⁹ https://www.thegef.org/council_members_alternates; accessed on 8/28/2016.

³⁰ http://unfccc.int/cooperation_and_support/financial_mechanism/standing_committee/items/6879.php; accessed on 8/28/2016.

themselves to nominating at all times one man and one woman to serve jointly to fill those positions, paying particular attention to the need to nominate women as principal members.

The UNFCCC Secretariat in its recent technical paper on guidelines and tools for integrating gender considerations under the convention, had highlighted the opportunities provided by national planning processes and climate strategic plans, such as NAMAs or NAPs. Financing the development and implementation of NAMAs and NAPs falls within the funding mandate of both the GEF and the GCF. And with respect to post-2020 ambition and implementation, both funds will be tasked to provide public financing to developing countries in order for them to turn their conditional INDCs into ambitious NDCs ready for implementation.

For the UNFCCC financial mechanism and its operating bodies this will be a unique opportunity as well as a significant challenge. It requires the GEF and the GCF to not only ramp up their own provision of public financing for climate actions to developing countries over the next five years until the first global stocktake in 2023 – for with they both need successful replenishments with a noticeable increase in total resources mobilized – but also to provide funding in a gender-responsive way and to account for how gender-responsive this provision of public climate finance really is. Thus, ideally, the first global stocktake in 2023 must take into account the quantitative and qualitative MRV of developed countries' public climate finance provision and its gender-responsiveness. This requires the strengthening of the gender mainstreaming efforts in both UNFCCC operating entities via continuous learning efforts. Last but not least, institutional gender learning in the GCF and the GEF should be improved through the expanded participation of gender groups and women's organizations, particularly also grassroots and community groups, in the UNFCCC financial mechanism's policy-setting and decision-making processes.

Contact:

Liane Schalatek

Heinrich Böll Stiftung North America

Ph: +1-202-462-7512, Ext. 225

Liane.schalatek@us.boell.org

<http://us.boell.org/>