

GOVERNING CLIMATE FUNDS WHAT WILL WORK FOR WOMEN?

Elizabeth Arend and Sonia Lowman

Gender Action

September 2011

As the international community mobilizes in response to global climatic changes, climate funds must ensure the equitable and effective allocation of funds for the world's most vulnerable populations. Women and girls, disproportionately vulnerable to negative climate change impacts in developing countries, have largely been excluded from climate change finance policies and programmes. This report examines four funds – climate funds and non-climate funds, to draw out the lessons for gender integration in global finance mechanisms. Women and girls must not only be included in adaptive and mitigative activities, but also recognized as agents of change who are essential to the success of climate change interventions.



CONTENTS

Introduction	3
The case for gender inclusion in climate finance	3
Gender integration in global non-climate finance mechanisms	5
Gender integration in global climate finance mechanisms	10
Lessons learned	18
Recommendations	22
References	24
Annex 1: Major climate finance mechanisms	
Annex II: the Global Fund's strategy for ensuring gender equality in the response to HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria	28
Annex III: the GAVI Alliance gender policy towards gender equality in immunization and related health services	36
Annex IV: GEF policy on gender mainstreaming	40
Notes	43
Acknowledgements	43

INTRODUCTION

As the international community mobilizes in response to global climatic changes, climate funds must ensure the equitable and effective allocation of funds for the world's most vulnerable populations. Women and girls, who bear a disproportionate burden of negative climatic changes in developing countries, have largely been excluded from climate change finance policies and programs. An empirical gender perspective must be applied to climate change financing in order to ensure that women and girls are not only included in adaptive and mitigative activities, but are also recognized as agents of change who are essential to the success of climate change interventions.

Gender Action (GA) prepared this report at the request of the Women's Environment and Development Organization (WEDO) and Oxfam in order to ascertain practices that could 'work for women' in climate change financing. GA conducted interviews and desk research to examine the extent to which two non-climate funds and two climate funds integrate gender issues into their policies and investments.¹ Case studies of the two non-climate funds, the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB and Malaria (Global Fund) and the Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization (GAVI Alliance), offer valuable lessons for gender integration in global finance mechanisms. Case studies of the two climate funds, the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and the Adaptation Fund (AF), provide insight into specific challenges and opportunities related to gender integration in climate change finance. While the latter present promising examples of gender integration in GEF and AF funded projects, Annex I demonstrates that climate finance funds on the whole still have a long way to go in order to achieve meaningful gender integration in their policies and programs. The best practices and lessons learned provide a valuable blueprint for other climate funds.

THE CASE FOR GENDER INCLUSION IN CLIMATE FINANCE

The disproportionately negative impacts of climate change on women and women's critical role in mitigating and adapting to climate change have been well documented (WEDO, 2007; Somera, 2009; UN, 2009; Sasvari, 2010; UNDP, 2011). Climate change adaptation and mitigation are not gender neutral (WEDO, 2008a). Rather, gender inequalities 'impact how people experience climate change, their abilities to cope with its impacts and their potential to influence decision making' (Sasvari, 2010). These inequalities, combined with social, economic and political factors, make women more vulnerable to the negative effects of climate change. The consequences are severe: UNIFEM reports, for example, that 'the proportion of women affected by climate-related crop changes [in Africa] could range from 73 percent in the Congo to 48 percent in Burkina Faso' (UN Women, 2011).

Although several multilateral declarations have underscored the importance of gender integration in climate financing,² climate financing funds have systematically neglected gender issues and failed to incorporate a gender perspective into programs and projects (Schalatek, 2009a). Existing global climate funds assume that climate change interventions will (a) succeed without specific efforts to include women and (b) automatically benefit women. This approach undervalues gender mainstreaming, rather than recognizing it as something essential for adequately addressing climate change. It also neglects the importance of collecting baseline sex-disaggregated data that would permit project design to incorporate the differential climate change activity needs and priorities of women and men. The climate sector tends to view women as passive victims of climate change, rather than effective agents of change (UN, 2009), ignoring women's extensive knowledge and expertise with regard to climate change mitigation and

adaptation strategies (UN, 2009; UNDP, 2011). If climate funds acknowledge gender at all, they tend to link gender to 'vulnerability' and community-based adaptation activities, instead of addressing gender as critical dimensions of both mitigation and adaptation.

Women's marginalization in climate finance reflects a 'systemic problem' within governments and societies that routinely ignore issues of gender justice (WEDO, 2007). As a result, women have insufficient access to funds to cover weather-related losses and support technologies for climate adaptation and mitigation (UN, 2009). For example, WEDO's examination of climate change impacts on Bangladeshi women found that their vulnerability arose from multiple factors, including limited access to early warning information, critical services, and facilities (i.e. shelters with adequate spaces for women and proper sanitation). Women also lacked access to financial security, decision-making platforms, and relief goods. Social expectations of women's 'appropriateness' and physical constraints on women's mobility further exacerbated their vulnerability to the negative impacts of climate change (WEDO, 2008b).

GA's 2009 report, 'Doubling the Damage' further demonstrates the consequences of ignoring gender justice in climate finance. The report reveals how the World Bank's Climate Investment Funds (CIFs) framework fails to address critical gender issues and actually reinforces gender insensitive policies and practices (GA, 2009). This undermines the World Bank's own commitment to promoting environmentally sound investments and upholding gender equality in climate finance. In its 2010 Strategic Environmental, Social and Gender Assessment, CIF finally acknowledged the potential to address 'gender co-benefits' in the planning of its investments (CIF, 2011), yet it has not taken concrete steps to realize this potential. For example, the CIF claims that households' shift from biomass fuel use to cleaner energy 'has a direct impact on women and children's health, as well as women's time [and] productivity' (CIF, 2010). However, a WEDO case-study in Senegal demonstrates how women lack access to cleaner technologies, *despite* government programs that introduced butane as an alternative to traditional biomass fuels such as wood and charcoal. WEDO found that rural women are still dependent on traditional fuels, and due to increasing deforestation, they are also forced to rely on non-conventional fuels (cow dung, plastics, crop residue) that present significant health hazards. Had women been involved in the design and implementation of the government's plan to introduce butane, the issue of women's access to fuel could have been addressed (WEDO, 2008b).

As women and men have 'different adaptive and mitigative capabilities,' climate finance 'needs to take these gender differentiated impacts into account' (Schalatek, 2009b). Climate change finance can only be 'fair, equitable and comprehensive when it incorporates gender awareness and strives toward gender equitable climate financing solutions' (Schalatek 2009a). If climate funds are to respond equitably and effectively to the differential needs of men, women, boys and girls, they must incorporate gender throughout project planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation (WEDO, 2010). Climate finance funds must also recognize that women are 'well positioned to be agents of change through mitigation, management and adaptive activities in their households, workplaces, communities and countries' and 'can be effective leaders within their community when it comes to addressing the harmful effects of climate change' (IUCN, 2007).

GENDER INTEGRATION IN GLOBAL NON-CLIMATE FINANCE MECHANISMS

The following case studies highlight two non-climate finance mechanisms that have developed innovative responses to gender integration challenges. Although these case studies highlight gender integration in public health financing, they offer valuable lessons and strategies that can be applied to gender integration in climate finance.

Case study I: The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB and Malaria ('GFATM'/'the Global Fund')

Established in 2002, the Global Fund collaborates with bilateral and multilateral institutions, governments, civil society and the private sector to address AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria. The Global Fund has approved over US\$21.7 billion in funding to support 600 programs in 150 countries to date.

Global Fund policy and practice for gender integration

The Gender Equality Strategy and Sexual Orientation and Gender Identities Strategy

In November 2008, the Global Fund Board—which includes people living with HIV/AIDS, members of civil society, and representatives of donor and recipient governments—approved a Gender Equality (GE) Strategy to 'ensure positive bias' in its proposals and programming (See Annex II; Seale, 2009). This strategy, arising from a two year consultative process, not only focuses on women and girls, but also addresses sexual minorities and other marginalized populations (Seale, 2010). To underscore this comprehensive approach to gender, the Board approved the Global Fund's Sexual Orientation and Gender Identities (SOGI) strategy in May 2009. The SOGI Strategy complements the GE strategy in order to link SOGI-related health and rights to women's and girls' empowerment (GFATM, 2009a).

In 2009, the Global Fund Secretariat approved a four-year 'Plan of Action' (2009-2012) that outlines the GE Strategy's implementation. The Plan of Action seeks to ensure that Global Fund policies, procedures and structures—as well as its partnerships—support programs that address gender inequalities, reduce women's and girls' vulnerabilities and enhance the involvement of men and boys. It also calls for 'a robust communications and advocacy strategy' and strong leadership to promote the GE strategy (GFATM, 2009b). The Global Fund's commitment to gender equality is further reflected in its Framework Document, which promises to support proposals that 'address social and gender inequalities, as well as behavior practices that fuel the spread of the three diseases' (GFATM, 2009b). The framework states that the funding process should prioritize 'the most affected countries and communities' and 'include efforts to eliminate stigmatization of and discrimination against those infected and affected by HIV/AIDS, especially for women, children and vulnerable groups' (Seale, 2010).

Gender organizational capacity

Out of a total of 600 employees, the Global Fund currently has 2 full-time senior gender advisors, 2 staff on the monitoring and evaluation team with a dedicated gender focus, and several staff who have gender expertise in the Global Fund's legal and civil society units. In order to strengthen its technical capacity to address gender inequalities, the Global Fund Secretariat also has an Internal Gender Task Team (IGTT), which is comprised of three full time staff and is responsible for identifying Global Fund staff

members to drive the implementation of the GE and SOGI Strategies (Seale, Personal Communication, 2011; GFATM, 2010a). The Global Fund Board has 20 voting members, including 9 women and 11 men. The GE strategy indicates that the Secretariat's gender balance is 60 percent women, 40 percent men, but in management, the ratio changes to 29 percent women, 71 percent men (see Annex II).

Gender integration challenges

Andy Seale, Senior Adviser for Sexual and Gender Diversity, reports that gender integration at the Global Fund faces a common challenge: most staff members perceive 'gender mainstreaming' as a 'soft issue' (Seale, 2011). With many priorities on which to focus, Global Fund employees can find gender 'easy to sidestep' (Seale, 2011). While Seale notes the importance of gender strategies and full time staff dedicated to gender mainstreaming, he also stresses that the Global Fund requires 'continued leadership' on this issue to ensure that gender is fully incorporated into its programming (Seale, Personal Communication, 2011).

Since Global Fund activities are based on the principle of 'country ownership,' grant recipients implement their own programs and choose their own performance measurement indicators (JSI, 2005; GFATM, 2009a). Seale acknowledges that this model creates 'the classic international development tensions of pursuing a rights-based agenda, while also supporting strong country ownership' for the sake of sustainability (Seale, 2010). This tension is especially problematic with regard to marginalized—and even criminalized—populations, such as men who have sex with men and injection drug users. As Seale points out, 'even when funding has been allocated to address HIV vulnerability in these communities, its broader impact is often limited by ongoing human rights abuses, poorly designed interventions, and the absence of a broader supportive environment' (Seale, 2010).

Dr. Francoise Ndayishimiye, Senior Gender Advisor in the Global Fund's Health Advisory Unit, highlights another challenge related to country ownership that affects the Global Fund's ability to integrate gender in monitoring and evaluation. Without the mandate to require specific gender indicators or collection of sex-disaggregated data, and due to sensitivities related to 'country ownership,' it is difficult to measure grant recipients' performance in relation to gender equality and sexual minority rights (Seale & Ndayishimiye, Personal Communication, 2011). Seale underscores this challenge by noting that only 37 of 128 countries reporting on the UN Declaration of Commitment to HIV/AIDS offered information on 5 indicators related to sexual minorities and HIV (Seale, 2010). As most countries lack government-level data that record HIV prevalence and socio-behavioral trends, which are essential to inform national policy, their absence is 'a major implementation barrier for the Global Fund' (Seale, 2010).

Best practices and lessons learned

Recommendations for Country Coordinating Mechanisms (CCMs)

The Global Fund encourages its CCMs to incorporate rights-based approaches into their programs, such as addressing sexual minorities and neglected sexual health issues, legal protection for people living with HIV, and programs to reduce stigma and discrimination. The Global Fund's 2010 report on SOGI implementation noted that a new CCM funding policy 'introduced flexibilities to ensure that [CCMs] can receive funding for additional efforts to secure greater representation, participation and strengthened capacity in relation to marginalized groups' (GFATM, 2010a). In addition, 'HIV-related proposal forms and guidance for applications to the Global Fund have been strengthened in order to ensure that the needs of sex workers, men who have sex with men, transgender people and/or other sexual minorities are adequately taken into account' (GFATM, 2010a). The Global Fund recommends that CCMs collect sex-disaggregated data and research access to HIV services for specific high-risk populations (GFATM, 2010b).

Cultivating 'informed demand'

In order to promote country ownership in tandem with its gender rights-based approach to funding, the Global Fund also tries to cultivate 'informed demand' in its country partnerships by providing countries with incentives to integrate gender into their programs and funding proposals. Seale describes this as a 'carrot and stick' approach, which allows the Global Fund to promote gender integration while still upholding the principle of country ownership (Seale & Ndayishimiye, Personal Communication, 2011). For example, the Global Fund Board established a dedicated funding reserve in 2010, which included US\$200 million over 5 years to fund proposals that focus solely on the needs of the most at-risk populations (MARPs). The Global Fund's first comparative analysis showed that 'approved MARPs reserve proposals contained 11 percent more activities related to prevention, care and support and to addressing stigma' compared to general HIV proposals (GFATM, 2011). The Global Fund has also established safeguards so that 'normative attitudes, assumptions and power dynamics that marginalize issues and groups,' including sexual minorities, are kept in check throughout the funding process. For example, the SOGI strategy allows some proposals to be submitted directly to the Global Fund, without the involvement of CCMs. This allows at-risk populations who are severely marginalized or criminalized to gain direct access to Global Fund support (Seale, 2010).

Promoting 'country ownership' through multi-stakeholder engagement

In order to facilitate greater gender integration in its proposals, the Global Fund acknowledges the critical need to understand each country's unique political, social and cultural contexts. It promotes 'a shared understanding across all partners...of 'country ownership' as a concept requiring multi-stakeholder engagement—not just high level or governmental support,' while ensuring that 'multiple stakeholders...ha[ve] the opportunity to work together to create better programs' (Seale, 2010). In particular, the Global Fund recognizes the importance of civil society responses to HIV, and is 'exploring new mechanisms to facilitate funding to civil society organizations in ways that are not necessarily mediated through national governments' (International AIDS Alliance, 2011).

Case study II: The Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization ('GAVI')

GAVI was launched in January 2000 as an innovative financing mechanism to 'accelerate access to existing underused vaccines, strengthen health and immunization systems in countries, [and] introduce innovative new immunization technology, including vaccines' (GAVI, 2011a). In order to achieve these objectives, GAVI works with partners in the private and public sectors, developing countries and donor governments, vaccine manufacturers, research and technical institutes, civil society organizations and multilateral organizations (GAVI, 2011a).

GAVI policy and practice for gender integration

Gender policy development

GAVI's Secretariat commissioned the Overseas Development Institute (ODI) to provide technical support to inform the gender policy development process (ODI, 2008). The policy, approved in July 2008 (see Annex III), 'promote[s] increased coverage, effectiveness and efficiency of immunization...by ensuring that all girls and boys, women and men, receive equal access to these services' (GAVI, 2008). It requires GAVI to 'apply a gender perspective to all its work,' 'complement partners' efforts to promote gender equity in health,' 'promote country ownership and alignment with regard to gender issues,' and 'exercise strong leadership and demonstrate political will' (GAVI, 2008). Since GAVI adopted the policy, it has revised its guidelines and application forms to include a 'gender component,' and encourages partner countries to 'use health system strengthening

support to address gender-related barriers' to immunization (GAVI, 2010). The gender policy is due for external review in 2012.

Gender leadership

ODI's initial assessment of GAVI's work revealed that there was 'minimal attention to gender within country support, funding and country progress reporting indicators, human resources capacity building and external communications' (ODI, 2008). The assessment found 'a pervasive lack of explicit acknowledgement of gender issues relating to the GAVI Alliance's external work, internal policies and strategic goals' (ODI, 2008). A 2007 study conducted by Social Development Direct showed that there was 'nothing to demonstrate that GAVI [was] committed to gender equality objectives,' reflected by insufficient collection of sex-disaggregated data and a lack of women and Southerners represented in the Secretariat (Watkins, 2007).

Since the development and approval of GAVI's gender policy, however, Meegan Murray-Lopez, an executive officer with GAVI's Secretariat, states that gender has become a much greater priority. Murray-Lopez, who acts as GAVI's 'focal point for gender mainstreaming' within the Secretariat, notes that GAVI had strong leadership on gender from its former CEO, Julian Lob-Levyt, 'who was appointed to become an MDG3 torchbearer' (GAVI Alliance, 2011b). With his appointment, he 'committed [his] work with GAVI's partners to accelerate the availability of vaccines to prevent diseases that cause suffering and death for girls and women' (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Denmark, 2009). Murray-Lopez also notes that support for gender mainstreaming has been strong within GAVI's Board and Secretariat. Although GAVI's Board is predominantly male (with 5 women and 19 men), Murray-Lopez notes that former Board Chair Mary Robinson drove the gender policy development process and GAVI's current Board Chair, Dagfinn Høybråten, has made gender a high priority. Murray-Lopez speculates that while there may be some resistance to promoting gender among GAVI's technical staff and partners, GAVI's Board and management have maintained their commitment in this area; the Board reviews regular reports on the gender policy's implementation (Murray-Lopez, Personal Communication, 2011).

Gender organizational capacity

GAVI's combined staff of 142 people (Geneva and Washington DC) is 60 percent female and 40 percent male. Rather than hiring 'gender champions' to support gender integration, GAVI decided to integrate gender competencies and build the capacity of its Secretariat as a whole. This has included providing gender training for existing staff and establishing a 13-member 'Gender Working Group,' including one representative from each Secretariat team (in some cases, multiple staff represent different functional areas within a team – i.e. donor funding, advocacy, media and communications). The Gender Working Group meets face-to-face on a monthly basis, and ensures that 'activities across the GAVI Secretariat related to the GAVI Gender Policy and GAVI Gender Help Desk are well coordinated, followed-up, and monitored' (Murray Lopez, Personal Communication, 2011). The representatives are self-nominated, and hold different levels of seniority within the organization; the group's gender breakdown is currently 30 percent male, 70 percent female (Murray Lopez, Personal Communication, 2011). In addition, GAVI is holding gender trainings throughout 2011 to ensure that GAVI staff members are equipped to discuss gender with developing country partners, multilateral partners and donors, and to integrate gender into all of GAVI's work. Targeted gender training sessions have also been planned for the Independent Review Committee, which reviews new proposals and monitors existing funding (Murray Lopez, Personal Communication, 2011).

Gender integration challenges

Sex-disaggregated data

As part of its gender policy implementation, GAVI commissioned a World Health Organization (WHO) report in 2009 to review sex differentials in immunization coverage. While the report found that coverage between boys and girls was similar in most countries, children from female-headed households did not have equal access to preventive health care (Hilber, et al., 2010; Murray-Lopez, Personal Communication, 2011). The collection of sex-disaggregated immunization data is essential, 'as the evidence on the gender implications of immunization coverage is still limited' (ODI, 2008). ODI's report emphasizes that 'health policy cannot be gender-sensitive unless informed by age- and sex-disaggregated data and gender-sensitive analysis' (ODI, 2008).

GAVI's two primary implementing partners, WHO and the United Nations Children's Fund, both have gender policies that mandate sex-disaggregated data collection. GAVI's implementation of its own gender policy, however, falls short in this regard. For example, one of GAVI's six operating principles under its new five year Strategy (2011-2015) is to ensure gender equity in all areas of engagement, but gender does not appear in its list of 'goal-level indicators' (GAVI, 2011b). Ensuring 'equity in immunization coverage,' as defined in the Strategy, refers only to equity in regard to economic status; the Strategy does not include an indicator to measure gender equity in immunization.

Although GAVI tries to have a 'light touch' and not impose too many funding requirements on its implementing partners (Murray-Lopez, Personal Communication, 2011), for the first time in 2010, GAVI requested that countries provide information in their Annual Progress Reports about whether they collect sex-disaggregated data. The Independent Review Committee, which 'provides objective, expert advice to the GAVI Alliance Board on country proposals and progress,' will review the reports in July 2011 (Murray-Lopez, Personal Communication, 2011). At this point in time, however, GAVI does not provide a separate funding stream for capacity building for countries to enhance their ability to collect and use sex-disaggregated data (although Murray-Lopez notes that countries are encouraged to request funds through the Health Systems Funding Platform for this purpose). GAVI also does not mandate that countries report on any specific gender indicators (Murray-Lopez, Personal Communication, 2011).

Box 1: Understanding multiple inequalities

In 2008, ODI noted that GAVI had to understand 'the interlocking effects of...various social inequalities and how addressing the gender-based inequalities within these marginalized populations could be a powerful influence in scaling up immunization coverage rates' (ODI, 2008). ODI argued that these issues had to be addressed if immunization coverage was to improve among vulnerable populations and across the life cycle (ODI, 2008). In response, GAVI requested that the WHO's Initiative for Vaccine Research examine evidence of gender-related disparities in children's immunization status (Hilber, et al., 2010) as part of GAVI's gender policy implementation. The report, which analyzed gender-related variables as predictors of vaccination status, included a series of case studies that examined national and sub-national data for evidence of gender-related barriers to immunization (Hilber, et al., 2010).

The report showed that in most countries, girls and boys are just as likely to be immunized, with core variables (i.e. household wealth) having the strongest association with vaccination status (Hilber, et al., 2010). It demonstrated that female gender-related variables were associated with immunization status, particularly those related to 'decision capacity' and 'concern about health care.' Although the report explained that women's relationships may therefore be a focal point for interventions to improve immunization access, it noted that more research was needed to determine whether household relationships or broader socio-economic factors had the greatest impact on immunization (Hilber, et al., 2010).

Best practices and lessons learned

The importance of gender leadership

GAVI has made significant strides in gender integration since ODI's 2008 report found that GAVI paid 'minimal attention' to gender in its policies and programs. As Murray-Lopez stated, GAVI's leadership, particularly among its Board and senior management, is primarily responsible for prioritizing gender and mandating organization-wide gender training. In contrast with the Global Fund, securing institutional 'buy-in' seems to have been much less challenging for GAVI, since there was such a strong commitment to gender integration from high level leadership.

Understanding multiple inequalities

As ODI argued, GAVI cannot achieve the goal of universal immunization coverage without an in-depth understanding of social inequalities in its partner countries, particularly in regard to gender. While the WHO report found that girls are as likely to be immunized as boys in most countries, more research is needed to understand gender relations at the household and societal levels and their association with immunization coverage.

GENDER INTEGRATION IN GLOBAL CLIMATE FINANCE MECHANISMS

The following case studies highlight two climate finance funds that demonstrate the challenges of gender integration in climate change initiatives and provide lessons for other climate finance funds.

Case study III: The Global Environmental Facility (GEF)

Established in 1991 as a US\$1 billion pilot program of the World Bank, GEF is now an independent³ financial organization representing 182 member governments in partnership with international institutions, nongovernmental organizations and the private sector. Currently the world's largest financier of environmental projects, GEF has allocated more than US\$9.5 billion, supplemented by over US\$42 billion in co-financing, for 2,700 plus projects in 165 countries. GEF grants support projects related to biodiversity, climate change, international waters, land degradation, sustainable forest management, the ozone layer and persistent organic pollutants. It serves as the financial mechanism for the Convention on Biological Diversity, United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, and UN Convention to Combat Desertification, and manages the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF), Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF), and GEF's Small Grants Program.

GEF policy and practice for gender integration

Gender policy

GEF approved a 'Public Involvement Policy' regarding stakeholder participation in 1996. The policy mentions the involvement of women in the design and implementation of GEF projects, particularly with regard to projects that impact the incomes and livelihoods of local populations. However, until quite recently, GEF did not have an explicit gender policy—it had a gender 'practice' (Watanabe, Personal Communication, 2011). This practice did not entail systematic application of gender integration or prompt project evaluators to examine gender issues, in large part due to GEF's operational structure. As GEF's Gender Expert, Yoko Watanabe, explains it, GEF's goal is 'climate change, not gender equality' (Watanabe, Personal Communication, 2011). With a current portfolio of over 600 individual projects, GEF does not have the capacity to 'get into the details' of

project implementation, according to Senior Monitoring Analyst Dima Reda (Reda, Personal Communication, 2011). GEF therefore strives to 'finance the incremental costs of projects related to the provision of global environmental benefits,' while relying on national actors to attend to environmental benefits at the local level (GEF, 2011).

GEF finances its projects through implementing agencies, which it selects based on fiduciary requirements and baseline social standards that do not mention gender. GEF expects these agencies to apply their own social, including gender, policies to GEF funded projects. Rather than superseding the policies of implementing agencies, GEF's own policies act as a 'second check.' As Reda states, GEF 'do[es] not police the implementing agencies' (Reda, Personal Communication, 2011). Consequently, to date, GEF has not had 'a set of clear policies to prevent or mitigate any unintended negative impacts to people and the environment that might arise through GEF operations' (GEF, 2011).

To address this gap, the GEF Council finally approved a gender mainstreaming policy on May 26, 2011 (see Annex IV), which 'aims to further the goal of gender equity in the context of GEF operations' (GEF, 2011). It seeks to go further than safeguards—which are designed to 'do no harm'—by taking a more proactive approach that uses analysis, indicators, and other tools to 'do good' (Watanabe, Personal Communication, 2011). The policy stipulates that the GEF Secretariat and GEF Partner Agencies must establish (a) policies, (b) strategies, or (c) action plans that promote gender equality in order to access funding. These tools must satisfy the minimum gender mainstreaming criteria included in GEF's gender policy (GEF, 2011).

The policy states that GEF will 'coordinate the development of corporate-wide guidance for use by GEF Agencies and GEF Secretariat program managers on the inclusion of gender aspects in the design of projects and on the monitoring and evaluation of gender dimensions in the context of its projects,' while taking into account that 'not all GEF projects involve gender aspects in equal measure, depending on the focal area and scope of the project' (GEF, 2011). GEF is also currently developing 'Socioeconomic and Gender Guidelines,' aimed for release in September 2011, to accompany its gender policy. These guidelines should provide project managers with gender questions and considerations needed for project evaluation (Reda, Personal Communication, 2011).

Gender evaluation

At the corporate level, GEF assesses each project three times: at baseline, midline, and completion. It also receives annual implementation reports on each project, which do not include data collection. In general, most of GEF's monitoring and evaluation reports 'do not include a specific section to report on progress and results related to gender elements of the project, unless these were specifically included in the project results framework as a project outcome, output, or indicator' (Watanabe, 2008). According to Watanabe, sex disaggregating of data 'does not always make sense,' so GEF asks for this 'as appropriate' (Watanabe, Personal Communication, 2011).

However, in May 2011, GEF introduced a new monitoring and evaluation tool for adaptation projects that looks at some gender differentiated impacts. This assessment tool, to be used with projects financed by GEF's Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) and Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF), requires sex-disaggregated data for 8 of its 47 outcome indicators. 'Gender' is also an explicit reporting requirement in the grant-making of GEF's Small Grants Program (SGP), which focuses on community-based grants and accounts for approximately US\$401 million of GEF financing (out of US\$9.2 billion).

Gender capacity

GEF has achieved a relatively gender balanced staff even in the absence of a gender equality policy. The number of professional female staff increased by 5 percent in the past year; women now constitute 49 percent of staff (47 females, and 49 males). GEF's Chief Executive Officer is female, but only 11 of 31 current Council members are female.

Out of 96 staff members, two have gender expertise (Yoko Watanabe and Boni Biagini) and GEF consults with an external gender expert. GEF reports that it plans internal gender training for summer/ fall 2011 to accompany GEF's new gender mainstreaming policy (Reda, Personal Communication, 2011). GEF does not provide capacity building for its institutional implementing agencies on the assumption that they will 'have their own gender capacity' (Watanabe, Personal Communication, 2011). National agencies seeking direct financing, however, can request funding for a gender expert as part of their project.

Gender integration challenges

As demonstrated by its move to adopt a separate gender policy, GEF's reliance on implementing agencies' policies proved inadequate with regard to gender integration. Although most agencies had 'social assessment' requirements in their work, GEF found that the agencies perceived GEF projects as 'environmental projects' to which their individual social or gender policies did not routinely apply (Watanabe, Personal Communication, 2011). The two agencies that implement the most GEF funds, the World Bank and United Nations Development Program (UNDP), both have institutional gender policies, but 'despite many years of practice, neither of these organizations is at the point of proficiency in gender mainstreaming that GEF can totally rely upon' (Awori, 2009). World Bank and UNDP staff 'do not get pressure from the GEF units to do a gender analysis of their projects'; this creates 'an undifferentiated approach to project design and implementation,' which results in 'weak project effectiveness [and] missed opportunities for sustainability of outcomes' (Awori, 2009).

GEF faces challenges related to 'double-mainstreaming,' in that GEF is primarily trying to 'mainstream the environment,' rendering gender an 'added layer of complexity' that is often subordinated to other concerns (Watanabe, Personal Communication, 2011). By 2006, only 12 percent of GEF projects had included social analysis at the design stage and 'in some instances, the lack of adequate gender analysis and awareness led to negative impacts on women' (Awori, 2009). Between 2003 and 2006, only 4 out of 36 climate change projects integrated gender in some way (Watanabe, 2008). Gender budgeting proved particularly weak because it is 'impossible to determine exact gender budgets [...] given that gender-related activities are often embedded in a larger project component' (Watanabe, 2008). However, this justification relies on the faulty assumption that such project components equally benefit women and men without proactive intervention.

Watanabe points out that the challenges in collecting sex-disaggregated data arise from a lack of baseline information. For example, in order to measure access to energy or firewood, one needs sex-disaggregated data *prior* to project implementation in order to monitor project outcomes and impacts, but the data are often unavailable. Although GEF claims that it recognizes the importance of accessing baseline data, and is reportedly 'working on it' (Watanabe, Personal Communication, 2011), lack of data can sometimes be 'used as an excuse not to implement gender-responsive climate policies' (Schalatek, 2009a). As Schalatek points out, 'it is the gender responsive policies that are likely to provide the necessary data' (Schalatek, 2009a).

GEF also struggles to reconcile national and local interests with global concerns. For example, according to Ms. Reda, it is 'much easier' to integrate gender into adaptation because the field deals with strengthening countries' and peoples' capacity to respond to adverse impacts of climate change. The bigger challenge, says Reda, lies in climate change mitigation: 'With CO₂ sequestration, for example, it is very difficult to take into account anybody—women or men. So that piece of it has to be part of a larger [national] project, such as building a factory to capture emissions, but GEF does not have control over [such funding]' (Reda, Personal Communication, 2011). This highlights an assumption that mitigation interventions addressing global environmental issues should theoretically benefit everyone on the planet, regardless of their sex, reinforcing the faulty notion that certain types of projects do not have differential impacts on men and women.

Instead, women need to be recognized as stakeholders in *all* climate change interventions.

Best practices and lessons learned

GEF projects show relative gender-sensitivity when women are clearly defined as stakeholders throughout project cycles. For example, women played a major role in GEF's climate change projects in Burkina Faso's agriculture sector and Mali's fuel wood production (see Box 1). When these projects targeted women as key participants and beneficiaries, they prioritized gender analysis, incorporated outcomes and objectives related specifically to women, and included gender-sensitive training. Burkina Faso's project in particular demonstrates how including women in its National Adaptation Program of Action Steering Committee allowed the project to respond 'directly and comprehensively' to the needs of female stakeholders, in this case farmers.

Ultimately, 'GEF has a mandate to address gender equality in its work through gender mainstreaming' (Awori, 2009). However, as Watanabe points out, gender and other socio-economic standards need to be applied in a more standard format (Watanabe, Personal Communication, 2011). She believes it is crucial to conduct a gender analysis at the onset of projects, as this 'provides an entry point for gender mainstreaming' and 'reveals connections between gender relations and the environmental problem to be solved under the project' (Watanabe, 2008). Watanabe emphasizes that gender mainstreaming must then be maintained throughout the project cycle by: linking performance indicators to project objectives, outcomes and activities; providing sex-disaggregated data; using different incentives for the participation of men and women; conducting awareness raising and training activities; and involving women's organizations in project design and implementation (Watanabe, 2008).

Box 2: Sample GEF projects with gender integration

'Strengthening Adaptation Capacities and Reducing the Vulnerability to Climate Change in Burkina Faso'

Total Cost: US\$3.3 million

'In Burkina Faso, from [National Adaptation Program of Action] NAPA preparation to project design and implementation gender concerns have been taken into consideration. The project was designed to address the climate change risks in agriculture sector, identified as most vulnerable in the country NAPA. This identification and prioritization was done through full participation of women who were represented in the NAPA Steering Committee. As women, especially female farmers were identified as one of the most vulnerable groups, the project responds directly and comprehensively to their needs. Overall the project aims to enhance Burkina Faso's resilience to climate change risks in the agricultural sector. In six representative villages best practices in climate resilient agro-pastoral production will be demonstrated in conjunction with dissemination of lessons learned. Participation of women has been clearly noted in both the project activities. Giving heed to LDCF/SCCF results framework and being mindful of the identified vulnerable groups, the project outputs specifies that credit for stock and inputs will be provided to at least 10 women livestock farmers per year. The project also ensures that women are included in trainings for climate resilient technologies; so that their knowledge related to climate change and adaptive methods could advance. In Burkina Faso, from prioritizing actions to in-field intervention women have been involved and their needs taken into account.'

–Language from the Climate Change and Chemicals Division of the GEF

'Mali Household Energy and Universal Rural Access'

Total Cost: US\$5.2 million

Project 'aims to increase access of isolated low income populations to basic energy services, in order to help achieve economic growth and poverty reduction targets and remove the barriers to adoption of renewable energy technologies that will reduce greenhouse gas (ghg) emissions, primarily carbon dioxide.'

'Women are the major actors in fuel wood production in Mali. In charge of daily budgets, cooking, and commerce, women are also the main beneficiaries of rural electrification and measures to improve fuel supplies and reduce their costs.'

'The project included gender-sensitive activities through social assessment (including gender analysis) and consultation with both women and men during project preparation. Strategies adopted throughout the project implementation specify women as a major target and a direct beneficiary of the project, as women are identified as the sole family caretakers through cooking and collecting wood, among other daily tasks. For instance, an increase in the number of improved wood stoves, and kerosene and LPg stoves used is directly correlated to a positive impact on women and children's education, health, and energy expenditures. Also, the biomass platforms permit mechanical processing of agricultural produce, which, when done manually, becomes a time consuming and arduous task expected of women. Mechanical processing of produce allows oil production, not only for use as fuel but for production of soaps that women can sell in order to generate income. Through these efforts, the project demonstrates social and economic development in communities. In addition, women's initiatives linked to electrification are supported in collaboration with micro-credit institutions. The quality of life of rural and peri-urban populations, particularly women, is expected to noticeably improve with the success of the project.'

—Excerpts from, 'Mainstreaming Gender at the GEF,' Watanabe, 2008

Case study IV: The Adaptation Fund (AF)

In 2001, the parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) established AF to finance concrete adaptation projects and programs in developing countries that are parties to the Kyoto Protocol. AF became operational in 2009, with the World Bank serving as trustee and GEF providing secretariat services. Its purposes are to reduce vulnerability to and increase adaptive capacity to cope with and address adverse climate change impacts. AF is financed primarily through carbon markets; resources available through 2012 are estimated to be US\$288-402 million. To date, the AF Board has approved one project in each of the following countries: Senegal, Eritrea, Honduras, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Solomon Islands, and Ecuador. Senegal's project is the only one to have started implementation.

AF aims to compensate developing countries for environmental damage done by developed countries, and has been structured to be a light and accessible 'direct financing' fund. After completing an accreditation process that addresses strict fiduciary standards but no social standards, national implementing entities (NIEs) are able to access the AF directly for approved projects and programs; they are given full responsibility for overall management, financial integrity, monitoring and reporting. Further, to expedite the process of approving projects and 'reduce unnecessary bureaucracy,' small-size projects undergo a one-step approval process by AF's Board, and regular projects—those exceeding US\$1 million—undergo either a one or two-step approval process. The Board evaluates potential projects through five major criteria: relevance to national sustainable development and poverty alleviation plans; effectiveness; efficiency; impact; and sustainability.

AF policy and practice for gender integration

Gender presence

AF does not have a gender policy. The original operational guidelines, accreditation procedure, and project review criteria included no specific references to gender. AF expects NIEs to 'consult with all necessary stakeholders' in order to obtain funding, but does not specify what that entails. Further, monitoring and evaluation are country-driven, meaning NIEs design their own indicators for tracking progress. The existing AF evaluation framework fails to mention gender, except through a definition of 'vulnerable groups' that includes women. Countries are 'invited to disaggregate data by sex where possible,' but not mandated to do so (Ndiaye, Ollikainen & Raghav, Personal Communication, 2011).

With little project implementation and no project evaluations to date, it is difficult to evaluate gender-sensitivity from an operational standpoint. Yet, despite lacking formal requirements for it, gender is showing up to varying degrees in AF project proposals.⁴ Senegal's project proposal, 'Adaptation to Coastal Erosion in Vulnerable Areas,' discusses women's particular vulnerabilities in both its situational analysis report and environmental impact assessment. One of the project's objectives addresses female fish processors directly, and specific consultations, training, and interventions for women are listed throughout the document (Senegal, 2010), which will be reflected in Senegal's assessment report, expected in June 2011. Most notably, the project includes a women and youth organization among its implementing agents (Dynamiques-Femmes). Pakistan's project, 'Reducing Risks and Vulnerabilities from Glacier Lake Outburst Floods in Northern Pakistan,' provides another example. The project proposal mentions consultations with a female only group of community members, as well as a 'Local Support Organization' with 40 percent female representation (Pakistan, 2011).

AF's Ethics and Finance Committee's (EFC) recently stated, 'the EFC may want to consider recommending to the Board an amendment to the project review template to include gender considerations as new review criteria' (AF, 2011a). Such review criteria amendments were proposed, and at its June 20, 2011 Board meetings, AF's Board approved the following changes to the project approval and operations procedures:

- *Describe how the project / programme provides economic, social and environmental benefits, with particular reference to the most vulnerable communities, and groups within communities, including gender considerations.*
- *Describe the consultative process, including the list of stakeholders consulted, undertaken during project preparation, with particular reference to vulnerable groups, including gender considerations. (AF, 2011b).*

Gender capacity

A woman heads the AF Board, although the Board itself is predominantly male (12 men and 4 women). While female presence does not guarantee that the Board will take gender considerations into account, 'giving women equal representation at the board level of such a premier global climate change financing instrument would send positive reform signals to other financing instruments [...] and revitalize gender mainstreaming and gender-equity efforts in the larger climate change community' (Vogt, 2010). AF's Secretariat consists of five staff members, three women and two males. All have field experience that has 'shown [them] first-hand the social impacts of climate change' (Ndiaye, Ollikainen & Raghav, Personal Communication, 2011), but none have formal gender expertise. The AF does not fund capacity building for implementing agencies to better enable them to carry out implementation.

Gender integration challenges

According to AF Secretariat staff, their Southern implementing partners ‘do not oppose gender,’ but social issues in general represent a ‘fundamental question over adding bureaucratic layers’ to the direct finance design. On the one hand, the AF strives to ‘do things right,’ but it also tries to have a quick and accessible funding process. Staff members note that their mandate is not to look at baseline development goals and gender equality—‘that is additional’ (Ndiaye, Ollikainen & Raghav, Personal Communication, 2011).

Direct financing and working through NIEs may ‘provide significant opportunities for making the fund more gender-sensitive in its programmes and projects’ in that ‘climate-change impacts are often socially and culturally specific’ (Vogt, 2010). However, meaningful civil society consultation remains an on-going challenge to the AF’s gender integration. Although NIEs are required to conduct community consultations, the Secretariat notes that consultations are not always reflected in actual project design (Ndiaye, Ollikainen & Raghav, Personal Communication, 2011).

AF also appears to view women in relation to their vulnerability rather than their potential to be agents of change and act as valuable resources in adaptation strategies (Ndiaye, Ollikainen & Raghav, Personal Communication, 2011). ‘Gender’ tends to be limited to social impact analyses and community-based projects. Other investments, such as those focused on infrastructure, are falsely presumed to be gender neutral. Such misperceptions among AF staff can have a profoundly negative impact for women and girls.

Best practices and lessons learned

AF is a relatively young fund and has spent its first few years getting ‘the big picture in place.’ As it now has an opportunity to review its own policies, Secretariat staff members feel this is an opportune moment to raise concerns and exert civil society pressure (Ndiaye, Ollikainen & Raghav, Personal Communication, 2011). In project approval processes, AF staff members ‘have looked for gender—it is now just a matter of putting it on paper’ (Ndiaye & Daouda, Personal Communication, 2011). The Board has also expressed an interest in incorporating gender into AF financing, but it does ‘not want to copy and paste from other funds’ (Ndiaye, Ollikainen & Raghav, Personal Communication, 2011). The forthcoming revision to the operational guidelines represents a first step to formal gender integration, but as they do not yet have any project reports to evaluate, AF staff believe ‘it is too soon to know’ the best approach to addressing gender (Ndiaye & Daouda, Personal Communication, 2011).

Ultimately, AF wants country-led processes without too many mandates. While AF tries to balance ‘country-ownership’ with strong project implementation and evaluation standards, Southern country partners have an opportunity to assume leadership in regard to gender integration in AF funded projects, as demonstrated by Senegal’s ‘Adaptation to Coastal Erosion in Vulnerable Areas’ project. This project illustrates how the AF and a Southern country partner can work together to successfully incorporate gender in project proposals in a manner that upholds principles of country ownership (see Box 2). However, in order to cultivate informed demand and encourage gender integration among country partners, the AF Board itself must also demonstrate a strong commitment to gender equality and attentiveness to gender integration throughout all project cycles by creating a gender policy that ensures accountability.

Box 3: Sample AF project with gender integration

Senegal: 'Adaptation to Coastal Erosion in Vulnerable Areas'

In January 2011, Senegal began a two-year AF-funded project, implemented nationally by the Centre de Suivi Ecologique. The following case review, taken from a June 9, 2011 interview with Dethie S. Ndiaye of the Centre de Suivi Ecologique, provides insight into Senegal's process of project design and approval:

When Senegal began working with the AF Secretariat, a long discussion took place about the benefits the project would bring to local community members, including women, for which the Secretariat was 'really concerned' (Ndiaye & Soumaré Personal Communication, 2011). As a result, project designers decided to involve women directly by bringing NGOs Green Senegal and Dynamiques-Femmes into the project as executing agencies. Dynamiques-Femmes, a women's rights organization, boasts years of experience on gender and the environment; Green Senegal has experience with women's capacity building.

Dynamiques-Femmes' involvement in project design was two-fold. First, the organization made a diagnostic of the situation in the area of Joal, where the women's group is situated. This allowed them to provide input into the needs and priorities of the local community. Second, Dynamiques-Femmes and the Centre de Suivi Ecologique worked together to determine what activities the women's group would lead. Further, the project includes capacity-building objectives; for each activity Dynamiques-Femmes spearheads, the Centre de Suivi Ecologique provides technical support and training. For example, in June 2011, the Centre de Suivi Ecologique trained Dynamiques-Femmes on how to pick the right company to build a dam (a project component) that complies with national regulations.

Overall, Mr. Ndiaye feels that gender issues were a big factor in whether this project would receive funding from AF. After each step of the review process, AF staff provided feedback that mentioned local communities and gender 'very often,' which Senegal's team worked into subsequent drafts (Ndiaye & Soumaré Personal Communication, 2011). Consequently, the Results Framework of the project proposal includes objectives for the capacity building of women and benefits for women in local communities. Though it is too early to assess the impact that working with Dynamiques-Femmes and Green Senegal will make, the inclusion of women's perspectives and priorities will likely improve the project overall.

LESSONS LEARNED

The above case studies present important lessons and best practices, which can inform the development of gender-sensitive climate funds by demonstrating the importance of the following elements.

A strong and comprehensive gender policy

Climate funds must develop and implement a strong and comprehensive gender policy. This is non-negotiable, as it sets the tone for any gender mainstreaming activities and outlines the terms for measuring success. Gender policies should assume a human-rights perspective instead of mere 'instrumentalist' ('Gender Equality as Smart Economics') or 'safeguard' approaches. A 'do no harm' policy is essential but insufficient when resources finance projects with unequal gender impacts. As this report demonstrates, it is also not enough to pepper documents with 'gender' and 'women': ensuring equal access to resources in areas where gender inequalities exist requires *extra, proactive* steps to overcome marginalization and identify and address gender issues in a meaningful way.

Three⁵ of the case studies demonstrate that climate fund gender policies should mandate at a minimum:

A commitment to human rights and gender equality	Global Fund, GAVI, GEF*
The application of a gender perspective to all activities	GAVI, GEF
Leadership and promotion of coordinated efforts to achieve gender equality among the fund's partners	GAVI, GEF
A commitment to promote country ownership and play a 'catalytic role' to ensure that countries 'recognize the potential and importance of addressing gender inequalities' (GAVI, 2008)	GAVI
The collection and use of sex-disaggregated data	Global Fund, GEF
Equitable participation of men and women in funded activities	Global Fund, GAVI
Gender equity in the fund's governance	Global Fund, GAVI
Measures to ensure full implementation of the gender policy through the development of an action plan or gender mainstreaming guidelines	Global Fund, GEF
A robust communications and advocacy strategy that highlights the importance of gender mainstreaming and addresses resistance to it	Global Fund, GAVI
A comprehensive framework for building gender capacity and providing gender training within the fund (see 'capacity-building at the climate fund level' below)	Global Fund, GAVI, GEF
Gender equality measures as part of staff performance assessments	GAVI

*See Annexes II, III, and IV for examples from the Global Fund, GAVI Alliance and GEF's gender policies, respectively.

Direct access finance

GEF has demonstrated the shortcomings of relying on multilateral implementing agencies (such as the World Bank, UNDP, etc.) to adequately implement social policies. Ideally,

climate funds should allow recipient countries to access finance directly, as AF does, but should also strengthen mandatory gender project review criteria (eg. gender impact assessment, gender consultation/ participation, etc.), and gender evaluation requirements. As the Global Fund demonstrates, it is also essential to maintain smaller funding channels, such as a dedicated funding reserve specifically for women and other marginalized groups to provide incentives for partner countries to fund projects that focus on these vulnerable populations. Further, climate funds should allow and encourage women's groups to apply for finance directly when national implementing agencies are not meeting their needs.

Climate finance in the form of grants

Climate funds should provide financial assistance in the form of grants only to avoid new debt and the poverty it causes. Climate finance is an obligation of developed countries, in view of their responsibility for causing climate change through excessive greenhouse gas emissions and their capacity to address it. Developing countries are entitled to climate finance grants, as they are least responsible for causing climate change, the worst hit by its impacts, and have the fewest resources with which to cope.

Capacity-building at the country level

The Global Fund's 2010 GE Strategy implementation report concludes that it is 'committed to further strengthening its partnerships with country stakeholders and technical partners and to continue to increase its advocacy on gender-related issues and interventions' (GFATM, 2010c). Similarly, GAVI's Gender Policy highlights that 'the GAVI Alliance can play a catalytic role in helping to ensure that countries recognize the potential and importance of addressing gender inequalities' (GAVI, 2008).

Climate funds must also catalyze country-level awareness of gender inequalities through building country staff members' capacity to respond to them. This may include gender training for national implementing agencies, or funding gender experts to work with country staff as part of the grant. Such capacity building is essential to ensure that country partners will conduct gender analyses and impact assessments, and collect and analyze sex-disaggregated data.

Capacity building at the climate fund level

Both the Global Fund and GAVI engage in institutional gender capacity building activities, but assume different approaches: while the Global Fund has a small, three member internal gender task team that facilitates its gender strategy implementation, GAVI aims to 'strengthen the capacity of all staff, and invest in the development of specialists in the area of gender' (GAVI, 2008).

GEF's Policy on Gender Mainstreaming requires the 'strengthen[ing of] gender-mainstreaming capacities among the GEF Secretariat staff to increase their understanding of gender mainstreaming, as well as socio-economic aspects in general' (Annex IV), though to date neither AF nor GEF provide systematic gender training for staff. Climate funds should follow GAVI's lead by providing gender training for *all* staff, which would enable them to identify and address project gender issues and evaluate gender impacts in recipient countries' progress reports. Mirroring the Global Fund's approach, climate funds could also identify a gender task team to monitor gender capacity building activities and ensure that trained staff members are held accountable for their performance on gender in annual performance reviews.

Gender equity at the climate fund level

Both the Global Fund and GAVI Alliance's gender policies illustrate the importance of gender equity in the funds' leadership, governance and staff. The Global Fund Secretariat 'has agreed on key performance indicators related to staff diversity that include three

diversity targets: sex, ethnicity and people living with the diseases or from [AIDS, TB and malaria] affected communities' (GFATM, 2010c). The Global Fund's Gender Equality Plan of Action also 'recognizes [country coordinating mechanism] CCMs, which develop and submit proposals for funding to the Global Fund and the Principal Recipients, as the key entry point for ensuring that proposals that take gender into account are prioritized at the country level' (GFATM, 2010c). The Global Fund has therefore proposed that 'revisions to the CCM Guidelines – the key reference document for CCMs worldwide – include strategies to strengthen gender expertise and achieve balanced gender representation in CCMs.'

GAVI's gender policy states that 'gender balance in all areas of GAVI work should be ensured, including throughout the governance structures, to the extent possible, as well as through staffing (all levels) and consultancies' (GAVI, 2008). Specifically, GAVI aims to 'assess gender parity trends in the Secretariat and ensure that meaningful efforts are made to identify equal numbers of qualified female and male candidates during recruitment and promotion processes' (GAVI, 2008).

As a critical step toward enhancing gender sensitivity in their institutional cultures, climate funds should aim to achieve gender equality in their leadership, governance and staff. Equal gender representation at each of these levels not only reflects a fund's commitment to gender equality, but also allows for more gender-balanced perspectives in decision-making processes. In addition, as demonstrated through the GAVI case study, climate fund leadership should 'champion' gender in order to overcome institutional resistance to gender mainstreaming.

Equal gender consultation at the local levels

Most climate funds, including GEF and AF, have public participation policies that require consultation with 'necessary stakeholders' in project areas. However, as the case studies demonstrate, these consultations are often neither equitable nor meaningful. They do not ensure adequate input from women about their unique needs and priorities. AF notes, for example, that consultation carried out by its partners is not always reflected in project design. This suggests that meaningful consultation with women in project areas at all project cycle stages—identification, design, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation—must be required for receipt of climate and non-climate finance. As women and men respond differently to incentives for participating in consultations, gender-distinct incentives can encourage greater female project participation. These incentives are best designed by local partners who can determine cultural barriers to female participation in project areas.

Standardized sex-disaggregated data collection and gender analysis

While the Global Fund, GAVI, and GEF recognize the importance of collecting and using sex-disaggregated data, none of them mandate sex-disaggregated data collection and analysis. The Global Fund has 'requested' its CCMs to include 'sex-disaggregation of relevant data as part of the monitoring and evaluation plans' (GFATM, 2010c) for its latest round of funding. GAVI's gender policy commits it to 'review and revise funding guidelines to ensure that countries include age- and sex-disaggregated data and gender analysis in needs assessments and that proposed targets and outcome measures incorporate a gender perspective' (GAVI, 2008). GEF plans to 'develop a system for monitoring and evaluating progress in gender mainstreaming, including the use of gender disaggregated monitoring indicators' (GEF, 2011). It is important to note, however, that the case studies' calls for sex-disaggregated data repeat decades of appeals to collect sex-disaggregated data. While many countries have access to such data (Demographic and Health Surveys and Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys, for example), these data are rarely used.⁶ Without specific requirements and dedicated funding streams to support capacity building in this regard, country partners are unlikely to value the use of sex-disaggregated data.

The requirement for sex-disaggregated data must be systematically applied and non-negotiable. In order to achieve this, climate funds should provide funds and technical support for country-based gender analysis, including the collection and use of sex-disaggregated data. Such activities must be conducted up front in order to integrate a gender perspective into all climate project cycle stages, including project identification, design, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation.

Accountability

As the Global Fund's gender 'Plan of Action' and GAVI's gender policy demonstrate, the degree to which funding mechanisms uphold their commitments to gender integration should be evaluated by an external party. GAVI sought external technical support from ODI to develop its policy, and will receive a 'full external review' in 2012 (GAVI, 2008). The Global Fund's report on GE Strategy implementation states that in order 'to ensure there is a transparent, professional and independent evaluation of the Secretariat's performance in implementing the Gender Equality Strategy, the Plan of Action will be subject to an external evaluation in the third year of implementation' (GFATM, 2010c). Climate finance mechanisms should follow these examples by establishing external independent evaluation mechanisms to assess implementation of their gender policies. If climate funds have robust gender policies, they could also implement gender-sensitive complaint and redress mechanisms for country-level gender policy violations.

An understanding of gender inequalities within local climate contexts

As ODI notes in its assessment of GAVI Alliance, 'the interlocking effects of...various social inequalities and how addressing the gender-based inequalities within these marginalized populations could be a powerful influence in scaling up immunization coverage rates' (ODI, 2008). ODI emphasized that understanding these 'various social inequalities' would be essential in order for GAVI to improve immunization coverage among vulnerable populations and across the life cycle (ODI, 2008). Similarly, in order to understand the social inequalities that affect boys' and girls' access to immunization, GAVI commissioned a study by the WHO.

The same principle holds true for climate finance mechanisms, which must understand the links between gender inequalities and climate change, including issues related to divisions of labor, land tenure, property rights, access to health care, and more. As GEF's Policy on Gender Mainstreaming states: 'It is important, in many instances for program and project interventions to take into account differences in ways men and women perceive incentives linked to the sustainable use of resources and how these perceptions can influence the achievement of the results specified in project objectives' (Annex 3). To achieve this, climate funds could commission local studies, drawing on local expertise, to examine the relationship between climate change and men and women, boys and girls to inform gender policy development and funding practices.

RECOMMENDATIONS

As reflected in 'Lessons learned,' climate funds can take numerous concrete steps to integrate gender:

Follow a strong and comprehensive gender policy

At a minimum, climate fund gender policies require:

- A commitment to women's human rights
- The collection, analysis and application of sex-disaggregated data
- Balanced participation of men and women in adaptation and mitigation efforts
- Gender balance in climate fund governance
- Measures to ensure full implementation of the gender policy through the development of an action plan or gender mainstreaming guidelines
- Measures to hold staff accountable for their performance on gender in annual performance reviews
- A robust communications and advocacy strategy that highlights the importance of gender mainstreaming and addresses resistance to it
- A comprehensive framework for building gender capacity within the climate fund

Fully integrate gender in operations

Climate funds should:

- Allow countries to directly access finance without going through intermediaries such as the World Bank or UNDP
- Maintain smaller funding windows as well as a dedicated reserve fund specifically for women and other marginalized groups
- Allow and encourage women's groups to apply for finance directly for adaptation and mitigation activities
- Offer grants—not loans—for all developing countries in order to avoid new debt and compensate for past climate debt
- Play a 'catalytic role' at the country-level to raise awareness of gender inequality with regard to climate change and build country staff's capacity to respond to it
- Provide gender training for all staff and identify an internal gender task team to monitor gender capacity building activities
- Maintain gender balance within their Boards, Secretariats and general staff
- Conduct genuine consultation with women in project areas at all project cycle stages—identification, design, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation. Gender-sensitive consultation should be required for project approval. Working with

local partners can help determine barriers to female participation in project areas. Further, as women and men respond differently to incentives for participating in consultations, gender-distinct incentives can encourage greater female participation

- Mandate gender analysis, including use of sex-disaggregated data, which must be conducted up front in order to integrate a gender perspective into all project cycle stages, including project identification, design, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation
- Establish external independent evaluation mechanisms to assess the implementation of gender policies
- Implement gender-sensitive complaint and redress mechanisms for country-level gender policy violations
- Ascertain necessary connections between climate change and gender issues by drawing on local expertise within partner countries

REFERENCES

Adaptation Fund Board, 2011a. 4th Meeting of the Ethics and Finance Committee: 'Review of the Operational Policies and Guidelines and Related Templates.' http://adaptation-fund.org/system/files/AFB.EFC_4.9%20Review%20of%20OPG%20mark%20up%20and%20introduction.pdf

Adaptation Fund, 2011b. Revised project criteria template for June 21, 2011 Board Review (unpublished).

Awori, T., 2009. 'OPS4 Technical Document #9: Gender Mainstreaming in the GEF.' Global Environment Facility Evaluation Office. http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/OPS4-TD9-Gender_Issues_in_GEF.pdf

Climate Investment Funds (CIF), 2010. 'Strategic Environment, Social and Gender Assessment of the Climate Investment Funds.' <http://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/sites/climateinvestmentfunds.org/files/CTF%20Inf%203%20Env%20Soc%20Gender%20Assessment%20nov%202010.pdf>

GAVI Alliance, 2008. 'Gender Policy.' http://www.gavialliance.org/resources/2_The_GAVI_Alliance_Gender_Policy.pdf

GAVI Alliance, 2010. 'Women's and Children's Health.' http://www.gavialliance.org/resources/Protecting_women_s_and_children_s_health_June_2010.pdf

GAVI Alliance, 2011a. 'Innovative Partnership.' http://www.gavialliance.org/about/in_partnership/index.php

GAVI Alliance, 2011b. 'Gender Policy webpage' http://www.gavialliance.org/vision/programme_policies/gender_policy/index.php

GAVI Alliance, 'Appendix 1-GAVI Alliance Strategy 2011-2015.' http://www.gavialliance.org/resources/Strategy_2011_2015_Table.pdf

Gender Action (GA), 2009. 'Doubling the Damage: World Bank Climate Investment Funds Undermine Climate and Gender Justice.' http://www.genderaction.org/images/2009.02_Doubling%20Damage_AR.pdf

GFATM, 2009a. 'Sexual Orientation and Gender Identities Strategy.' http://www.theglobalfund.org/documents/publications/other/SOGI/SOGI_Strategy.pdf

GFATM, 2009b. 'Gender Equality Strategy Plan of Action, 2009-2012.' http://www.aids-kampagne.de/fileadmin/Downloads/Global_Fund/Implementation_plan_of_the_Gender_Equality_Strategy_final_July_2009.pdf

GFATM, 2010a. 'The Global Fund, HIV, and Sexual Orientation/Gender Identities.' <http://www.theglobalfund.org/documents/replenishment/2010/The%20Global%20FUND%20SOGI%20Strategy%20Update.pdf>

GFATM, 2010b. 'CCM Newsletter, Issue No. 3.' http://www.theglobalfund.org/documents/ccm/CCM_Newsletter_03_en.pdf

- GFATM, 2010c. 'Implementation of the Global Fund Gender Equality Strategy.'
<http://www.theglobalfund.org/documents/replenishment/2010/Implementation%20of%20the%20Global%20Fund%20Gender%20Equality%20Strategy.pdf>
- GFATM, 2011. 'Analysis of Rounds 8, 9 and 10 Global Fund HIV proposals in relation to men who have sex with men, transgender people and sex workers.'
http://www.msmgf.org/files/msmgf//Advocacy/Rounds_8_9_10_MSM_TG_SW_Report_April_2011.pdf
- Global Environmental Facility, 2011. 'Policies on Environmental and Social Safeguards and Gender Mainstreaming.'
http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/C.40.10_GEF_Policies_on_Safeguards_and_Gender.April_26_2011.pdf
- Hilber, et al., 2010. 'Gender and Immunization: Summary Report for SAGE, 2010.'
http://www.who.int/immunization/sage/1_immunization_gender_reports_without_graphics.pdf
- International AIDS Alliance, 2011. 'Making HIV Prevention Funding Work: Campaign Briefing.'
http://www.aidsalliance.org/includes/Publication/AA_WPP_Report.pdf
- International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), 2007. 'Gender Aspects of Climate Change.'
http://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/climate_change_gender.pdf
- John Snow, Inc. (JSI), 2005. 'Reporting Requirement and Indicator Harmonization for HIV Medicines and Diagnostics: A Review of PEPFAR, GFATM and Country Specific Requirements and Indicators.'
www.who.int/hiv/amds/JSI_FinalReport9-29-05.pdf
- Keels, V. Personal Communication, May 31, 2011.
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Denmark, 2011. 'Five MDG3 Torches Handed Over in Geneva.'
<http://www.missionfngeneve.um.dk/en/servicemenu/News/FiveMDG3TorchesHandedOverInGeneva.htm>
- Murray-Lopez, M. Personal communication, May 12, 2011.
- Ndiaye, Ollikainen & Raghav, Personal Communication, May 9, 2011.
- Ndaiye & Daouda, Personal Communication. June 3, 2011.
- Ndiaye & Soumaré, Personal Communication. June 9, 2011.
- ODI, 2008. 'A Knowledge Stocktaking Exercise and an Independent Assessment of the GAVI Alliance: A Report Commissioned by the GAVI Alliance Secretariat.'
<http://www.odi.org.uk/resources/download/4421.pdf>
- Pakistan Project Information Document, 2011. 'Reducing Risks and Vulnerabilities from Glacier Lake Outburst Floods in Northern Pakistan'
<http://www.adaptation-fund.org/sites/default/files/Pakistan%20final%20project.pdf>
- Reda, D. Personal Communication. May 9, 2011.
- Sasvari, A., 2010. 'Changes in Climate Negotiations: Gender Equality Towards Copenhagen.'
Global Social Policy 10:15.
- Seale, A., 2009. 'Overview of the Global Fund Strategies on Gender Equality Sexual Orientation and Gender Identities: Opportunities for the South and West Asia Region.'

http://www.theglobalfund.org/documents/regionalmeetings/thailand2010/SWA-Report_en.pdf

Seale, A., 2010. 'Partnership, sex and marginalization: Moving the global fund sexual orientation and gender identities agenda.'

<http://www.hhrjournal.org/index.php/hhr/article/viewArticle/210/304>

Seale, A. & Ndayishimiye, F. Personal Communication, May 2, 2011.

Senegal Project information document, 2010. 'Adaptation to Coastal Erosion in Vulnerable Areas.'

http://adaptationfund.org/system/files/SENEGAL_Adapation%20project_full_28%20oct%202010_0.pdf

Schalatek, L., 2009a. 'Gender and Climate Finance: Double Mainstreaming for Sustainable Development.'

http://www.boell.org/downloads/DoubleMainstreaming_Final.pdf

Schalatek, L., 2009b. 'The Missing Link: Bringing Gender Equality to Climate Financing.'

<http://boell.org/web/135-450.html>

Somera, N., 2009. 'Why Climate Change is a Women's Problem.'

http://www.isiswomen.org/phocadownload/print/isispub/wia/wia2009-2/2wia09_26cim_nina.pdf

UN, 2009. 'Women and Climate Change Fact Sheet.'

http://www.un.org/womenwatch/feature/climate_change/downloads/Women_and_Climate_Change_Factsheet.pdf

UNDP, 2011. 'Gender and Climate Change.'

<http://www.undp.org/climatechange/gender.shtml>

UN Women, 2011. 'Facts and Figures on Gender and Climate Change.'

http://www.unifem.org/partnerships/climate_change/facts_figures.php

Vogt, E., 2010. 'Climate Adaptation Fund: A Gender Assessment and Implications for Women.'

http://www.networkedintelligence.com/wp/wp-content/uploads/2010/10/Adaptation_Fund_assessment.pdf

Watanabe, Y., Personal Communication, May 31, 2011.

Watanabe, Y. 2008. 'Mainstreaming Gender at the GEF.'

<http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/publication/mainstreaming-gender-at-the-GEF.pdf>

Watkins, F. 2007. 'Assessing the Capacity of Multilateral Organizations to Deal with Gender Equality: Revised Assessments, London: Social Development Direct.'

http://www.gendermatters.eu/resources_documents/UserFiles/File/Resourse/IFED_gender_multilateral.pdf

WEDO, 2008a. 'Gender and Climate Change Workshop: Final Report.'

www.wedo.org/wp-content/uploads/finalreport-dakar-workshop-2008.pdf

WEDO, 2008b. 'Gender, Climate Change and Human Security.' <http://www.wedo.org/wp-content/uploads/hsn-study-final-may-20-2008.pdf>

WEDO, 2010. 'Climate Change Finance: Why it Matters for Gender Equality.'
<http://www.wedo.org/wp-content/uploads/Climate+Finance+final2.pdf>

WEDO & Heinrich Boell Foundation, 2007. 'Report of High-level Roundtable How a Changing Climate Impacts Women.'
http://boell.org/downloads/Report_WomenClimateChange2007.pdf

Annex I: Major climate finance mechanisms

Fund	Basics	Theme/objective	Governance (by gender)	Gender policy, gender rights	Gender: consultation & participation	Gender: monitoring & evaluation
Adaptation Fund (AF) [United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, UNFCCC]	Operational in 2009 USD 224.79 million pledged; USD 12.63 dispersed. 7 projects to date	Finance adaptation projects in developing countries that are parties to the Kyoto Protocol.	AF Board: 12 men and 4 women.	No explicit gender policy.	Consult with 'necessary stakeholders.' Language may change in June 2011 (see case study) to include consultation with women as a requirement for funding.	Indicators are to be developed by recipient countries. Evaluation Framework gives definition of 'vulnerable' groups that includes women. Language may change in June 2011 (see case study).
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) [Global Environment Facility, GEF]	Operational in 2002 USD 262 million pledged; approx. USD 92.28 million dispersed. 94 projects to date	Assist Least Developed Country Parties (LDCs) prepare and implement National Adaptation Programs of Action (NAPAs).	GEF Council: 20 men and 12 women.	Operational Guidelines include 'gender equality' as one of the guiding elements for developing NAPAs. GEF approved a gender mainstreaming policy on May 26, 2011.	(Non-mandatory) guidelines for preparation of NAPAs states, 'particular attention should be given to... the voices of the poor (women and men) during stakeholder consultations.'	Results-Based 'Effectiveness and Efficiency Results Framework' tracks the % of projects with gender analysis; 8 of 47 LDCF/ SCCF 'Monitoring and Assessment Tool' indicators disaggregate data by sex.
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF) [Global Environment Facility, GEF]	Operational in 2002 USD 149 million pledged; USD 73.51 million dispersed. 32 approved projects to date	Implement long-term adaptation measures that increase the resilience of national development sectors to the impacts of climate change.	GEF Council: 20 men and 12 women.	Currently, gender equality is not a decision criterion or guiding principle for approval of SCCF projects. *GEF approved a gender mainstreaming policy on May 26, 2011.	(Non-mandatory) guidelines for preparation of NAPAs states, 'particular attention should be given to... the voices of the poor (women and men) during stakeholder consultations.'	Results-Based 'Effectiveness and Efficiency Results Framework' tracks the % of projects with gender analysis; 8 of 47 LDCF/ SCCF 'Monitoring and Assessment Tool' indicators disaggregate data by sex.
Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) [World Bank]	Operational in 2008 USD 221.27 million pledged; USD 10.34 dispersed 37 countries	Assist countries in achieving REDD + and provide insights into the challenges of implementing a REDD + mechanism.	Participants Committee; names/ genders not publicly available.	Choose which 'World Bank safeguard policies' to apply; the World Bank does not have a gender safeguard policy or human rights approach.	Operational policies subsume consultation with local stakeholders under 'indigenous peoples and other forest-dependent communities' without recognition of gender breakdown.	Evaluation Framework fails to mention gender.
Forest Investment Program (FIP) [World Bank]	Operational in 2009 USD 558 million pledged; USD 3 million disbursed 8 pilot countries	Support REDD-efforts and finance readiness reforms; address underlying causes of deforestation and forest degradation.	FIP Sub-Committee members: 9 men and 2 women.	No explicit gender policy. Gender rights addressed in Operational Guidelines in relation to 'co-benefits,' which entails 'the promotion of gender equality.'	Investment/ project review criteria includes, 'Inclusive processes and participation of all important stakeholders; Operational Guidelines mention consulting 'women's groups.'	No explicit mention of need for gender analysis. Results Framework calls for differentiation by gender 'when appropriate'; specifically calls for sex disaggregated data in 'income change and employment.'
Pilot Program for Climate Resilience (PPCR) [World Bank]	Operational in 2009 USD 971.75 million pledged; USD 8 million, disbursed 9 pilot countries	Pilot ways to integrate climate risk and resilience into core development planning and implementation.	PPCR Sub-Committee: 9 men and 6 women.	Choose which 'World Bank safeguard policies' to apply; the World Bank does not have a gender safeguard policy or human rights approach.	Consultation with 'key stakeholders,' not specifically women.	Suggests including 'gender-sensitive' vulnerability studies; and disaggregating data by men and women in: % of people classified as poor and food insecure; number of lives lost/ injuries.
Clean Development Mechanism [UNFCCC]	Established through the Kyoto Protocol in 2007; approximately 2,500 projects registered with Executive Board.	Emission-reduction projects in developing countries earn certified emission reduction credits; main source of income for UNFCCC adaptation fund.	Executive Board: 9 men and 1 woman.	No gender policy. Project development guidelines do not incorporate gender.	'Consult with local stakeholders', not specifically women.	Project reporting requirements do not address gender. No requirements for gender analysis or sex disaggregated data.

Annex II: The Global Fund's Strategy for Ensuring Gender Equality in the Response to HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria

Part 1: Rationale

1. Internationally, the standards recognizing gender equality have been set out in a number of declarations and plans of action. In the majority of countries applying for funding from the Global Fund, the government has committed to realizing gender equality and women's empowerment through the adoption of various human rights instruments, including the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination (CEDAW).
2. Both biological and social differences make women and girls, men and boys vulnerable to different health risks, engage in different health-seeking behaviour and comply differently with treatment. Often women and men receive different responses from health systems, which results in less-than-optimal health outcomes. Because gender differences play a role in who is infected and affected by the three epidemics – especially with HIV/AIDS, as is well-documented, but also to some extent with TB and malaria – interventions must take gender differences into account, since this will determine the success or failure of these interventions. It is therefore important for the Global Fund to give a very clear message to countries: that they are expected, through their proposals to the Global Fund, to demonstrate an understanding of the issues and address these different health risks.

HIV/AIDS

3. Gender inequality fuels the HIV epidemic and intensifies its impact. In sub-Saharan Africa, three quarters of the people living with HIV between the ages of 15 and 24 are young women. Women and girls bear a disproportionate burden of care for sick family members and children orphaned by AIDS. Most prevention of mother-to-child transmission (PMTCT) programs only prevent infection to the newborn baby and do little for the HIV-positive mother. Harmful gender norms – including those that reinforce the submissive role of women, cross-generational sex, concurrent partnerships, and gender-based violence – are key drivers of the HIV/AIDS epidemic. Economic, educational, legal and political discrimination faced by women and girls contribute to their vulnerability.
4. Norms around masculinity also puts men at risk of HIV and creates barriers to their access to care. Homophobia (which results in the stigmatization of men who have sex with men, as well as bisexual and transgender people) makes these populations more likely to conceal their sexual behavior, which can increase their risk of infection. Homophobia may also affect their ability to access HIV services. This also creates a greater risk for women whose partners may be men who have sex with men. Reducing gender inequality and addressing the economic, legal and political discrimination faced by women and girls should be part of a comprehensive programmatic response.

Tuberculosis

5. Globally, men account for two-thirds of the notified TB cases. However, in sub-Saharan Africa, because of the co-epidemic of HIV and TB and because rates of HIV are higher in women than in men in this region, more TB cases among women have been reported recently (especially in those aged 15–24). In several countries in sub-Saharan Africa, the majority of notified TB cases are now in women. This shift highlights the need to target both men and women in TB responses.

Malaria

6. Although malaria affects both men and women, vulnerability to malaria and access to treatment is often different for women and men, and is influenced by gender roles and issues. Women – in particular pregnant women – are at the greatest risk of contracting and dying of malaria in both high- and low-malaria endemic areas. Inequitable access to health care both intensifies a woman's vulnerability to malaria and affects her ability to access prevention and treatment services appropriately. Plus, socially-determined gender norms mean that women most often carry the extra burden of caring for sick family members. Men are also vulnerable to contracting malaria through occupational exposure (for example, working in gold mines, working at night) and malaria programs must also meet their needs.

Part 2: The Global Fund and gender equality

7. 1. The Framework Document of the Global Fund states that the Global Fund will support proposals that include 'public health interventions that address social and gender inequalities, as well as behavior practices that fuel the spread of the three diseases.'
8. 2. Three key areas promoted by the Global Fund can be useful in creating a meaningful response that takes gender issues into account:

Health systems strengthening

9. 3. If appropriately designed and implemented, national health management information systems can provide key information on assessing gender inequalities, informing gender-related program strategies and assessing program performance with respect to gender disparities. Information systems must be strengthened to capture the types of data needed to analyze and report on key gender dimensions of the epidemics. This will help target interventions to diminish the gender gap.

Community systems strengthening

10. 4. Supporting people who are infected and affected with HIV/AIDS, TB or malaria and their families often happens at the community level. It is community-based organizations (many of which are staffed mainly by women) that have the reach and expertise to support DOTS (the basic package that underpins the Stop TB strategy) treatment, care for family members sick with malaria, provide home-based care and care for children orphaned by AIDS. Applying for funding to strengthen community responses is strongly encouraged by the Global Fund and where this is done in a manner that addresses gender inequality these activities will help alleviate the burden placed on caregivers and service providers at the grass-roots level (for example, funding compensation for caregivers).

Dual-track financing

11. 5. Civil society and community health organizations are powerful vehicles for addressing gender inequality in the policy, advocacy, management and delivery of health care services. In fact, many prevention and care interventions are spearheaded by civil society organizations. The Global Fund dual-track financing mechanism provides an opportunity for funding of civil society organizations that strengthen and complement existing efforts.
12. 6. As noted above, gender equalities play an important role in the development of the pandemics of HIV/AIDS, TB and malaria. The Global Fund has committed itself to addressing this issue in the programs which it supports as it seeks to expand its

investments in programs which focus on women and girls and those most at risk of the three diseases.

13. 7. The Global Fund will champion and fund proposals that:

- Scale up services and interventions that reduce gender-related risks and vulnerabilities to infection;
- Decrease the burden of disease for those most at risk;
- Mitigate the impact of the three diseases, and
- Address structural inequalities and discrimination.

Concrete examples of programs the Global Fund will champion and fund are noted Annex 2.

14. 8. The Global Fund will do this by focusing on the following four areas of intervention:

I. Ensure that the Global Fund's policies, procedures and structures – including the Country Coordinating Mechanism and the Technical Review Panel – effectively support programs that address gender inequalities.

II. Establish and Strengthen Partnerships that effectively support the development and implementation of programs that address gender inequalities and reduce women's and girls' vulnerabilities, provide quality technical assistance, and build the capacity of groups who are not currently participating in Global Fund processes but should be.

III. Develop a robust communications and advocacy strategy that promotes the Gender Equality Strategy and encourages programming for women and girls and men and boys.

IV. Provide leadership, internally and externally, by supporting, advancing and giving voice to the Gender Equality Strategy

Part 3: Actions

This section outlines the specific areas in the Global Fund model and within the four strategic objectives noted above that provide opportunities to realize the Gender Equality Strategy.

3.1 Ensure that the Global Fund's policies, procedures and structures support programs that address gender inequalities.

The Country Coordinating Mechanism

15. 2. Because the Country Coordinating Mechanism is responsible for developing and submitting new requests for funding, it is pivotal in ensuring that gender equality is taken into account in country proposals. The Country Coordinating Mechanism guidelines currently reference the need for appropriate programming for women and girls, and encourage the inclusion of women's groups and civil society networks as Country Coordinating Mechanism members. But more must be done.

16. 3. There are a number of ways that Country Coordinating Mechanisms can incorporate and promote gender equality throughout their work. Strong drivers of change at the country level are the requirements in the Guidelines for Proposals that are issued for each round, since Country Coordinating Mechanisms are obliged to respond to these in order to receive funding. The Country Coordinating Mechanism Guidelines will be strengthened to provide clearer guidance on how gender issues should be taken into account in Country Coordinating Mechanism operations, and a gender analysis should be the basis for program development. Country Coordinating Mechanisms will be required to declare their capacity in gender as part of the

application process (modeled on the conflict of interest statement) and would then receive an allocation to support strengthening their capacity in this area.

17. 4. In order to change approaches in programming, guide appropriate proposal development, and provide technical assistance for implementation, Country Coordinating Mechanisms need to be able to access high-quality gender expertise. Partners in country can play an important role in this area and they should be active in providing training, capacity building and support to facilitate strong gender programming in all sectors.
18. 5. Tools provided by the Global Fund will include terms of reference for gender experts and other Country Coordinating Mechanism members. Country Coordinating Mechanisms must strive to achieve sex parity among their membership and leadership.

Proposals Submission

Ensuring Quality Programming

19. 6. Programming on AIDS, TB and malaria that takes gender issues into account should build on national health and disease strategies. These can then be the basis for Global Fund proposals. The Global Fund will, together with partners at the country level, promote a gender analysis in the context of national strategy development and proposal preparation (see Annex 3, for Opportunities for Partner Engagement).
20. 7. The Global Fund is also working on a National Strategy Application process, which – together with partners – defines a number of attributes that need to be considered in order to validate the strategy. A gender analysis and appropriate interventions targeting vulnerable groups (according to age, sex and sexual behaviors) should be included in the criteria for validating national strategies.
21. 8. In-country partners must promote the necessary operational research in the area of access to health services for specific groups, in particular health-seeking behaviors. This operational research should be part of the request submitted to the Global Fund for funding either through specific grants or through the National Strategy Application.

Guidelines for Proposals

22. 9. The Global Fund's Proposal Guidelines will be strengthened by introducing a mandatory requirement for a gender analysis, based on age- and sex-disaggregated data, which would be supported by the measures described above. Countries that are not yet able to provide this must submit proposals to strengthen their systems so that a proper gender analysis will be possible.

Technical Review Panel

23. 10. The Technical Review Panel bases its review on the technical quality of the proposal, according to criteria approved by the Board. The criteria are based on accepted, evidence-based interventions that are proven to be effective against the diseases.
24. 11. The current Technical Review Panel reviews proposals based on three key criteria: a. soundness of approach; b. feasibility; and c. potential for sustainability and impact.
25. 12. The Technical Review Panel places equal weight on each area and takes a 'know your epidemic' approach to its reviews. Proposals that do not provide evidence of a thorough gender analysis will not be seen as exhibiting a 'soundness of approach'. Proposals should include a gender analysis, an explanation of how vulnerable groups will be reached and how interventions will have a sustained impact for women and girls.

26. 13. An understanding of and experience in gender issues for the three diseases must be a more important criterion in the selection of Technical Review Panel members. Methodologies will be developed to ensure the immediate reinforcement of the Technical Review Panel with gender experts.

Monitoring and Evaluation

27. 14. In the Global Fund context, there is a strong link between performance against agreed objectives and continued funding, and the Performance Framework provides the basis for how this happens. The Global Fund works closely with technical and other partners to ensure the monitoring and evaluation is based on technically sound and agreed measures that are harmonized with those of other funders and country actors. The third version of the Monitoring and Evaluation Toolkit, which systematically addresses issues of gender inequality for the three diseases and provides recommendations for doing a gender analysis was published in 2009.
28. 15. The Global Fund will require countries to ensure that data – disaggregated by sex and by relevant age group– are available for regular analysis of gender- equality approaches in health care services. Many countries already collect this data; countries that need to establish systems in order to disaggregate data will be asked to include requests for funding these efforts.
29. 16. The overall Global Fund approach will ensure the strongest consistency between what is requested at the proposal submission stage, the national strategy application and the implementation process and performance-based funding decisions.
30. 17. The Global Fund will take into account gender equality as a central measure of success in future evaluations. A specific evaluation of this strategy will be planned and an update available in 2010.

3.2 Establish and strengthen partnerships that effectively support the development and implementation of the Gender Equality Strategy

31. 18. As part of the wider development of a partnership strategy for the Global Fund, attention will be given to building a network specifically focused on activities that address gender inequality. Many actors are currently engaged in work of this nature, including the United Nations, multilateral and bilateral agencies, private foundations, the private sector and civil society, including communities affected by the diseases. The role the Global Fund can play is catalytic, by providing resources to enable rapid scale-up of relevant activities.
32. 19. In-country partnerships are crucial to ensuring action. Government ministries responsible for gender and the sexual and reproductive health departments of ministries of health must be included in planning processes with the national AIDS commissions and ministries of health. Involvement of global partners – multilateral and bilateral organizations, foundations, the private sector, and international, regional and national civil society organizations – in all aspects of Global Fund grants (from proposal development to implementation) will help ensure that attention is given to gender equality (See Annex 3 for More Opportunities for Partner Engagement).
33. 20. For an ambitious partnership agenda to succeed, it will need strong collaboration and commitment from the Secretariat: Fund Portfolio Managers and those who work directly with the stakeholders – the Partnerships unit, Local Fund Agent and Country Coordinating Mechanism teams, the Proposals team, the Strategy, Performance and Evaluation cluster – all play important roles. The Gender Advisor will take the lead in coordinating these efforts and ensure cohesion in the approach.
34. 21. Collaboration on this issue will also require strong involvement and direction from the Global Fund Board, which includes representation of all stakeholders.

3.3 Develop a robust communications and advocacy strategy

35. 22. The Global Fund will play a strong advocacy role in ensuring that gender equality is taken into account in preparing and implementing interventions related to HIV, TB and malaria. Where possible, the Global Fund's communications strategy will integrate messaging on gender issues into general messaging about the Global Fund, positioning a commitment to gender equality as a key component of 'who we are.' To this end, the internal guidelines on branding will be an important tool in ensuring internal consistency of messages on this issue and as reference material for staff who communicate externally.
36. 23. The Global Fund leadership (the Chair and Vice Chair of the Board and the Executive Director) will play a key role in communicating these messages and promoting the Gender Equality Strategy.

3.4 Provide leadership, internally and externally, by supporting, advancing and giving voice to the Gender Equality Strategy

Role and Capacity of the Secretariat

Technical capacity

37. 24. The Global Fund has strengthened its technical capacity by recruiting a senior-level Gender Advisor. A Senior Advisor on men who have sex with men, transgender people, bisexual and lesbian populations has also been recruited. The Gender Advisor will have the responsibility of developing a detailed implementation plan to accompany the Gender Equality Strategy.
38. 25. A gender section of the Secretariat Skills Bank will be developed so that staff with specific skills, or with specializations such as sexual and reproductive health, violence against women, or experience working on issues affecting bisexuals, men who have sex with men, women who have sex with women or transgender people can be easily accessed to provide specialist input.

Secretariat Culture

39. 26. Gender equality and awareness and non-discrimination of other differences, especially sexual identity, will be part of the organization's values and culture and become a key component of the working environment of the Secretariat. Gender equality will be integrated into all aspects of staff management and culture.
40. 27. Overall in the Secretariat, the current gender balance is 60 percent women, 40 percent men. However, in the management categories, the ratio changes to 29 percent women, 71 percent men. By ensuring gender balance and diversity, including men who have sex with men, transgender people, bisexual and lesbian populations in staffing and public representation of the Global Fund, the values of the organization will be clearly conveyed.
41. 28. The leadership must set an example and 'live the values', as this will be an important factor in the implementation of new policies on gender equality.

Global Fund Governance Structures

42. 29. All Global Fund governance structures will make it their priority to give sufficient attention to gender equality principles in their operations. The Board and its committees will strive for a gender balance in all leadership appointments. Achieving a gender balance in membership is challenging because of the representative nature of the Board, but the Board and its committees will ensure they have access to appropriate gender expertise when necessary.

43. 30. There is an important leadership and advocacy role for the Board (in particular by the Chair and Vice-Chair) to play by highlighting gender equality issues in their activities and through living the values in the manner in which they operate. Board decisions, and the emphasis put on issues such as gender equality by the Board, can be catalytic at the country level and have a dramatic impact. Therefore all members of the Board should champion gender quality. The Board should consider having a 'Gender Equality Champion' on the Board. Regular strategic sessions at the Board dedicated to gender equality issues in the portfolio will be important to maintain a focus on the issue and track progress.

Part 4: Implementation and Next Steps

44. 1. The Global Fund developed the implementation plan for the Gender Equality Strategy and presented it to the appropriate Board committee in the second quarter of 2009. The implementation of the strategy will be everybody's responsibility at the Global Fund Secretariat and in the governance structure, and not just that of the Gender Advisor.
45. 2. The Global Fund will establish a rigorous monitoring and evaluation framework for the implementation of the gender strategy. The baseline review of Rounds 1-7 as well as a gender analysis of Round 8 will form the basis for measurement of progress. These reviews will take into account the work already done by partners. The Secretariat will measure some outcomes itself but the Technical Evaluation Reference Group will also be requested to undertake a full evaluation of the Gender Equality Strategy within three years of its implementation. The Global Fund will also encourage partners' evaluations of the strategy as well as the establishment or strengthening of global watchdogs that can keep track of progress on key issues with an independent approach.
46. 3. The implementation plan for the Gender Equality Strategy was published in the fourth quarter of 2009 and is available on the Global Fund website.

*See full GFATM Gender Equality Strategy at:

http://www.theglobalfund.org/documents/strategy/TheGenderEqualityStrategy_en.pdf

Annex III: The GAVI Alliance Gender Policy Towards Gender Equality in Immunization and Related Health Services

1. Goal and scope of the policy

47. 1.1 The goal of GAVI Alliance's Gender Policy is to promote increased coverage, effectiveness and efficiency of immunisation and related health services by ensuring that all girls and boys, women and men, receive equal access to these services.
48. 1.2 Adoption of a gender policy is consistent with GAVI Alliance's mission and the GAVI Principles and is necessary for fulfilling its commitment to the Millennium Development Goals. It is also aligned with the principles of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, and its cross-cutting issues of human rights and gender equality. The policy seeks to enable the GAVI Alliance to contribute to the scaling-up of gender mainstreaming in the health sector.
49. 1.3 The policy is grounded in existing international legal and political commitments, as well as on the conviction that gender equality is everyone's responsibility and warrants special attention and resources. The policy also aims to identify, develop, use and promote creative ways to engage men and boys, as well as women and girls, as agents of change in the pursuit of gender equality.
50. 1.4 The guiding principles of this policy are for the GAVI Alliance to:
51. 1.4.1 Apply a gender perspective to all its work. To realise its mission, and in line with internationally agreed-upon legal and political commitments to gender and health, the Alliance will apply a gender perspective to all relevant work.
52. 1.4.2 Complement partners' efforts to promote gender equality in health. As an Alliance and in line with the commitments made by its partners, the GAVI Alliance will strive to exercise leadership and raise awareness of, and promote coordinated international efforts towards, the realisation of existing international commitments to gender equality and health equity.
53. 1.4.3 Promote country ownership and alignment with regard to gender issues. Efforts to mainstream gender in immunisation services and support health systems will be rooted in the interest in, awareness of and capacity at country level. The GAVI Alliance can play a catalytic role in helping to ensure that countries recognise the potential and importance of addressing gender inequalities.
54. 1.4.4 Exercise strong leadership and demonstrating political will. The GAVI Alliance will play a catalytic role in promoting awareness and realisation of effective strategies to address gender inequality in the health sector. This will include the identification of existing bottlenecks about gender inequalities and their underlying causes in the field of immunisation, and the manner in which partners can address them through promotion and support for best practice.

2. Definitions

2.1 Sex is concerned with physiological and biological characteristics that are used to define and differentiate humans as either female or male. **Gender** is concerned with the social roles and values that are ascribed to girls and boys, women and men, and the ways in which these socio-cultural understandings of

appropriate behaviour and roles for females and males are underpinned in most societies by unequal power relations. Gender roles are learned through socialisation and are changeable rather than fixed.

2.2 Gender equality refers to the absence of discrimination on the basis of one's sex in terms of resources, benefits, services, and decision-making power. Initiatives to empower girls and women are often necessary to achieve gender equality, to address unequal opportunities and access to resources.

2.3 Gender sensitivity: refers to perceptiveness and responsiveness concerning differences in gender roles, responsibilities, challenges and opportunities.

2.4 Gender perspective: is a way of analysing and interpreting situations from a viewpoint that takes into consideration gender constructs in society (i.e. notions of appropriate behaviour for men and women, which may include issues of sexual identity) and searching for solutions to overcome inequalities.

3. Rationale for a gender policy

3.1 To attain the MDGs, respect, protect and fulfil the human right to the highest attainable standard of health, and promote gender equality and child well-being, there is a need to redress gender inequalities and their impact on access to and use of essential health services. Gender equality is both a determinant of programming effectiveness and a prerequisite for poverty reduction and development.

3.2 While socioeconomic inequality is the strongest determinant of health status, gender-based relations of power that are at the root of gender inequality constitute one of the most influential social determinants of health. These inequalities are shown as vulnerability to disease and ill-health; the extent to which different people's health needs and concerns are acknowledged; access to health services; quality of health care; and the very research on which health policies and decision making are based.

3.3 Immunisation has often been perceived as gender neutral, however existing evidence suggests that: (1) sex differentials in immunisation coverage exist in a range of contexts; (2) such differentials are exacerbated in the hardest to reach populations; and (3) there are major sex differentials in the burden of disease across vaccine-preventable illnesses. However it is also clear that more evidence is needed as the evidence on the gender implications of immunisation coverage is still limited. This is partly due to the failure of the international community to uphold its commitment to support the generation, consistent reporting and analysis of age- and sex-disaggregated data⁷.

4. Strategic directions

The Alliance will pursue this policy by: (1) generating, reporting and analysing new evidence; (2) ensuring gender sensitive policy and funding support, and (3) advocating for gender equality in health.

4.1 Generate, report and analyse new evidence

Developing an understanding of the gender-based implications of the evidence base on which immunisation policy and programming decisions are made is a prerequisite for achieving gender equality in immunisation services and the health system more broadly. Consequently the GAVI Alliance commits to:

- 4.1.1 Encourage routine, systematic reporting and analysis of sex-disaggregated data in all areas of GAVI support.
- 4.1.2 Conduct gender analysis of immunisation and related health services.
- 4.1.3 Strengthen linkages between immunisation and other health services to improve outcomes for all girls and boys, women and men throughout their life course.

4.2 Ensure gender sensitive funding and policies

Policymaking and funding support present central opportunities to highlight the gender dimensions of immunisation and related services. It can also leverage change across and beyond the GAVI Alliance to improve both the gendered outcomes of immunisation and development more broadly. Consequently the GAVI Alliance commits to:

- 4.2.1 Review and revise funding guidelines to ensure that countries include age- and sex-disaggregated data and gender analysis in needs assessments and that proposed targets and outcome measures incorporate a gender perspective
- 4.2.2 Incorporate a gender perspective into any new area of program and funding.
- 4.2.3 Promote the use of the different funding mechanisms, especially the health system strengthening (HSS) window and the support to civil society, to support pilot activities that demonstrate the effectiveness of gender sensitive approaches.
- 4.2.4 Encourage inter-agency coordination committees (ICCs) and health sector coordination committees (HSCCs) and other relevant national coordination bodies to consult with appropriate national institutions and ministries with knowledge in gender to ensure that their approach is informed by national expertise in the area.
- 4.2.5 Incorporate gender dimensions into policy development, policy formulations, new investment decisions and agenda setting.
- 4.2.6 Incorporate a gender perspective in monitoring and evaluation procedures and activities. This includes the development of gender sensitive indicators and supporting the strengthening of health information systems, in cooperation with partners.

4.3 Advocate for gender equality as a means to improve immunisation coverage and access to health services

The GAVI Alliance can have a catalytic role in advocating for gender equality as a means to improve immunization coverage and access to health. The message and communication at global, regional and national levels will be key to:

- 4.3.1 Ensure that all GAVI communications: (1) demonstrate Alliance commitment to gender mainstreaming; (2) encourage greater focus on gender mainstreaming and gender issues in immunisation; and (3) employ gender appropriate language;
- 4.3.2 Actively disseminate and promote evidence and lessons learned regarding the impact that gender mainstreaming has on immunisation service access, coverage and impact

5. Gender Sensitive Approaches within the GAVI Alliance structures

5.1 Resources

- 5.1.1 Committing adequate human and financial resources for gender mainstreaming is essential for the effective implementation of the Gender Policy.

5.2 Governance

5.2.1 Progress towards gender equality will be integrated into accountability outcomes at all levels. Gender balance in all areas of GAVI work should be ensured, including throughout the governance structures, to the extent possible, as well as through staffing (all levels) and consultancies.

5.3 The Role of Partners

5.3.1 Given the GAVI Alliance's mode of operation (largely through its partners), implementation of the policy will require a clear articulation by each partner of its specific contributions to the realisation of the Gender Policy aims. Gender expertise and experience of Alliance partners should be engaged.

5.4 The Secretariat

5.4.1 Building and fostering a gender-sensitive Secretariat is a prerequisite for supporting the effective implementation of a Gender Policy and realising positive outcomes. Development of an effective gender infrastructure and organisational culture that facilitates the implementation of the policy includes:

5.4.2 Strengthen the capacity of all staff, and invest in the development of specialists in the area of gender.

5.4.3 Assess gender parity trends in the Secretariat and ensure that meaningful efforts are made to identify equal numbers of qualified female and male candidates during recruitment and promotion processes.

5.4.4 Include gender equality measures as part of performance assessments.

6. Timeline for Implementation and Review

6.1 The policy will take effect as of July 2008.

6.2 Following adoption, the Secretariat in cooperation with partners will finalise an implementation strategy that defines specific objectives and activities, immediate, medium and long-term priorities, responsible parties and a monitoring plan for presentation to the board (or board executive committee). This will include reviewing the GAVI Alliance Roadmap and Work Plan to ensure it is consistent with this policy.

6.3 The Executive Secretary will be responsible for reporting to the GAVI Alliance Board on progress towards delivery of these outcomes on an annual basis.

6.4 A full external review of the Gender Policy and its implementation will be conducted in 2012. Based on the results, the GAVI Alliance may consider revising the policy.

Annex IV: GEF Policy on Gender Mainstreaming

Introduction

55. 1. This policy expresses the GEF's commitment to address the link between gender equality and environmental sustainability and towards gender mainstreaming in its policies, programs, and operations. It has been developed to assist the GEF and its Agencies ensure that GEF operations promote gender equality, and equity.
56. 2. The GEF recognizes that gender equality is an important goal in the context of the projects that it finances because it advances both the GEF's goals for attaining global environmental benefits and the goal of gender and social inclusion.
57. 3. While the degree of relevance of gender dimensions to finance activities may vary depending on the GEF focal area or type of engagement, accounting for gender equity and equality is an important consideration when financing projects that address global environmental issues, because gender relations, roles and responsibilities exercise important influence on women and men's access to and control over environmental resources and the goods and services they provide.
58. 4. The GEF acknowledges that project results can often be superior when gender considerations are integrated into the design and implementation of projects, where relevant. It is important, in many instances for programme and project interventions to take into account differences in ways men and women perceive incentives linked to the sustainable use of resources and how these perceptions can influence the achievement of the results specified in project objectives.

Background

59. 5. The GEF has adopted, since its early days, a Public Involvement Policy that aims to ensure both women's and men's involvement in GEF projects. This policy is the key GEF policy that relates specifically to social issues, including gender, and provides the basis for public involvement in the design, implementation, and evaluation of GEF-financed projects. It applies to all GEF focal areas programs and projects; spells out the rationale, terms, and principles for public involvement; and solidifies the operational requirement for stakeholder involvement and partnership in the design, implementation, and evaluation of GEF-financed activities.
60. 6. All GEF Agencies have their own policies and strategies on gender mainstreaming and promoting gender equality in the context of project interventions, and these apply for GEF projects as well. In recent years, following the UN's mandate on gender equality and other international agreements, many of the GEF Agencies have revised and strengthened their approach to gender issues in their operations, by developing Gender Plans of Action and gender related strategies.
61. 7. Given these changes and new approaches to gender mainstreaming, the GEF is renewing and expanding its commitment towards gender mainstreaming, and building on its Public Involvement Policy by adopting a new Policy on Gender Mainstreaming.

Relevance: Corporate-wide Objectives

62. 8. The GEF Secretariat and GEF Partner Agencies shall strive to attain the goal of gender equality, the equal treatment of women and men, including the equal access to resources and services through its operations. To accomplish this goal, the GEF Secretariat and GEF Partner Agencies shall mainstream gender into its operations, including efforts to analyze systematically and address the specific needs of both women and men in GEF projects.

Application of the Policy

63. 9. The Policy specifies the criteria for gender mainstreaming that all GEF Partner Agencies will need to meet in order to implement GEF-financed projects, separate or as part of larger policies. This policy will apply equally to the ten GEF Agencies as well as to accredited GEF Project Agencies. The Council may grant GEF Agencies a time bound waiver to enable the Agency to meet the criteria within a specific phase-in period.
64. 10. The GEF understands that gender mainstreaming at the corporate and the project level is long-term undertaking and a sustained commitment, which includes tracking its progress. It also acknowledges that approaches to gender mainstreaming evolve. In light of this, the GEF Council will review its Policy on Gender Mainstreaming in 2015.

Criteria and Minimum Requirements for GEF Partner Agencies

Criteria:

65. 11. Established policies (including relevant laws, regulations, strategies, or action plans) require the Agency to design and implement projects in such a way that both women and men (a) receive culturally compatible social and economic benefits; and (b) do not suffer adverse effects during the development process; and that (c) fosters full respect for their dignity and human rights;
66. 12. The Agency's systems and policies satisfy the minimum requirements listed below;
67. 13. The Agency has sufficient institutional capability to implement the policies and procedures and apply them to GEF financed projects.

Minimum Requirements:

68. 14. Strengthen the institutional framework for gender mainstreaming, and socio-economic aspects in general, by having a focal point to support developing, implementing, and monitoring guidance and strategy on gender mainstreaming, in coordination GEF partners.
69. 15. Pay increased attention to socio-economic aspects of GEF projects, including gender elements, as important drivers and incentives for achieving global environmental benefits through existing project review criteria on project design;
70. 16. Undertake social assessment that includes gender analysis, or use similar methods to assess potential roles, benefits, impacts and risks for women and men of different ages, ethnicities, and social structure and status. These studies may be used, along with other types of studies to inform project formulation, implementation and monitoring and evaluation;

71. 17. Identify measures to avoid, minimize and/or mitigate adverse impacts;
72. 18. Prepare a gender mainstreaming strategy, as appropriate, using qualified professionals based on-site studies and meetings. The plan will cover gender sensitive activities while recognizing and respecting the different roles that women and men play in resource management and in society. It should be accompanied by a monitoring and evaluation plan (including gender disaggregated indicators), implementation schedule, and estimated budget;
73. 19. Develop a system for monitoring and evaluating progress in gender mainstreaming, including the use of gender disaggregated monitoring indicators;
74. 20. Monitor and provide necessary support by experienced social/gender experts on the implementation of gender mainstreaming in the projects.

Requirements for the GEF Secretariat

75. 21. The GEF Secretariat will strengthen gender-mainstreaming capacities among the GEF Secretariat staff to increase their understanding of gender mainstreaming, as well as socio-economic aspects in general.
76. 22. The GEF Secretariat shall designate a focal point for gender issues to support developing, implementing, and monitoring guidance and strategy on gender mainstreaming, and coordinating internally and externally on such issues.
77. 23. Recognizing that each GEF Agency has a different gender policy and/or strategy, with varying application to GEF projects, the GEF Secretariat will work with its Agencies and other partners to strengthen gender mainstreaming, including, as feasible, a more systematic approach to programming that incorporates this issue.
78. 24. The GEF Secretariat will establish and strengthen networks with partners that have substantive experience working on gender issues, and utilize their expertise to develop and implement GEF projects.

NOTES

- ¹ This methodology is contained in GA's April 2011 contract with WEDO.
- ² The Manila Declaration for Global Action on Gender in Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction (2008); the Nordic Summit on Climate, Gender and Equality (2009); the International Colloquium on Women's Empowerment, Leadership Development, International Peace and Security (2009); and the Joint ACP African, Caribbean and Pacific-EU (European Union) Declaration on Climate Change (2009).
- ³ GEF is still housed within the World Bank.
- ⁴ In project proposal documents: Senegal and Ecuador mention gender fairly comprehensively; Eritrea, Solomon Islands, and Pakistan mention gender in a few instances; Honduras and Nicaragua barely mention gender.
- ⁵ AF lacks a gender policy.
- ⁶ See GA's report, 'Why Engendering PRSPs Reduce Poverty, and the Case of Rwanda' for further discussion. (<http://www.genderaction.org/images/dp2001-112.pdf>)
- ⁷ ODI (2008) 'Knowledge Stocktaking Report on Gender and Immunisation', Commissioned by the GAVI Alliance.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This is a joint publication of Gender Action, Oxfam, and the Women's Environment and Development Organization (WEDO). This report was commissioned by Oxfam and WEDO, with funding from Oxfam Great Britain and coordination by WEDO. Primary authors of this report are Elizabeth Arend and Sonia Lowman of Gender Action. Contributing authors include Elaine Zuckerman of Gender Action; Tracy Carty, Claire Godfrey and Monique Mikhail of Oxfam GB; Sandra Freitas, Rachel Harris and Cate Owren of WEDO.

Research Reports

This research report was written to share research results, to contribute to public debate and to invite feedback on development policy and practice. It does not necessarily reflect Oxfam policy positions. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of Oxfam.

© Oxfam International September 2011

This publication is copyright but text may be used free of charge for the purposes of advocacy, campaigning, education, and research, provided that the source is acknowledged in full. The copyright holder requests that all such use be registered with them for impact assessment purposes. For copying in any other circumstances, or for re-use in other publications, or for translation or adaptation, permission must be secured and a fee may be charged. E-mail publish@oxfam.org.uk.

The information in this publication is correct at the time of going to press.

www.oxfam.org

Published by Oxfam GB for Oxfam International under ISBN 978-1-84814-955-7 in September 2011. Oxfam GB, Oxfam House, John Smith Drive, Cowley, Oxford, OX4 2JY, UK.

Oxfam is an international confederation of fifteen organizations working together in 98 countries to find lasting solutions to poverty and injustice. Please write to any of the agencies for further information, or visit www.oxfam.org.

www.wedo.org

www.genderaction.org

www.oxfam.org/grow

