

**Report<sup>1</sup> on the Workshop on  
Gender-Responsive Indicators and Performance Measurement  
with Relevance for the Green Climate Fund (GCF) and other Climate Funds**

**24 of April 2015, Washington DC**

---

## **Objective**

To develop and strategize on recommending possible gender indicators, as well as gender-responsive sector indicators, for climate-relevant funding contexts, such as the Performance Measurement Frameworks (PMF) for the GCF.

## **Welcome and introductions**

The organizers, Liane Schalatek from the Heinrich Böll Stiftung North America Office, and Lorena Aguilar from the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) Global Gender Office welcomed the participants in Washington and online (see Annex I with a list of workshop participants) and introduced the objective of the workshop.

The workshop was structured around an introductory presentation on the status of GCF and specifically PMF operationalization, given by Anna Williams, a specialist consulting on monitoring and evaluation with the GCF Secretariat. This was followed by short descriptions of lessons learned and challenges experienced with respect to the integration of gender considerations in the Climate Investments Funds (CIFs), the climate instruments under the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and the Adaptation Fund. Gender and sector experts discussed then in small groups possible improvements to the existing GCF PMFs, focusing on the indicators still to be decided. A concluding feedback session in the plenary then collected and discussed small group proposals and formulated some key recommendations. It is expected that these will provide useful suggestions for the finalization of the GCF PMFs, to be decided either at the upcoming 10<sup>th</sup> or 11<sup>th</sup> GCF Board meetings later this year.

## **Status of the GCF PMFs—What Input from gender and sector experts is needed? Presentation by Anna Williams**

Anna Williams, a consultant for the GCF Secretariat, gave a quick overview on the status of operationalization of the GCF<sup>2</sup>. Ms. Williams also highlighted the accreditation of the first seven GCF implementing entities in March and further progress in finalizing the GCF investment framework with its set of criteria that focus also on sustainable development multiple-benefits, including the gender dimension, as well as the needs of the recipient countries in a country-driven approach. It is in this context of country-drivenness that the proposed indicators and PMFs have to also consider the capacity, interests, and needs of developing countries receiving GCF funding.

A gender sensitive approach in the GCF is part of the guiding principles detailed in the GCF Governing Instrument with approval of the GCF Gender Policy and Action Plan at the March 2015 Board Meeting. One of the Gender Action Plan priority areas focuses on the relevance of gender-sensitive objectives and indicators. As a part of the approved GCF Gender Action Plan, two portfolio-level indicators to monitor the implementation of the GCF gender policy were adopted, namely, 1) looking at the

---

<sup>1</sup> This workshop report was written by Liane Schalatek, hbs North America, and Margaux Granat, IUCN Gender team, based on notes taken during the workshop, the documented report back results of the individual working groups, as well as comments, feed-back and edits received from workshop participations on a draft workshop report sent out for review. For questions and comments regarding the workshop and the report, please email [liane.schalatek@us.boell.org](mailto:liane.schalatek@us.boell.org) and [lorena.aguilar@iucn.org](mailto:lorena.aguilar@iucn.org).

<sup>2</sup> These included a description of its agreed allocation framework, which will designate 50 percent of its funding for adaptation, with half of the adaptation funding designated to SIDs, LDCs, and Africa countries; a status report on the initial resource mobilization with \$10.2 billion pledged and the first contribution agreement signed toward a deadline for the effectiveness of the GCF by end of April; as well as progress in the designation of national authorities to engage with the Fund with 119 countries registering National Designated Authorities (NDAs) or focal point and 59 of these countries requesting readiness support.

percentage of adaptation and mitigation projects that include specific gender elements and gender-sensitive implementation arrangements to ensure quality of entry; and 2) proposing, on the basis of best practices from other organizations, a portfolio classification system, which consists of a project rating at entry for gender sensitivity. It was not clear yet, how these portfolio gender indicators will relate to the overall GCF results management framework (for example, if they would become an integral part of performance measurement approaches).

The GCF accreditation process thus far has incorporated an analysis of entities' gender policy, procedures and competencies in terms of how their policies are being implemented. Gender will also be considered at the investment decision-level and in the Results Management Framework (RMF) and the Performance Management Framework (PMF) to facilitate monitoring, evaluation, and reporting that is gender-responsive and allows for learning and knowledge enhancement.

Regarding the status of the RMF in the GCF, Ms. Williams underlined that its development has been a long process with indicators driven largely by the logic models for both adaptation and mitigation, with specific language and impact areas determined through negotiations and compromises derived in the Board. With some core indicators adopted, several proposed indicators need further refinement in a way that balances ambition with the capacity of countries and entities to ensure commitments are attainable.

Currently, some mitigation and adaptation indicators have been approved and gender disaggregation has been earmarked, for example with respect to energy access and transportation. With this, the Fund is already at the leading edge of work on gender integration and has tried to push the envelope. Further ambition in this regard will necessitate research into the sectors, as well as the "gender relevance" of indicators to be considered while being mindful for example of efforts to create efficient indicators and guidance already given by the UNFCCC COP and Convention bodies, such as the Adaptation Committee, to streamline and reduce the number of GCF indicators and the reporting burden of recipient countries.

Mindful of these challenges, the experiences of other peer institutions are relevant, especially with respect to:

- What does the existence of indicators mean for practice of reporting on them? What is the level of ambition for those indicators and what does it mean for resources and country capacity needed?
- How is the issue of qualitative (versus quantitative) indicators addressed?

The next steps by GCF in finalizing its results management and performance measurement frameworks involve:

- Revise and adopt those indicators marked in the Barbados framework (Decision B.08/07) as needed further work and improvement;
- Discuss and develop methodologies that are suitable for indicator measurement—these will largely be based on lessons learned from other finance mechanisms, such as methodology used by Clean Development Mechanism on reducing GHG;
- Speedy development of toolkits for monitoring and reporting;
- Further development of the overarching monitoring and evaluation policy of the GCF with the PMF ready for implementing entities to be able to report against it in time for the first GCF projects to be approved later this year.

Workshop participants were reminded that the indicators being developed and proposed at the workshop, and relevant recommendations forwarded to the GCF Secretariat, are for Fund aggregate-level indicators looking at portfolio outcomes, not indicators for individual projects or country-wide reporting, which are at the discretion of the countries. There are also opportunities for the elaboration and development of project-level gender-responsive output indicators at a later stage.

The workshop is part of a wider consultation effort by the GCF Secretariat on the proposed refinement to the PMF, but decision on the indicators remain within the context of the framework already agreed upon by the board and were urged to be as specific as possible in providing a rationale on the why, how and who of the reporting.

## Overview of other climate funds' experiences in implementing a gender-responsive results management approach

### Climate Investment Funds

For the CIF Administrative Unit, Anne Kuriakose, Senior Social Development Specialist, detailed some of the challenges the CIF—which is currently with a capitalization of US\$ 8.1 billion, the largest active climate fund—faces in integrating gender into their work, with a gender action plan only added more recently (2014) following a gender review conducted by IUCN (2012) that showed some shortcomings. With respect to results management, the four CIF programs—Clean Technology Fund (CTF), Pilot Program for Climate Resilience (PPCR), Forest Investment Program (FIP), and Scaling Up Renewable Energy in Low Income Countries Program (SREP)—all have individual results frameworks where gender integration is partially taken up. Ms. Kuriakose described qualitative differences between the core indicators, which are monitored annually but where gender is barely considered and additional more co-benefit focused indicators, which are sector-specific and much more gender-responsive. However, the latter indicators are monitored only at the end of the program and often only “indicative”. With respect to gender, the CIFs are currently just monitoring outcomes with a focus on sex-disaggregated numbers, but not (yet) CIF-wide transformation results. Based on the CIF experience, some key recommendations are:

- Recognize need for clear, specific gender-sensitive indicators which don't allow for customization by giving the option to report on a list of potential beneficiaries (by lumping in several units of analysis for recipients such as businesses, community services, households, men and women into one indicator); in such cases implementers will “pick and chose” which unit to report on;
- Think about the utility of proxy indicators in fund-wide reporting on gender impacts;
- Determine monitoring and implementation, and funding, as a part of capacity-building efforts;
- Look at a wider range of reporting options on gender beyond the actual results frameworks; and
- Think about consequences in cases where reporting on gender-disaggregated indicators are specified as requirement but not followed up.

### Global Environment Facility

For the GEF Trust Fund and its US\$ 10.5 billion expenditure over the last two decades, Yoko Watanabe, Senior Biodiversity Specialist and Gender Focal Point, described differences in the six focal areas with a large number of sectors in gender mainstreaming efforts with the natural resource related sectors focusing on biodiversity, water management and adaptation doing better at integrating gender in results management than in the climate change focal area which has a stronger focus on industrial level investment policy and frameworks. The GEF has had a gender policy since 2011 and recently in fall 2014 agreed on a gender equality action plan (GEAP) after a year-long discussion with its 15 GEF implementing agencies and regional MDBs. Recently accredited agencies had to show gender capacity as one of the accreditation criteria. GEF results management is on three levels – corporate, focal area, and project area, with five gender core indicators identified at the corporate level which measure 1) the percentage of projects with a consideration of a gender analysis (current baseline of 18% of the overall GEF portfolio); 2) gender-responsive projects results (baseline different according to the focal area, with currently 57% incorporating some type of gender measurement); 3) disaggregating beneficiaries by women and men; 4) level of gender consideration in national reporting requirements under the Rio Conventions – a proxy indicator relying on data collecting under the Rio Conventions; and 5) the percentage of M&E reports that incorporate gender in mid-term and annual, as well as final reports. She described the GEF efforts as a “work in progress” and urged joint learning opportunities.

For the LDCF and SCCF, with US\$ 1.3 billion under implementation over 10 years, the focus is on tracking in projects how to reduce the vulnerability and increase resilience of women by looking at the number of direct beneficiaries or the percentage of women benefitting from certain technologies or resources; these are then aggregated across portfolios, but with an outlook to aggregate at fund-level. However, in the experience of GEF adaptation expert Fareeha Iqbal, the real qualitative substance comes from a set of questions on the project level, both through a formal review on gender but also through the “hardening effect” of an iterative process in which implementers are asked by the GEF Secretariat in informal exchanges and discussions. The GEF experience has been that there is a degree

of “underreporting” on gender with GEF implementing agencies actually already doing more than they are reporting, or even have formally planned.

#### Adaptation Fund

While the Adaptation Fund does not (yet) have a formal gender policy, gender equality and a human rights framing are the basis of its environmental and social policy adopted in 2014 and a gendered look at beneficiaries are required for project approval and in results management

Underlining that some of the experiences in the Adaptation Fund with respect to gender have been similar to those of the LDCF/SCCF, Dima Shocair Reda from the Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat urged a stronger focus on following where the money is going in terms of reporting on gender-responsiveness in implementation. She highlighted in particular the experiences of several Adaptation Fund projects where depending on who the executing entities in adaptation projects are can drive the gender-responsiveness of implementation significantly. Because of this, the Adaptation Fund is looking now at tracking the percentage of local consultants that are women and the local executing entities that are women-led or women NGOs as one aggregate proxy indicator for gender-responsive implementation.

### **General discussion and report back from sector group work on indicator suggestions**

In the general discussion before sharing from the small groups sessions, participants highlighted a number of overarching issues that should guide any further efforts on gender-integration in the GCF PMFs.

- **On quantitative versus qualitative indicators:** Several participants pointed out it was not just a matter of disaggregating beneficiaries, as a disaggregation is not addressing some of the underlying issues of existing power-relationship between men and women and the question of access to resources and wealth. Of equal importance therefore is what is measured, not just how many men or women are affected by or benefit from specific activities. Speakers pointed out that sex-disaggregation does not get at the question of women’s empowerment and thus showing real transformation in social and economic transformation. The focus has to be on the use/utility of measured parameters for women’s empowerment and the ability of men and women to act as a result. Thus, the focus has to shift on the “quality of implementation.” This cannot be accomplished just by counting heads.
- **Women and men as rights-holders:** Several discussants underlined that results management has to take a human rights framework as a starting point focused on men and women as rights-holders. There are existing sectoral requirements stemming from such an approach (e.g. right to water and food) that then need to inform sector-specific performance measurement in the GCF context in line with UN-wide approaches. The GCF as a fund under the UN system is not exempt from the human rights framework.
- **The gendered dimensions of the care and informal economy need to be considered in performance measurement:** Several discussants recommended that aggregate indicators should look at a change in the burden of care and the redistribution of care (e.g. via time-use surveys/data, UN Women has done work with UN Stats); this is particularly relevant for a number of adaptation sector performance measurements, including for agriculture/food security, water and health but can also not be ignored for mitigation performance measurement with respect to energy access and power generation and transportation
- **Comparability with other climate funds and awareness of ongoing processes:** Participants recommended a clear and consistent definition of terms used across indicators, such as for example “benefits”, “beneficiaries” or “vulnerability” or “vulnerable populations”. These terms are not only used in the proposed GCF PMFs, but also in the results management frameworks of other climate funds. Consistent and coordinated definitions within and across climate funds would thus pose the opportunity for aggregating information on the gender-responsiveness of climate actions on a grander scale beyond the GCF. The idea of a regular exchange and discussion across funds was supported. Discussants also referred to ongoing processes such as

SE4All or the SDGs, which are also working on gender integration as an opportunity for creating some coherence across funding approaches.

- **On time-horizons for indicators:** Groups discussed that these indicators need to reflect a longer-term horizon to be indicative of the societal changes necessary to have lasting impacts and contribute to a paradigm-shift of development approaches. Groups were not quite clear what the suggested time frame of particularly impact-level indicators was.

Specific sector and small group specific recommendation follow below. Due to a limited number of break-out groups, not all GCF PMF impact areas could be discussed.

## Forests, REDD+ and Environmental Services

The small group discussed that in relation to forests, REDD+ approaches and the determination of environmental services under the mitigation PMF, it was difficult to incorporate gender considerations into a performance measurement primarily focused on the reduction of tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>; however, participants pointed out that it was in line with decisions that the COP has already taken on REDD+ to incorporate a focus on participation in decision-making and of the gender-dimension into performance measurement of GCF aggregate mitigation activities under mitigation Fund impact area 4.0 and project/program outcomes area 9.0.

The group proposed the following sub-indicator(s) **IN RED** under already adopted impact indicator 4.1:

Expected result	Indicator (☑ = Board-adopted ; ☐ = proposed)	Reporting	Notes
4.0 Reduced emissions from land use, deforestation, forest degradation, and through sustainable management of forests and conservation and enhancement of forest carbon stocks	<p>☑ 4.1 Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (t CO<sub>2</sub>eq) reduced or avoided (including increased removals) as a result of Fund-funded projects/programmes – <i>forest and land-use sub-indicator</i></p> <p><b>PROPOSED sub-indicators from the forests/REDD group:</b></p> <p>☐ 4.1.1. Number of men and women participating in capacity training and knowledge sharing (with regard to improved land/forest management and CO<sub>2</sub> reductions) as result of Fund-funded projects/programmes</p> <p>☐ 4.1.2. Number of households and individuals (males and females) with improved access to and control of land and forests as a result of fund support</p> <p><b>PROPOSED sub-indicator from the agriculture group (see also separate section):</b></p> <p>☐ 4.1.3 Number of sustainable management systems that include equity considerations and number of women and men benefitting from programs that are reducing CO<sub>2</sub> (sex-disaggregated, and by most-vulnerable)</p>	IEs/ intermediaries	<p>Informed by CIF FIP Indicator 1, pending Fund work on the performance framework for REDD+, the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility Methodological Framework (Dec. 2013), UN REDD and emerging United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) guidance on REDD+.</p> <p><i>Gender disaggregation is to be researched and included if possible.</i></p>

The group also proposed to change draft mitigation outcome indicator 9.1 and to add new draft mitigation indicators 9.2 and 9.3 as follows (with an additional/alternative indicator from the agriculture group):



9.0 Improved management of land or forest areas contributing to emissions reductions	<input type="checkbox"/> 9.1 Hectares of land or forests under improved and effective management that contributes to CO2 emission reductions <b>disaggregated by women-led/men-led activities</b>  <b>Proposed additional indicators:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 9.2 Number of men and women participating in capacity training and knowledge sharing with regard to improved land and forest management and CO2 reductions <input type="checkbox"/> 9.2.1 Gender-disaggregated innovations resulting from 9.2 (new knowledge/activities etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> 9.3. Number of women/men-led organizations benefitting as a result of fund supported projects/programs  <input type="checkbox"/> 9.4 Number of sustainable management systems that include equity considerations in management/decision-making and benefit-sharing	IEs/ inter-mediaries	Informed by work on REDD+ performance framework (currently being developed). Can draw on CIF Forest Investment Program (FIP) indicator guidance, Forest Carbon Partnership Facility Monitoring and Evaluation Framework, UN REDD, and UNFCCC guidance.  <i>NOTE: indicators 9.2 and 9.3 were proposed by the land use/REDD group; indicator 9.4 was suggested by the agriculture group</i>
--	---	----------------------	--

## Health/Well-being, Food and Water Security

The small group looking at this issue recommended that as the adaptation impact area and related adaptation impact indicators dealing with health (adaptation indicator 2.1), food security (adaptation indicator 2.2.) and water security (adaptation indicator 2.3) have already been approved, the following are suggestions for refinement of the methodologies/considerations of what should be looked at under those core indicators.

The group strongly felt that the focus on the (absolute) number of men and women or of male- and female-headed households was less indicative of the desired sector-specific adaptation impacts than a look at the *percentage/proportion* (emphasis added) of women or female-headed households. They also suggested the introduction of sub-indicators under water and food security that look at the *change in burden of care for women and men in accessing* (emphasis added) food or safe water supplies as well as the question of who manages and determines water use.

Communities have prioritization of water for different activities which makes it complex as water deals with domestic, agricultural, and industrial uses; these dimensions include the relative proportion/percentage of women and men contributing to each sector and gender-specific implications on employment, ownership, livelihood and income for each of these different water uses that also need to be considered.

The recommended changes under adaptation impact area 2.0 are summarized below **IN RED**:

Expected result	Indicator ( <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Board-adopted ; <input type="checkbox"/> = proposed)	Reporting	Notes
2.0 Increased resilience of health and well-being, and food and water security	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2.1 Number of males and females benefitting from introduced health measures to respond to climate-sensitive diseases  <b>Proposed sub-indicator:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 2.1.1 Percentage/proportion of females benefitting from introduced health measures to respond to climate-sensitive diseases	IEs/ inter-mediaries	Disaggregated by health measure ( <b>looking specifically at reproductive health issues</b> ), disease Disaggregated by gender, <b>looking specifically at the percentage of women benefitting</b> <i>Informed by: n/a. WHO data</i>

	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2.2 Number of food- secure households (in areas/periods at risk of climate change impacts)</p> <p>Proposed sub-indicators:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2.2.1 Proportion/percentage of women (in male and female-headed households) with access to adequate levels of food</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2.2.2. Proportion/percentage of women (in male and female-headed households) at risk for malnutrition</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2.2.3. Change in burden of care for women and men in accessing food (time-use surveys)</p>	IEs/ intermediaries	<p>Disaggregated by male and female-headed households</p> <p><b>PROPOSED:</b></p> <p>Look instead at proportion/percentage of women in male and female-headed households with access to adequate levels of food and at risk for malnutrition households</p> <p><i>Informed by CIF PPCR A1.1.</i></p>
	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2.3 Number of males and females with year-round access to reliable and safe water supply despite climate shocks and stresses</p> <p>Proposed impact sub-indicators:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2.3.1 Change in burden of care for women and men in accessing safe water supply</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2.3.2 Percentage of communities (rural, urban, and peri-urban) with access to reliable and safe water supply</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2.3.3 Percentage of female-headed households with access to reliable and safe water for domestic and multiple use activities</p> <p>Proposed project/program outcome indicators:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2.3.4 Percentage difference by gender in reported beneficiary satisfaction of domestic water supply services provided</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2.3.5. Number of water user associations (WUAs) operating that formally address multiple use to the benefit of women and men. Of these, proportion of WUA</p>	IEs/ intermediaries	<p>Disaggregated by gender in relation to domestic, agricultural and industrial uses and multiple use activities in urban, peri-urban and rural settings sources.</p> <p>Disaggregated by male and female-headed households for domestic sources.</p> <p><i>Informed by CIF PPCR A1.4.; look at UN Women World Survey on Women in Development;</i></p> <p><i>NOTE: similar to energy access (SE4All) a multi-tier framework is proposed looking at reliability and service – also applicable to energy access/power provision</i></p> <p><i>NOTE: the issue of critical mass in decision-making (1/3 of decision-makers being women) is also of relevance for forest, agricultural or ecosystem management systems or user associations</i></p>

## Ecosystems and Ecosystem Services

While there was no breakout group focusing on ecosystems and ecosystem services, this issue was discussed in the small group dealing with water. As water supply and access can also be linked with ecosystem benefits and watershed management, the small group proposed, and was supported on, the addition of a sub-indicator under adaptation indicator 4.1 focused on the number of communities and the percentage of women in these communities benefiting from effective, climate-resilient watershed management.

Expected result	Indicator (☑ = Board-adopted ; ☐ = proposed)	Reporting	Notes
4.0 Improved resilience of ecosystems and ecosystem services	☐ 4.1 Coverage/scale of ecosystems protected and strengthened in response to climate variability and change <b>Proposed sub-indicator (by ecosystem type):</b> ☐ 4.1.1 number of communities and the percentage of women in these communities benefiting from effective, climate-resilient watershed management (or forest,	IEs/intermediaries	Disaggregated by ecosystem type.  To examine how impact on people can be captured.  <i>Informed by Adaptation Fund (core-4); LDCF/SCCF 2.</i>
	☐ 4.2 Value (US\$) Utility of ecosystem services generated or protected in response to climate change for the livelihood of natural-resource dependent communities	IEs/intermediaries	<i>Informed by LDCF/SCCF 2.</i>  <i>Disaggregated by indigenous peoples, men/women</i>

## Energy and Transportation

The group that worked on developing gender-responsive indicators in the energy and transportation sector proposed different indicators under the mitigation PMF where gender sub-indicators have been ear-marked for development and future approval by the Board. The group suggested to go beyond sex disaggregation of data as the primary effort, but instead rate the aggregate portfolio of GCF energy access and power generation projects as well as transportation projects against the compliance with a previously defined set of gender guidelines for those sector activities. These guidelines would not just focus on the number of men and women participating, but on the quality of their inclusion, for example in addressing questions like who owns the energy generation system, for what purpose is energy used and generated (addressing and easing for example the drudgery of women's unpaid care burden) and who drives and makes decisions on low-carbon energy generation and use or with respect to transport regarding the inclusively and affordability of (public) transport options free of violence against women/safe for their use. Some guidelines already exist (for example, the German GIZ as well as the World Bank developed gender-responsive transportation guidelines); in the case of energy access, discourses around the SE4All gender inclusion as well as the SDG discourse currently work on the integration of gender consideration into indicators (for energy access, for example via looking at multi-tier users and uses).

The group also discussed that the resilience and reliability of energy service provision and generation was an important point, including to build resiliency (cross-cutting mitigation/adaptation). It was felt that reporting could be eased by considering a binary (compliance with guidelines, yes/no or partially) response.

The group proposed the following sub-indicator(s) **IN RED** under already adopted impact indicator 1.1 and 2.1.

The group also proposed to add new draft mitigation co-benefit impact indicator 45.1 with a suggested focus below:



Expected result	Indicator ( <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = Board-adopted ; <input type="checkbox"/> = proposed)	Reporting	Notes
1.0 Reduced emissions through increased low-emission energy access and power generation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.1 *Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (t CO <sub>2</sub> eq) reduced or avoided as a result of Fund-funded projects/programmes <i>–gender-sensitive energy access power generation (sub-indicator)</i> <b>Proposed sub-indicator:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 1.1.1 Percentage of GCF-funded energy access and power generation projects in compliance with defined gender-standards (i.e. governance, ownership, decision-making, expertise, priority for those with least access= demand/need focus)	IEs/ intermediaries	<b>Energy access:</b> - Based on gender-sensitive methodologies used by CIF's Program for Scaling Up Renewable Energy in Low Income Countries (SREP) core indicator 2. Disaggregated by gender.
2.0 Reduced emissions through increased access to low-emission transport	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2.1 *Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (t CO <sub>2</sub> eq) reduced or avoided as a result of Fund-funded projects/programmes <i>– low emission gender- sensitive transport (sub-indicator)</i> <b>Proposed sub-indicator:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 2.1.1 Percentage of GCF-funded transportation that complies with defined transportation gender-standards (i.e. free of violence against women, safe, inclusive, affordable, & accessible)	IEs/ intermediaries	<b>To be supported by existing guidelines under GIZ, WB, SLOCAT</b> <i>Informed by CIF PPCR A1.1.</i>
Co-benefits	<input type="checkbox"/> Social, environmental, economic co-benefit index/indicator at impact level	IEs/ intermediaries	<b>Proposed principles for such an indicator include:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased gender parity in provision and benefit</li> <li>• Must reduce and redistribute unpaid domestic and care work</li> <li>• Must reduce inequalities (gender+)</li> <li>• Must comply with decent work standards (ILO)</li> </ul>
6.0 Increased number of small, medium and large low- emission power suppliers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 6.1 Proportion of low-emission power supply in a jurisdiction or market.	IEs/ intermediaries	To be determined by recipient countries. Disaggregated by size of supplier, ownership structures and focus of power generation (industrial/export, domestic – addressing energy poverty)

	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 6.2. Number of households, and individuals (males and females) with improved access to <b>and primary use of</b> low-emission energy sources	IEs/inter-mediaries	Informed by CIF SREP 2. Disaggregated by males and females. Disaggregated by urban, <b>peri-urban</b> and rural. To be informed by SE4All – <b>focus on primary use/uptake and affordability</b> . Assumes that it will not be possible to measure improved access from large-grid systems; therefore the data will be linked to off-grid access (e.g., solar panels) and mini-grid systems.
8.0 Increased use of low-carbon transport	<input type="checkbox"/> 8.1 Number of additional female and male passengers using low-carbon transport as a result of Fund support.	IEs/ inter-mediaries	Informed by CIF CTF indicator 4, pending work by MDBs and IFIs on transport GHG accounting harmonization.  <b>Baseline = data from gender-analysis of existing transport options and usage</b>  Additional passengers = mode shift To consider underlying reasons for mode shift, such as transit-oriented development, <b>affordability, safety of use/access (gender violence)</b>

## Agriculture

The group that looked at agriculture emphasized particularly the need for consistent definitions on households, vulnerable populations, and benefits— and issue already coming up in other sector contexts as well and previously identified as an over-arching issue. Within the mitigation PMF the group also found that under the sub-indicator to be added regarding forests and land-use, agriculture should be included as a main emitter, but also a driver of deforestation for agricultural expansion, and should consider the women and men behind the management for reducing tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> and their equitable participation in and benefit from such management systems.

The group proposed the inclusion of equity principles under mitigation indicators 4.0 and 9.0, as follows **IN RED** (seen as a complement and addition to suggestions by the forest/REDD working group on the same indicators:

Expected result	Indicator (☑ = Board-adopted ; ☐ = proposed)	Reporting	Notes
4.0 Reduced emissions from land use, deforestation, forest degradation, and through sustainable management of forests and conservation and enhancement of forest carbon stocks	<input type="checkbox"/> 4.1 Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (t CO <sub>2</sub> eq) reduced or avoided (including increased removals) as a result of Fund-funded projects/programmes – forest and land-use sub-indicator  <i>PROPOSED additional sub-indicator (others are included in the recommendations by the forest/REDD group):</i> <input type="checkbox"/> 4.1.3 Number of sustainable management systems that include equity considerations, and number of women and men benefitting from programs that are reducing CO <sub>2</sub> (sex-disaggregated, and by most-vulnerable)	IEs/intermediaries	Informed by CIF FIP Indicator 1, pending Fund work on the performance framework for REDD+, the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility Methodological Framework (Dec. 2013), UN REDD and emerging United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) guidance on REDD+.  <i>Gender disaggregation is to be researched and included if possible.</i>
9.0 Improved management of land or forest areas contributing to emissions reductions	<input type="checkbox"/> 9.1 Hectares of land or forests under improved and effective management that contributes to CO <sub>2</sub> emission reductions <i>PROPOSED additional indicator (others are included in the recommendations by the forest/REDD group)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> 9.4 Number of sustainable management systems that include equity considerations in management/decision-making and benefit-sharing	IEs/intermediaries	Informed by work on REDD+ performance framework (currently being developed). Can draw on CIF Forest Investment Program (FIP) indicator guidance, Forest Carbon Partnership Facility Monitoring and Evaluation Framework, UN REDD, and UNFCCC guidance,; <b>must incorporate existing COP decisions on REDD safeguards and non-carbon benefits</b>

The group working on agriculture also took on some of the proposed indicators in the adaptation PMF that they felt had relevance for the agricultural sector, even if not specific to the agricultural sector. In this context, they looked particularly at Adaptation PMF outcomes indicators looking at strengthened regulatory and planning systems and climate information provision systems (result areas. 5.0 and 6.0)

They articulated a concern that the approved Fund-level core indicator for adaptation should consider the following specification, to be including into guidelines for this indicator, namely to focus on the : “Total number of direct and indirect beneficiaries **disaggregated by sex and most-vulnerable**; Number of beneficiaries relative to total population”.

The group also proposed indicator 1.1 be separated into two specific areas but remove from the indicators (as indicated below) “expected losses of lives” and “economic assets” because it is unclear how a baseline would be set. The group also suggested that the methodology for Adaptation impact indicator 1.2 utilizes an index for women’s economic empowerment (such as for example the USAID WEAI, or UN Women indexes).

Other proposed changes in the adaptation PMF elaborated by this group include **IN RED**:

Expected result	Indicator (☑ = Board-adopted ; ☐ = proposed)	Reporting	Notes
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Total Number of direct and indirect beneficiaries, <b>disaggregated by sex and most vulnerable</b> ; Number of beneficiaries relative to total population	IEs/intermediaries	

1.0 Increased resilience and enhanced livelihoods of the most vulnerable people, communities and regions	<p><b>Proposed division of indicator 1.1:</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1.1.1 <del>Change in expected losses of lives as measures by a</del> <b>reduction in the humanitarian case load, due to the impact of extreme climate-related disasters in the geographic area of the GCF intervention</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1.1.2. <del>Change in expected losses of economic assets (US\$) livelihoods...</del></p>	IEs/Intermediaries/country	
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> 1.2 <del>Number of males and females</del> <b>Percentage of male and women (economically) empowered by benefiting from the adoption of diversified, climate-resilient livelihood options (including fisheries, agriculture, tourism, etc.)</b></p>	IEs/intermediaries	<p>Disaggregated by gender; to consider equitable sharing of benefits. → <b>consider the use of an index for women's (economic) empowerment to show transformation rather than "head-counting"</b></p> <p>Methodology to consider (e.g., climate- resilient agriculture, sustainable climate- resilient tourism, fisheries, green jobs, etc.)</p> <p><i>Informed by Adaptation Fund 6.1, 6.2; LDCF/SCCF 3.</i></p>
5.0 Strengthened institutional and regulatory systems for climate-responsive planning and development	<p><input type="checkbox"/> 5.1 Institutional and regulatory systems that improve incentives for climate resilience and their effective implementation.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 5.2 Number and level of <b>inclusiveness</b> of effective <b>domestic/sub-national</b> coordination mechanisms</p> <p><b>Proposed indicator</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 5.3 <b>Percentage of country budget resources devoted to climate change (climate-aware and responsive) programs (national investment)</b></p>	IEs/intermediaries/country	<p><i>Informed by Adaptation Fund 7; CIF PPCR A2.1, B2; Adaptation Fund 7.1; LDCF/SCCF 12.</i></p> <p><b>NOTE: workshop participants were not clear if the coordination mechanisms referred to country/sub-national level; they stressed the importance to include women machineries in such coordination</b></p>
6.0 Increased generation and use of climate information in decision-making	<p><input type="checkbox"/> 6.2 <b>Increased use/ability to act on Use of climate information products/services in decision-making in climate-sensitive sectors disaggregated by gender/vulnerable populations ()</b></p>	IEs/intermediaries	<p>Disaggregated by stakeholder (government, private sector, and general population, <b>disaggregated by gender and vulnerable populations</b>).</p> <p>This indicator is qualitative in nature and country-specific. It will require an in-depth analysis or a scorecard approach to capture the understanding of the political economy determining decisions.</p>

## Disaster Risk Reduction

The group focused on Disaster Risk Reduction within the Adaptation PMF was concerned with how to demonstrate integrated risk management and the transformative process showing what makes women and men more resilient in the face of disaster, and what data needs to be measured with that goes beyond counting heads. The group generally suggested indicators should monitor and evaluate the fund-level impact, not just project level and that any DRR indicators need to consider the informal and care economies of particularly gender-importance as well as, subsistence agriculture, which are not captured in GDI measurements. The discussed the possibility of using a proxy indicator, such as giving men and women land tenure security as a way to increase and measure increased resilience

The group specifically noted in relation to adaptation indicator 5.1, that consideration for capacity building for institutions will need to take place in order to create effective, efficient and equitable investment plans and incentives, particularly in ensure gender-sensitive and –responsive approaches for DRR and suggested that including women's participation in decision-making could be included in a suggested score-card approach for such an indicator (as suggested in the Barbados framework). Additionally, under result 6.0, the group encouraged climate information needs to be gender-responsive and that women and men decision-makers need to both be included in any proposed indicators. And finally, the group was very interested in the issues of land titles and how monitoring land tenure of women and men could indicate resilience, or adaptive capacity, pre- and post-disaster.

The recommended changes under adaptation impact area 7.0 are below **IN RED**:

Expected result	Indicator (☑ = Board-adopted ; ☐ = proposed)	Reporting	Notes
7.0 Strengthened adaptive capacity and reduced exposure to climate risks	☐ Proposed 7.1: Use by vulnerable households, communities, businesses and public-sector services of Fund-supported tools, instruments, strategies and activities to respond to climate change and variability	IEs/ intermediaries	This indicator is qualitative and/or quantitative in nature and country-specific. The qualitative aspects will require an in- depth analysis or a scorecard approach to determine the extent of progress.  Households: disaggregated by male-headed and female-headed  <i>Informed by CIF PPCR B1</i>
	☐ 7.2: Number of males and females <b>with access to and ability to use</b> <del>reached by for total geographic coverage of</del> climate-related early warning systems and other risk reduction measures established/strengthened  <b>Additional indicator proposed:</b> ☐7.3 Number of land titles given to <b>landless and other vulnerable groups (disaggregated for poor men and women) to gain access to resources pre- and post-disaster</b>	IEs/ intermediaries	An early warning system is perceived as a composite of four dimensions: (1) knowledge on risks, (2) monitoring and warning service, (3) dissemination and communication, (4) response capability.  Disaggregated by hazard and geographical coverage.  <b>NOTE: Some participants suggested that land tenure security, not just legal land titles must be considered</b>  Disaggregated by gender.



**Annex I: List of Workshop Participants**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>
<b><u>In Washington, DC:</u></b>	
David Hoffmann	Heinrich Böll Stiftung North America
Liane Schalatek	Heinrich Böll Stiftung North America
Sai Jyothirmai Racherla	ARROW
Lulwa Ali	GEF/Chemicals
Fareeha Iqbal	GEF/CCA
Nicky Sundt	WWF
Moushumi Chaudhory	WRI
Dennis Bours	GEF IEO
Emilia Reyes	Women's Major Group Coordinator/ SDG process
Natalie Elwell	USAID
Eric Haxthausen	USAID
Scott Berendt	AWF
Seemin Qayum	UN Women
Janet Edmond	CI
Young Hee Lee	Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat
Anna Williams	GCF
Rebecca Snyder	IUCN
Mariama Williams	South Centre
Patrick Wylie	IUCN
Lorena Aguilar	IUCN
Maggie Roth	IUCN
Margaux Granat	IUCN
Dorcas Robinson	CARE
Jane Tarh	Independent consultant
Anne Kuriokose	CIF Administrative Unit
Gabriella Richardson Temm	GEF
Andre Mershon	USAID
Jennifer Schutzman	ICRW
Aisha Shaikh	Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat
Dima Shocair Reda	Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat
Mikko Ollikainen	Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat
A. Tianna Scozzaro	Population Action International
Yoko Watanabe	GEF
<b><u>Participating online:</u></b>	
Heidi Norden	WEDO
Verania Chao	UNDP
Jonas Brun	University of Manchester
Kasmala Kakakhal	WEDO
Patricia Biermayr	FAO consultant

Houria Djoudi  
Leisa Perch  
Courtney Sullivan  
Elena Villalobos Prats

CIFOR  
UNDP  
WWF  
WHO