

OPS5

FIFTH OVERALL PERFORMANCE STUDY OF THE GEF

SUB-STUDY ON THE GEF'S POLICY ON GENDER MAINSTREAMING

OPS5 Technical Document #16

OPS5 Technical Document #16

**Sub-study on the GEF's Policy on
Gender Mainstreaming**

Marcia Brewster (Lead Consultant)

October 31, 2013

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Background and Context.....	3
2.1 OPS4 findings and the Council’s policy response	4
2.2 Policy on Gender Mainstreaming.....	6
2.3 Constraints	7
3. Summary of Key Findings	7
4. Methods of Data Gathering and Analysis.....	12
4.1 Assessment of completed projects	12
4.2 Quality-at-entry assessment of projects at CEO endorsement/approval	13
4.3 Meta-evaluation of GEF Agency evaluations on gender	15
5. Review of Completed Projects	16
5.1 Classification of projects by category.....	16
5.2 Attention to gender by focal area.....	21
5.3 Results by GEF Agency	22
6. Quality-at-Entry Review.....	23
6.1 Review of Full- and Medium-Size projects	23
6.2 Review of Enabling Activities.....	25
7. GEF Secretariat Responsiveness to Gender Mainstreaming Policy.....	27
7.1 GEF Secretariat assessment of 10 GEF Agencies	27
7.2 Agency best practice examples can provide guidance for GEF	30
7.3 Change in approach to projects deemed Gender Not Relevant	31
7.4 Efforts to mainstream gender in GEF Secretariat	32
7.5 Appropriateness of the policy.....	34
8. Recommendations	35
Annexes.....	38
Annex 1: GEF Partner Agencies Gender Policy Evaluations.....	38
Annex 2: Interviewees.....	42

1. Introduction

1. The terms of reference of the Fifth Overall Performance Study (OPS5) of the GEF include a key question on the “extent to which cross-cutting policies have achieved their objectives and whether this strengthens results on the ground.” The purpose of this OPS5 sub-study is to assess the extent to which the Policy on Gender Mainstreaming has been implemented and the appropriateness of the policy for the GEF in line with international best practices in the field, and to assess trends of gender mainstreaming in the GEF. The findings and conclusions of the sub-study will inform the final report of OPS5. Findings are also expected to inform the review of the GEF Policy on Gender Mainstreaming in 2015, as decided by the GEF Council at the adoption of the policy.

2. This sub-study consists of two main parts: 1) an assessment of the trends in gender mainstreaming at the GEF and in GEF projects; and 2) an assessment of the progress of the implementation of the GEF Policy on Gender Mainstreaming to date and the appropriateness of the policy. The assessment is being undertaken through a project-level evaluation of gender mainstreaming in GEF projects and a review of the GEF Secretariat’s progress in implementing the Policy at the institutional level. Completed projects were reviewed to assess how the GEF has performed when the policy was not yet in place, to get a better perspective on what the implementation of the policy needs to address.

2. Background and Context

3. The GEF relies on its Partner Agencies to mainstream gender. The GEF Partner Agencies include the ten institutions that were entitled to receive GEF Trust Fund resources directly as of June 2011 (GEF Agencies)¹ and the GEF Project Agencies accredited since June 2011. Thus, the impetus for the Policy on Gender Mainstreaming also came as the GEF began the process to accredit new institutions—the GEF Project Agencies—to become eligible to receive GEF resources to implement and execute GEF-financed projects apart from the ten GEF Agencies.

4. The publication *Mainstreaming Gender at the GEF* issued by the Secretariat in 2008 (and reissued in 2013)² raised the issue of gender mainstreaming in GEF operations. In addition, OPS4 raised specific issues and recommendations on gender mainstreaming that were subsequently addressed in the Council’s Policy on Gender Mainstreaming, as presented in table 1 below.

5. The GEF Policy on Gender Mainstreaming was adopted by the GEF Council on May 26, 2011. The Policy developed from principles, overall directions and safeguards, dating back to a policy on public participation in GEF projects from 1996 (Public Involvement in GEF Projects),³ the key GEF policy that relates specifically to social issues, including gender, until the current policy. The policy was issued initially as part of the GEF Policies on Environmental

¹ Available at:

<http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/publication/Mainstreaming%20Gender%20Eng.pdf>.

³ *Public Involvement in GEF Projects*, GEF/C.7/6, 1996; available at:

<http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/C.7.6.pdf>.

and Social Safeguards Standards and Gender Mainstreaming and was then revised and issued as a stand-alone document on May 1, 2012 (GEF/PL/SD/02).⁴

6. The GEF Policy on Gender Mainstreaming originates partly from guidance issued by various conventions. Conventions increased their gender-related guidance in the years prior to the adoption of the policy. By way of illustration, UNFCCC was the last Convention that had not provided a clear mandate on gender mainstreaming, which it issued at the Conference of the Parties on its sixteenth session.⁵ Such guidance has significance for GEF activities under several or all focal areas. GEF “cross-cutting policies” are developed by the GEF Secretariat and approved by the GEF Council.

2.1 OPS4 findings and the Council’s policy response

7. OPS4 assessed gender mainstreaming in the GEF in a technical document that emphasized the need for a streamlined cross-cutting gender policy in GEF operations. During the GEF-5 period, the Council approved a policy that addressed most of OPS4 concerns and recommendations. OPS4 noted that “Social and gender issues in GEF strategies and projects are not addressed systematically, and the GEF cannot rely completely on the social and gender policies of its Agencies.”

8. Notably, OPS4 Recommendation 7 stated that project performance should be further strengthened through improved guidelines, a better fee structure, and strengthening of social and gender issues. OPS4 also proposed that revisions of terminal evaluation guidelines and practices can be included in the upcoming revision of the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy.

9. Table 1 links OPS4 findings and recommendations on GEF gender mainstreaming policy and practices with GEF Council responses during GEF-5.

Table 1: GEF Council Policy Response to OPS4 Findings and Recommendations

OPS4 FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	GEF POLICY	KEY PRESCRIPTIONS FROM THE POLICY
Recommendation 7: Project performance should be further strengthened through improved guidelines, a better fee structure, and strengthening of social and gender issues. (page 17)	The Council adopted a Policy on Gender Mainstreaming that commits the GEF and its Agencies to ensuring the equal treatment of men and women in its operations. It requires that each GEF Partner Agencies have adopted either a policy, strategy, or action plan, or their equivalent, that meet certain minimum	Secretariat will need to hire consultants to assess whether each of the existing ten GEF Agencies complies with the final GEF Policy on Gender Mainstreaming. The Secretariat shall convey this report to the Council together with a Council paper containing recommendations. <i>GEF Policies on Environmental and</i>

⁴ Available at:

http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/document/PL.SD_02.Policy_on_Gender_Mainstreaming.05012012.Final_.pdf.

⁵ Report of the Conference of the Parties on its sixteenth session held in Cancun from November 29 to December 10, 2010. 3/CP.16, Additional guidance to the Global Environment Facility
<http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2010/cop16/eng/07a02.pdf#page=6>.

	requirements. <i>GEF Policies on Environmental and Social Safeguards and Gender Mainstreaming</i> (May 2011 GEF/C.40/10/Rev.1) Corporate-wide guidelines forthcoming	<i>Social Safeguards and Gender Mainstreaming</i> (May 2011 GEF/C.40/10/Rev.1)
Social and gender issues in GEF strategies and projects are not addressed systematically, and the GEF cannot rely completely on the social and gender policies of its Agencies (page 17).	Policy on Gender Mainstreaming adopted requires that each GEF Partner Agencies have adopted either a policy, strategy, or action plan, or their equivalent, that meet certain minimum requirements. The GEF Accreditation Panel will assess whether applicants for accreditation meet this policy. <i>GEF Policies on Environmental and Social Safeguards and Gender Mainstreaming</i> (May 2011 GEF/C.40/10/Rev.1)	The GEF Accreditation Panel will require that all applicants demonstrate compliance with the Policy on Gender Mainstreaming in order to be accredited as a GEF Project Agency. <i>GEF Policies on Environmental and Social Safeguards and Gender Mainstreaming</i> (May 2011 GEF/C.40/10/Rev.1)
GEF projects thoroughly assess options that, without undermining the effectiveness or efficiency of attainment of global environmental benefits, contribute to improvements of the livelihood of local populations, including gender aspects. (page 150)	GEF-financed operations that achieve benefits in one area should not lead to adverse environmental or social impacts in other areas. All efforts should be made to avoid adverse impacts, and if avoidance is not feasible, then they should be minimized, mitigated, and offset, as appropriate. <i>Policy on Agency Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards</i> (Nov 2011 GEF/C.41/10 Rev.1)	Minimum Standard for projects: Provide socioeconomic benefits in ways that are culturally appropriate, and gender and generationally inclusive. <i>Policy on Agency Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards</i> (Nov 2011 GEF/C.41/10 Rev.1)
GEF operations have no adverse effects on indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities, women, the poor, and other vulnerable populations (page 150)	The Agency is required to identify measures to avoid, minimize and/or mitigate adverse gender impacts. <i>Policy on Gender Mainstreaming</i> (May 2012 GEF/PL/SD/02)	The Agency is required to undertake social assessment, including gender analysis, or to use similar methods to assess the potential roles, benefits, impacts and risks for women. <i>Policy on Gender Mainstreaming</i> (May 2012 GEF/PL/SD/02)

All the NAPA priority projects should use evidence based inquiry into the ways climate change effects are differentiated between genders, introduce measures that identify women's vulnerability to climate change, and listen to the voices of climate vulnerable women (page 90).	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 their operations, including efforts to analyze systematically and address the specific needs of both women and men in GEF projects. <i>Policy on Gender Mainstreaming (May 2012 GEF/PL/SD/02)</i>	- GEF Secretariat and GEF Partner Agencies shall mainstream gender into their operations, including efforts to analyze systematically and address the specific needs of both women and men in GEF projects. - Use of gender disaggregated monitoring indicators. <i>Policy on Gender Mainstreaming (May 2012 GEF/PL/SD/02)</i>
Some revisions of terminal evaluation guidelines and practices can be included in the upcoming revision of the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy.	Ongoing	

2.2 Policy on Gender Mainstreaming

10. The GEF acknowledges that project results can often be improved when gender considerations are integrated into the design and implementation of projects, where relevant. All GEF Partner Agencies (the ten GEF Agencies and GEF Project Agencies) have their own policies and strategies on gender mainstreaming and on promoting gender equality in the context of project interventions which they apply to GEF projects as well. The objective of the GEF Policy on Gender Mainstreaming is that “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.”

11. As described in the document *Mainstreaming Gender at the GEF* (2013), gender mainstreaming “means being deliberate in giving visibility and support to both women’s and men’s contributions individually, rather than assuming that both groups will benefit equally from gender-neutral development interventions.”⁶

12. The GEF Policy on Gender Mainstreaming requires GEF Partner Agencies to have policies or strategies that satisfy seven minimum requirements to ensure gender mainstreaming: institutional capacity for gender mainstreaming, consideration of gender elements in project review and design, undertaking of gender analysis, measures to minimize/mitigate adverse gender impacts, integration of gender sensitive activities,

⁶ <http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/publication/Mainstreaming%20Gender%20Eng.pdf>, p. 8.

monitoring and evaluation of gender mainstreaming progress, and inclusion of gender experts in projects.

13. The policy also has four requirements for the GEF Secretariat: to strengthen gender-mainstreaming capacities among its staff; to designate a focal point for gender issues; to work with its Partner Agencies and other partners to strengthen gender mainstreaming with a more systematic approach to programming; and to develop networks with partners that have gender experience. In applying the policy, the Secretariat is required to hire consultants to assess whether the existing ten GEF Agencies comply with the policy. Finally, the GEF Accreditation Panel will require that all applicants demonstrate compliance with the minimum requirements.

2.3 Constraints

14. The GEF Policy on Gender Mainstreaming is very recent, and therefore much of the analysis the evaluators undertook is based on projects that were initiated and completed before the Policy was adopted in May 2011. Nonetheless, this analysis is useful as it shows the baseline against which the mainstreaming policy can be judged in future years. Furthermore, the principles, overall directions and safeguards, outlined in the policy on public participation in GEF projects (Public Involvement in GEF Projects, 1996), covered social and gender issues until the current policy, and provide a basis for understanding the baseline. In addition, Technical Document 9 from OPS4, *Gender Mainstreaming in the GEF*,⁷ made recommendations on how to mainstream gender in GEF projects. The GEF Council policy response to OPS4 findings and recommendations is outlined in table 1.

15. The Terminal Evaluations (TEs) reviewed for the OPS5 cohort of projects did not necessarily address gender in the projects being evaluated, and the Guidelines for Terminal Evaluations do not include a question related to gender. The criteria for review of GEF projects include only one question related to project beneficiaries under project design: “Does project document adequately respond to questions regarding baseline project..., potential risk, and stakeholder consultation, etc.?” This question would not prompt an evaluator to examine whether the project addressed gender concerns or not.

3. Summary of Key Findings

16. A short summary of key findings is included in this section. More details follow in the body of the paper below.

Key Finding 1: Of the 281 projects completed since OPS4, 124 (44%) did not consider gender and were not expected to do so. When these are excluded from the analysis, 55 (35%) of the remaining 157 projects adequately mainstreamed gender in design and implementation.

17. The GEF Policy on Gender Mainstreaming Policy was adopted in May 2011 and thus has not influenced the projects completed since OPS4 (281 projects). The analysis of completed projects was carried out to understand the baseline of the policy; i.e. the issues it needs to address. However, the GEF was not without gender considerations before 2011; it had a policy

⁷ OPS4 Technical Document No. 9, *Gender Mainstreaming in the GEF*, by Thelma Awori, TA/GEF/09, September 2009.

on public participation in GEF projects that outlined principles, directions and safeguards (Public Involvement in GEF Projects, 1996), and the GEF Council had prepared a response to the findings and recommendations of the OPS4 Technical Document on *Gender mainstreaming in the GEF*, as presented in table 1.

18. In an initial review of the OPS5 completed projects that did consider gender issues (Y) and those that did not mention gender, women or female/male concerns (N), it was found that 167 or 59% received an N rating and 114 or 41% received a Y rating (see table 7). If we compare this to the rating of GEF projects from the 2009 OPS4 technical study,⁸ we find that 57% of the 210 projects reviewed received an N rating and 43% received a Y rating on the gender indicator. On a macro scale this would seem to indicate that the attention to gender has stayed steady or deteriorated. However, on closer examination, a large proportion of the completed projects in OPS5 (44%) did not consider gender issues and were not expected to do so. Thus, the review team rated these 124 completed projects as Gender Not Relevant (NR), because of their technical nature, *and excluded them from further analysis*. Table 8 presents the results for projects receiving an NR rating under OPS5 by focal area. Box 1 summarized the rating categories used in this study.

Box 1. Project Rating Categories used in this Study

NR - Not Relevant Gender and social issues were not considered and were not expected to be considered in the project (section 5.1.1).

SO - Serious Omission The project contained little or no reference to gender issues, but it should have included gender concerns because of the nature of the project (section 5.1.2).

GM - Gender Mainstreamed Gender issues were integrated into the project (section 5.1.3).

NS - Not Sufficient Gender issues were mentioned in the project documents, but no real attention was paid to these concerns in project activities (section 5.1.4).

Note: See section 4 for methodology and sections 5 and 6 for examples.

19. Of the completed projects in the OPS5 review for which gender is considered relevant (excluding the NRs), the evaluators determined that 55 projects or 35% of the total had mainstreamed gender. These received a GM classification (see table 9). The terminal evaluations (TEs) and terminal evaluation reviews (TERs) indicated that women and men were beneficiaries of the projects, that there was attention to inclusion of women in project activities and that outcomes were positive for both women and men. Of these, good practices were found in 12 projects, as discussed in section 5.1.3.

Key Finding 2: Of the 157 remaining projects, 43 (27%) did not mention gender. However, based on the terminal evaluations of these projects, the evaluators determined that these 43 should have considered gender and were thus gender relevant. They were designated Serious Omissions (SO), as the lack of attention for gender where it was needed may have resulted in gender related unintended negative consequences.

20. The TEs and the TERs indicated that of the 157 completed projects reviewed, 43 projects should have considered gender issues, but made no mention of gender concerns at all, thus receiving an 'N' rating on the first review. These included projects related to community-based natural resources management, conservation and sustainable management of biological diversity, capacity building for integrated natural resources management and participatory planning. Some of the TEs for these projects include specific recommendations

⁸ OPS4 Technical Document No. 9, Ibid.

that the community or women should be involved. Others state that participation of local or community groups must be strengthened. Designated Serious Omissions (SOs), 27% of the completed projects (excluding the NRs) fell into this category (see table 9). Examples of SOs can be found in section 5.1.2.

Key Finding 3: Among the 157 completed projects, 38% mentioned gender, but did not incorporate gender into their activities. The evaluators rated these projects as Gender Not Sufficient (NS).

21. Of the total excluding NRs, 59 completed projects (or 38%) made a reference to gender, but did not incorporate gender concerns into their activities. These projects were placed in the NS category: Not Sufficient attention to gender. There were no sex-disaggregated data, no gender assessments, and very little attention paid to the people living in the project area who would have to ensure the project's sustainability. Examples of projects rated NS where gender was considered but not sufficiently are found in section 5.1.4. Projects falling into the SO and NS categories could have mainstreamed gender in a more substantial and concrete manner by learning from good practices, including conducting gender analyses and using sex-disaggregated data (see section 5.1.3).

Key Finding 4: Based on a review of CEO-endorsed and approved projects under GEF-5, the proportion of projects (excluding the NRs) that mainstreamed gender increased from 22% of the reviewed projects before May 2011 to 31% following adoption of the GEF Gender Mainstreaming Policy in May 2011, excluding the projects rated NR.

22. In the quality-at-entry sample, the number of projects in the pre-2011 period that mainstreamed gender (rated GM) was 16 out of 72 (22%), rising to 39 out of 125 in the post-May 2011 period (31%). At the same time results of the review showed that there was a decline in the number of projects that received an N rating and a reduction in those that were considered NR after May 2011. For all agencies, the pre-2011 sample showed 51% receiving a N rating and 34% of the projects considered gender Not Relevant. The post-May 2011 sample showed that 43% of the project sample received an N rating and 22% were considered Gender Not Relevant. The results are shown in tables 11 and 12. Some of the Agencies indicated that in the earlier period they had understood that gender was not considered an important consideration in GEF projects.

Key Finding 5: The total number of CEO-endorsed and approved projects rated NS or SO declined from 78% in the pre-May 2011 period to 68% after May 2011, excluding the projects rated NR.

23. The CEO-endorsed and approved projects that were rated SO fell from 36% of the total in the pre-May 2011 period to 22% in the post May 2011 period, while those rated NS rose from 42% in the pre-May 2011 to 46% in the post-May 2011 period (see table 13). This indicates that, although there was a mention of gender in a larger number of projects in the latter period, in over 40% of the sample it is a superficial mention, without any content. It should be pointed out here that at least two of the GEF Agencies simply inserted standard generic paragraphs that referred to gender/social concerns into their project proposals.

Key Finding 6: There was some improvement in the CEO-endorsed and approved projects following the adoption of the GEF Gender Mainstreaming Policy in May 2011. However, a

major shift occurred in late 2011 due to gender mainstreaming in Enabling Activities.

24. Overall, for the whole sample taken in the post-May 2011 period for all GEF Agencies, 43% of the projects and Enabling Activities mainstreamed gender, 44% mentioned gender but did not specify how to incorporate gender concerns and 13% were rated as serious omissions (see table 14). Thus, as a result of policies adopted by both GEF and the GEF Agencies, there was a real improvement in the attention paid to gender and social concerns in the most recent period.

25. With the CEO approved Enabling Activities starting in late 2011, a shift in attention to gender becomes apparent (see table 14). The main GEF Agencies to undertake Enabling Activities are UNDP, UNEP and UNIDO. Among the Enabling Activities approved for these three agencies, 57% were considered GM (55 out of 96) and 42% were NS (40 out of 96). Only one Enabling Activities received an SO rating and none were considered NR. It should be noted that GEF's "Request for Enabling Activity: Proposal for Funding under the GEF Trust Fund" includes the question: "Is there a clear description of how gender dimensions are being considered in the project design and implementation?"

26. The Gender Mainstreaming Policy calls for monitoring and evaluation of the gender mainstreaming progress, and inclusion of gender experts in projects. While the results of the assessment of CEO endorsements and approvals show a shift in attention to gender in the Enabling Activities, it will be extremely important to examine the Terminal Evaluations from those projects down the line.

Key Finding 7: Recent strategies and policies adopted by the GEF and the GEF Agencies in the last two years provide good examples of best international practice and guidance to the GEF for improving project design and approval processes.

27. Several of the GEF Agencies have recently adopted gender mainstreaming policies for their operational activities. Examples of Best International Practices from the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), and the World Bank provide guidance that can be drawn upon. The Climate Investment Funds (CIF) have also adopted useful tools that could be incorporated into GEF guidelines. These tools could provide guidance to the GEF for improving project design and approval processes, so that gender issues will be effectively mainstreamed into GEF projects.

Key Finding 8: The GEF Secretariat has made significant efforts to develop the Policy on Gender Mainstreaming and to put in place institutional systems to implement the policy since GEF-4. In order to adequately implement the policy, the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies requires resources and support.

28. Since OPS4, the GEF Secretariat has made progress in responding to the OPS4 findings and recommendations and others on gender mainstreaming. The Policy on Gender Mainstreaming was developed and adopted, which clarified the commitment and elements of gender mainstreaming at the GEF. A gender focal point was designated at the GEF Secretariat during GEF-5, and a regular gender review and monitoring of the portfolio has been conducted through the Annual Monitoring Review process since 2011. Through this, program managers have become more aware about the process. GEF Agencies have also made considerable progress in developing their own gender policies as outlined in section 7.2.

29. Despite the adoption of the Policy on Gender Mainstreaming, there has been limited capacity development in the GEF Secretariat in this area. The Secretariat only has one part-time gender focal point; there has been limited gender training for program managers; and there are no guidelines for mainstreaming gender into project activities.

4. Methods of Data Gathering and Analysis

4.1 Assessment of completed projects

30. This sub-study assessed the OPS5 project cohort of Terminal Evaluations (TEs) and Terminal Evaluation Reviews (TERs) of completed GEF projects submitted to the GEF Evaluation Office since OPS4. For this assessment, in order to capture the trends in mainstreaming gender in GEF projects with regards to project results, completed projects included in this OPS5 sub-study (281 projects) were reviewed by the Evaluation Office team. Details about the distributions of projects by modality and focal area are presented in tables 2 and 3.

Table 2 - Completed Projects by Modality	
<i>Project Modality</i>	<i>Number of Projects</i>
FSP	159
MSP	121
EA	1
Total	281
Note: FSP - Full-Size Project; MSP - Medium-Size Project; EA - Enabling Activity.	

Table 3 - Completed Projects by Focal Area	
<i>Focal Area</i>	<i>Number of Projects</i>
BD	126
CC	67
IW	35
LD	17
MF	30
POP	6
Total	281
Note: BD - Biodiversity; CC - Climate Change; IW - International Waters; LD - Land Degradation; POP - Persistent Organic Pollutants; MF - Multifocal.	

31. In the assessment of completed projects, they were initially rated on whether they considered gender issues (Y) or not (N). The portfolio review of the TEs and TERs submitted since OPS4 provides a baseline for observing the trends in mainstreaming gender in GEF with regard to project results. The evaluators also understood that many GEF projects did not consider gender or social issues and were not expected to take those issues into account. Thus, the evaluators decided to look more closely into the TEs that received an N rating for more insight on those projects that had not considered gender and social issues. The evaluators found that some of the projects indeed were not expected to consider gender, but others should have considered gender and social issues in their activities. As a result of reviewing the TEs in more depth, the evaluators divided the sample of 281 projects reviewed into four categories, as follows and in box 1:

- **NR:** Not Relevant: gender and social issues were not considered and were not expected to be considered (see section 5.1.1);
- **SO:** Serious Omission: the project contained little or no reference to gender issues but it should have included gender concerns because of the nature of the project (section 5.1.2).

- **GM:** Gender Mainstreamed: gender and social issues were integrated into the project (section 5.1.3);
- **NS:** Not Sufficient: gender issues were mentioned in the project documents, but no real attention was paid to these concerns in project activities (section 5.1.4).

32. The evaluators then decided that it would be useful to exclude from the analysis the 124 projects that were not expected to include gender, and divide the remaining 157 projects into the three categories SO, GM and NS, as gender and social considerations are deemed important in all of these categories.

4.2 Quality-at-entry assessment of projects at CEO endorsement/approval

33. This sub-study also conducted a quality-at-entry review of GEF Full- and Medium-Size Projects (FSPs and MSPs) as well as Enabling Activities, endorsed and approved by the GEF CEO during GEF-5 before and after the adoption of the GEF Policy on Gender Mainstreaming (May 26, 2011). The point of endorsement and approval by the CEO was chosen for assessment as it is at this point within the project preparation stage that a project's design is expected to be the most complete. Small Grants Program projects were not included in the review.

34. The evaluators reviewed and rated two randomly selected samples of projects. One sample comprised 111 projects, out of a total of 154, which were endorsed and approved by the GEF CEO *before* the adoption of the GEF Policy on Gender Mainstreaming on May 26, 2011 and a second sample comprised 271 projects, out of total of 429, which were endorsed and approved by the GEF CEO *after* the adoption of the GEF Policy on Gender Mainstreaming.

35. The first sample of 111 projects the evaluation team reviewed for the pre-May 2011 category is comprised of 109 FSP and MSP projects. There were only two Enabling Activities in the pre-May 2011 period so they were added to the sample. The second sample, for the post-May 2011 category, includes 161 FSP and MSP projects. The evaluation team added a sample of 110 Enabling Activities from the same period. Details are presented in table 4. The overall results for the OPS5 cohort have a 95% probability of being within a 5 percentage point of the results that this study found in the sample.

36. Similar to the methodology used for the assessment of completed projects, proposals reviewed for the quality-at-entry analysis were initially rated on whether they considered gender/social issues (Y) or not (N). The assessment subsequently divided the sample into four categories: GM: Gender Mainstreamed; NS: Gender considered but Not Sufficiently; SO: Serious Omission; NR: Gender not Relevant.

Table 4 - Quality-at-Entry by Modality		
<i>Pre-May 2011</i>	<i>OPS5 cohort</i>	<i>Sub-study sample</i>
FSP	109	77
MSP	43	32
EA	2	2
Total	154	111
<i>Post-May 2011</i>	<i>OPS5 cohort</i>	<i>Sub-study sample</i>
FSP	204	119
MSP	71	42
EA	154	110
Total	429	271
Note: The GEF Policy on Gender Mainstreaming was adopted by the GEF Council on May 26, 2011. FSP - Full Size Project; MSP - Medium Size Project; EA - Enabling Activity.		

37. Table 5 presents the project cohort by focal area, and table 6 by GEF Agency.

Table 5 - Quality-at-Entry by Focal Area				
FSP and MSP			EA	
<i>Pre-May 2011</i>	<i>OPS5 cohort</i>	<i>Sub-study sample</i>	<i>OPS5 cohort</i>	<i>Sub-study sample</i>
BD	67	48	0	0
CC	48	34	1	1
LD	4	3	0	0
IW	6	4	0	0
POP	16	12	0	0
ODS	0	0	0	0
MF	11	8	1	1
Total	152	109	2	2
<i>Post-May 2011</i>	<i>OPS5 cohort</i>	<i>Sub-study sample</i>	<i>OPS5 cohort</i>	<i>Sub-study sample</i>
BD	71	41	67	48
CC	128	75	14	10
LD	10	6	28	20
IW	12	7	0	0
POP	15	9	45	32
ODS	2	1	0	0
MF	37	22	0	0
Total	275	161	154	110
Note: BD - Biodiversity; CC - Climate Change; IW - International Waters; LD - Land Degradation; POP - Persistent Organic Pollutants. FSP - Full Size Project; MSP - Medium Size Project; EA - Enabling Activity.				

Table 6 - Quality-at-Entry by GEF Agency				
FSP and MSP			EA	
<i>Pre-May 2011</i>	<i>OPS5 cohort</i>	<i>Sub-study sample</i>	<i>OPS5 cohort</i>	<i>Sub-study sample</i>
UNDP	52	36	0	0
World Bank	22	16	1	1
UNEP	39	28	0	0
UNIDO	10	9	0	0
FAO	9	8	0	0
IADB	5	1	0	0
IFAD	4	3	0	0
ADB	7	5	0	0
EBRD	3	2	0	0
AfDB	1	1	0	0
GEFSEC	0	0	1	1
Total	152	109	2	2
<i>Post-May 2011</i>	<i>OPS5 cohort</i>	<i>Sub-study sample</i>	<i>OPS5 cohort</i>	<i>Sub-study sample</i>
UNDP	84	51	55	41
World Bank	63	37	1	0
UNEP	57	35	35	23
UNIDO	32	16	38	29
FAO	8	3	5	5
IADB	8	5	0	0
IFAD	11	8	0	0
ADB	8	5	0	0
EBRD	3	1	0	0
AfDB	1	0	0	0
GEFSEC	0	0	20	12
Total	275	161	154	110
Note: BD - Biodiversity; CC - Climate Change; IW - International Waters; LD - Land Degradation; POP - Persistent Organic Pollutants. FSP - Full Size Project; MSP - Medium Size Project; EA - Enabling Activity.				

4.3 Meta-evaluation of GEF Agency evaluations on gender

38. The Evaluation Office team collected evaluative evidence from gender policy evaluations of GEF Agencies and third party evaluations. This desk review examined the agencies' gender mainstreaming policies, strategies and action plans to assess the appropriateness of the GEF Policy on Gender Mainstreaming. The desk review and meta-evaluation also gathered information on the trends of mainstreaming gender in GEF projects with regards to project results by Agency. This also assisted in identifying international best practices from gender policies in the GEF Agencies.

39. The meta-evaluation did not provide significant insight into the project results, but it provided useful information on the trends in international best practices, which are outlined in section 7.2 of this report. The GEF Secretariat assessment of agencies discussed in section 7.1 of the report also provided valuable information for assessing the appropriateness of the Policy on Gender Mainstreaming for the GEF.

5. Review of Completed Projects

40. The review of the TEs and TERs submitted to the Evaluation Office since OPS4 provides a picture of the trends in mainstreaming gender in GEF with regard to project results. Following the ratings on projects that did consider gender issues (Y) and those that did not mention gender, women or female/male concerns (N), it was found that 167 or 59% received an N rating and 114 or 41% received a Y rating (see table 7). If we compare this to the rating of GEF projects from the 2009 OPS4 technical study,⁹ we find that 57% of the 210 projects reviewed received a No rating and 43% received a Yes rating on the gender indicator. On a macro scale this would seem to indicate that the attention to gender has stayed steady or deteriorated. It should be kept in mind, however, that the TEs reviewed were of projects that were completed during the last four years. Many of them had started much earlier, well before the Policy on Gender Mainstreaming was approved.

Table 7 - Distribution of Completed Projects by Focal Area and Gender Rating			
<i>Focal Area</i>	<i>Gender (Yes)</i>	<i>Gender (No)</i>	<i>Total</i>
BD	66	60	126
CC	12	55	67
IW	8	27	35
LD	13	4	17
MF	11	12	23
POP	4	9	13
Total	114	167	281
Note: BD - Biodiversity; CC - Climate Change; IW - International Waters; LD - Land Degradation; POP - Persistent Organic Pollutants.			

5.1 Classification of projects by category

41. The evaluators also understood that many GEF projects did not consider gender issues and in fact were not expected to take those issues into account. Thus, the evaluators examined the TEs for projects that received an N rating more closely for insight on those projects that had not considered gender and social issues. The evaluators found that some of the projects indeed were not expected to consider gender, but others should have considered gender and social issues in their activities.

⁹ OPS4 Technical Document No. 9, Gender Mainstreaming in the GEF, by Thelma Awori, TA/GEF/09, September 2009.

5.1.1 Projects that consider gender Not Relevant (NR)

42. The evaluators placed projects that were not expected to consider gender issues in the Gender Not Relevant (NR) category. These made no reference to gender or women (and in most cases did not refer to people or communities) and generally were not expected to consider social or gender issues. They include projects related to geophysical imaging, species inventories, power generation, energy technologies, energy efficiencies, power markets, solar and wind technologies, coal-bed methane, phasing out of ozone-depleting substances, land and energy assessments, public lighting systems, alternatives to DDT, financial instruments and similar topics.

43. Of the total of 281 projects reviewed by the evaluators, 124 projects or 44% of the total were considered in the NR category (see table 8). Due to their purely technical nature, they did not consider social or gender issues at all and were not expected to do so. Thus, this might be the appropriate number to compare to the 57% in the “No” category from the 2009 study. As the criteria for giving projects an ‘N’ rating in the earlier study were not elaborated, the comparison is not exact.

44. It is important to point out here that in the past it had been accepted practice in the GEF to identify many categories of projects as “gender not relevant.” However, international gender specialists are increasingly providing evidence that these categories (such as energy technologies and energy efficiency) are in fact gender relevant. In this study, evaluative evidence from the completed projects rated N found that in 43 of the projects (or 15% of the total), gender was relevant after all. With the mainstreaming policy now in place, the GEF Secretariat should update itself with the latest body of scientific literature to demonstrate clearly the types of projects that are gender relevant.

Table 8 - Completed Projects in which gender was considered Not Relevant (NR) by Focal Area				
Number of projects and % of total				
<i>Focal Area</i>	<i>Gender (No) (# of projects)</i>	<i>NR (# of projects)</i>	<i>% of total</i>	<i>Total projects</i>
BD	60	35	28	126
CC	55	52	78	67
IW	27	18	51	35
LD	4	2	12	17
MF	12	9	39	23
POP	9	8	62	13
Total	167	124	44	281
Note: BD - Biodiversity; CC - Climate Change; IW - International Waters; LD - Land Degradation; POP - Persistent Organic Pollutants; NR - Gender Not Relevant				

45. The evaluators decided that it would be useful to exclude the 124 NR projects from the gender analysis. Thus, the remaining 157 projects for analysis could be divided into three categories: Serious Omission (SO); Gender Mainstreamed (GM); and Gender Not Sufficient (NS). Gender considerations are deemed important in all of these categories. The results by focal area are summarized in table 9.

5.1.2 Projects classified as Serious Omissions (SO)

46. The TEs and the TERs indicated that of the completed projects reviewed, 43 projects should have considered gender issues, because of the nature of the projects, but made no mention of gender concerns at all, thus receiving an ‘N’ rating on the first review. Designated Serious Omissions (SOs), 27% of the completed projects (excluding the NRs) fell into this category (see table 9). These projects should have paid attention to gender concerns, as they included projects related to community-based natural resources management, conservation and sustainable management of biological diversity, capacity building for integrated natural resources management, sustainable land-use planning, participatory planning, forest conservation, and fostering a global dialogue on oceans and SIDS.

47. Some of the TEs for these projects include specific recommendations that the community or women should have been involved. Others state that participation of local or community groups must be strengthened. According to the TEs, the outcomes for at least three of these projects were considered unsatisfactory, mainly as a result of not involving the local population in project activities. These projects that were initially rated N are included in the review of gender-relevant projects. Some examples of SO projects are presented below.

Table 9 - Findings for Completed Projects by Focal Area Number of projects and %							
<i>Category</i>	<i>BD</i>	<i>CC</i>	<i>IW</i>	<i>LD</i>	<i>MF</i>	<i>POP</i>	<i>Total</i>
GM	33 (36%)	5 (33%)	7 (41%)	8 (53%)	2 (14%)	0	55 (35%)
NS	33 (36%)	7 (47%)	1 (06%)	5 (33%)	9 (64%)	4 (80%)	59 (38%)
SO	25 (27%)	3 (20%)	9 (53%)	2 (14%)	3 (21%)	1(20%)	43 (27%)
Total	91	15	17	15	14	5	157
Note: GM - Gender Mainstreamed; NS - Gender considered but Not Sufficiently; SO - Serious Omission; BD - Biodiversity; CC - Climate Change; IW - International Waters; LD - Land Degradation; POP - Persistent Organic Pollutants. Totals may not add up to 100% due to rounding.							

48. Among the 91 BD completed projects included in the analysis, 25 were considered Serious Omissions. These were projects that did not explicitly take gender concerns into consideration but clearly should have done so. These include such examples as UNDP’s Catalyzing sustainability of the wetland protected area system in Belarus [ID: 2104]. The TE recommended that, in the PA system strategy and action plan, the government should: find mechanisms to include local people in the development and management of protected areas (thereby transferring some of the responsibility to them); identify opportunities for women within tourism (thus gender aspects); and ensure that when economic or environmental benefits are accrued from protected areas, the local people are aware of the degree to which they are benefiting and that those benefits are directly linked and related to the protected area. A World Bank project in Mongolia (ID: 1100) on community-based conservation of biological diversity in mountain landscapes focused on community-based conservation management, information centers and eco-clubs. While such activities would have provided an excellent opportunity to mainstream gender and involve women's groups, the evidence of involvement of women and men in project activities was not available to the evaluator.

49. An example of a Serious Omission under the Climate Change focal area is a UNDP project in Costa Rica (ID: 1132) on an off-grid electrification program based on renewable

energy. The TE recommends that “...gender issues should have been incorporated to analyze the role of women as users, beneficiaries, participants. This would allow analysis of women’s roles and responsibilities both as beneficiaries of electricity supply in their communities and in their role as energy service users such as domestic, productive or communal uses. Specific activities such as workshops or meetings aimed to develop an awareness-raising process on gender issues, taking advantage of the technological incursion, would extend benefits with social outcomes. Women’s participation can also value their role in equipment maintenance and use and possibly generate an active participation in more productive uses of electricity.”

5.1.3 Projects that Mainstreamed Gender (GM) and examples of good practices

50. For the remaining 114 projects that originally received a Y classification, all had reference to gender, women and men, community participation, or some indication that these issues had been considered in project formulation or implementation. This would be 73% of the total excluding the NR projects (table 9). The evaluators determined that 55 projects or 35% of the total had mainstreamed gender. These received a GM classification. The TEs and TERs indicated that women and men were beneficiaries of the projects, that there was attention to inclusion of women in project activities and that outcomes were positive for both women and men. Examples of good practices in mainstreaming gender are presented below.

51. Among the 55 GEF-funded projects that were identified as having mainstreamed gender during the review period, the evaluators selected 12 projects that include examples of good practices. Six of the projects were executed by UNDP, five by the World Bank and one by UNEP. Four of the projects were located in Latin America and the Caribbean; three were in Africa; two were in the Middle East/North Africa; and one each in Asia, Europe and Global. Ten out of 12 were in the focal area of Biodiversity; one was in International Waters and one in Climate Change. Ten out of 12 were full-size projects, while two were medium size. These examples could be instructive or illustrative for future policy and program development at GEF. Some of them are summarized below.

52. For example, a UNDP BD project in Morocco (ID: 1) on Transhumance for Biodiversity Conservation in the Southern High Atlas integrated the gender dimension into the conceptualization, planning and implementation of the project. Women and men were integrated into programs related to natural resources management, training of herders, literacy and awareness raising, and access to credit. Many new activities led to creation of small alternative economic models that helped change the perceptions about women and provided technical and managerial skills. Sustainability was improved because of the targeting of a large and diverse array of actors, including women, to raise awareness of conservation needs.

53. A World Bank BD project in Costa Rica on Ecomarkets (ID: 671) brought about a change in land titling rules that enabled women to participate in the country’s Payment for Environmental Services (PSA) program. One of the project’s goals was to increase the participation of women into the PSA by 30%. The change in land titling rules, which allowed women to jointly register for land titles with their husbands, led to a very robust increase in women heads of households participating in the program.

54. A UNDP-executed BD project in Egypt (ID: 776) on conservation and sustainable use of medicinal plants in arid ecosystems involved women actively in both associations and in training activities. This increased their revenues, which in turn raised their status in the

household. Women (in particular Bedouin women) were also consulted for the register on Traditional Knowledge (TK), and the regulation on the use of medicinal and Aromatic Plants (MAPs).

55. Two BD projects in Mexico showed good practices involving initial social assessments (SAs) that led to better outcomes. In the Mexico Mesoamerican Biological Corridor Project (ID: 779, World Bank), an SA was performed for each of the corridors, with special attention to indigenous peoples and gender, including participatory community workshops with the support of social specialists. The evaluation showed the socioeconomic impact of the project resulted in: improved production processes, alternative market opportunities, and the inclusion of gender and cultural equity in production activities and incentives. The other project included three phases (IDs: 877, 2078 and 2654) of the consolidation of the Protected Area System (SINAP II). A study was carried out that analyzed the socioeconomic indicators for the protected areas (PAs). It provided important insights into the impact on different groups, including indigenous people and women, according to the type of activity supported by sustainable development initiatives (IDS). A final impact assessment showed that about 3,000 persons had benefited from IDS in the 12 PAs during six years of implementation, of whom 36% were women. The activities that benefited women in greater proportion were handicrafts, water collection and conservation and sustainable agriculture. Women were beneficiaries of 96% of all initiatives focused on handicrafts.

56. A World Bank BD project in Croatia (ID: 1133) on karst ecosystem conservation showed positive improvements in the ecosystem as the result of an initial SA. The study identified the types of projects that would be successful and elaborated a grants program to support them. The grants supported entrepreneurial projects that demonstrated linkages among sustainable use of natural resources, economic development, and biodiversity conservation. They contributed to economic empowerment among rural women by providing funding for entrepreneurial activities. Six of the 24 beneficiaries were women, and local women served on three regional advisory committees that evaluated project proposals and selected finalists.

57. A UNEP global project in the International Waters focal area (ID: 1893) established The International Waters Learning Exchange and Resource Network (IW:LEARN). The project involved an NGO, the Gender and Water Alliance (GWA), as a full partner. GWA organized travelling expos, first in Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) and then in Africa to raise awareness of gender concerns in water management. The project was augmented by a separately-funded project in the South Pacific, a 'Gender/Water/Climate' expo produced for Montreal Climate COP (2005).

58. Finally, a UNDP Climate Change project in Namibia (ID: 2256) focused on removal of barriers to the Namibian Renewable Energy Program -phase II. NAMREP II is considered an example of good practice in addressing gender equality and empowerment in energy projects. Training on community management of demonstration units was carried out for 60 people in seven regions of the country. Of these, about 50% were women and 50% were men. Technicians training held included a 25% participation of women. The project has led to solar electrification of three villages in a remote area, where women and men now have equal access to modern lighting. Support to entrepreneurs has encouraged the participation of women in renewable energy enterprises, and NAMREP II has engaged women in three of its six positions.

5.1.4 Projects rated Gender Not Sufficient (NS)

59. Finally, there were 59 projects (38% of the total excluding NR) where gender, women or social issues were mentioned in the project documents, but there was no real attention to involving both men and women in project activities. There were no sex-disaggregated data, no social assessments, and very little attention paid to the people living in the project area who would have to ensure the project's sustainability. These projects were placed in the NS category: Not Sufficient attention to gender.

60. Examples of projects rated NS where gender was considered but not sufficiently include a UNDP regional BD project in Mauritania and Senegal (ID: 457) where the TE recommends that "The involvement of women in planning and decision making with regards to the use of resources and livelihoods at the local level needs to be strengthened. There is a need for a thorough analysis to determine the comparative advantage that women bring to the management of biodiversity. Women constitute real social capital."

61. An observation from a TE for a World Bank-supported project in Turkey on Biodiversity and Natural Resources Management (ID: 458) shows that positive results occurred despite the lack of attention to gender issues: "Although the project was not originally designed with explicit poverty, gender or social development objectives or outcomes, some of its participatory planning and small grants-based activities had positive impacts in these areas.... relevant income-generating activities (e.g. beekeeping, animal husbandry, customary craft production) played a larger role in local social development, gender sensitivity and poverty alleviation than had originally been anticipated. As a result, project outcomes included support from villages and populations that had been initially hostile to establishment of protected area management" (Terminal Evaluation, p. 9). It is likely that these positive outcomes were influenced by the Small Grants Program element in the project.

62. Another UNDP BD project in Armenia (ID: 2800) that was rated NS provides this revealing statement: "The gender issue was not raised by the project specifically, but the project team composition, representatives of the key stakeholders, composition of the SC shows obviously that there were no gender restrictions during project implementation: ladies are even more active in the discussions and decision making in the project issues rather than the stronger sex" (p. 25). While this statement does not show gender sensitivity, it does demonstrate change and growing inclusion.

5.2 Attention to gender by focal area

63. Among the focal areas, it is interesting to note that for three focal areas a large percentage of the TEs for projects under OPS5 received an NR rating: climate change (78%); international waters (51%) and POPs (61%). These overall results are shown in table 8 above. As the important role that communities, indigenous people, women and men have to play in climate change mitigation and adaptation, water resources management and control of toxic chemicals, this situation should be in the process of change. However for the OPS5 completed projects, a majority of projects in those focal areas did not consider gender concerns and were not expected to do so.

64. NR ratings based on the TEs were given to a much lower percentage of projects in the Biodiversity (BD) focal area (28% or 35 out of 126), in the land degradation (LD) area (12% or 2 out of 17) and in the Multi-Focal area (39% or 9 out of 23).

65. Almost 45% of the completed projects were in the BD focal area (126 out of 281). Excluding the NRs, the evaluators found that based on the TEs, 73% of the BD projects (66 out of 91) considered gender and social issues, of which half made a serious effort to mainstream gender while the other half considered gender but not sufficiently (see table 9). The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) has the strongest gender mandate; paragraph 13 recognizes the important role that women play in conservation and sustainable use for biological diversity conservation. The Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) mentions women's practices, knowledge, and gender roles in food production, as do various decisions of the Conference of the Parties. Moreover, the CBD Secretariat has prepared its own Plan of Action for using a gender approach in its work.

66. Leaving out the NR projects, about one-third of the projects in the BD and CC focal areas were rated as making an effort to mainstream gender, while 41% of the IW and 53% of the LD projects did so (although the sample is small). The MF projects came in at about 14% only. The results are summarized in table 9.

5.3 Results by GEF Agency

67. Regarding the GEF Agencies that implemented the completed projects reviewed for OPS5, UNDP and the World Bank were the main partners, followed by UNEP. For UNDP, the agency which executed the most GEF projects, about 39% of those projects were rated as having mainstreamed gender. This compares to 42% that received a Y in the OPS4 completed projects, but the figures are not directly comparable. Another 47% of UNDP projects had considered gender but not sufficiently (NS), while 14% had not considered gender at all, but should have done so (SO).

68. The World Bank had a similar score for mainstreaming gender (38% of its projects), while 38% represented SOs and 25% were considered Not Sufficient attention to gender. In OPS4, the World Bank received a Y rating for gender on 46% of its projects. The OPS5 review found that UNEP had a lower percentage of projects where gender was mainstreamed (19%), while 31% were considered Not Sufficient and 50% as SOs. This compares to a score of 43% of its projects with a Y rating in the earlier study. The other Agencies had too small a sample size at this point to be included in the analysis of the OPS5 completed projects. These results are found in table 10.

Table 10 -Findings for Completed Projects by GEF Agency Number of projects and %							
Category	UNDP	WB	UNEP	IADB	ADB	UNIDO	Totals
GM	31 (39%)	18 (38%)	5 (19%)	1 (50%)	—	—	55 (35%)
NS	37 (47%)	12 (25%)	8 (31%)	—	1(100%)	1(100%)	59 (38%)
SO	11 (14%)	18 (38%)	13 (50%)	1 (50%)	—	—	43 (27%)
Total	79	48	26	2	1	1	157
Note: GM - Gender Mainstreamed; NS - Gender considered but Not Sufficiently; SO - Serious Omission. Totals may not add up to 100% due to rounding.							

6. Quality-at-Entry Review

6.1 Review of Full- and Medium-Size projects

69. Parallel to the development of the GEF Policy on Gender Mainstreaming, compatible gender policies have been introduced by many of the GEF Agencies. Prior to the adoption of the GEF Policy in May 2011, the only reference to gender/social concerns in the GEF Project Identification Form (PIF) template¹⁰ was the following: “A.2. Stakeholders: Identify key stakeholders (including civil society organizations, indigenous people, gender groups and others as relevant) and describe how they will be involved in project preparation.” This was not a sufficient impetus to mainstream gender into GEF projects by client countries or GEF Agencies. Until May 2011 in project review sheets, there was frequently a general response about “the involvement of stakeholders” or no response at all.

70. Using the same scoring methodology as for the OPS5 completed projects, representative samples of pre-May 2011 full-size and medium-size projects and post-May 2011 FSPs and MSPs and Enabling Activities were examined using the project review sheets and CEO endorsements and approval documents. As with the assessment of completed projects, the Evaluation Office went through the sample and rated them on whether they considered gender issues (Y) or not (N). For the pre-May 2011 period, 53 out of 109 projects were rated Y (49%), while 51% received an N rating. For the post-May 2011 period, 91 out of 161 received a Y rating (57%), while 43% received an N rating. For the Enabling Activities, 94 out of 99 (95%) received a Y rating, and only 5% were rated N. The totals for the breakdown between Y and N ratings are shown in table 11.

Table 11 - Distribution of CEO-Endorsed and Approved Projects by Gender Rating. Number of projects and %			
<i>Focal Area</i>	<i>Gender (Yes)</i>	<i>Gender (No)</i>	<i>Total</i>
Pre-May 2011 FSP/MSPs	53 (49%)	56 (51%)	109
Post-May 2011 FSP/MSPs	91 (57%)	70 (43%)	161
EAs	94 (95%)	5 (5%)	99
Total	239	132	369
Note: The GEF Policy on Gender Mainstreaming was adopted by the GEF Council on May 26, 2011. FSP - Full Size Project; MSP - Medium Size Project; EA - Enabling Activity.			

71. Looking more closely at the projects rated N, results of the review show that for all agencies, the pre-2011 sample had 37 out of 109 projects considered gender Not Relevant (34%). The post-May 2011 sample for all agencies had 36 out of 161 projects rated gender Not Relevant (22%). The results by GEF Agency are shown in table 12. There was a significant reduction in the number of projects that received an N rating and those that considered NR after May 2011.

¹⁰<http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/1708>.

Table 12 - GEF-5 Project Proposals by GEF Agency pre- and post-May 2011 in which Gender was Considered Not Relevant. Number of projects (% shown in parenthesis)												
	<i>UNDP</i>		<i>World Bank</i>		<i>UNEP</i>		<i>UNIDO</i>		<i>FAO</i>		<i>Total projects for 10 GEF agencies</i>	
	Pre-May 2011	Post-May 2011	Pre-May 2011	Post-May 2011	Pre-May 2011	Post-May 2011	Pre-May 2011	Post-May 2011	Pre-May 2011	Post-May 2011	Pre-May 2011	Post-May 2011
Total	36	51	16	37	28	35	9	16	8	3	109	161
NR	13	12	7	6	5	7	8	6	0	1	37	36
%	36%	24%	44%	15%	18%	20%	89%	38%	0	33%	34%	22%
Note: NR - Gender not Relevant. Totals for all agencies are greater than sums for the five agencies.												

72. The evaluators found that 22% of the CEO-endorsed and -approved projects in the pre-May 2011 period were considered to have mainstreamed gender. For the post-2011 sample, 31% were considered to have mainstreamed gender. The results are shown in table 13. While this sample implies a worse performance regarding gender than what was found in the OPS5 completed projects, the two samples are not directly comparable.

73. The CEO-endorsed and approved projects that were rated SO fell from 36% of the total in the pre-May 2011 period to 22% in the post May 2011 period, while those rated NS rose from 42% in the pre-May 2011 to 46% in the post-May 2011 period (see table 13). Combining the projects that were rated SO and NS, the total came to 78% of the sample in the pre-May 2011 period, falling to 68% in the later period. The large proportion of the projects rated NS in both samples indicates that the agencies (and client countries) were not seriously attempting to mainstream gender, and this may reflect the inability of the GEF Secretariat to enforce the new policy until more recently. Although there was a mention of gender in a larger number of projects in the latter period, in over 40% of the sample it had little or no content. It should be pointed out here that at least two of the GEF Agencies simply inserted into their project proposals standard generic paragraphs that referred to gender concerns.

Table 13 - GEF-5 Project Proposals by GEF Agency pre- and post-May 2011 Number of projects (% shown in parenthesis)												
Category	<i>UNDP</i>		<i>World Bank</i>		<i>UNEP</i>		<i>UNIDO</i>		<i>FAO</i>		<i>Total projects for 10 GEF agencies</i>	
	Pre-May 2011	Post-May 2011	Pre-May 2011	Post-May 2011	Pre-May 2011	Post-May 2011	Pre-May 2011	Post-May 2011	Pre-May 2011	Post-May 2011	Pre-May 2011	Post-May 2011
GM	5(22)	13 (33)	0	12(39)	4(17)	2(6)	0	4(40)	3(38)	1(50)	16(22)	39 (31)
NS	9(39)	23(59)	6(67)	12(39)	10(43)	13(47)	1(100)	5(50)	3(38)	0	30(42)	58 (46)
SO	9(39)	3(8)	3(33)	7(22)	9(39)	13(47)	0	1(10)	2(25)	1(50)	26(36)	28 (22)
Total	23	39	9	31	23	28	1	10	8	2	72	125
Note: GM - Gender Mainstreamed; NS - Gender considered but Not Sufficiently; SO - Serious Omission. Totals for all agencies are greater than sums for the five agencies.												

74. The new GEF and GEF Agency policies implemented in late 2011 have had an impact on the attention paid to gender concerns in project proposals endorsed after May 2011 under GEF-5. In the GEF project review sheet for FSPs and MSPs under GEF/LDCF/SCCF and NPIF

trust funds,¹¹ Question 9 is now included: “Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?” Question 10 relates to the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples.

75. While these two new criteria do not require a rigorous examination of attention to gender in a project, they seem to have had some impact. Since these questions were raised, client countries and the GEF Agencies have attempted to address gender concerns in their GEF projects.

6.2 Review of Enabling Activities

76. The real change in CEO-approved projects (particularly in the case of UNDP, UNEP and UNIDO) is illustrated by Enabling Activities approved in the post-2011 period, as compared to the post-May 2011 MSPs and FSPs (see table 14). Enabling Activities provide support to countries to produce plans, strategies and encourage integration of convention objectives into national development efforts and sectors, in order to guide effective response measures (e.g. investment priorities). They are a means of fulfilling essential communication requirements to the global environmental conventions, providing basic information to enable policy and strategic decisions to be made, or of assisting planning that identifies priority activities within a country. Enabling activities support countries to formulate and direct sectoral and economy-wide programs that address global environmental problems through a cost effective approach within the context of national sustainable development efforts.¹²

77. Starting in late 2011, GEF’s “Request for Enabling Activity: Proposal for Funding under the GEF Trust Fund” asks question 11: “Is there a clear description of how gender dimensions are being considered in the project design and implementation?” This question is answered in UNDP’s proposals by using its Gender Equality Strategy (2008-13)¹³ and gender marker.

78. The UNDP sample consists of 41 Enabling Activities, of which only one was rated NR. Of the remaining 40, 65% were considered GM, while 35% were considered NS (see table 14). None received an SO rating. In line with UNDP’s Gender Equality Strategy,¹⁴ since 2009 a system of accounting called the Gender Marker¹⁵ was introduced. Most of the UNDP Enabling Activity project proposals since mid-2011 have thus included a section called “Gender Marking”, which generally gives a good overview of gender power relations and the legal, economic and social context of gender roles and responsibilities in the individual host country.

79. The UNDP proposals also specify the use of the UNDP gender marker in the project: “This requires that each project in UNDP’s ATLAS system be rated for gender relevance. This will for example include a brief analysis of how the project plans to achieve its environmental objective by addressing the differences in the roles and needs of women and men.” This

¹¹ <http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/3915>.

¹² GEF 1995, GEF Operation Strategy.

¹³ <http://www.undp.org/content/dam/aplaws/publication/en/publications/womens-empowerment/gender-equality-strategy-2008-2011/0601.pdf>.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ Guidance Note: Tracking Gender-Related Investments and Expenditures in ATLAS. Bureau for Development Policy, UNDP Gender Team, 2009.

section of the proposal also includes a reference to guidelines from the conventions. For example, regarding the Convention on Biological Diversity, “COP guidance (will be followed. More specifically two decisions are worth mentioning: (i) COP Decision 1X/24 on the approval and endorsement of the CBD Gender plan of Action; and (ii) COP Decision X/19, which amongst other matters invited Parties to consider gender as a core cross-cutting issue in the implementation of biodiversity-related activities.¹⁶

Table 14 - GEF-5 Post-May 2011 Project and Enabling Activities Proposals by GEF Agency
Number of projects (% shown in parenthesis)

Category	UNDP			World Bank			UNEP			UNIDO			All 10 GEF Agencies		
	Post-May 2011	EAs	Total	Post-May 2011	EAs	Total	Post-May 2011	EAs	Total	Post-May 2011	EAs	Total	Post May 2011	EAs	Total
GM	13 (34)	26 (65)	39 (49)	12 (39)	0	7 (50)	4 (17)	10 (43)	11 (27)	4 (40)	18 (64)	22 (58)	39 (31)	55 (57)	94 (43)
NS	22 (58)	14 (35)	38 (47)	12 (39)	0	4 (29)	10 (43)	12 (53)	20 (49)	5 (50)	10 (36)	15 (39)	58 (46)	40 (42)	98 (44)
SO	3 (8)	0	3 (4)	7 (22)	1 (100)	3 (21)	9 (39)	1 (4)	10 (24)	1 (10)	0	1(3)	28 (22)	1 (1)	29 (13)
Total	38	40	80	31	1	14	23	23	41	10	28	38	125	96	221

Note: EA - Enabling Activities; GM - Gender Mainstreamed; NS - Gender considered but Not Sufficiently; SO - Serious Omission. Totals in last columns are greater than for the four selected agencies.

80. UNDP also requires that sex-disaggregated data will be used for the following indicators: full-time project staff; number of Project Steering Committee members; and number of jobs created by the project held by men and women. These indicators will be a good start for generating sex-disaggregated data, but they do not include people trained under the project and beneficiaries impacted by the project.

81. The other agency that showed a big change in its ratings when the Enabling Activities are included was UNIDO, for which 64% of its Enabling Activities were considered GM. The caveat here, however, is that UNIDO has introduced a number of standard generic paragraphs into its Enabling Activity proposals that cover gender and social concerns. These paragraphs describe how gender will be mainstreamed, including social assessments, consultations with women’s groups, sex-disaggregated data and so on. Unlike in UNDP’s case, there is very seldom any text that describes the particular situation in the host country. However, assuming that the agency will conduct those assessments and consultations, it is a great improvement.

82. UNEP exhibited a similar tendency to UNIDO in that it used a standard generic paragraph to describe the gender-related aspects in most of the Enabling Activities. Unlike UNIDO, however, UNEP’s paragraph does not describe any effort or activity that will take place. The standard paragraph in an Enabling Activity in support of revision of national biodiversity strategies and action plans reads as follows:

¹⁶ See e.g. www.cbd.int/doc/nbsap/nbsapcbw-pac-02/nbsap-nadi-scbd-gender.pdf and www.cbd.int/doc/publications/cbd-ts-49-en.pdf.

“Gender considerations and social and environmental safeguards: - the initial NBSAPs had ignored mainstreaming of gender perspectives into the implementation of the Convention and promotion of gender equality in achieving its three objectives. This aspect will now be included to ensure that views on how various social groups utilize biodiversity, how lack of conservation might affect both genders and how the needs of indigenous groups, forest communities and other local communalities should be taken care of in BD conservation. In the same vein, issues of BD conservation and poverty alleviation should be well articulated in the consultations in this project. Although the project itself is not intervention based, it is important to discuss the poverty-conservation nexus, so that the right principles are laced in the final official documents.”

83. While gender and other social concerns are mentioned in this paragraph, it also notes that the project itself is not intervention based and implies that it will have little impact on men and women living in the host country. Unlike UNDP it does not describe the particular situation in the host country. Among the Enabling Activities for UNEP, 43% received a GM rating, and another 53% were considered NS, as there was no detail about how gender would be mainstreamed.

84. Overall, for the whole sample taken in the post-May 2011 period for all GEF agencies, 43% of the projects and Enabling Activities mainstreamed gender, 44% mentioned gender but did not specify how to incorporate gender concerns and 13% were rated as serious omissions (see table 14). Considering just the Enabling Activities, 57% were rated GM; 42% as NS and 1% as SO. Thus, as a result of policies adopted by both GEF and the GEF agencies, there was a real improvement in the attention paid to gender and social concerns in the most recent period.

85. While the results of the assessment of CEO endorsements and approvals show a shift in attention to gender, it will be important to examine the TEs from those projects down the line. It remains to be seen whether these projects and Enabling Activities will have an impact on both men and women.

7. GEF Secretariat Responsiveness to Gender Mainstreaming Policy

7.1 GEF Secretariat assessment of 10 GEF Agencies

86. The GEF Secretariat is currently undertaking an assessment of the existing 10 GEF Agencies for compliance with GEF Policy on Gender Mainstreaming. This is in response to the Council's decision to expand the GEF partnership through the accreditation of new Agencies that would be permitted to implement GEF projects (“GEF Project Agencies”). In the context of approving accreditation for new GEF Project Agencies, the Council had emphasized that any GEF policies that are applied to entities applying for accreditation as GEF Project Agencies must also be applied to the existing GEF Agencies. The Council therefore requested that the 10 GEF Agencies be assessed on whether they meet the agreed minimum standards under the Policy on Gender Mainstreaming.

87. The review of the Agencies and the scoring against the criteria as set out by GEF Secretariat was an independent process carried out by a consultant.¹⁷ The consultant not only

¹⁷ Susan Bazilli, B.A., LL.B., LL.M., Director, International Women's Rights Project, Vancouver, BC, Canada.

reviewed the documents and materials submitted by the Agencies, but also reviewed external evaluations and reviews of these agencies' gender mainstreaming track records, in order to quantify the findings.

88. The assessment by GEF of the Agencies is extremely timely, as it feeds into this report for the OPS5 and comes at a time when GEF is reviewing its policy. The full working document can be found in GEF Council paper GEF/C.45/10¹⁸ posted on 9 October 2013. The review of the GEF Agencies shows that many have undertaken gender mainstreaming in a strategic way and are able to show some success in their recent efforts. The 10 annexes to the report give an excellent overview of the gender policies of each GEF Agency and how well these policies comply with the minimum standards used as a guide by the GEF Secretariat.

89. For the sections on gender, the assessment examines each Agency to see whether its policies are in compliance with the GEF policy. The policy requires GEF Partner Agencies to have policies or strategies that satisfy seven minimum requirements to ensure gender mainstreaming: institutional capacity for gender mainstreaming; consideration of gender elements in project review and design; undertaking of gender analysis; measures to minimize/mitigate adverse gender impacts; integration of gender-sensitive activities; monitoring and evaluation of gender mainstreaming progress; and inclusion of gender experts in projects.

90. According to the preliminary assessment, eight of the 10 GEF Agencies have met all of the minimum requirements for compliance with the GEF Gender Mainstreaming Policy. Two GEF Agencies, UNEP and UNIDO, have met five out of the seven requirements, but need to make improvements in two areas each. Specific recommendations on actions to improve performance in gender mainstreaming, in areas such as monitoring and evaluation, are provided in Annex VIII for UNEP and Annex IX for UNIDO.¹⁹ Recommendations are also included for other Agencies who did not meet all the requirements, including UNDP. Good practice examples are provided by Agency for gender mainstreaming in operations, but not necessarily in GEF projects. Agencies requested to develop action plans on specific items were, for the most part, aware of the need to increase their own capacity and had already begun the development of addressing these core issues.

91. One person interviewed for this sub-study mentioned that the process for applying the criteria for the 10 GEF Agencies was somewhat more flexible than the process for accrediting the GEF Partner Agencies, as there was more back-and-forth consultation with the GEF Agencies. It was suggested that the same flexibility should be applied to GEF Partner Agencies now applying for Accreditation.

92. This process reinforces the assessment of project-based findings for OPS5, in particular on measuring the strengths and weaknesses of individual Agencies, as well as providing examples of best international practices for the GEF Secretariat to consider in strengthening and revising the GEF Gender Mainstreaming policy. This process is to take place in 2015. The experience and knowledge gained over the past four years on what works and what does not work in mainstreaming gender can be applied in future projects to improve development

¹⁸ *Review of GEF Agencies on Environmental and Social Safeguards and Gender Mainstreaming*. GEF Council Paper GEF/C.45/10, 9 October 2013. Working Document at: <http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/GEF.C.45.10%20Review%20of%20GEF%20Agencies%20on%20Safeguards%20and%20Gender%20October%209%202013.pdf>.

¹⁹ GEF/C.45/10, Annex VIII for UNEP (paras. 43-47) and Annex IX for UNIDO (paras. 15-20).

effectiveness. One positive consequence of this assessment process could be the sharing of good practices and lessons learned among the Agencies, as well as for the GEF Secretariat in order to revise and strengthen its own gender policy.

93. The most critical element—mainstreaming gender in operations—has only been undertaken recently by some of the Agencies, which partly explains why the shift has only been evident in the last two years. Implementation for some agencies has focused more on internal organizational dimensions, such as staffing, policies, developing indicators, and training of all staff. A key challenge is that of filling in the ‘missing middle’, the gap between a gender policy and actual implementation in projects and programs. Gender equality and women’s rights need to be firmly established from the top leadership of the organizations as corporate strategic priorities. Gender mainstreaming takes time, resources, skill, and persistence. Success depends on the skills, resources, and influence of internal gender advocates, together with the effect of external influences, on the enabling environment of the organization.

94. Preliminary observations of learning based on the GEF review of Agencies in mainstreaming gender into projects include:

- integrate women from the start, not as an afterthought, and involve both men and women in needs assessments, and ensure that women’s needs are understood;
- consider and reflect the different roles and responsibilities of men and women in project design and implementation;
- ensure that communication, training and extension address both men’s and women’s needs and expertise;
- identify and take into consideration institutional and legal barriers that limit women’s access to resources and services;
- support women to participate in community level decision-making and planning, recognizing social and religious barriers to their participation and seeking culturally acceptable means of surmounting them;
- apply a gender perspective in the analysis of constraints and opportunities;
- identify and promote income-earning opportunities of special interest to women;
- ensure that monitoring and management information systems continuously assess the extent to which men and women are reached by project activities;
- build in corrective mechanisms so that gender biases are rectified in a timely manner;
- develop indicators and techniques to capture context-specific, long-term, and qualitative aspects of organizational change;
- measure against a baseline to recognize, measure and value progress;
- learn from experience to improve practice; and
- ensure accountability and gender mainstreaming commitments with national country partners.

95. Preliminary lessons learned for improving gender mainstreaming through financed activities and loans based on gender action plans:

- increase participation by women in loan activities, particularly through community-based organizations;
- enable more equitable access to project and program resources including skills training, technology, and government services;

- build in practical benefits for women such as increased income, greater financial security, and more livelihood options;
- move toward gender equality, by encouraging a change in decision-making patterns in the household, membership in and leadership of community-based organizations, and increased mobility.

7.2 Agency best practice examples can provide guidance for GEF

96. As several of the GEF Agencies have recently introduced policies to guide gender mainstreaming and empowerment of women, selected tools that have been introduced to their operations could provide examples to the GEF Secretariat for revising its gender policy. It would be valuable for the GEF Secretariat to convene a gender working group among agency focal points to formulate guidelines for mainstreaming gender into GEF operations. Some of the useful measures introduced by agencies are outlined below.

97. UNDP mainstreams gender equality and women's empowerment considerations across its operations. The UNDP Gender Equality Strategy (2008-2013) outlines the organization's commitment to promoting gender equality and women's empowerment and was prepared in conjunction with its strategic plan. Its results framework incorporates a broad range of gender-sensitive outcomes and indicators for each result area of the Strategic Plan. Examples of best practices include:

- A system of accounting, the Gender Marker, helps to track gender investments at the project output level. The Gender Marker facilitates UNDP teams to guarantee accurate reporting on UNDP's contributions to gender equality, and is included in the checklist for project appraisal committees. Each output is allocated a gender rating ranging from 1-3, indicating whether the outputs have gender equality as a principal objective, a significant objective, will contribute in some way to gender equality or are not expected to contribute to gender equality.
- The Environmental and Social Screening Procedure (ESSP) looks at the potential environmental and social impacts of proposed projects, including those related to gender equality, indigenous peoples, climate change, biodiversity and others.
- The Gender, Climate Change and Community Based Adaptation Guidebook presents experiences and examples taken from the UNDP-supported GEF-funded *Community-Based Adaptation Programme*.
- *Gender in Action: 2010-2011* is a Gender Report of UNDP Supported GEF-Financed Projects. (2010-11 reporting).
- A question on the UNDP Terminal Evaluation Review is: "Have gender issues been taken into account in project design and implementation (i.e. project team composition, gender-related aspects of pollution impacts, stakeholder outreach to women's groups, etc.)? If so, indicate how."

98. The World Bank's strategy for mainstreaming gender-responsive actions into its development assistance work, *Integrating Gender into the World Bank's Work: A Strategy for Action*, was adopted in January 2002. The Bank implements the strategy through measures such as:

- Every region has a gender focal point who focuses on gender concerns and is a social development specialist; and a gender action plan is prepared for each country and region.
- Country Gender Assessments are part of Country Assistance Strategies.
- A good practice note on *Integrating gender into investment lending operations* (identifying entry points; designing actions; monitoring progress) was issued in June 2012.
- A new flag to facilitate tracking of gender in operations was introduced in January 2013.

99. IFAD adopted its Policy on Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment in 2012, but had had a plan of action for gender mainstreaming in operations since 2003. This is now the central policy on gender as part of the IFAD Strategic Framework 2011-2015 and builds on the plan of action from 2003. As part of its gender policy, IFAD has a gender checklist which is used to guide project design and a note describing how to operationalize the gender policy in projects. Its gender marker is a tool for classifying the gender sensitivity of a project at various stages in the project cycle. The marker is used to score projects on their gender dimension at design, implementation and completion.

100. Climate Investment Funds (CIF) gender review (March 2013) suggests the use of a dedicated gender scorecard as an effective tool for gender-related performance. A CIF gender scorecard could be used to measure progress made in achieving transformation by enterprises and sectors such as those covered by the funds.²⁰

101. More detail on the good practices being implemented by the GEF Agencies can be found in the Council document referred to above (GEF/C.45/10).

7.3 Change in approach to projects deemed Gender Not Relevant

102. In line with Agency best practice examples outlined above, it is appropriate to re-examine the identification of whether or not a GEF project is gender relevant. As the evaluative evidence in this study shows, there were many GEF projects rated "Gender not Relevant", except among the Enabling Activities. There is a growing literature on gender and climate change which shows that a number of topics that are included in section 5.1.1 as not relevant are in fact gender relevant, such as power generation, energy technologies, impacts of chemicals, and land assessments.²¹

103. Even in those cases where there is no reference in the project to men, women or people, it should be remembered that men and women are employed in implementing GEF projects, and women scientists and specialists should be given equal opportunities to participate in implementing the projects. Since GEF funds are collected without regard to

²⁰ Gender Review of the CIF (Climate Investment Funds). Prepared by the Global Gender Office of the International Union for Conservation of Nature–IUCN. March 2013, p. 84.

²¹ See gender and climate change information at <http://www.gendercc.net/metanavigation/home.html/> and Global Gender and Climate Change Alliance tools at <http://www.wedo.org/library/global-gender-climate-alliance-ggca>.

gender or race, they should be spent in a manner that ensures equal opportunities and indeed affirmative action for women and minorities as beneficiaries. Some OECD member countries require representation of women in counterpart agencies and in private sector firms that receive project funds. They also set aside training spaces for women in projects, including in the energy and transportation sectors.

104. Methods for measuring accountability for gender impact are included in the DAC Guidelines on Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment in Development Cooperation (OECD, 1999).²² Thus, GEF and its Agencies should ensure that gender is considered relevant in GEF projects and that women have access to employment in the projects themselves and that the science and research takes into consideration differential impacts on women (including for DDT, street lighting, and access to power as in electricity and placement of wind energy facilities).

7.4 Efforts to mainstream gender in GEF Secretariat

105. Efforts to mainstream gender in the GEF Secretariat have been slow to show results. There is only one Gender Focal Point in the entire Secretariat, and she does the job on a part-time basis (approximately 15% of her time). The total budget for gender activities covers only part of her salary and some training activities and learning missions. There is also some budget provided for the Annual Monitoring Report to include gender monitoring. Some of the focal area teams have an individual who is informally designated to provide advice on gender to agencies and other staff on an *ad hoc* basis. However, none of them has received training related to gender mainstreaming. Moreover, reports submitted by Agencies often lack information on gender specific results based on sex-disaggregated indicators. This makes it difficult for the GEF Secretariat to track progress made on the impact of project activities on both women and men. None of the work to support the GEF Policy has been institutionalized. This needs to be changed if the GEF is serious about implementing its gender mainstreaming policy. One of the requests under GEF 6 would have to be to include at least one full-time staff in the Secretariat to undertake these responsibilities and a budget to support the effort to mainstream gender in GEF projects.

106. Despite the limitations, the GEF Secretariat is committed to further engage in and address gender mainstreaming during GEF-6, based on its Policy on Gender Mainstreaming. The GEF has regularly reported on gender issues related to projects, starting with *Mainstreaming Gender at the GEF* (originally published in 2008 and reissued in 2013). The GEF Secretariat has also been providing regular analysis and reporting on gender mainstreaming among its projects through the Annual Monitoring Review (AMR) since 2010. In the AMR reports the GEF secretariat analyzes (among other things) how gender issues are integrated and addressed in GEF-financed projects. The analysis in the AMRs from 2011 and 2012 are quite useful in showing areas where there is more likelihood to be attention paid to gender and social issues. The findings are somewhat similar to those shown in this report, even though the project samples are different.

107. The Secretariat also monitors project implementation under the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) and the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF). The 2012 monitoring report was the first to examine the inclusion of gender in adaptation under these funds. The report notes, for example, that "The climate change adaptation projects financed through

²² <http://www.oecd.org/social/gender-development/28313843.pdf>.

the LDCF are based on projects prioritized in National Adaptation Programs of Action (NAPAs). As of April 2009 over half of the then-completed 39 NAPAs identified gender differentiated impacts from climate change, and most of these recognized women as a particularly vulnerable group.” The next step would be to identify women as a group who could contribute significantly to adaptation activities.

108. The GEF Secretariat found that during FY12, 25 out of 37 adaptation projects reviewed include clear gender considerations through vulnerability or social/gender needs assessments, use of sex-disaggregated indicators, or inclusion of women as key project stakeholders. In the LDCF project in Cambodia (GEF ID: 3404), the Gender Action Plan (GAP) was developed and the Rapid Gender Assessment (RGA) was included in the vulnerability assessment of all the target provinces. The project activities are being implemented according to these assessments and plans.

109. As has been shown in this sub-study for OPS5, the integration of gender in GEF projects varies significantly. While some progress has been made in integrating gender in GEF projects, the Secretariat recognizes that inclusion of gender mainstreaming actions in GEF projects is less than ideal, and varies among focal areas and its programs. For example, gender mainstreaming has been relatively strong in projects related to natural resources management and biodiversity conservation. This comes out clearly in the AMR reviews.

110. In other areas, there is no strong intellectual leadership or support for gender concerns. For example, one staff member noted that a senior manager makes the observation: “Climate Change is gender-neutral”. Considering how important it will be to involve women and men in climate change adaptation and mitigation, each contributing different skills and knowledge, this attitude is probably outdated. It is vitally important to get the views of women upstream in the planning and design stages, so that technologies introduced at the local level will be the right ones for their needs. Many of the project documents contain such language as “This energy-saving technology will provide benefits to women by reducing drudgery...” It would make sense to consult the targeted women and ask them whether they are interested in adopting energy-saving technology and what would be the preferred type.

111. A number of actions to strengthen gender mainstreaming are being discussed as possible proposals for GEF-6. Some of the relevant suggestions include:

- Develop GEF Guidelines on Gender Mainstreaming in consultation with GEF Agencies and taking into account that each agency has its own gender policy, strategy, and/or action plan with varying application to GEF projects.²³ These Guidelines would facilitate a systematic approach and provide practical guidance for the implementation of the GEF Policy on Gender Mainstreaming.
- Introduce Gender Screening/Categorization of GEF Projects at Entry and during Implementation, without increasing the burden in the project cycle. Building on the practices and experiences of various GEF Agencies (e.g., UNDP's Gender Marker, ADB's Gender Mainstreaming Categories, etc.) and other relevant partners, the Secretariat could prepare a simple gender screening criteria and system at the project concept stage, in coordination with the GEF Agencies.

²³ Mainstreaming Gender at the GEF, 2013; available at:
<http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/publication/Mainstreaming%20Gender%20Eng.pdf>.

- Strengthen Results-based Management on Gender Mainstreaming. It is expected that during GEF-6, the GEF will explore ways to further strengthen GEF-wide accountability for gender mainstreaming by enhancing gender-specific performance targets and indicators of progress on gender related outcomes and outputs.
- Ensure GEF Partner Agencies' Compliance with the GEF Policy on Gender Mainstreaming. The assessment on the compliance of the existing 10 GEF Agencies with the *GEF Policy on Gender Mainstreaming* indicates those areas in which the Agencies meet or exceed the minimum requirements of the Policy and where they do not. All applicants for accreditation as new GEF Project Agencies will have to demonstrate consistency with the minimum requirements of the Policy.

112. While all these suggestions are admirable and would have a positive impact on the extent to which gender is mainstreamed in GEF projects, it must be pointed out that these proposals do not carry with them specific resource requirements, including full-time staff, budget and training resources. In order to make it possible for the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies to undertake such actions as those proposed above, GEF-6 will need to allocate adequate resources for staff and training, as well as project resources for gender/social assessments, sex-disaggregated indicators and enhanced reporting on gender social issues.

7.5 Appropriateness of the policy

113. According to the Agencies interviewed for this review, none had any difficulty with the GEF Gender Mainstreaming Policy, the Agency assessment or compliance with the policy. One agency noted that it was an “arduous process”, but none felt it was inappropriate. Most agencies pointed out that they already have a gender policy that they apply to all their projects. However, in the past it did not seem to be a major consideration for GEF projects. Since May 2011, the Agencies have responded to the policy and questions raised in the Review Sheets and other interactions with GEF Secretariat staff. Most of the Agencies interviewed considered the review and assessment a good exercise that could lead to more collaboration and consultation on how to incorporate gender and social concerns into GEF projects. More than one suggested that GEF could convene a Gender Working Group that could discuss international best practices and work on Guidelines for Mainstreaming Gender in the GEF.

114. One thing that seems to be missing in the GEF Policy on Gender Mainstreaming is that there is no mention of empowerment of women, even though many of the projects contribute to empowerment through natural resources management, small-scale enterprises led by women or decision-making positions in community conservation or water committees taken up by women.

115. The policy could also be improved by recognizing the important contributions both men and women make to improving environmental outcomes in all parts of the world. Many of the project documents seem to treat women as part of vulnerable groups or people at risk from climate change and other environmental threats. GEF projects should acknowledge the potential contributions of women and women's groups to sustainability. Women can provide different inputs to the body of knowledge being developed in areas such as medicinal plants, non-timber forest products, location of water resources, and protection and conservation of watersheds and biodiversity. This is precisely why gender concerns need to be mainstreamed into GEF projects and programs.

8. Recommendations

116. **Recommendation 1.** With the mainstreaming policy now in place, the GEF Secretariat in consultation with GEF Agencies should explore a more systematic way to determine whether or not projects are gender relevant and under what circumstances to incorporate gender surveys, sex-disaggregated data and gender specialists in project design and preparation.

- In line with Agency best practice examples, it is appropriate to re-examine the identification of whether or not a GEF project is gender relevant. As the evaluative evidence in this study shows, there were many projects rated “Gender not Relevant”, except among the Enabling Activities. Even in those cases where there is no reference in the project to men, women or people, it should be remembered that men and women are employed in implementing GEF projects, and women scientists and specialists should be given equal opportunities to benefit from the projects. Since GEF funds are collected without regard to gender or race, they should be spent in a manner that ensures equal opportunities and indeed affirmative action for women and minorities as beneficiaries.
- International gender specialists are increasingly providing evidence that the categories that do not take gender into account (such as energy technologies, street lighting and energy efficiency) are in fact gender relevant. In this study, evaluative evidence from the completed projects rated N found that in 43 of the projects (or 15% of the total), gender was relevant after all.

117. **Recommendation 2.** In line with the Gender Mainstreaming Policy, GEF projects (other than those in the NR category, such as those on geophysical mapping or energy efficient technology testing) should include gender experts on the team, gender analyses, and monitoring and evaluation of the gender mainstreaming progress. Projects reviewed since OPS4 that conducted gender or social assessments in the pre-project stage and engaged social scientists on the team showed improved outcomes for people living in the project area.

- As was shown in some of the good practice examples in section 5.1.3, the projects that did assess the social/gender and economic situation on the ground in the pre-project stage were far better prepared to offer project activities that were relevant and attractive to the people living in the project area.
- Gender assessments and evaluation of benefits and beneficiaries can provide evidence of the value of the project to people living in the area. Such evidence is useful in demonstrating value added when requesting resources through the replenishment process.
- While the assessment of CEO approvals and endorsements shows improvement in attention to gender since late 2011, it will be important to examine the TEs from those projects down the line. It remains to be seen whether the projects and Enabling Activities will have an impact on both men and women.

118. **Recommendation 3.** Sex-disaggregated information on project participants and achievements on gender mainstreaming, as well as gender qualifiers, are needed and should be included, especially in the review of project proposals and terminal evaluations. Relevant questions and gender markers are used by agencies including IFAD, UNDP and the World Bank.

- UNDP now requires that sex-disaggregated data are used for the following indicators: full-time project staff; number of Project Steering Committee members; and number of jobs created by the project held by men and women. Collecting these indicators will be a good start for generating sex-disaggregated data, and can be supplemented by data on men and women trained under the project and beneficiaries impacted by the project.
- The criteria for review of GEF projects in terminal evaluations include only one question related to project beneficiaries. Under Project design: *“Does project document adequately respond to questions regarding baseline project..., potential risk, and stakeholder consultation, etc.?”* This could be revised to a question similar to the review of Enabling Activities: *“Is there a clear description of how gender dimensions are being considered in the project design and implementation?”*
- The GEF Secretariat project review sheet for GEF projects could be improved by including more in-depth gender indicators/questions:
 - Question 7 (*“Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?”*): This could be followed by a relevant question on whether sex-disaggregated indicators will be included in the project’s results framework.
 - Question 9 (*“Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?”*): This could be supplemented by a question on whether relevant gender-sensitive indicators have been added to the results framework to track benefits to women and men.
- The Project Identification Form (PIF) and CEO Endorsement Template could be improved by more specific questions on the engagement of women and men in project preparation and how the project benefits will be delivered. Revisions in these forms should be done in consultation with GEF Agencies (see recommendation 3 below).

119. Recommendation 4. The GEF should consider convening an interagency gender working group to prepare guidelines that work, using gender markers and other tools already prepared and used by GEF Agencies. The working group could exchange ideas and practices and provide the GEF with constructive next steps.

- A set of GEF guidelines on gender mainstreaming can be developed in consultation with GEF Agencies and taking into account that each agency has its own gender policy, strategy, and/or action plan with varying application to GEF projects. These Guidelines would facilitate a systematic approach and provide practical guidance for the implementation of the GEF Policy on Gender Mainstreaming.
- Results-based Management on gender mainstreaming could be strengthened by enhancing gender-specific performance targets and indicators of progress on gender related outcomes and outputs.

120. Recommendation 5. The revision of the GEF Policy on Gender Mainstreaming in 2015 should include some reference to the empowerment of women, since many of the GEF projects contribute to empowerment through natural resources management, small-scale

enterprises led by women or decision-making positions in community conservation or water committees taken up by women.

- Several of the GEF Agencies have selected tools for their operations (such as UNDP's Gender Marker) that guide gender mainstreaming and empowerment of women, which could provide examples to the GEF Secretariat for revising its gender policy.
- The revised policy should recognize the valuable contributions of both men and women to improving environmental outcomes in all parts of the world. Project documents could acknowledge the potential contributions of women and women's groups, rather than treating women as part of vulnerable groups. Women can provide different inputs to the body of knowledge being developed by GEF, and this is why it is important to mainstream gender concerns into GEF projects and programs.

121. **Recommendation 6.** Since OPS4, the GEF Secretariat has made progress in responding to the OPS4 findings and recommendations, by developing the Policy on Gender Mainstreaming, designating a gender focal point and conducting a regular gender review through the Annual Monitoring Review process since 2011. At the same time, capacity development and training in the GEF Secretariat in this area need to be strengthened and resources allocated for improving the capacity of the GEF Secretariat to undertake gender mainstreaming seriously.

- Allocations under GEF 6 should include at least one full-time gender specialist in the Secretariat to undertake gender mainstreaming responsibilities.
- An adequate allocation of resources will be needed for gender training at the Secretariat level. The GEF Secretariat could also avail itself of training offered by GEF Agencies on mainstreaming gender in projects. The World Bank and other Agencies may wish to invite GEF Secretariat staff for training at their own institutions.
- Agencies are increasingly undertaking country gender and social assessments and using sex-disaggregated indicators in their projects. They should be encouraged to apply such assessments at the pre-project stage and incorporate the indicators in their GEF projects in order to better mainstream gender in GEF projects.

Annexes

Annex 1: GEF Partner Agencies Gender Policy Evaluations

AGENCY	POLICY/STRATEGY	EVALUATION
WORLD BANK	The Bank's official gender policy is OP/BP 4.20, http://go.worldbank.org/Y97RQLC8T0 (March 2003, revised March 2012). The original strategy document, Integrating Gender into the World Bank's Work: A Strategy for Action, adopted in January 2002 is http://go.worldbank.org/B7MTOABOY0 To further strengthen its impact, the World Bank introduced a Gender Action Plan in 2007 that focused on four key markets—land, labor, agriculture, and finance—as well as on infrastructure related to access to these markets. http://go.worldbank.org/FSV68RJ1F0 When the World Development Report (WDR) on Gender Equality and Development was released in 2011, PREM issued an Implications of WDR 2012 paper, which outlined some key strategic directions for the World Bank going forward, in order to address and implement the WDR's findings. http://go.worldbank.org/LROQ7XSDA0 When gender was designated a special theme of the International Development Association (IDA) for its 16th replenishment, 2011-2014, specific and measurable targets were put in place to gauge progress on gender integration into the World Bank work in the poorest countries (IDA results framework).	IEG has done a few evaluations of progress (but nothing too recent. Last one in 2010, An Evaluation of World Bank Support, 2002-08. Gender and Development http://go.worldbank.org/JJJ53E0X20) The Board asked an annual update on the Implications of WDR 2012 paper (one was approved in September 2012; another is in the works, to be submitted for this year's annual meetings.) During this process, regional and network teams provide updates on their gender work; PREM monitoring team assesses regional and network performance on gender integration into their portfolios; and the Bank outlines key priorities for the coming year. (<i>Report will be made available</i>) PREM provided a mid-term review of progress on the IDA targets (here) in November 2012, based on the IDA results framework, and continue to track this work. Gender will continue to be a special theme for IDA 17 and PREM will continue to update and strengthen the results framework in order to improve the gender component of investments made. There are also specific gender-related targets and commitments in the World Bank's Corporate Score Card, http://corporatescorecard.worldbank.org (under Operational Effectiveness)
IADB	The Operational Policy on Gender Equality in Development was adopted in November 2010. The Policy integrates gender considerations through four elements. 1) Gender Mainstreaming, 2) Direct Investment, 3) Gender Safeguards and 4) Monitoring Indicators. The IDB also prepared an internal, bank-wide Gender Action Plan for Operations 2011-2012 in March 2011	The Gender Action Plan for Operations 2011-2012 asked that the Bank systematically collects data for the Gender Policy indicators through the Bank's investment portfolio and knowledge and capacity building products. It will be used as an internal coordination and monitoring tool that will be updated annually. A progress report, GAP 2012 Progress Report on the Implementation of the Gender Policy, was recently completed (to

		be requested). <u>Note:</u> Trust fund projects, such as GEF, are not counted in the overall statistics of gender mainstream.
AFDB	The AFDB wide Strategy for 2013–2022 adopted in 2013 includes a gender perspective.	The AFDB Operations Evaluation Department published a report, Mainstreaming Gender Equality: A Road to Results or a Road to Nowhere? In 2012. Link here. However, the report does not include any gender evaluations carried out by the African Development Bank “because no gender evaluations have been commissioned or conducted”.
ADB	In April 2013 the board adopted a Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment Operational Plan, 2013–2020. ADB’s Policy on GAD requires that gender is mainstreamed in all ADB projects. To help translate the policy into concrete actions, activities and programs, the board published a series of Plan of Action Implementation Matrix. Last one here	The evaluation unit has published Annual Implementation Progress Reports that provide summaries of gender performance and progress made on implementation of the Gender and Development Plan of Action in the three key action areas: (i) country partnership strategies and lending operations; (ii) policy dialogue and support to developing member countries; and (iii) organizational effectiveness. (Last one July 2012 http://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/gad-plan-of-action-2011-ar.pdf)
EBRD	EBRD first gender strategy, Strategic Gender Initiative (link here) was adopted in April 2013. The main purpose of the strategy is to assess existing gender gaps both in countries of operations and the potential countries of EBRD operations in the southern and eastern Mediterranean, and identify how the Bank can help to address these gaps through its projects, technical assistance and policy dialogue. The Gender Strategy focuses on three key themes: access to employment, access to finance, and access to services.	None. EBRD first gender strategy was adopted in 2013.
FAO	The new FAO gender policy adopted in 2012, Policy on Gender Equality: Attaining Food Security Goals in Agriculture and Rural Development, recommends targets for increasing the organization’s effectiveness in addressing gender imbalances, including incorporating sex-disaggregated data into all major FAO statistical databases by 2015 (where relevant and available) and allocating 30 percent of FAO’s operational work and budget at the country and regional levels to targeted,	

	women-specific interventions by 2017. fao.org/docrep/017/i3205e/i3205e.pdf FAO also adopted a Gender and Development Plan of Action (2008-2013) In November 2007	
IFAD	A Gender equality and women's empowerment Policy was adopted in September 2012. Gender, targeting and social inclusion will be addressed as cross-cutting concerns under all five objectives. IFAD Gender Markers (related to projects), August 2013 Here IFAD also adopted a Strategic Framework 2011-2015.	In 2010, IFAD Independent Office of Evaluation undertook a corporate-level evaluation on gender for the first time, IFAD's Performance with regard to Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment. Here The evaluation report helped shape the design of the 2012 IFAD gender policy. IFAD now prepares an annual report on implementation progress with the gender policy, which appears in Annex 1 to the Report on IFAD's Development Effectiveness. Here IFAD also tracks the gender sensitivity of the loans portfolio at design, implementation and completion (see gender marker paper). Since 2011, IOE has included gender as a separate evaluation criteria. The gender dimension of IFAD's Results and Impact Management System (RIMS) is currently being strengthened.
UNDP	UNDP's work on gender is guided by the Beijing Platform for Action (BPFA), Convention of the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) and the frameworks provided by the Millennium Declaration and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). A Gender Equality Strategy 2008-2013 was adopted in 2012.	The Bureau for Development Policy Gender Team released an Implementation of UNDP Gender Equality Strategy 2008-2013. Background Paper for the Annual Report to the Executive Board in January 2013. Here
UNEP	The Gender Plan of Action 2006-2010 pursues the following three strategic objectives on gender mainstreaming: • Human equality, equity and rights are well respected across gender. • Promote equality of opportunity and treatment between women and men in the environmental sector at national, regional, and global levels. • Increase the quality and efficiency of UNEP's work in environmental conservation and promotion of sustainable development.	UNEP Evaluation Office conducted a Review Gender Mainstreaming in UNEP, May 25, 2012. Here

UNIDO	A Policy on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women was adopted on 21 April 2009. The policy main elements are: (a) Accountability (b) Results-based management for gender equality (c) Oversight through monitoring, evaluation, audit and reporting (d) Human and financial resources (e) Capacity development (f) Coherence, coordination and knowledge management	Evaluation of gender mainstreaming included in the Annual Report 2011. Here (p.31) Thematic evaluation on MDGs UNIDO conducted in 2012. It contains a chapter on gender. Here
-------	---	--

Annex 2: Interviewees

GEF Agencies

United Nations Development Program

Bennet, Nancy, Results Management Adviser, Global Environment Facility

Daniels, Ciara, Bureau of Development and Policy, Global Environment Facility

United Nations Environment Program

Niamir-Fuller, Maryam, Director of the Division of Global Environment Facility Coordination (DGEF)

World Bank

Kayser, Dominique Isabelle, Operations Officer, CPFIA

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)

Braun, Genevieve, Programme Officer, FAO-GEF Coordination Unit

Cooney, Barbara, Senior Programme Officer, FAO-GEF Coordination Unit

Griffin, Jeff, Environment Officer, Investment Center Division

Hierold, Juergen, UNIDO GEF Coordinator

Mihara, Kae, Associate Professional Officer, Gender, Equity and Rural Employment Division (ESW);

Petri, Monica, Technical Officers, Plant Production and Protection Division (AGP)

Poisot, Anne Sophie, Technical Officers, Plant Production and Protection Division (AGP)

Asian Development Bank (ADB)

Dunn, Bruce, Senior Environment Specialist, Environment and Safeguards Division (RSES)

Tanaka, Sonomi, Lead Social Development Specialist (Gender and Development)

Inter-American Development Bank (IDB)

Angulo, Inés, IDB-GEF Coordination Team, RND / CCR

Marquez, Luis E., Technical Coordinator

United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)

Femundsenden, Hedda, Gender Officer

Hierold, Juergen, UNIDO GEF Coordinator

GEF Secretariat

Arif, Sherif, Senior Environment and Water Consultant, The World Bank

Biro Kirtman, Yasmin, Senior Environmental Specialist

Dobardzic, Saliha, Climate Change Specialist

Velthaus, Andrew, Senior Policy Officer

Watanabe, Yoko, Program Manager, Senior Biodiversity Specialist (Gender Focal Point)

Global Environment Facility
Independent Evaluation Office
1818 H Street, NW
Washington, DC 20433
USA

www.gefio.org