



Gender Responsiveness Index for Climate Action


LWF Contribution in Engaging Faith-Based Organizations

MADAGASCAR EDITION



THE
LUTHERAN
WORLD
FEDERATION

A Communion
of Churches



*Cover Photo:
Observing “Gender Day”
theme at COP 27 in Egypt,
in 2022, LWF delegates join
faith-based organizations
standing up for gender
justice in climate emergency
response.*

Photo: LWF/Albin Hillert

ISBN: 978-2-940642-96-0

© The Lutheran World Federation, 2024

Published by: The Department for Theology, Mission and Justice
Chemin du Pavillon 2
1218 Le Grand-Saconnex
Geneva
Switzerland

Editing: Elena Cedillo Vargas

Authors: Thomas Hirsch, Silke Bölts, Antonella Kania, Ajita Tiwari Padhi

Proofreading: Alexander-Freeman Diehm, Pauline Mumia

Design and layout: Allie Hill

Acknowledgement: This research is a product of the “Local to Global Action for Climate Justice” Project, implemented with support from Brot für die Welt.

Table of Contents

<i>Preface</i>	4
<i>Executive summary</i>	5
<i>Why gender responsiveness matters in climate action</i>	8
<i>The Gender Action Plan (GAP)</i>	12
<i>GAP Performance Index 2024</i>	15
<i>Methodology, data sources, and correlation coefficient</i>	20
<i>Results of the country evaluation</i>	24
<i>Republic of Madagascar (Rank 5)</i>	26
<i>Conclusions</i>	30
<i>Policy recommendations</i>	31
Index of figures	33
Index of tables	33
Abbreviations.....	33
<i>Bibliography</i>	34

Preface

The intersection of gender and climate change has gained increasing attention in global policy discussions, particularly under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). This focus arises from the recognition that climate change not only exacerbates existing gender inequalities, but it also affects the key role of women in managing resources that enable them to adapt their livelihoods accordingly. Women’s extensive knowledge and experience make them effective actors and agents of change. Addressing these inequalities and ensuring equitable participation in decision-making processes is fundamental in both advancing gender equality and achieving climate justice.

This research explores the crucial role that faith-based organizations (FBOs) can play in advancing the implementation of the Gender Action Plan (GAP) under the Paris Agreement and the UNFCCC. Due to their inherent influence FBOs play a critical role in shaping values and behaviors, and promoting policies that advance justice, equity and inclusive climate action. They can mobilize advocacy for the integration of gender perspectives into climate policy at the national and international levels.

The scope of this research includes a detailed analysis of the GAP, its implementation with a focus on 20 countries in Africa, Asia-Pacific, Latin America and the Caribbean, and an overview of their performance in implementing gender-responsive climate action. It also proposes the development of an index to measure GAP implementation and offers policy recommendations to improve gender-responsive climate policies.

The Lutheran World Federation strongly believes that FBOs have a key role to play in advancing the GAP implementation, especially in advocating for policies that address the disproportionate impacts of climate change on women and girls, especially in vulnerable communities. Persistent gender inequalities, cultural norms and power imbalances continue to limit women's participation in climate policy and decision-making processes, thereby increasing their vulnerability. Through this engagement, FBOs can help to ensure that gender perspectives are meaningfully integrated into climate solutions.

Through climate policy recommendations grounded in a faith-based perspective, this research aims to contribute to implementation of the GAP, which will not only strengthen climate justice, but also support broader efforts toward sustainable development, building resilience, and social equity. This approach ensures that marginalized voices, especially those of women and girls, are central to climate solutions, paving the way for a more just and sustainable future.

Elena Cedillo Vargas
Program Executive for Climate Justice

Executive summary

In December 2019, at COP25 in Madrid, the Enhanced Lima Work Program on Gender (LWPG) and its Gender Action Plan (GAP) were adopted, acknowledging the need for gender mainstreaming in climate policies and actions, given the fact that climate change impacts differ largely due to gender inequalities. Addressing inequalities in and by climate action as well as due participation in decision-making is essential to achieving gender equality and climate justice.

Therefore, building up respective capacities; enhancing gender responsiveness in climate policies, plans, and actions; ensuring coherence and monitoring; and improving women's participation in decision-making processes and institutions are at the center of the Gender Action Plan (GAP) of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). It aims at guiding international, national, and subnational climate action and has been subject of a five-year work program, ending at COP29. However, it had long been apparent that most countries had made far too little progress in shaping climate policy in a gender-equitable way. Therefore, The Lutheran World Federation (LWF) has decided to undertake its own GAP performance analysis in order to advance the discussion on successful ways and hurdles of a gender-responsive implementation of the Paris Agreement.

The GAP Performance Index measures the performance of countries in the implementation of the UNFCCC Gender Action Framework (GAP) in a comparative way. So far, it has been applied to twenty countries, but it can be extended to any other country. It can also be used to measure how far a country has made progress in implementing the GAP if the index is calculated again after a certain time. Furthermore, the assessment shows, in a comparative way, how well the five GAP priorities are addressed.

The assessment was conducted for seven African countries, seven from Latin America, and six from Asia-Pacific. The first rank goes to Colombia, followed by Peru and Fiji. The laggards are Papua New Guinea, Brazil, and

Cuba. The best quarter of our sample of twenty achieved good scoring results, the second-best quarter was above average, the third quarter showed a medium performance, and the worst quarter achieved poor to medium results. Comparing the five GAP priority areas, the highest performance was achieved in the category of gender capacity development, the second-best in gender implementation, the third-best performance in gender coherence, the second lowest in gender balance, and the lowest performance was in the category of gender monitoring.

Interestingly, according to our correlation analysis, the results achieved by the countries surveyed in implementing the GAP are relatively independent of the overall level of gender equality in a country: this means that countries can implement the GAP well even if they perform poorly in terms of overall gender equality. However, the reverse is also true.

Altogether, the index reveals that the performance of most sample countries in implementing the GAP at the national level is not yet adequate. However, despite many shortcomings, there are also good practices to learn from. The most important drivers for gender-responsive climate action are a strong representation of women in leadership positions, collaborations between different stakeholders, international exchange, and a culture of cooperation that appreciates the involvement of otherwise often marginalized women from rural or Indigenous backgrounds.

The greatest obstacles to gender-sensitive climate policy are the still prevalent discrimination against women in many countries, the lack of political will to overcome power structures that are unfavorable to women, the lack of strong institutional structures for implementing targets and plans, and the lack of gender-disaggregated data and monitoring tools. The study concludes with eighteen policy recommendations on how to improve country performance in GAP implementation, grouped according to the five priority areas of the GAP:

A. Capacity building, knowledge management and communication

- A.1 Collect gender-disaggregated data, analyze climate impacts in a gender-disaggregated way, and understand the hurdles and opportunities of different genders to become change agents in terms of climate action.
- A.2 Undertake a national stocktaking process on gender-responsive climate action, co-organized by faith-based organizations (FBOs) as a first step, it should bring together CSOs, FBOs, government, academia, and international organizations and lead to a permanent dialogue and ultimately to a common roadmap for gender-responsive climate action.
- A.3 Develop capacity and use social media and web resources to create innovative communication tools to share gender-responsive climate change initiatives.
- A.4 Raise awareness on gender and climate change issues at all levels, especially among rural women and the youth. Also target men in awareness raising and capacity building on gender.
- A.5 Avoid stereotypes and take an empowerment approach: women should not only be seen as victims of climate change but also as effective agents of change.

B. Gender balance, participation, and women's leadership

- B.1 Promote women's leadership in climate governance, including through a quota system.
- B.2 Assign full-time gender and climate focal persons and build their capacity, particularly on the gender impact of climate change and climate-focused gender analysis.
- B.3 Strengthen the knowledge and skills of women leaders, candidates, and elected authorities for their participation in decision-making spaces. Also incorporate a gender climate perspective in the self-government systems of Indigenous autonomies.

C. Coherent integration of gender considerations toward the consistent implementation of gender-related mandates and activities

- C.1 Build and/or strengthen institutional capacities for gender mainstreaming in local, national, and regional climate change actions. Understand gender-based vulnerability drivers and barriers to gender-sensitive approaches in legislation across various sectors, specifically in climate legislation and policy.
- C.2 Consequently mainstream the gender approach across all relevant climate policies, programs, and actions; use synergies with biodiversity-related work and networks; build up collaboration and coordination with CSOs working on these issues.
- C.3 Mainstream gender into emerging frameworks under the UNFCCC regime, such as the just transition work program (decision 3/CMA.5) and the Global Goal on Adaptation framework (decision 2/CMA.5).

D. Gender-responsive implementation and means of implementation

- D.1 Update the GAP and mainstream its key components in the NDC and NAP in order to make them more gender-responsive and ultimately gender-transformative. Align gender-sensitized NDC and NAP with the country's development planning in a way that is coherent with national pathways leading to the achievement of the SDGs and the goals of the Paris Agreement.
- D.2 Allocate climate finance in a gender-responsive way by using gender budgeting and microfinancing approaches. Specifically invest in the design and implementation of gender-responsive climate adaptation, climate disaster preparedness and response, and climate mitigation programs.
- D.3 Use Brazil's G20 presidency (2024) and COP presidency (2025) should be used as an opportunity to focus on financing for gender-responsive climate action, highlighting the specific resilience-building potential of Indigenous people.
- D.4 Use synergies with regional and international initiatives on gender and climate change.

E. Monitoring and reporting on the implementation of gender-related actions

- E.1 Define gender-related key performance indicators for climate action.
- E.2 Develop a results-based indicator system for the monitoring and evaluation of gender-relevant climate programs.
- E.3 Introduce a system of gender-responsive climate action budgeting.

Why gender responsiveness matters in climate action



In Colombia, it is expected that the different needs, roles, skills and expectations of women and men are integrated in all climate change mitigation and adaptation actions. In this photo, women advocates for the protection of the Atrato River.

Photo: LWF/Colombia

YO SOY
GUARDIAN
DEL
BIÓ ATRATO

A LA
RESTAURACIÓN

A LA
PROTECCIÓN

A LA
CONSERVACIÓN

A EL
MANTENIMIENTO

MEMORIA
SOLIDARIDAD
con las víctimas del
conflicto armado.
Jorge Eliecer Maturana Usuga
Alcalde de Murindo
2016-2019

Why gender responsiveness matters in climate action

Just as gender equality is a fundamental pillar of the inalienability of human dignity, women's rights are human rights. However, their realization is further endangered by climate change, which is a "threat multiplier that amplifies and multiplies existing vulnerabilities."¹ According to UN Women, by 2050 climate change may push up to 158 million more women and girls into poverty, and 236 million more may face food insecurity.² While the particular vulnerability of women and girls before, during, and after climate-related extreme events is generally recognized, far too few concrete actions follow. This applies in particular to girls, whose already disproportionate disadvantage in many places is further increased by climate change: "Where climate risks are high, girls are more likely to drop out of school, more likely to experience violence, more likely to be subjected to human trafficking and more likely to experience child marriage. Climate impacts such as extreme heat, drought or floods also disproportionately affect girls' health, nutrition and livelihoods."³ Although these circumstances are known, this leads far too rarely to an adaptation of climate policy: only 2% of all Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs, the climate pledges of state members of the Paris Agreement) refer specifically to girls, as UNICEF found in a study.⁴

Women suffer disproportionately from adverse climate impacts, especially due to their lack of control over resources, because of cultural norms and a lack of decision-making power. Yet it would be wrong to portray women only as victims, rather than recognizing differences between women and the potential for women to use their agency and informal networks to negotiate their situations,

as the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) – the most authoritative scientific voice on climate change – stresses in its Sixth Assessment Report.⁵

According to the IPCC, addressing inequalities in access to resources, assets, and services as well as participation in decision-making is essential to achieving gender equality and climate justice: women are underrepresented in climate negotiations and, at the same time, are often the ones with the least formal protection against climate and other risks.⁶ To address these inequities is a matter of procedural and distributive justice. Gender-responsive social protection measures, early warning, and disaster risk reduction are required, as well as explicit attention to procedural justice, for example through balanced participation of women in decision-making.

Issues of unequal power and agency need to be addressed. Experience shows that ensuring a gender-responsive focus in climate adaptation and mitigation planning and implementation can lead to positive equity outcomes, especially for the most vulnerable and marginalized. We also know that gender responsiveness has greater effects when it is a central rather than one of many goals and that commitments need to translate into actions and financial flows: gender responsiveness also needs to be tracked in climate finance, as DanChurchAid, in collaboration with Act Church of Sweden, Finnish Evangelical Lutheran Mission (Felm), Finn Church Aid, and Norwegian Church Aid showed.⁷

1 <https://theconversation.com/advancing-the-rights-of-girls-and-women-promotes-justice-and-is-also-effective-climate-action-225766>.

2 <https://www.unwomen.org/en/digital-library/publications/2023/11/feminist-climate-justice-a-framework-for-action>

3 <https://theconversation.com/advancing-the-rights-of-girls-and-women-promotes-justice-and-is-also-effective-climate-action-225766>

4 <https://www.unicef.org/media/118691/file/Bring%20In%20the%20Girls!.pdf>

5 <https://www.ipcc.ch/report/sixth-assessment-report-working-group-ii/>

6 Ibid.

7 DCA et al., 2021, From Words to Actions: Lessons from Nordic Efforts to Integrate Gender Equality in Climate Finance.

Climate change affects men and women differently due to existing social, economic, and cultural inequalities. Women often bear the brunt of climate impacts, particularly in developing countries where they are more reliant on natural resources for their livelihoods and have less access to resources like land, credit, and technology. Gender-responsive strategies take these differences into account and can thus contribute to ensuring that all members of a community contribute to and benefit from climate adaptation and mitigation efforts. Thus, gender responsiveness is essential for effective climate action.

Considering the unique needs and perspectives of all genders leads not only to more effective but also to more equitable climate solutions. Women's knowledge and experience, especially in managing natural resources, can contribute significantly to sustainable practices and resilience building. Addressing gender in climate action, at the same time, empowers women, which, ultimately, not only benefits them but also strengthens communities and entire societies, as gender equality is linked to improved social and economic outcomes.

Finally, promoting and ensuring a better-balanced participation of women in climate decision-making processes leads to more comprehensive and inclusive policies, as diverse leadership results in better governance and more innovative solutions to climate challenges. Overall, integrating gender considerations in climate action is essential for achieving more equity, inclusiveness, sustainability, and effectiveness.

To firmly anchor gender aspects in climate action requires enabling framework conditions, especially with regard to climate policies, laws, budgets, strategies, and programs. Therefore, systematically mainstreaming gender across all these fields and improving women's participation in decision-making processes and institutions are at the center of the Gender Action Plan (GAP) of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). In the following chapters, we will first look at and analyze the GAP a little bit further. In a second step, we will introduce our GAP Performance Index, a tool that assesses, compares, and scores how well countries are implementing the GAP at home. Then, we will apply this new approach to a sample of twenty countries. Based on these assessment results, we will formulate our conclusions and policy recommendations.

We are thankful to the members of the LWF steering group who have accompanied the process that led to this report. Their valuable feedback helped us tremendously. We would particularly like to thank the external experts who critically reviewed and commented on our policy recommendations. We would also like to thank everyone else who provided us with important input. The contents of this study are the sole responsibility of the authors and the LWF as the client.



In Burundi, Immaculée Manirambona is a member of an LWF-supported cooperative through which small-scale farmers gain skills to increase food security at family and community level.

Photo: LWF Burundi / L. Gillibert

The Gender Action Plan (GAP)

The Lima Work Program on Gender (LWPG) was originally established in 2014 to advance gender balance and to better integrate gender considerations in climate actions and policies.⁸ In December 2019, at COP25 in Madrid, the Enhanced Lima Work Program on Gender and its Gender Action Plan (GAP) were adopted in Decision 3/CP.25,⁹ acknowledging the need for gender mainstreaming through all relevant targets in activities under the Convention in recognition of the fact that climate change impacts on women and men can differ due to gender inequalities. Special emphasis is put on developing countries, especially local communities and Indigenous peoples.¹⁰ The enhanced LWPG also emphasizes, as an important context factor of gender responsiveness, the “imperatives of a just transition of the workforce and the creation of decent work and quality jobs in accordance with nationally defined development priorities,”¹¹ a nexus that was taken up four years later at COP28 in Dubai and led to the establishment of the COP28 Gender-Responsive Just Transitions and Climate Action Partnership.¹²

The 5-years enhanced LWPG and its GAP call on parties to enhance efforts in gender mainstreaming through all targets and goals in climate action. Special attention should be paid to five priority areas of action, as set out by the GAP. For each of them, specific objectives and activities are defined:

1. Capacity-building, knowledge management, and communication to enhance the systematic integration of gender considerations into climate policy and action and the application of understanding and expertise to the actions called for under the LWPG, and facilitation of outreach, knowledge-sharing, and the communication of activities undertaken to enhance gender-responsive climate action.

2. Gender balance, participation, and women’s leadership to achieve and sustain the full, equal, and meaningful participation of women in the UNFCCC process.

3. Coherence to strengthen the integration of gender considerations within the work of UNFCCC constituted bodies, the secretariat, and other United Nations entities and stakeholders toward the consistent implementation of gender-related mandates and activities.

4. Gender-responsive implementation and means of implementation to ensure the respect, promotion, and consideration of gender equality and the empowerment of women in the implementation of the Convention and the Paris Agreement.

5. Monitoring and reporting to improve tracking of the implementation of and reporting on gender-related mandates under the enhanced LWPG and its GAP.

Furthermore, it was decided to undertake an intermediate review of the implementation of the enhanced LWPG and the GAP. In order to facilitate implementation, Parties were encouraged to appoint national gender and climate change focal points and to regularly submit information on steps taken.

8 [https://www4.unfccc.int/sites/NWPStaging/Pages/Lima-Work-Programme-on-Gender.aspx#:~:text=The%20Lima%20Work%20Programme%20on%20Gender%20\(LWPG\)%20was%20established%20in,responseive%20climate%20policy%20and%20action](https://www4.unfccc.int/sites/NWPStaging/Pages/Lima-Work-Programme-on-Gender.aspx#:~:text=The%20Lima%20Work%20Programme%20on%20Gender%20(LWPG)%20was%20established%20in,responseive%20climate%20policy%20and%20action)

9 <https://unfccc.int/documents/210472>

10 Ibid.

11 Ibid.

12 <https://www.cop28.com/en/cop28-gender-responsive-just-transitions-and-climate-action-partnership>

In June 2022, a synthesis report¹³ from the UNFCCC secretariat on the implementation of activities under the GAP opened the intermediate review that was concluded at COP27 in Egypt with some amendments to the GAP.¹⁴ At COP28, it was decided to undertake the final review of the enhanced LWPG and the GAP at the 60th session of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) in June 2024 and to conclude it at COP29 in Baku.¹⁵ On 27 May 2024, another synthesis report by the UNFCCC secretariat on the progress and challenges in the implementation of the enhanced LWPG and the GAP was launched with a view to inform its final review.¹⁶ Apart from summarizing the inputs received from Parties on the progress and challenges in implementing the GAP, the report also includes proposals for a new work program on gender. Altogether, the UNFCCC received forty-eight submissions from Parties, groups of Parties, UN organizations, and accredited observer organizations, including one from ACT – Action of Churches Together, to which the LWF is an affiliated member. As with regard to the progress achieved in gender-responsive action, the synthesis report concluded that it was impossible to present a systematic picture given the fact that the submissions received varied substantially with regard to their scope and nature. Regarding the main challenges in GAP implementation, the synthesis report emphasized that many of the challenges described in the submissions received were crosscutting and multidimensional, spanning financial, technical, institutional, and societal aspects. It became clear that many of them are linked to persistent gaps in the effective integration of gender considerations in climate policies and actions. Special attention was paid to financial constraints.¹⁷

In other words, there seems to be little progress in gender responsiveness, despite a five-year work program and many more attempts undertaken by a variety of actors. With a view to future work that could be undertaken in relation to gender and climate change, there seems to be interest among Parties in setting up a new work program.¹⁸

However, this raises the question of what can be done to ensure that a new Gender Action Plan leads to better and, above all, more concrete results. Some of the submissions to which the Synthesis Report refers to comment on this. Among other things, they suggest strengthening existing activities such as developing indicators to better monitor progress, strengthening the focus on implementation, strengthening gender-responsive means of implementation and means to implement GAP activities, and exploring ways to strengthen consideration of intersectionality.¹⁹

The synthesis report contains a detailed list of measures taken by the Parties and other stakeholders and assigns them to the five priority areas and sub-targets of the GAP. However, the report does not contain a real analysis of the measures or even strategic conclusions. This is due to the limited mandate of the UNFCCC secretariat in preparing such synthesis reports: they are usually limited to a value-neutral, summarized presentation and largely abstain from an assessment. However, this limits their usefulness.

In view of the politically intended, narrow limits of the synthesis reports, and the resulting gap in a real assessment of the progress but also of the weaknesses in the implementation of the GAP by the Parties, The Lutheran World Federation (LWF) has decided to prepare itself a GAP performance analysis in order to advance the discussion on successful ways and hurdles of a gender-responsive implementation of the Paris Agreement and the UNFCCC.

In the following chapter we present our approach.

13 https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/sbi2022_8.pdf

14 <https://unfccc.int/documents/626560>

15 https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/cop28_auv_13_gender.pdf

16 <https://unfccc.int/documents/638589>

17 Ibid.

18 Ibid.

19 Ibid.

GAP Performance Index 2024

The GAP Performance Index as the first of its kind measures the performance of countries in the domestic implementation of the UNFCCC Gender Action Framework (GAP) in a comparative way. Thus, it facilitates statements about the importance of gender aspects in climate action. So far, it has been applied to twenty countries, but it can be extended to any other country. It can also be used to measure a country's progress in implementing the GAP if the index is calculated again after a certain time. The comparative assessment also enables statements to be made about which GAP priorities are better and which are less well addressed.

The GAP Performance Index was developed by the think tank on Climate and Development Advice, on behalf of the LWF. In this way, the LWF aims to contribute to a more gender-equitable and gender-responsive climate policy practice. The assessment results should help countries to better assess their own strengths and weaknesses and to learn from international comparisons. The index and the

country-specific evaluation also provide LWF members with a tool to enter into dialogue with the national focal point on gender and climate change and other relevant stakeholders with the aim of improving the gender responsiveness of the most important national climate laws, policies, and programs.

The GAP Performance Index shows the screening results of the implementation of the Gender Action Plan in each of the five areas defined as priority fields of action. To measure performance, a total of fifteen criteria have been defined across the five priority areas. For each country, a performance score is calculated for each of the five priority areas and an overall performance score is calculated as an average of the partial results. In addition, the individual focus areas were weighted in such a way that they contribute to the overall result to varying degrees, with the respective weighting resulting from the relevance we attach to the focus areas. The focus areas and their weights are spelled out as follows:

What the GAP Performance Indicator evaluates

	PRIORITY AREA
GENDER CAPACITY	A: Capacity building, knowledge management and communication to enhance the systematic integration of gender considerations into climate policy and action (20% weight of the GAP Performance Index value).
GENDER BALANCE	B: Gender balance, participation, and women's leadership (30% weight of the GAP Performance Index value).
GENDER COHERENCE	C: Coherence to strengthen the integration of gender consideration within the national climate policy frameworks (10% weight of the GAP Performance Index value).
GENDER IMPLEMENTATION	D: Gender-responsive implementation and means of implementation to ensure the respect, promotion, and consideration of gender equality and empowerment of women in the implementation of the Convention and the Paris Agreement at the national level (30% weight of the GAP Performance Index value).
GENDER MONITORING	E: Monitoring and reporting to improve the tracking of the implementation of and reporting on gender-related mandates and climate actions (10% weight of the GAP Performance Index value).

The assessment criteria and the uniform evaluation grid are explained in more detail in the next chapter. A score between 0 and 3 can be achieved in each of the five fields of action and is detailed as follows:

CLASSIFICATION OF THE INDEX VALUES

Poor performance: score of less than 1.5

Medium performance: score between 1.5 and less than 2

Good performance: score between 2 and less than 2.5

Very good performance: score between 2.5 and 3


When assessing the performance of individual countries, the main focus is on the efforts that have been made since the GAP was adopted at COP23 (2017), particularly in the last three years. To a certain extent, however, efforts made before 2017 are also included in the assessment, provided they were steps that comply with the GAP recommendations. A certain difficulty arises in the evaluation if a country's policy shows a high degree of discontinuity with regard to gender aspects, for example as a result of government change. This is the case in some of the countries surveyed.

Even if, due to the limited research mandate, we have not carried out in-depth country analyses that go into technical detail, but only a screening, the results nevertheless allow us to make comparative statements about the countries' performances to date in implementing the GAP that are sufficiently validly substantiated, as the country-specific chapters in this study show, in which the results for each country are summarized in short form together with an extensive reference to sources.

The assessment was conducted for seven countries from Africa, seven from Latin America, and six from Asia-Pacific. The countries were selected because LWF members there are involved in a joint project supported by Bread for the World to combat climate change and promote climate justice, or because they offer particularly inspiring examples. Figure 1 shows the twenty assessed countries on a map.

Figure 1:

Countries rated by the GAP Performance Index



The average of all twenty countries amounted to an index value of 1.80. The average values for all three world regions are relatively similar: Asia-Pacific is slightly ahead (1.85), immediately behind comes Africa (1.84), and Latin America follows at a slightly greater distance (1.76). If you look at all twenty countries separately, however, the gaps between them are significantly greater than between the continents. In the overall ranking, there is a clear winner and an equally clear laggard: the first rank goes to Colombia by a wide margin (2.48), followed by Peru (2.15), and Fiji (2.05). The laggards are Papua New Guinea (1.54), Brazil (1.43), and Cuba in the last place (1.11).

The best quarter of our sample of twenty achieved good scoring results of between 2.03 and 2.48, the second-best quarter was above average with scoring results between 1.82 and 2.02, the third quarter showed a medium performance of between 1.63 and 1.78, and the worst quarter achieved poor to medium results of between 1.11 and 1.58.

Table 1 contains the ranking list, which includes the overall results for all twenty countries as well as the partial results in the five categories.

Table 1: GAP Performance Index – Ranking of the countries

RANK	COUNTRY	TOTAL GAP INDEX VALUE	GENDER CAPACITY INDEX VALUE	GENDER BALANCE INDEX VALUE	GENDER COHERENCE INDEX VALUE	GENDER IMPLEMENTATION INDEX VALUE	GENDER MONITORING INDEX VALUE
1	Colombia	2.48	3.00	2.25	2.50	2.50	2.00
2	Peru	2.15	2.00	2.50	2.00	2.00	2.00
3	Fiji	2.05	3.00	1.50	2.00	2.00	2.00
4	Nepal	2.04	2.33	1.25	2.50	2.50	2.00
5	Madagascar	2.03	1.00	2.75	2.50	2.50	0.00
6	Argentina	2.02	2.33	2.50	1.50	1.50	2.00
7	Kenya	1.98	2.00	2.25	2.00	2.00	1.00
8	Philippines	1.98	2.00	2.25	2.00	2.00	1.00
9	Ghana	1.92	2.33	1.50	1.50	2.50	1.00
10	Sierra Leone	1.82	1.33	1.50	2.00	2.00	3.00
11	Tanzania	1.78	2.00	1.25	2.50	2.50	0.00
12	Indonesia	1.77	2.33	2.00	1.50	1.50	1.00
13	Ethiopia	1.73	1.67	2.00	1.50	1.50	2.00
14	Bangladesh	1.71	1.67	1.25	2.00	2.00	2.00
15	South Africa	1.63	2.00	1.75	1.50	1.50	1.00
16	Bolivia	1.58	0.67	1.50	2.50	2.50	0.00
17	El Salvador	1.58	2.67	1.50	1.50	1.50	0.00
18	Papua New Guinea	1.54	1.33	1.25	2.00	2.00	1.00
19	Brazil	1.43	2.00	1.75	1.00	1.00	1.00
20	Cuba	1.11	1.67	1.25	1.00	1.00	0.00
AVERAGE VALUES		1.82	1.97	1.79	1.88	1.93	1.20

Comparing the five scored GAP focus areas, the lowest performance was achieved in gender monitoring (1.20), the second lowest in gender balance (1.79), the third best in gender coherence (1.88), the second best in gender implementation (1.93), and the highest in gender capacity development (1.97). However, the appropriate participation of women in the political negotiation process and good impact measurement, the two fields of action that have performed the weakest, are particularly relevant in order to ensure real transparency and accountability with regard to gender equality and responsiveness in climate action. Rapid progress is therefore needed here.

Are there any significant factors that can explain the country ranking?

Based on the hypothesis that the degree of gender equality in a country could have an impact on its performance in terms of GAP implementation, we first correlated the results achieved in the GAP Performance Index with the countries' performances in the Gender Inequality Index (GII).²⁰ However, this resulted in a very weak positive relationship (correlation coefficient 0.063, according to Spearman analysis; for more details see the next chapter), which is not significant. This means that, at least for our twenty countries examined, GAP performance is relatively independent of the respective level of gender equality. Thus, our initial hypothesis that countries with high gender inequality tend to perform poorly with regard to their GAP

implementation has not been confirmed, which leads us to the conclusion that countries can implement the GAP well even if they perform poorly in terms of general gender equality. In our comparative analysis, Madagascar and Nepal appeared as the greatest outperformers in GAP implementation vis-a-vis gender equality. However, the reverse is also true, as the examples of Brazil, El Salvador, and, above all, Cuba show. Altogether, nine countries performed better in the GAP Index compared to the GII (five of them from Africa), five performed similarly (four of them from Asia), and five worse (four of them from Latin America).

We also examined whether the income level of a country (according to the World Bank classification²¹) or the country-specific climate risk (determined by using a modification of the EU Risk Inform Index^{22 23}) has a recognizable relationship with GAP performance. However, these analyses did not reveal any strong correlations either. Such dependencies, which initially seemed plausible to us, cannot be proven. We therefore conclude that GAP performance is not a variable that is strongly dependent on any of the aforementioned variables. This means that countries can successfully implement the GAP recommendations for gender-responsive climate policies and actions even under adverse framework conditions, that is, when there is a high degree of gender inequality in the country, when the country is exposed to high climate risks, and when the financial scope for action is low.

20 <https://hdr.undp.org/data-center/thematic-composite-indices/gender-inequality-index#/indicies/GII>

21 See <https://blogs.worldbank.org/en/opendata/new-world-bank-group-country-classifications-income-level-fy24#:~:text=The%20World%20Bank%20Group%20assigns%20the%20world's%20economies,GNI%20per%20capita%20of%20the%20previous%20calendar%20year.>

22 For the EU Risk Inform, see <https://drmkc.jrc.ec.europa.eu/inform-index#:~:text=INFORM%20Risk%20Index%20The%20INFORM%20Risk%20Index%20is,can%20support%20decisions%20about%20prevention%2C%20preparedness%20and%20response.>

23 For the modification, see https://www.brot-fuer-die-welt.de/fileadmin/mediapool/downloads/fachpublikationen/Anpassungsindex/Climate_Adaption_Finance_Index_2023.pdf.

Table 2: Correlation analysis to determine possible drivers for the GAP Performance Index

COUNTRY	GAP PERFORMANCE INDEX RESULTS	GII RESULTS (RANK WITHIN THIS SAMPLE GROUP AND VALUE)	INCOME GROUP	CLIMATE RISK LEVEL
Colombia	1 (2.48)	7 (0.392)	UMIC	High risk
Peru	2 (2.15)	5 (0.380)	UMIC	High risk
Fiji	3 (2.05)	3 (0.332)	UMIC	Moderate risk
Nepal	4 (2.04)	12 (0.452)	LMIC	Medium-high risk
Madagascar	5 (2.03)	17 (0.556)	LIC	High risk
Argentina	6 (2.02)	1 (0.287)	UMIC	Medium-high risk
Kenya	7 (1.98)	13 (0.507)	LMIC	Medium-high risk
Philippines	7 (1.98)	10 (0.419)	LMIC	High risk
Ghana	9 (1.92)	15 (0.529)	LMIC	Medium-high risk
Sierra Leone	10 (1.82)	19 (0.633)	LIC	Medium-high risk
Tanzania	11 (1.78)	18 (0.560)	LMIC	High risk
Indonesia	12 (1.77)	11(0.444)	UMIC	Medium-high risk
Ethiopia	13 (1.73)	14 (0.520)	LIC	Very high risk
Bangladesh	14 (1.71)	16 (0.530)	LMIC	High risk
South Africa	15 (1.63)	8 (0.405)	UMIC	Medium-high risk
Bolivia	16 (1.58)	9 (0.418)	LMIC	High risk
El Salvador	16 (1.58)	4 (0.376)	UMIC	Medium-high risk
Papua New Guinea	18 (1.54)	20 (0.725)	LMIC	High risk
Brazil	19 (1.43)	6 (0.390)	UMIC	Low risk
Cuba	20 (1.11)	2 (0.303)	UMIC	Medium high-risk

Methodology, data sources, and correlation coefficient

To calculate the index value, the following formula is used:

$$\text{Index value} = ((I_1 * 20) + (I_2 * 30) + (I_3 * 10) + (I_4 * 30) + (I_5 * 10)) / 100$$

Where: $(I_1 = ((C_1 + C_2 + C_3) / 3))$ and $(I_2 = ((C_4 + C_5 + C_6 + C_7) / 4))$ and $(I_3 = ((C_8 + C_9) / 2))$
and $(I_4 = (C_{10} + C_{11} + C_{12} + C_{13} + C_{14}) / 4)$ and $(I_5 = C_{15})$

Table 3: Definition of all variables and the evaluation matrix of how they are to be scored

INDEX VALUES	CRITERIA	EVALUATION MATRIX
I ₁ : Gender capacity	C ₁ : Capacity-building measures on gender and climate change	Score 0: no/not clear. Score 1: not yet but planned. Score 2: yes, at the level of single events. Score 3: yes, in a systematic way, with revolving capacity-building measures on gender-responsive climate action.
	C ₂ : Research on gender and climate change and UNFCCC submissions on gender	Score 0: no research products. Score 1: single research products. Score 2: research products and/or UNFCCC submissions of the country on the topic are regularly published. Score 3: constant stream of research products / UNFCCC submissions indicating that gender-responsive climate action is being seen as a priority topic.
	C ₃ : Media coverage of gender and climate change	Score 0: not an issue. Score 1: only single/very few articles. Score 2: articles on the topic are regularly published. Score 3: constant stream of quality articles indicating that gender-responsive climate action is being seen as an important topic.
I ₂ : Gender balance	C ₄ : Female delegates at COP25 and COP28	Score 0: <10% females. Score 1: 10–25%. Score 2: 25.1–50%. Score 3: >50%.
	C ₅ : Gender balance trend COP25–COP28	Score 0: decrease. Score 1: similar percentage or up to 10% increase. Score 2: increase of 11–25%. Score 3: Increase >25% or female quota >50%.
	C ₆ : Appointment of national climate change and gender focal point	Score 0: no/not clear. Score 1: not yet but discussed. Score 2: not yet, but announced. Score 3: yes.
	C ₇ : Female head of delegation at COP28	Score 0: no. Score 3: yes.
I ₃ : Gender coherence	C ₈ : GAP and/or gender reference of national climate policies/ strategies	Score 0: no reference to gender. Score 1: reference to gender but in a generic way; not describing impact chains and/or action to be taken. Score 2: reference is made and impact chains and/or actions to be taken are described. Score 3: UNFCCC GAP as such is referred to and impact chains and/or gender-responsive actions are systematically included.
	C ₉ : Sharing of international climate finance projects with Rio gender marker	Score 0: <20% of projects have a gender component. Score 1: 20–35% have a gender component. Score 2: >35–50% have a gender component. Score 3: >50% have a gender component
I ₄ : Gender implementation	C ₁₀ : Availability of national gender and climate change strategy/reference to GAP	Score 0: no/not clear. Score 1: not yet but planned. Score 2: yes. Score 3: yes, in high quality, reflecting recommendations from the GAP process, and with ambitious objectives.
	C ₁₁ : Sharing of international climate finance projects with gender as the principal objective (according to the Rio gender marker)	Score 0: <3% of projects have gender as main component. Score 1: 3.1–6% have gender as main component. Score 2: 6.1–9% have gender as main component. Score 3: >9% have gender as main component.
	C ₁₂ : Gender/GAP reference in NDC	Score 0: no. Score 1: yes, but not in a systematic way. Score 2: yes, in a systematic way. Score 3: yes, in high quality and with ambitious objectives.
	C ₁₃ : Gender/GAP reference in NAP/adaptation plans	Score 0: no. Score 1: yes, but not in a systematic way. Score 2: yes, in a systematic way. Score 3: yes, in high quality and with ambitious objectives.
	C ₁₄ : Membership in gender-related international climate partnership	Score 0: no/not clear. Score 1: not yet but discussed. Score 2: not yet, but announced. Score 3: yes.
I ₅ : Gender monitoring	C ₁₅ : Gender-related reporting at the national level or to UNFCCC	Score 0: no. Score 1: yes, but not in a systematic way. Score 2: yes, in a systematic way. Score 3: yes, in high quality and with ambitious objectives.

Only officially accessible sources are used as the data basis for determining the results. These are broken down in detail in the following country assessments. Table 4 provides an overview of the most important data sources.

Table 4: Overview of important data sources applicable to all countries

CRITERIA	SOURCE
C ₁ : Capacity-building on gender and climate	Diverse sources
C ₂ : UNFCCC submissions on gender	https://www4.unfccc.int/sites/submissionsstaging/Pages/Home.aspx
C ₄ /C ₅ : Female delegates at COP25 and COP28	https://unfccc.int/documents/634503
C ₆ : Appointment of national climate change and gender focal point	https://unfccc.int/topics/gender/resources/list-of-gender-focal-points-under-the-unfccc
C ₇ : Female head of delegation at COP28	https://unfccc.int/documents/634503
C ₈ : GAP and/or gender reference of national climate policies/strategies	Diverse sources
C ₉ /C ₁₁ : Sharing of international climate finance projects with Rio gender marker	https://web-archive.oecd.org
C ₁₂ : Gender/GAP reference in NDC	https://unfccc.int/NDCREG
C ₁₃ : Gender/GAP reference in NAP	https://napcentral.org/submitted-naps
C ₁₄ : Membership in gender-related international climate partnership	https://www.cop28.com/en/news/2023/12/COP28-launches-partnership-to-support-women-economic-empowerment
C ₁₅ : Gender-related reporting to UNFCCC	https://unfccc.int/non-annex-I-NCs https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/parties-non-party-stakeholders/non-party-stakeholders/submissions/submission-portal


The significance of the country-specific results cannot be transferred to the countries as a whole since the selection of countries was not made on the basis of representativeness, but rather, as explained above, because the LWF is carrying out a climate project in these countries.

For the correlation analysis between the ranking in the GAP Performance and the Gender Inequality Index, a Spearman analysis was applied, leading to the conclusion that the GAP Performance Index results correlate only very

weakly with the Gender Inequality Index values: the rank correlation coefficient is 0.063205435 in a range between -1 and +1, with the value +1 meaning that there is a strong positive correlation and the value -1 meaning that there is a strong negative correlation. The value 0 means that there is no correlation. The calculation underpins the observation from the scatter diagram, which also shows no correlation between the characteristics. The p-value is 0.7912, meaning that the analysis would most likely also apply if we were to look at a sample of other countries.

Figure 2: Scatter diagram - GAP Performance Index and GII

Results				
Correlation coefficient (Spearman)	t-value	p-value	H0	H1
0.063205435	0.2686952	0.7912	no correlation	correlation





Plenary of the UN Climate Conference SB60. Photo: UNFCCC/Amira Grotendiek

Results of the country evaluation

In the following, we will present the analysis and evaluation results for the 20 countries examined in the form of brief country profiles. The order of the countries corresponds to the rank they achieved in the country comparison.

For each country, the implementation of the GAP priorities is described and assessed using the same evaluation scale. This results in the overall assessment. In addition, country-specific strengths, weaknesses, potential that has not yet been fully exploited, good practice examples, and possible hurdles are briefly highlighted. The report concludes with a number of country-specific recommendations that can be derived from the assessment.

The result achieved by the individual continents in our comparison is somewhat interesting.

Asia performs best with an average score of 1.85, followed very closely by Africa (1.84). In the case of Asia, the range of individual results is relatively broad, ranging from 3rd place (Fiji) to 18th place (Papua New Guinea), but with a clear concentration in the midfield.

Africa, on the other hand, has a relatively narrow bandwidth and a very strong concentration in the midfield, with no front-runners and no tail-runners.

Latin America ranks last with a significantly worse mean score of 1.76 and has the most pronounced spread: no country ranks in the middle of the field, but the first two and last two places in the ranking go to Latin America.




Republic of Madagascar

Madagascar is an island in the Indian Ocean, off the southeast coast of Africa. The closest neighbor to the east is Mozambique. Madagascar covers a surface of about 590,000 square kilometers and has a population of about 28.8 million. Madagascar’s climate is tropical and rainy along the east coast, arid in the south-west, and temperate in the mountains.

Madagascar’s second NDC was published on 29 January 2024, and its National Adaptation Plan (NAP) in May 2022. According to the Climate Adaptation Finance Index 2023, Madagascar is at high climate risk and highly underfinanced with regard to adaptation.²⁴ The Climate Action Tracker has not assessed Madagascar. The gender inequality index (GII) is very high, putting Madagascar at rank 145 with a score of 0.574 (1 being extremely unequal).

With a GAP Performance Index score of 2.03, Madagascar takes the 5th rank among all 20 countries assessed and performs considerably better compared to its GII ranking within this study sample (ranked 17 in the 20 countries of this study).



24 https://www.brot-fuer-die-welt.de/fileadmin/mediapool/20_Unsere-Themen/Anpassungsindex/Weitere_Dateien/Web_Rangliste.pdf.


RANK 5 Republic of Madagascar
GAP priority area A: Capacity building, knowledge management and communication to enhance gender-responsive climate action: 1.00 score

Capacity building: In Madagascar, the national focal point on gender and climate change regularly attends international training courses. However, there have been only very few or even no capacity-building measures in the country so far.

UNFCCC submissions and research on gender and climate change: So far, Madagascar has released one UNFCCC submission on gender and climate change, addressing the necessity to receive international financial support to implement the GAP.²⁵ A national platform to share or receive national climate policy data is not available.

Media coverage of gender and climate change: UN institutions, such as UNICEF, publish climate-related blog posts in local Malagasy, however there is no gender focus.

GAP priority area B: Gender balance, participation, and women's leadership in UNFCCC processes: 2.75 score

*Percentage of female party delegates at COPs:*²⁶ 21% of the Madagascar's party delegates at COP25 were women. This proportion increased sharply to 74% at COP28, leading to an average of 34%, which can be considered medium.

National Climate Change and Gender Focal Point: Madagascar appointed Ms Antonine Clara Raharisoa from the National Climate Change Coordination Office as national climate change and gender focal point.

Female leadership at COPs: Madagascar's delegation at COP28 was led by a woman, H. E. Ms Marie-Orléa Vina, Minister of Environment and Sustainable Development.

GAP priority area C: Coherence to strengthen the integration of gender considerations toward the consistent national implementation of gender-related mandates and activities: 2.50 score

Reference level of national climate strategies and action plans to gender considerations: Madagascar's strategies refer to the Global Plan of Action and/or include gender-mainstreaming elements.

Proportion of international climate financing projects in which gender components play an important role: In slightly less, 44.4%, than half of the projects recorded in the OECD-DAC database for climate finance (until 2021) in Madagascar, a gender-related component is either the principal objective or at least a significant objective.

25 <https://www4.unfccc.int/sites/SubmissionsStaging/Documents/202404081155---PROGRES%20ET%20DEFIS%20PAG%20MADAGASCAR.pdf>.

26 Including party and party overflow badges at COP28, <https://unfccc.int/documents/634503>.

<https://unfccc.int/topics/gender/resources/list-of-gender-focal-points-under-the-unfccc>.

 **RANK 5** Republic of Madagascar**GAP priority area D: Gender-responsive implementation and means of implementation:
2.50 score**

National Gender and Climate Change Strategy and linkages to the GAP process: Madagascar's national gender and climate change strategy reflects recommendations from the GAP process.

Gender responsiveness in the NDC: Madagascar does not make much reference to gender aspects in its NDC, and if so, it is very general.

Gender responsiveness in the NAP or other adaptation policies and programs: Madagascar's NAP mentions the inclusion of women as a guiding principle, referring specifically to the consideration of gender issues. The NAP emphasizes the need to strengthen women-specific capacities.

Proportion of international climate financing projects with gender components as the principal component: 6.6% of all projects recorded in the OECD-DAC database for climate finance in Madagascar (until 2021) have gender as their principal component, which is considered medium in this context.

Membership of the country in the COP28 Gender-Responsive Just Transitions and Climate Action Partnership: No.

GAP priority area E: Monitoring and reporting on the implementation of gender-related actions: 0.00 score

Inclusion of information on progress made concerning gender considerations in their regular national and/or international reporting: Gender aspects have not been included in Madagascar's climate reporting.



RANK 5 Republic of Madagascar

Concluding observations

Madagascar takes the 5th rank in the GAP Performance Index which is relatively good. It can be highlighted that Madagascar's national focal point on gender participates regularly in international trainings. Furthermore, Madagascar's national climate strategies also take up GAP recommendations.

Resulting policy recommendations to the Government of Madagascar:

- Undertake a national stocktaking process on gender-responsive climate action, organized in cooperation with FBOs, as a first step; it should bring together CSOs, FBOs, government, academia, and international organizations and lead to a permanent dialogue and ultimately to a common roadmap for gender-responsive climate action
- Build and strengthen institutional capacities for gender mainstreaming in local, national, and regional climate change actions. Understand gender-based vulnerability drivers and barriers to gender-sensitive approaches in legislation across various sectors, specifically in climate legislation and policy
- Mainstream the gender approach across all relevant climate policies, programs, and actions; use synergies; build up collaboration and coordination with CSOs working on these issues
- Update the GAP and mainstream its key components in the NDC and NAP to make them more gender-responsive and ultimately gender-transformative. Align gender-sensitized NDC and NAP with the country's development planning in a way that is coherent with national pathways leading to the achievement of the SDGs and the goals of the Paris Agreement
- Continue sending female staff to climate conferences and increasing their share to at least 50%. Provide capacity training and briefings to relevant staff, especially on the gender-climate nexus
- Monitor progress on climate and gender in a more detailed way and start also reporting on the gender-climate nexus

Conclusions

The index reveals that the performance of most sampled countries in implementing the GAP at the national level is not yet adequate and leaves a lot of room for improvement, especially regarding adequate gender representation in international processes and decision-making, but also regarding monitoring and implementation.

However, despite many shortcomings, there are good practices to learn from. There are particularly two countries to learn from, Colombia and Peru, but there is also a group of other countries from all continents that perform relatively well, some of them despite the severe financial constraints and climate risks they face. This group includes Fiji, Nepal, Madagascar, and Argentina.

Are there overarching approaches and factors that can explain why some countries are better at planning, deciding, and implementing their climate policies and programs in a gender-responsive way than others? Or are there factors that could in turn explain why certain countries are particularly bad at implementing the GAP? We conducted several correlation analyses between GAP performance and the Gender Inequality Index, national income levels, and climate-risk exposure of countries, but could not find significant correlations. Thus, it can be concluded that gender-responsive climate policies and actions can principally take place successfully under very different framework conditions and that a higher level of gender equality does not automatically lead to gender responsiveness in climate action.

Even if we were unable to find any such superordinate impact chains and interrelationships, we were still able to identify some typical obstacles but also drivers of gender-responsive climate action in the course of the country analyses that ultimately led to the assessment of GAP performance.

The greatest obstacles to gender-sensitive climate policy in most countries are the still prevalent, often culturally deeply rooted discrimination against women (especially with regard to land and property rights), the lack of political will to overcome power structures that are unfavorable for women, the lack of strong institutional structures for implementing targets and plans, and the lack of gender-disaggregated data and monitoring tools.

A combination of these factors generally leads to poor implementation, financial underfunding, weak or absent monitoring, and, in many cases, to NDCs, NAPs, and other climate policies and programs which, although they do include gender aspects at an abstract level and sometimes in an ambitious form, contain hardly any implementation elements. When evaluating gender policies, it is therefore important to consider not only their objectives, but also their institutional and financial resources, implementation instruments, monitoring, and, last but not least, the participation of women in decision-making processes and their representation in leadership positions.

Conversely, the most important drivers for gender-responsive climate action that we were able to identify are a strong representation of women in leadership positions, a lively atmosphere of cooperation with diverse collaborations between different stakeholders from government and civil society, openness and interest in international exchange, as well as an inclusive and participatory culture of cooperation that also appreciates the involvement of otherwise often marginalized women from rural or Indigenous backgrounds.

When a combination of these factors occurs – and this can be the case in both more traditional and more modern societies – it is more likely that gender responsiveness, in addition to overcoming specific gender-related vulnerabilities in climate adaptation, also aims to mobilize particular gender-specific potentials for successful climate action, promote innovation and transformation, build and strengthen institutional capacities, and provide significant financial resources for this purpose.

There is a wide range of good practices that have a strong potential for replication and scaling up. But there is still a long way to go, especially in countries with limited space for civil society.

Policy recommendations

The study concludes with policy recommendations on how to improve country performance in GAP implementation.

On the one hand, the policy recommendations are derived from the results of the GAP Performance Index, including the more detailed recommendations from the 20 country chapters of this publication.

Secondly, they build on recommendations and comments from gender experts and from participants at our side event in June 2024 in Bonn, Germany, with whom we discussed our interim results.

We hope that they will inform the final evaluation of the enhanced LWPG and the GAP at COP29 in Baku, Azerbaijan, as well as a new Gender Action Plan, and above all, to advance gender responsiveness in climate action at national and subnational levels in the countries we assessed, and even beyond them.

We have grouped 18 recommendations under the five priority areas of the Gender Action Plan.

A. Capacity building, knowledge management and communication

- A.1 Collect gender-disaggregated data, analyze climate impacts in a gender-disaggregated way, and understand the hurdles and opportunities of different genders to become change agents in terms of climate action.
- A.2 Undertake a national stocktaking process on gender-responsive climate action, co-organized by faith-based organizations (FBOs) as a first step, it should bring together CSOs, FBOs, government, academia, and international organizations and lead to a permanent dialogue and ultimately to a common roadmap for gender-responsive climate action.
- A.3 Develop capacity and use social media and web resources to create innovative communication tools to share gender-responsive climate change initiatives.
- A.4 Raise awareness on gender and climate change issues at all levels, especially among rural women and the youth. Also target men in awareness raising and capacity building on gender.
- A.5 Avoid stereotypes and take an empowerment approach: women should not only be seen as victims of climate change but also as effective agents of change.

B. Gender balance, participation, and women's leadership

- B.1 Promote women's leadership in climate governance, including through a quota system.
- B.2 Assign full-time gender and climate focal persons and build their capacity, particularly on the gender impact of climate change and climate-focused gender analysis.
- B.3 Strengthen the knowledge and skills of women leaders, candidates, and elected authorities for their participation in decision-making spaces. Also incorporate a gender climate perspective in the self-government systems of Indigenous autonomies.

C. Coherent integration of gender considerations toward the consistent implementation of gender-related mandates and activities

- C.1 Build and/or strengthen institutional capacities for gender mainstreaming in local, national, and regional climate change actions. Understand gender-based vulnerability drivers and barriers to gender-sensitive approaches in legislation across various sectors, specifically in climate legislation and policy.
- C.2 Consequently mainstream the gender approach across all relevant climate policies, programs, and actions; use synergies with biodiversity-related work and networks; build up collaboration and coordination with CSOs working on these issues.
- C.3 Mainstream gender into emerging frameworks under the UNFCCC regime, such as the just transition work program (decision 3/CMA.5) and the Global Goal on Adaptation framework (decision 2/CMA.5).

D. Gender-responsive implementation and means of implementation

- D.1 Update the GAP and mainstream its key components in the NDC and NAP in order to make them more gender-responsive and ultimately gender-transformative. Align gender-sensitized NDC and NAP with the country's development planning in a way that is coherent with national pathways leading to the achievement of the SDGs and the goals of the Paris Agreement.
- D.2 Allocate climate finance in a gender-responsive way by using gender budgeting and microfinancing approaches. Specifically invest in the design and implementation of gender-responsive climate adaptation, climate disaster preparedness and response, and climate mitigation programs.
- D.3 Use Brazil's G20 presidency (2024) and COP presidency (2025) should be used as an opportunity to focus on financing for gender-responsive climate action, highlighting the specific resilience-building potential of Indigenous people.
- D.4 Use synergies with regional and international initiatives on gender and climate change.

E. Monitoring and reporting on the implementation of gender-related actions

- E.1 Define gender-related key performance indicators for climate action.
- E.2 Develop a results-based indicator system for the monitoring and evaluation of gender-relevant climate programs.
- E.3 Introduce a system of gender-responsive climate action budgeting.

Index of figures

Fig. 1: Map with countries rated by the GAP Performance Index

Fig. 2: Scatter diagram – GAP Performance Index and GII

Index of tables

Table 1: GAP Performance Index – Ranking of the countries

Table 2: Correlation analysis to determine possible drivers for the GAP Performance Index

Table 3: Definition of all variables and the evaluation matrix of how they are to be scored

Table 4: Overview of important data sources applicable to all countries

Abbreviations

ACT	Action by Churches Together
ccGAP	Climate Change Gender Action Plan
CSO	Civil society organization
COP	Conference of the Parties
FBO	Faith-based organization
GAP	Gender Action Plan (of the enhanced LWPG)
GII	Gender Inequality Index
IPCC	Inter-Governmental Panel on Climate Change
LIC	Low-income country
LMIC	Lower middle-income country
LWF	The Lutheran World Federation
LWPG	Lima Work Program on Gender (under the UNFCCC)
NAP	National Adaptation Plan
NDC	Nationally Determined Contribution
SBI	Subsidiary Body of Implementation (under the UNFCCC)
SIDS	Small island developing states
UMIC	Upper middle-income country
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund

Bibliography

ACT Alliance Ethiopia Forum and PATH Consulting. 2022. *Policy Recommendations from Ethiopia: Nuances of the UNFCCC Gender Action Plan*. https://www.svenskakyrkan.se/filer/578537/Ethiopia_policy%20recommendations_final.pdf.

Asian Development Bank. 2022. *Women's Resilience in Fiji: How Laws and Policies Promote Gender Equality in Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management*. <https://wrd.unwomen.org/practice/resources/womens-resilience-fiji-how-laws-and-policies-promote-gender-equality-climate>.

Bernadette P. Resurrección, Beth A. Bee, Irene Dankelman, Clara Mi Young Park, Mousumi Haldar, and Catherine P. McMullen. 2019. *Gender-Transformative Climate Change Adaptation: Advancing Social Equity*. <https://www.sei.org/publications/gender-transformative-climate-change-adaptation-advancing-social-equity/>.

Brot für die Welt. 2023. *Climate Adaptation Finance Index 2023*. https://www.brot-fuer-die-welt.de/fileadmin/mediapool/downloads/fachpublikationen/Anpassungsindex/Climate_Adaption_Finance_Index_2023.pdf.

Dazé, A., and C. Hunter. 2022. *Gender-Responsive National Adaptation Plan (NAP) Processes: Progress and Promising Examples (NAP Global Network Synthesis Report, 2021–2022)*. Published by IISD. www.napglobalnetwork.org.

IPCC. 2022. *IPCC Sixth Assessment Report. Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability*. <https://www.ipcc.ch/report/sixth-assessment-report-working-group-ii/>.

Jaramillo, G.M. 11 April 2024. "Advancing the Rights of Girls and Women Promotes Justice and Is Also Effective Climate Action." Published by The Conversation. <https://theconversation.com/advancing-the-rights-of-girls-and-women-promotes-justice-and-is-also-effective-climate-action-225766>.

Lagi, R. "Curui': Weaving Climate Justice and Gender Equality into Fijian Educational Policies and Practices." *Comparative Education* 59, no. 2 (2023) <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/03050068.2023.2188370>.

NAP Global Network. UNFCCC. LDC Expert Group. Adaptation Committee. 2019. *Toolkit for a Gender-Responsive Process to Formulate and Implement National Adaptation Plans (NAPs): Supplement to the UNFCCC Technical Guidelines for the NAP Process*. Dazé, A., and Church, C. (lead authors). Winnipeg: IISD. https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/NAP_Gender_Toolkit.pdf.

Roy, C., and S. Bisan. 2021. *From Words to Action: Lessons from Nordic Efforts to Integrate Gender Equality in Climate Finance*. Published by DCA, act – Church of Sweden, Felm, Finn Church Aid, Norwegian Church Aid. https://actalliance.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/Climate_FromWordToAction-final.pdf.

Turquet, L., C. Tabbush, S. Staab, L. Williams, and B. Howell. 2023. *Feminist Climate Justice. A Framework for Action*. Conceptual framework prepared for Progress of the World's Women series. New York: UN-Women. <https://www.unwomen.org/en/digital-library/publications/2023/11/feminist-climate-justice-a-framework-for-action>.

UNDP. 2008. *Guía: Recursos de género para el cambio climático*. <https://www.undp.org/es/publicaciones/guia-recursos-de-genero-para-el-cambio-climatico>.

UNFCCC. 2024. *Progress, Challenges, Gaps and Priorities in Implementing the Gender Action Plan, and Future Work to Be Undertaken on Gender and Climate Change. Synthesis Report by the Secretariat*. Published by UNFCCC Subsidiary Body for Implementation. SBI Sixtieth session. <https://unfccc.int/documents/638589>.

UNFCCC. 2023. Decision -/CP.28. Gender and Climate Change. https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/cop28_auv_13_gender.pdf.

UNFCCC. 2023. *Progress, Good Practices and Lessons Learned in Prioritizing and Incorporating Gender-Responsive Adaptation Action*. Implementation of the activities contained in the gender action plan, areas of improvement, and further work to be undertaken. Policy brief. <https://unfccc.int/documents/632960>.

UNFCCC. 2022. *Implementation of the Activities Contained in the Gender Action Plan, Areas for Improvement and Further Work to Be Undertaken: Synthesis Report by the Secretariat*. Published by UNFCCC Subsidiary Body for Implementation. SBI Fifty-sixth session. https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/sbi2022_8.pdf.

UNFCCC. 2021. Decision 20/CP.26. "Gender and Climate Change." In *Report of the Conference of the Parties on Its Twenty-Sixth Session, Held in Glasgow from 31 October to 13 November 2021*, 35–37. <https://unfccc.int/documents/460955>.

UNFCCC. 2020. "Enhanced Lima Work Programme on Gender and Its Gender Action Plan." In: *Report of the Conference of the Parties on Its Twenty-Fifth Session, Held in Madrid from 2 to 15 December 2019: Addendum*. Decisions adopted by the Conference of the Parties. https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/cp2019_13a01_adv.pdf.

UNFCCC. 2014. Lima Work Programme on Gender (LWPG). [https://www4.unfccc.int/sites/NWPStaging/Pages/Lima-Work-Programme-on-Gender.aspx#:~:text=The%20Lima%20Work%20Programme%20on%20Gender%20\(LWPG\)%20was%20established%20in,responsive%20climate%20policy%20and%20action](https://www4.unfccc.int/sites/NWPStaging/Pages/Lima-Work-Programme-on-Gender.aspx#:~:text=The%20Lima%20Work%20Programme%20on%20Gender%20(LWPG)%20was%20established%20in,responsive%20climate%20policy%20and%20action).

Indices and classifications

Gender Inequality Index (GII): <https://hdr.undp.org/data-center/thematic-composite-indices/gender-inequality-index#/indicies/GII>.

INFORM, the EU Risk Inform Index: <https://drmkc.jrc.ec.europa.eu/inform-index#:~:text=INFORM%20Risk%20Index%20The%20INFORM%20Risk%20Index%20is,can%20support%20decisions%20about%20prevention%2C%20preparedness%20and%20response>.

World Bank Income Level Classification: <https://blogs.worldbank.org/en/opendata/new-world-bank-group-country-classifications-income-level-fy24#:~:text=The%20World%20Bank%20Group%20assigns%20the%20world's%20economies,GNI%20per%20capita%20of%20the%20previous%20calendar%20year>.



THE
LUTHERAN
WORLD
FEDERATION