

Keynote by Liane Schalatek, Associate Director, Heinrich Böll Stiftung North America*

Given at a workshop organized by NDF, ADB, IGES and SNV on “Gender-Responsive Climate Change Mitigation in Asia and Beyond: Creating a Marketplace for Change Agents, Policy Makers and Funders

Hanoi, Viet Nam, 20 December 2016

Thank you very much to the organizers for the invitation to share with you some thoughts as part of this keynote address. It is a great honor and responsibility to have been asked to deliver it at this important workshop, and I hope I can do the expectations justice.

I was asked to concentrate in my remarks on answering the following the following key questions:

- 1. What would a truly gender-responsive national climate policy landscape look like?**
- 2. How can some of the experiences shared yesterday (in the plenary and marketplace) help carry forward that vision?**
- 3. What are some changes (both visible and less visible) that need to happen to make this vision a reality?**

I will be addressing the first and third question together, as both are really inseparable for my reflections. **So, what would a truly gender-responsive national climate policy landscape look like? And what are some changes (both visible and less visible) that need to happen to make this vision a reality?**

- **We have to start with changing the discourse** – climate change is about people. It is not a technological fix. Period. The discourse about national climate policy and how to make it gender-responsive cannot be addressed as a technical question or purely a technical integration question, as the terminology of gender mainstreaming with its guidelines and approaches often seems to apply, **but it is fundamentally a political question**. And thus, it becomes a question of power and power relations and how to change them. Who holds power? Who doesn't? How accountable are those that hold power? How transparent are their actions and decision-making? How can the ability of women and men as citizens to equally participate in decision-making at all political levels be increased?
- **It has to acknowledge that the focus of any national climate change discourse has to be human- and human rights-centered, looking at needed behavioral change of how people relate to each other and the environment, the use and abuse of natural resources.** Technology is just a means to address this and should not be the focus or presented as the solution; in fact, very often smaller-scale, low-tech solutions that build on traditional practices or experiences will contribute more directly to gender-responsiveness than high-tech fixes. There are solutions and approaches that women have been traditionally using to adapt and mitigate to climate change without calling it adaptive or mitigative actions. Thus, just by increasing the space and the visibility of those solutions and voices that women bring to the table, we increase the gender responsiveness of national climate policy.

* Comments and questions are welcome. Please share them with the author at liane.schalatek@us.boell.org. For the work of the Heinrich Böll Stiftung North America on climate change policy and climate finance and its gender dimensions, including specifically our work on the Green Climate Fund (GCF), please see our website at: <http://us.boell.org/categories/climate-policy-finance>.

- When thinking about the task of writing these remarks, I started to think in terms of a list of defining adjectives and characteristics of a gender-responsive national climate change policy landscape. **It would be inclusive, just, equitable, participatory, human rights-based and acknowledging and being supportive of women’s human rights and gender equality; it would bring climate mandates in line with human rights and gender equality mandates in national policy setting (including national obligations under CEDAW or existing human rights conventions with a focus for example on the right to food or water, right to housing, right to political participation etc.). It would also be mindful of and addressing the intersectionality of gender equality with challenges/discriminations brought on by race, class or extreme poverty.** The ability for a indigenous women or a women in extreme poverty, the lower half of the lowest quintile, to participate in national climate policy discourse in many countries is very different from that of a women parliamentarian, a woman working in a government agency or a well-connected business woman living in the nation’s capital.
- Truly gender-responsive national climate policy landscape would focus **on deliberately empowering women to take leadership positions in planning committees, on taking on executing roles in implementation; would focus on targeting beneficiaries in a way that increases their ability to provide for a decent living for themselves, their families and communities; and would assess their needs as a focused priority,** starting listening to the voices articulating the needs, but also the solutions of women in community, rural, and grassroots settings;
- Integrating those voices, experiences and needs into national climate policy is key. So is the role of national legislation as well as of national planning instruments – and **to have a transparent and accountable domestic discourse and inclusive planning.** National adaptation plans (NAPs), for example, should be perceived as an iterative process, not a one-time document. For NAPs, nationally determined contributions and their continued upgrading (NDCs), or national communications (NCs) financial support can be provided through UNFCCC financial instruments, including the GEF and GCF. Such financial assistance should be used to further inclusive and participatory, gender-responsive policy dialogues at all political levels as well as for setting up internal communication and feed-back channels for true country coordination, not to pay international consultants tasked with writing those plans and communications. **The process of developing those plans and communications, seeing them as an iterative participatory engagement opportunity at the national and sub-national level,** is more important than their polished result on paper.
- Gender-responsive national climate policy **puts the question of equitable access central** – access to resources, access to decision-making, access to legal remedies and judicial recourse; access to information. Yesterday, in some marketplace discussions the issue of energy tariff reform in addressing the mitigation strategy in developing countries came up. From a perspective of gender-responsiveness affordability, inclusiveness and accessibility of energy and energy sector reform approaches remains crucial. Are we guaranteeing as a result of those reforms (continued or new) basic access to clean and renewable energy? Are we addressing the care burden and drudgery of women? Are we discussing how those burdens can be more equitably shared in societies as part of conceptualizing national climate policies and interventions?

- A truly gender-responsive national climate change policy **would demand that all projects and programs implemented under its policy frameworks are gender-responsive**, irrespective of whether it is through national implementation or international implementation via multilateral and bilateral partners, such as the ADB or the Nordic Development Fund. As part of the country ownership shown by endorsing or approving projects for national implementation, the corresponding government focal point, national designated authority or government ministry should ask project/program implementers a couple of tough questions before giving their no-objection to implementation in their countries. These questions would have to include the following: Does the project or program...?
 - Approach gender issues from a human rights perspective (focus on provision of basic services; right to water, food, adequate housing, CEDAW)
 - Acknowledge and seek to redress gender inequalities
 - Provide and analyze gender data (project design – baseline and M & E)
 - Analyze gender relations in social, legal, historical and economic context
 - Look at equitable gender access to project/program benefits
 - Promote equal opportunities for men and women to provide input and participate throughout project/program cycle
 - Plan project outcomes and outputs that respond to differential gender needs
 - Provide budgetary resources/gender budget commensurate with the tasks
 - Consider longer-term gender impacts of projects/programs and their sustainability
- With all these questions and considerations in mind as determining factors, **the differentiation between mitigation, adaptation and development – the attempt to devise some artificial fault lines on where development ends and where adaptation and mitigation start, and with it the understanding of an incremental finance provision, becomes very artificial and often detrimental to gender-responsiveness**. Take the example of the recent discussion in the GCF Board in Samoa. A project for implementation in Bangladesh, looking at making existing social protection systems fit for addressing the burdens climate challenges place on people with an explicit focus on the poorest women and girls, was rejected by many developed country Board members in the discourse about the merits of project proposals as being to development focused. “The GCF is a climate fund, not a development fund”, they argued. I find this discourse cynical and counter-productive. In the specific national contexts in developing countries, climate approaches cannot be divorced from the sustainable development context, they must be cross-cutting and holistic.

Climate interventions on agriculture are a good example. For a woman subsistence farmer dealing with lack of financing to buy agricultural equipment because she cannot get credit from local commercial financial institutions, who is left with rain-fed agriculture due to a lack of water for irrigation; who doesn't hold a formal land-title; or is looking for seeds/plant varieties or techniques that allow her to maintain or increase crop harvests and provide food security for her family and community in the face of changing unpredictable weather patterns, addressing those issues is more important than the mitigation potential or the carbon credit of her work. This focus is not her focus, but one placed upon her engagement with the land from an international community with the goal of trading/offsetting cheaper mitigation intervention in developing countries against delayed action to reform to consumption and production patterns in developed countries. Such an approach is not in line with a climate justice approach – the normative framing that my organization, the Heinrich Böll Stiftung places on climate policy development and the global

climate change process. And a climate justice approach to climate change is impossible without gender-just climate change approaches and solutions.

- Within this workshop in Hanoi, our discourse centered on mitigation. So a key part of **how gender-responsive mitigation policy on the national level should be discussed is through its focus**. For example, does it address **persistent energy poverty**? We heard yesterday that globally 2.8 bn people remain dependent on traditional biomass for heating and cooking. **Off-grid/small-grid distributive renewable energy solutions focused on increasing energy access are inherently gender-responsive as they address this key question. In contrast, a large hydropower dam is not** – not transformative, not ensuring environmental integrity, often in violation of human and women rights in conceptualization and implementation. Thus, a gender-responsive climate policy does not only throw a little bit of gender into mitigation projects and programs that are otherwise conceived largely business-as-usual (BAU) and treats gender otherwise as an add on. Instead gender-responsive national climate policy fundamentally rethinks climate mitigation projects and approaches. It also means that in a truly gender-responsive national climate policy landscape a number of interventions that are normally considered to be part and parcel of a stock option of climate interventions would not be any longer pursued, especially with respect to mitigation...
- A truly gender-responsive national – and international – climate policy approach will also challenge the way that we **measure effectiveness and efficiency of climate interventions**. **Again, this cannot be limited to a truly national discourse as we have international inflows of climate-relevant financing, through climate funds or development institutions, that bring with them their “theory of change”, log-frames and results management and performance measurement frameworks**. The **indicators that we use to measure effectiveness and efficiency must be changed, adjusted and upgraded to account for gender-responsive climate action and equity**. And it cannot be enough to do head-counting of men and women – quantitative indicators are important, but not sufficient and must be accompanied by qualitative indicators that address the changes in the power dynamics between men and women. A concrete example: predominant mitigation indicators – on both the individual project, but also a fund portfolio level—continue to focus on emissions reduction and how cost-effective they are achieved comes. Such narrow performance measurement for mitigation comes at the detriment of gender-responsiveness and is often supporting the violation of women’s human rights. Instead, there must be a focus on the multiplicity of desired outcomes and impacts – multiple benefits approaches, a clear sustainable development contextualization and a focus on environmental integrity, and including such performance indicators into effectiveness and efficiency assessments are important components for measuring the gender-responsiveness of mitigation measures.
- Lastly, a truly gender-responsive national-international climate policy landscape will **focus on the role and responsibility of the private sector in supporting the implementation of gender-responsive climate interventions by using a carrot and stick approach**, both incentivizing and mandating integration of gender-equality considerations in private sector investments and approaches. Here the experience of private sector engagement in the GCF can be instructive. Both national and international commercial banks have to show the existence of and institutional gender policy and of institutional gender expertise as a precondition to receiving funding from the GCF.

For gender-responsive private sector engagement, the **focus should be on the domestic micro-, small- and medium-sized enterprises (MSMEs) and the financial provision, including through the strengthening of local commercial financial institutions**, to support in particular

women-owned MSMEs, which are predominantly concentrated in the micro and small enterprise sector and by also looking at role of women entrepreneurs in the informal sector. This includes as a crucial component capacity-building and interventions to address existing biases against women entrepreneurs in the domestic financial institutions themselves, and not just a focus on reaching out to the credit consumer.

Concrete that would mean ensuring that the concessionality of public mitigation finance provided to the private banking sector (in form of loans, equity investment, risk guarantees) is passed on to women as end costumers, f.ex. in the form of easily accessible green credit lines with highly concessional, patient small-scale loans and that the subsidy capture by the private sector financial intermediary is avoided. This can be done in several ways

- Risk guarantees for small-scale loans (reducing the need for/or the size of a collateral micro- and small-scale business of women entrepreneurs have to put up to access financing). The need would be here to take a big risk with small actors, and not just to show willingness to finance large-scale risky interventions
- Buying down interest rates and increasing the maturity of small-scale RE loans is also an options with immediate benefit for micro- and small scale women-owned enterprises or just women consumers.

Allow me now to address **how can some of the experiences shared yesterday (in the plenary and marketplace) can help carry forward this vision?** Our discussions on the ADB technical assistance project showcased a variety of approaches that help contribute to making a more gender-responsive climate policy landscape a reality and that should be replicated widely in other a countries, and scaled up, in the case of some subnational or local pilot, nationally.

First of all, in looking at the presentation of the ADB project, it is clear that **it was conceived differently** – not just by adding gender into a BAU project and stirring. It also worked in a holistic and mutually reinforcing approach, allowing for different national contexts and experiences to determine the specific approach to institutional capacity-building, policy mainstreaming and the involvement of women in concrete pilot projects

I don't pretend to be fully able to capture and appreciate all the benefits and commendable approaches of the project, but listening just yesterday to the discussions in the plenary, a few things stood out for me.

- **Capacity-building** – with a targeted focus on identifying missing knowledge, and also tapping into existing knowledge and expertise. I liked the approach that realized and addressed that capacity building has to cut both way. For women's groups/gender machineries, gender working groups this means increasing their climate change related technical capacity and expertise, focusing on creating "gender plus" capacities and understanding; for example by strengthening in Cambodia the ability of the Gender and Children's Working Group (GCWG) in the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, and Fisheries (MAFF) to participate in the technical working group on climate change within MAFF, but also exchange with other government agencies on climate change. At the same time through the project intervention in Lao PDR the Department of Disaster Management and Climate Change (DDMCC) in the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE) increased its gender understanding/expertise and the integration of gender into the review of the National Climate Change Action Plan.
- **Increasing communication and coordination at all levels of climate decision-making and planning, from national to local/municipal**– bringing women's machineries and women's organizations formally into the climate policy discourse on various political levels is crucial. This happened at the level of the national government in Lao PDR where the Lao Women's Union is

now formally engaged in the national technical working group on climate change, or at the municipal level in Dang Hoe in the Vietnam case, where the Dang Hoe's Women Union got to participate in municipal planning and decision-making on climate change interventions, and where local women were given a leadership role, in project implementation

- **The local/municipal example of the Dong Hoi City pilot is powerful** – women through their work with communities and their focus on livelihood and service provision for communities might have much better opportunities to take on leadership roles and influence planning in local settings. Internalizing and applying the **subsidiarity principle as a guiding principle for gender-responsiveness is key: decision-making and implementation/execution should be at the most local level possible to still get the job down.**
- **Creating independent income opportunities for women** – economically empowering women by creating new livelihood opportunities for a decent living as part of a gender-responsive climate intervention is an important component.
- **Targeted financial provision** f.ex. in the form of subsidized, small-scale, patient, highly concession, low-cost loans for MSMEs where the focus is on the first “M” of MSME, the micro enterprise sector, as the part where women entrepreneurs, existing ones and start up businesses are disproportionally concentrated and by **looking at the sustainability of the financial support, via the setting up of a revolving fund** that should continue even once the public finance intervention has ended. This is useful in **addressing demand side – creating demand for women to be entrepreneurs. The revolving fund of the Dong Hoi pilot project example also shows the importance of bringing women into the management structure of financial organizations.** In the future, it could be very useful to look at the financial role that women's cooperatives can play, and the potential for cooperative banking in terms of climate finance provision and its implementation for gender-responsive climate actions at the local level.
- Lastly, and I will end with this, I want to **underscore the continued importance of grant support for mitigation interventions**, acknowledging that there are public good mandates, such as capacity building and technical support, that have to be supported in order for revenue-generating private sector-led mitigation activities to work. This is particularly important for building the capacity of and for the outreach to public and private sector actors on integrating gender equality and women's human rights approaches in mitigation interventions. Without it, even in the face of wonderfully sounding policy requirement for the private sector to develop intervention-specific gender action plans, implementation and the long-term transformation of private sector engagement to benefit gender-responsive implementation of climate investments will be jeopardized.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to address you here today, and I am looking forward to your comments and questions.