Gender and Climate Impact Assessment
Introduction

• GCCIA combines experience with CCIA and GIA (both examples of impact assessment – CBA, MCA, BIA, PSIA, RRA, EIA, HIA ..)

• Benin study first time (?) for GCIA (ie CCIA and GIA done jointly using the same framework)

• IBFCCA supporting double-mainstreaming - GCCIA one of several techniques (eg G/CPEIR, G/CBT, CCFF, CEGIM ...)

• CCIA experience mainly in Asia, but a bit in Africa

• Mostly still studies but a few countries have piloted budget reforms for CCIA (but not GCCIA)
What is GCCIA

• Assess the extra benefits that a programme provides when C&G are taken into account
• Disaggregate benefits and assess the relative importance of each benefit
• Assess the expected increase in each benefit when C&G are taken into account
• Need to know
  • The impact of C&G on programme beneficiaries (ie climate loss and damage and gender inequality)
  • How the programme reduces that impact
• Assess the weighted average increase in benefit for the whole programme
• Scoring methods vary with country – same principles
Additional Benefits (ie ‘M’ below)

A = K + L = 35 x 30 = 1050
B = K + L + M = 1050 + 10 x 35 / 2 = 1225
CC% = (B − A) / B = 175 / 1225 = 14%
# Typical Example of GCCIA Grid

## Typical Conservation Agriculture Programme GCCIA Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Benefit</th>
<th>Relative Importance 1 - 4</th>
<th>How does the benefit become more important with CC?</th>
<th>Increase in benefit F/H/M/L</th>
<th>How does the programme reduce gender inequality?</th>
<th>Improved gender equality F/H/M/L</th>
<th>Added benefits¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yields on traditional crops increased and made more reliable</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Losses from rainfall irregularity and drought reduced from 40% to 30%</td>
<td>H 30%=1.2</td>
<td>The women’s marketing initiative means women will control 20% of crop sales</td>
<td>M 20%=0.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for new crops leading to wider diversity of income sources</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Diverse crops more important with yield irregularity</td>
<td>H 30%=0.6</td>
<td>Women more likely to benefit if new crops are horticultural</td>
<td>H 30%=0.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced use of fertilisers reduces water pollution and improves soil quality</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>More intense rainfall increases runoff and soil loss</td>
<td>M 20%=0.4</td>
<td>Reduced water pollution could limit need to travel for washing</td>
<td>L 10%=0.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour savings create new income generating opportunities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Diverse incomes more important with yield irregularity</td>
<td>H 30%=0.3</td>
<td>Potential for women to benefit if targeted for women</td>
<td>M 20%=0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher soil organic matter and reduced agrochem improves biodiversity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Protection becomes more valuable as biodiversity challenges increase</td>
<td>L 10%=0.2</td>
<td>Gender neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased soil organic matter contributes to carbon sequestration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Only valuable if climate change considered a problem</td>
<td>F 100%=1</td>
<td>Gender neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil water retention slows runoff and reduces risks of flooding downstream</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>More intense rainfall increases runoff and flood risks</td>
<td>H 30%=0.9</td>
<td>Gender neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total                            | A: 15                     | C: 4.5                               | D: 1.8                      | B: 6.4                         |

Notes. For column 2, 1 is low and 4 is high. For columns 4 and 6, F=full, H=high, M=mid, L=low. These are converted into %s: F= 100%, H=50%, M=20%, L=10%. Multiplying the relative importance score (ie 1-4) by the % gives the increase in benefit when climate or gender are considered. Adding the rows gives the total increase in climate or gender benefits, which can be divided by A to give an estimate of the % increase in benefits for the programme as a whole. Column 4 adds the increase in benefits for climate and gender and gives total increase in each benefit, which can then also be added for the whole programme.
Why Bother with GCCIA?

• Discussion about C&G programmes can be a bit general and circular
• So need a framework to structure the discussion
  -> helps to adapt design to maximise benefits
• MoFs/funders like to see objective assessment
  -> CCIA helps obtain/protect funding
• Can be used in C&G budget tagging
• Informs results chain for management and monitoring
• Informs indicators for evaluation
Examples of CCIA

- Thailand – from full to rapid CBA
- Cambodia – rapid CCIA
- Indonesia – hybrid, expert team
- India – hybrid CCIA on priorities selected by state governments
- Malawi CPEIR – rapid qualitative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>ABS</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRIDE</td>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>Nkhata Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBMMP</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Ntcheu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFERP</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Zomba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIYAP</td>
<td>AfDB</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALFP</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Nkhata Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASAF IV</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>Ntcheu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADAPT PLAN</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>Zomba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IYEP</td>
<td>AU</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDRRP</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Nkhata Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRWSIP</td>
<td>AfDB</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>Ntcheu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Technical Challenges for GCCIA

- Disaggregated benefits can overlap – keeping a hierarchy
- ‘Framing’ the analysis and the ‘counterfactual’
- Keeping focused on change in benefits (not just vulnerability/inequality)
- Hybrid method - mixing quantitative evidence and expert opinion (scored relative to quantitative)
- Realism – avoid inflating values (BCRs of >5 probably wrong)
- Identifying the benefits that only happen when both climate and gender are taken into account (eg higher adaptation and equality if women involved) - not yet done
Lessons for Managing GCCIA

- There are several ways of doing the basics – roughly comparable but slightly different
- Takes some experience to build consistency, but is then relatively easy to apply
- Numbers aren’t exact estimates, but the relative levels should be informative
- Line ministries are initially interested, but the system needs to change before GCCIA could be mandatory
- MoFs are impressed with structured appraisal (so helps with the reputation of the line ministry) but MoFs not yet requesting it in budget guidelines
- Funding bodies (eg GCF or NCFs) are not yet using GCCIA but they are asking for more rigorous approaches
CCIA in the budget cycle
GCCIA and Budget Reform

• Design – spending ministries estimate C&G benefits when designing programmes, to improve design
• Appraisal – independent checks on line ministry assessments, offering quality control/review
• Negotiation – budget guidelines require GCCIA results and these are taken into account during negotiations
• Accounting – C&G budget tagging informed by GCCIA results (complement to OECD DAC markers)
• Evaluation – ex-post evaluation assesses whether specified C&G benefits are likely to materialise