Oxford Policy Management

Process Evaluation of the Mitigation Action Facility's Implementation of the Gender Action Plan

Amanda Woomer, Maha Kamal, Judith Münster

May 2026

Disclaimer

The results and analysis included in the report are based on an external and independent evaluation conducted by the consortium Dorsch Impact (formerly Ambero)-OPM. The conclusions drawn in the report do not necessarily reflect the official views of the Mitigation Action Facility (formerly NAMA Facility).

List of abbreviations

AP	Action Plan
COP	Conference of Parties under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)
CfP	Call for Projects
DPP	Detailed Preparation Phase
EE	Energy Efficiency
ELE	Evaluation and Learning Exercise
EQ	Evaluation Question
EV	Electric Vehicle
GAP	Gender Action Plan
GBV	Gender Based Violence
GESI	Gender Equality and Social Impact
GFP	Gender Focal Point
KII	Key Informant Interview
MEL	Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning
MSMEs	Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises
OPM	Oxford Policy Management
TSU	Technical Support Unit

Executive Summary

This process evaluation assessed how the Mitigation Action Facility has implemented its first Gender Action Plan (GAP 2023–2025) through the lens of 26 projects as they undertook Gender Analyses, designed GESI Action Plans (APs), and implemented those plans. It explores the successes and challenges those projects faced as well as the lessons learned. The specific evaluation questions are:

1) To what extent are projects developing GESI Action Plans (APs) in line with the Facility's GAP vision and objectives?

2) What is the experience for projects that are implementing their GESI APs?

3) What challenges and opportunities have projects faced in developing their GESI APs?

Conducted between August 2025 and February 2026 by Oxford Policy Management (OPM), the evaluation draws on a review of Mitigation Action Facility and project-level documents, interviews with 31 key informants, and four in-depth case studies of projects with geographic, sectoral and cohort diversity. The evaluation also included a validation workshop with the Facility's Technical Support Unit (TSU). Its objective was to develop insights and recommendations that can be used as evidence for shaping the upcoming GAP 2.0.

Overall, the evaluation finds that the GAP has significantly strengthened gender integration across the portfolio—especially for newer projects. It has also identified key challenges related to GESI-specific budgets and capacities, contextualisation of guidance, and clarity around expectations. Specific findings and resulting recommendations are outlined below.

Findings

1. GESI AP actions are considered by stakeholders to be realistic and relevant, with the required Gender Analysis playing a key role in this. In particular, the analysis has allowed some projects to ensure the ambition of their gender-related actions is effectively tailored to the context.

GESI APs are generally tailored to the specific industries, cultural and societal norms forming the context of each project with relevant and realistic ways to incorporate GESI principles and increase women's participation and empowerment. Ways of involving women in the projects generally fall into two categories: augmenting existing plans for their inclusion or adding activities with objectives related to transforming male-dominated industries. The main drivers of contextual relevance for GESI APs and their activities are the Gender Analysis required by the Mitigation Action Facility and the individual experiences of key project staff.

2. While generally robust, the Gender Analyses undertaken by projects varied greatly in approach and tools used, with newer projects taking a more in-depth approach in alignment with Mitigation Action Facility requirements and guidance. Most projects included detailed analysis of potential risks, although gaps in available data had some influence on robustness.

The Gender Analyses varied over time, with newer projects benefitting from the GAP as well as more in-depth guidance and templates showing more robustness and higher levels of

utility. Newer projects were more likely to use mixed methods such as interviews, workshops, and field visits. These analyses were instrumental in tailoring interventions to cultural norms, sectoral dynamics, and structural barriers faced by women and marginalised groups. Across the portfolio, data gaps and limited time for primary data collection constrained the ability to fully identify and address gender-related risks. In general, most Gender Analyses included a consideration of risks (including those related to conflict, displacement, and health).

3. "Do-no-harm" approaches are not yet well incorporated into GESI APs, although some project stakeholders are aware of related processes. This may be linked to limited understanding of what do-no-harm means and, as a result, perceptions that these approaches are not relevant to Mitigation Action Facility-funded projects.

Few projects have explicitly integrated "do no harm" measures into their GESI APs, although stakeholder interviews reveal more projects have considered them. This limited inclusion of related approaches may be the result of limited awareness of what "do no harm" means and what these approaches might look like. However, Gender Analyses indicate that there are inherent risks to projects, and that do-no-harm is a relevant concept.

4. The introduction of the Mitigation Action Facility GAP and associated requirements has likely led to increased consideration of groups beyond women as well as to increasing numbers of gender-responsive and gender-transformative activities included in the design of projects.

Both older and newer projects incorporate similar gender-related activities like training for women, gender-disaggregated analysis and data, and financial tools targeting women. More recently developed GESI APs, however, demonstrate more frequent consideration of groups beyond women and go beyond more tangible outputs to tackle awareness raising and the shaping of gender norms and beliefs. The Facility's GAP requirements and guidance as well as support provided through workshops and the external experts have likely contributed to these increasingly inclusive and holistic approaches to GESI.

5. Many projects include gender-responsive activities, with some also planning gender-transformative pilots. Limited evidence to-date shows some promising progress, with important challenges related to resources, buy-in, and contextual considerations.

While the intent of including GESI APs is to ensure gender-responsive projects, many older projects for which GESI APs were not part of the design process have budgetary or time constraints and have thus included activities that are gender-sensitive in nature rather than gender-responsive. There are, however, numerous examples of gender-responsive activities included in GESI APs, especially where GESI APs were part of the design process and there was sufficient room, budget and buy-in from project teams, largely in the categories of technical and leadership training; communication and outreach; institutional mainstreaming; and financial inclusion. A smaller group of projects also initiated potentially transformative pilots, such as campaigns to shift social norms or initiatives enabling the participation of marginalised groups in value chains. Some projects—especially those from older cohorts—achieved notable progress even with minimal resources by leveraging partnerships and local networks and even when GESI APs were included mid-way only. While there are early signs of progress, notable barriers include limited staffing, competing priorities for Gender Focal Points (GFPs), tight budgets, and insufficient buy-in from leadership.

6. There are multiple potential pathways to sustainability as indicated by project GESI APs and stakeholders, including through institutionalisation and partnerships.

Key to project sustainability is embedding or institutionalising a gender lens and securing stakeholder buy-in. Conversely, where GESI was viewed as a "checkbox," activities remained minimal, reducing both progress and potential sustainability. Other strategies include alignment with government institutions and financial service providers, although worries about financial viability remain a challenge.

7. While the evaluation revealed a handful of positive unintended outcomes, there are likely to be more positive and negative outcomes attributable to projects that are not captured through existing monitoring, evaluation, and learning mechanisms.

Positive unintended effects—such as increased visibility of women, replication of local gender-responsive initiatives, or improved household wellbeing—were identified in several projects. However, systematic reporting of unintended (negative or positive) or transformative outcomes is limited due to past reporting requirements.

8. Projects' ability to conduct and integrate a Gender Analysis into the project design varied widely based on individual experience and expertise as well as project history.

The depth of a Gender Analysis and the ambition of GESI APs are often reflection the prior specialisation, experience, and individual interest of those project staff who are responsible for these deliverables. Whether a project has also worked with other funders with GESI requirements is also a factor.

9. Meaningful GESI integration is often driven by institutional buy-in and proactive senior leadership.

Institutional buy-in is a critical internal factor to effective GESI integration and the roll out of GESI APs. A supportive "boss" or others in leadership and project teams who prioritise GESI and gender-related approaches were identified as a primary driver of success in three projects. On the other hand, senior management that views GESI as only a "checkbox" exercise present important barriers to the implementation of GESI APs. Specific project examples demonstrate that both GFP and broader institutional stakeholder beliefs can impact the integration of gender-sensitive, gender-responsive and/or gender-transformative activities and their results. These factors similarly affect the integration of an intersectional lens in project design, which is particularly important for "do no harm" approaches and avoiding negative unintended consequences.

10. Broader sociocultural norms around gender as well as systems that discriminate on gender (such as financial systems) also play an important role in project GESI implementation.

The sociocultural contexts in which projects take place—including the intersectionality of issues like gender, youth, socioeconomic status, sector, and education—plays a key role in their ability to effectively undertake gender-sensitive and gender-transformative activities, placing important limits on what a project can realistically achieve. There are also key interlinkages with socioeconomic status, all of which have implications for gender-sensitive, gender-responsive and, especially, gender-transformative outcomes.

11. The type and focus of Mitigation Action Facility support (including workshops and technical assistance) was generally highly appreciated by projects. Additional needs expressed by projects relate to more targeted support and more human and financial resources.

Training, templates, and technical support from the TSU were widely valued. However, project stakeholders across the portfolio also requested more specific training related to geographic, cultural context, sectors, and topics (such as communication). Limited human and financial resources further complicate these needs, although these challenges are more commonly referenced by older projects.

12. Project stakeholders indicate the need for clearer GAP requirements and additional language support.

There was some stakeholder feedback that the format of required tools and annexes can sometimes be too simplistic to capture cultural nuances on the ground or that they are duplicative between GESI and non-GESI required documentation. Additionally, non-English speaking teams noted they would benefit from additional linguistic accessibility.

Recommendations

1. The Mitigation Action Facility's GAP 2.0 should include more detailed and (in some cases) stringent requirements for design and implementation, particularly as it relates to budgets for GESI activities and the GFP role, the level of effort expected for the GFP role, the depth of gender analysis required (including considerations of intersectionality), and "do no harm" minimum standards.

To further streamline expectations on GESI integration for Mitigation Action Facility projects and ensure that projects have the resources needed to move toward gender transformation and social inclusion, the Facility should refine the requirements of the GAP 2.0 to:

- More clearly define key terms such as "do-no-harm" and how they might apply to projects to ensure a shared understanding of concepts and their successful incorporation into project design and implementation.
- Expand GESI-related budgetary requirements for projects related to undertaking comprehensive Gender Analyses, tailoring GESI-related team trainings, and securing more specific and ongoing GESI support.
- Further elaborate the GFP role and its responsibilities, including levels of effort (LoE) and experience or background.
- Update annexes and other requirements to allow for more detail and specificity to account for contextual differences between projects.

2. The TSU should further tailor support to projects in ways that support more in-depth peer learning and promote access to context-specific resources (e.g., those related to geography, sector, culture, language, and institutional capacity) while considering intersectionality.

To address high demand for a shift away from general, overarching international GESI frameworks and technical support, the TSU should consider:

- Establishing peer learning mechanisms for group learning, sharing of resources, and brainstorming of solutions.

- Developing industry-specific toolkits that are tailored and include "real-world" examples relevant to specific technical challenges and geographies.
- Moving beyond surface-level training to address sector-specific GESI barriers and key topics like communications and data collection. This could be supported by requiring projects to budget for more specific training based on their needs.
- Including guidance on intersectionality in sector-specific toolkits and GESI GFP training to ensure more than just gender is considered.
- Prioritising regional expertise by hiring regional GESI consultants and/or creating a pool or roster of diverse GESI experts.
- Translating resources into additional languages or requiring projects to build that into their budgets when necessary.

3. The GAP 2.0 should incorporate requirements for projects to consider how they can build institutional capacity, buy-in and integration to increase the likelihood of impactful and sustainable projects, including through dedicated budgeting.

For GESI APs to be effective drivers of change rather than "checkbox" exercises, they must have the full support of senior management within implementing institutions. The TSU should consider ways to support this work, including:

- Bringing GESI into any existing training or awareness raising activities done with leadership from project teams.
- Providing GFPs with specific resources or training on strategies for building institutional buy-in or supporting such conversations through peer learning mechanisms.
- Screening projects (such as with a self-screening tool) to assess their level of institutional buy-in and, when relevant, encouraging them to budget for supportive activities.

Evaluation and Learning Exercises (ELEs) can also be used as a mechanism to assess these efforts and identify lessons learned on effective approaches to building support.

4. The Mitigation Action Facility should consider ways to increase its understanding of progress among projects and associated learnings, including by undertaking a more in-depth evaluation or building in additional opportunities for reporting or reflection.

To better understand the progress of its projects, the Facility can continue to enhance its annual reporting template, including by asking projects to share GESI-related success stories or unanticipated outcomes (including on specific topics), building more reflection on progress on GESI into peer-learning approaches, undertaking more in-depth evaluations, and refining the ELE approaches to better integrate GESI.

Conclusion

As the Mitigation Action Facility prepares GAP 2.0, the evidence points toward four strategic levers:

1. clearer and more ambitious requirements
2. targeted and contextualised support
3. stronger institutional capacity and leadership engagement
4. improved learning and evaluation systems

Together, these will help ensure that gender equality and social inclusion become embedded, sustainable, and transformative components of Facility-supported climate action.

Table of contents

List of tables

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

The Mitigation Action Facility demonstrated a strong commitment to integrating Gender Equality and Social Inclusion (GESI) into its climate mitigation initiatives through its Gender Action Plan (GAP) 2023–2025. This plan followed the Facility's introduction of an ambitious Gender Vision in 2022, which deepened its commitment to advancing gender justice in climate action.[1] In alignment with this vision as well key international frameworks such as the Paris Agreement and Lima Work Programme on Gender, the GAP was developed as a commitment of the Facility to justice for people of all genders as well as those facing social exclusion or discrimination. In particular, the GAP highlights the need for an inclusive and context sensitive approach that builds capacities in gender justice and social inclusion, fosters participation of women and other marginalised groups, and integrates the needs and experiences of these groups into design and implementation of projects.

The Mitigation Action Facility has its Gender Action Plan and utilizes the OECD-DAC Gender Equality Policy Marker as its core framework, requiring all projects to meet a minimum score of 1 ("significant") to ensure gender equality as a primary objective. The integration of gender exists along a continuum, from gender-negative and gender-blind through gender-sensitive, gender-responsive, and gender-transformative[2]. The Facility has broadened its understanding to recognise how gender intersects with other forms of disadvantage – such as age, disability and poverty – and now encourages applying the same logic of the marker to these additional groups to ensure equitable participation and outcomes. Additionally, the GAP seeks to contribute to the Facility's goal or promoting knowledge creation through evidence generation and knowledge products.

It is important to note that the GAP, which came into effect in June 2023, applies to all Mitigation Action Facility projects. This includes those that were already in progress at the time of the GAP's launch. Therefore, there are differing levels of ambition for new and ongoing projects.

- **New projects** as of Call for Projects (CfP) 2023 must fulfil the GAP fully, including through a budget entry for gender as part of the Detailed Preparation Phase (DPP).
- **Projects in DPP** were required to conduct a Gender Analysis and integrate relevant considerations into project design.
- **Ongoing projects with at least 15 months remaining** were asked to fulfil the GAP but with less ambitious goals.
- **Ongoing projects with less than 15 months remaining** were instructed to speak with the Mitigation Action Facility directly about the feasibility of GAP-related actions.

All projects were required to commit to a **"do-no-harm"** approach and to **increasing meaningful representation** of women and/or groups facing social exclusion and discrimination.

[1] See https://mitigation-action.org/publications/gender-vision/
[2] See https://one.oecd.org/document/DCD/DAC/GEN(2025)2/en/pdf. A score of 1 indicates that "gender equality is an important and deliberate objective, but not the principal reason for undertaking the project/programme" (p. 5).

The GAP is divided into nine commitments with a total of 11 milestones (see Annex 2), which are further divided into sub-milestones. Responsibility for achieving these milestones is divided between the Technical Support Unit (TSU), projects, or both the TSU and projects.

1.2 Evaluation Objectives and Questions

The initial GAP ended in December 2025, and the Mitigation Action Facility is set to develop a second GAP that builds on the first in ways that further gender justice. To support this renewal project, the Facility commissioned Oxford Policy Management (OPM) to conduct a process evaluation to **assess the implementation of the GAP** to date, identifying **lessons learned** to inform the next iteration of the strategy as well as its implementation by the TSU.

To achieve this objective, the evaluation is structured around three core Evaluation Questions (EQs). These questions were operationalised to test hypotheses regarding project design, implementation experience, and institutional capacity. A full list of the EQs and associated sub-questions can be found in Annex 1.

EQ1: Design and Alignment – To what extent are projects developing GESI Action Plans (APs) in line with the Mitigation Action Facility's GAP vision and objectives?

This question assessed the extent to which projects developed GESI APs in line with the Facility's GAP vision. Sub-questions focused on:

- How gender outcomes were prioritised relative to **financial objectives**.
- Whether GESI actions were **realistic, context-specific**, and followed a "**do-no-harm**" approach.
- The robustness of the GESI analysis and risk screening tools

EQ2: Implementation Experience – What is the experience for projects that are implementing their GESI APs?

This question focused on the lived experience of project teams as they transitioned from design to implementation. Key areas of inquiry included:

- Progress against GESI AP milestones.
- Examples where gender-responsive design enhanced **financial viability** or expanded market reach.
- **Unintended positive and negative consequences**.

EQ3: Capacity and Challenges – What challenges and opportunities have projects faced in developing their GESI APs?

This question evaluated the internal and external factors that facilitated or hindered the roll out of project APs. Sub-questions examined:

- The role and effectiveness of **Gender Focal Points (GFPs)** and the challenges of the "**double burden**" (non-dedicated staff time).
- The impact of **socio-cultural norms** and financial institution resistance.

- The effectiveness of TSU training and the demand for **sector-specific toolkits**.

In addition to these three EQs, the evaluation also asked specific learning-focused questions on how to improve the Mitigation Action Facility's GAP and its implementation. This included questions on the guidance, training and support provided to projects thus far as well as additional resources or support that would be needed to enhance GESI integration under GAP 2.0.

1.3 Evaluative Approach and Methodology

To effectively respond to the above questions, the evaluation used qualitative methods to gather relevant information in the form of documents, key informant interviews (KIIs), and one workshop with the TSU to gather evidence and sense check emergent findings. This included four in-depth case studies of Mitigation Action Facility projects in different countries. Over the evaluation timeframe (August 2025 to February 2026), the team reviewed 26 projects at different stages of implementation of the GAP, from those who had yet to complete a Gender Analysis to those in implementation and with a GESI AP. Projects spanned multiple cohorts of Facility funding up to CfP 2024 (see **Table 1**: Projects Reviewed). The evaluation team used documents[3], KIIs and the workshop to triangulate findings, identifying areas of convergence and divergence. The specifics on each data collection method and the analysis process are outlined below.

Table 1: Projects Reviewed

Project Short title	Phase	Cohort
Mauritius - Energy Efficiency	DPP	CfP 2023
Pakistan - Battery Swapping Network	DPP	CfP 2023
Brazil - E-Buses Industry	DPP	CfP 2024
India - Industrial Clusters	DPP	CfP 2024
Vietnam - Sustainable Industries	DPP	CfP 2024
Mongolia - Clean Heating	DPP/IP > Selection	Round Two
Kazakhstan - Reactive Power for Energy Savings	DPP/IP > Selection	CfP 2024
Colombia - Energy Communities	DPP/IP > Selection	CfP 2023
Indonesia - Biogas	DPP/IP > Selection	CfP 2023
Brazil - Carbon-negative Fertiliser	DPP/IP > Selection	CfP 2023
Philippines - Tidal Stream	IP1	7th Call
Costa Rica - Green Hydrogen	IP1	Ambition Initiative
Kenya - Post-Harvest Solar Cooling	IP1	Ambition Initiative
Kenya - Small Vehicles E-Mobility	IP1	Ambition Initiative
Rwanda - E-Mobility	IP1	7th Call
South Africa - Public Buildings and Infrastructure	IP2	3rd Call
Guatemala - Cookstoves	IP2	3rd Call
Mexico - SME Energy Efficiency	IP2	4th Call
India - Waste Management	IP2	5th Call

[3] The document review did not cover 2025 reports, so the insights may differ from the Facility's Annual Report 2025.

Project Short title	Phase	Cohort
Cabo Verde - Electric Vehicles	IP2	5th Call
Brazil - Industrial Energy Efficiency	IP2	5th Call
Honduras - Livestock	IP2	6th Call
Mongolia - Building Retrofitting	IP2	6th Call
Nepal - Electric Transport	IP2	Ambition Initiative
Namibia - Biomass	IP2	Round Two
Mozambique - Waste Management	IP2	5th Call

1.3.1 Data Collection Methods

To triangulate evidence from multiple sources, the evaluation team relied on a systemic document review, Key Informant Interviews (KIIs), and a validation workshop with the TSU (see table below).

Table 2: Data Collection Methods

Data collection method	Description	Insights
Systematic Document Review	Nearly 160 project documents reviewed: - Gender Analyses - GESI APs - Annual Reports from 2023 and 2024 - Other documents from TSU (monitoring data, OECD-DAC marker list, ELEs)	- Establish baseline of compliance - Identify trends in how GESI requirements are interpretated
KIIs	25 in-depth, virtual KIIs with 31 stakeholders (30-90 mins), including with: - GFPs (general interviews and case studies) - Main partners (case studies) - Project partners (case studies) - External gender experts with knowledge of country and sector context (case studies)	- Provide qualitative evidence from a broad sample of projects - Understand project context - Understand lessons learned
In-depth Case Studies	Four in-depth case studies[4] of projects at different stages and in different geographies. Multiple stakeholders for each project were interviewed, and detailed documentation was reviewed. The projects of focus were: - Pakistan – Battery Swapping Network - Kazakhstan – Reactive Power for Energy Savings - Cabo Verde – Electric Vehicles - Namibia – Biomass	- Provide in-depth qualitative information on a smaller portion of projects - Dig deeper into lessons learned

[4] While Brazil was also initially chosen as a case study for the evaluation, COP30 took place in Belém, Brazil during the evaluation and made it impossible to secure sufficient interviews.

Data collection method	Description	Insights
Validation Workshop	Virtual mini workshop with TSU staff (January 2026)	- Gather additional information on experiences with the Mitigation Action Facility's GAP implementation - Validate preliminary findings - Discuss possible recommendations relevant for GAP 2.0

The four case studies (see **Table 3** below) were selected to provide a multi-dimensional view of Facility's portfolio that incorporated geographic diversity, representation from multiple cohorts (including more mature projects as well as those from more recent CfPs), and variety in terms of project sectors. This allowed the evaluation team to look across projects and at the ways their various circumstances (maturity, sectors of focus, degree of requirements and support from the Facility, etc.) affected their implementation of the GAP. Additional detail regarding each case study project's selection is included in the Table.

Table 3: Case Study Projects for Process Evaluation

Region	Project Name	Sector	CfP	Rationale
SIDS	Cabo Verde - Electric Vehicles	Transport	CfPs 3-6	Older project; GESI AP developed in last year of implementation.
Sub-Saharan Africa	Namibia - Biomass	Energy	CfPs 7, AI1 & AI2	Included rural and ethnic minority populations; developed GESI AP early in implementation.
South Asia	Pakistan - Battery Swapping	Transport	CfP2023	Received in-depth support from external consultants; high scalability potential.
Central Asia	Kazakhstan - Reactive Power	Grid/Energy	CfP 2024	Represented an underrepresented region and a highly technical sector.

1.3.2 Data Analysis and Synthesis

The analysis was conducted in the three stages below:

Stage 1: Descriptive Analysis – Qualitative data from interviews, case studies, and documents were coded using **thematic analysis**. The team used an analysis matrix to compile evidence for each EQ and sub-EQ while allowing for **emergent themes**.

Stage 2: Synthesis and Interpretation – The second stage involved **triangulating findings** across all data sources. The evaluation team looked across the evidence to identify patterns, themes, and outliers. This stage also involved multiple internal, evaluation team workshops to discuss emerging findings and gaps as well as one workshop with the Facility's TSU to gather further evidence and sense check the emerging finings.

Stage 3: Reporting – This stage focused on drafting the findings and associated recommendations contained in this report. It included quality assurance checks by OPM staff

external to the evaluation team as well as a review of the draft report by the Facility and its donors.

1.4 Limitations

The evaluation faced several limitations that affected the team's ability to comprehensively respond to all evaluation questions. This included:

- Stakeholders interviewed sometimes had limited awareness of GESI-related components (and, for projects outside of the case studies, interviews were generally limited to one person per project). For example, team members other than the GFP often did not know the details of the GESI AP, and some project partners only looked at their components and did not necessarily know about the GESI AP or even of the existence of the GFP. This affected their ability to speak about all the ways in which GESI may have been integrated (including the development of GESI APs or the work of GFPs). This was especially the case for the financial architecture of the projects, to which almost no stakeholders could speak (likely because project staff that are experts in gender, who were the focus of interviews, may not overlap with those who are experts in the financial aspects of the work).

- There was limited documentation on more recent project progress for the evaluation team, which conducted its literature review from October to early December 2025. At this time, annual reports and ELEs were only available for 2023 and 2024, which means that activities kicked off in 2024 and/or implemented in 2025 were not described in any documents. Combined with the virtual nature of and small number of individual project interviews, this limited the evaluation team's ability to assess project outcomes to date. This was particularly important for understanding any unintended outcomes, which are difficult to perceive through virtual interviews and without direct site of projects or project participants.

- The evaluation team encountered scheduling challenges related to the availability of some project stakeholders (including for the Namibia – Biogas case study and the planned Brazil – Industrial Energy Efficiency case study). In the case of the Brazil project, this resulted in the inability to conduct a full case study.

- The share of new Gender Analyses and GESI APs that build on the TSU's templates and guidance after GAP roll-out is relatively small in the evaluation sample, with six projects from CfPs 2023 and 2024 being interviewed, of which four had developed GESI documents. There are important variations between projects that have made comparisons between them challenging. For example, prior to the GAP roll-out, some projects relied on their own formats for Gender Analyses (such as GIZ standard templates for projects implemented by GIZ). Also, certain projects received different kinds of guidance on completing key project templates (such as the Gender Analysis), with some being allowed to use previously conducted analyses. In addition, templates and guidance are updated by the TSU from call to call. While these differences do not represent problems with Mitigation Action Facility's approach, they have made understanding the differences in effect of processes on project outcomes difficult.

To overcome these limitations, the evaluation team focused on the valid data available to triangulate reasonable findings, which in some cases meant that specific sub-EQs could not be answered.

2 Findings

This chapter provides a comprehensive analysis of the evaluation findings regarding the Mitigation Action Facility's GAP implementation based on each EQ.

2.1 EQ1: Alignment and Design of GESI APs

This EQ centres on projects as they develop their GESI APs, and whether this is done in alignment with the Facility's GAP vision and objectives. As a result, it focuses on the 21 of 26 projects reviewed that currently have GESI APs. It assessed the degree to which GESI AP actions are realistic, relevant and context-specific; whether they adopt a "do-no-harm" approach; how gender outcomes are defined and prioritised; and the robustness of the GESI analysis, particularly when it comes to risks.

Finding 1: GESI AP actions are considered by stakeholders to be realistic and relevant, with the required Gender Analysis playing a key role in this. In particular, the analysis has allowed some projects to ensure the ambition of their gender and social inclusion related actions is effectively tailored to the context.

GESI APs are generally tailored to the specific industries of focus as well as the cultural and societal norms that affect those industries, with many APs describing contextually relevant ways to incorporate GESI principles and (more specifically) to increase women's participation and empowerment. The tailored approaches described in GESI APs include the use of local languages in communication (particularly in Latin America) and the incorporation of key Indigenous groups and conflict issues in areas with long histories of conflict. Interviews confirmed that many project stakeholders feel their APs are realistic and relevant, and they described specific cultural and sectoral barriers that they aim to address. For example, some sectors are traditionally dominated by men or involve tasks that may be unsafe for women. Women, members of vulnerable groups, or youth may also lack access to the relevant financial tools needed to engage, and this understanding has helped projects to define new activities.

As a result, project stakeholders have identified creative, alternative ways to involve women and other groups seen to be underrepresented in the respective sectors. These approaches generally fall into two categories: augmenting existing plans (such as by increasing the reach of project activities to increase participation) or adding activities with the objective of transforming male-dominated industries into more inclusive ones. In both cases, nearly all project APs describe increasing the participation of women and marginalised groups into the labour force, including by upskilling of women in technical and leadership roles. They also aim to improve safeguards in work environments, increase access to finance, and (in more limited cases) support relevant policies.

The main drivers of the contextual relevance of GESI APs and their associated activities appear to be the Gender Analysis required by the Mitigation Action Facility as well as the individual experiences of key project staff (see **Finding 8**). Projects like that in Cabo Verde, for example, make explicit reference to the expertise of project staff in developing realistic and relevant GESI APs. Additionally, some project stakeholders noted that they have been

able to effectively plan relevant activities because of their experiences with other donors or projects or because of their education (such as a recent master's degree). The process of developing a Gender Analysis has also allowed projects to explore issues in greater detail, such as through interviews and new studies (see below). Flexibility in that process and support from the TSU was also listed by one stakeholder as essential to ensuring the Gender Analysis yielded helpful results. The completion of the Gender Analysis and GESI AP was also described by another stakeholder as providing a grassroots understanding of problems and identifying existing policies that could be leveraged.

Finding 2: While generally robust, the Gender Analyses undertaken by projects varied greatly in approach and tools used, with newer projects taking a more in-depth approach in alignment with Mitigation Action Facility requirements and guidance. Most projects included detailed analysis of potential risks, although gaps in available data had some influence on robustness.

The Gender Analyses conducted varied over time, with newer projects that have benefited from the GAP as well as more in-depth guidance and templates showing more robustness and higher levels of utility. While nearly all projects relied on desk reviews, newer projects often took advantage of a multitude of methods, including broad stakeholder engagement such as through interviews, site visits, surveys, focus groups, and stakeholder engagement workshops. In some cases, large consultations were held, such as a 2-day workshop with 14 entities in Honduras and a large-scale meeting with 35 people from academia, human rights groups, and ethnic organisations in Colombia. This is likely supported by the fact that newer Mitigation Action Facility projects are required to provide a justification if they use only a desk review for their analysis.

In addition to the timing of the Gender Analyses (and the ability to rely on newer Facility guidance), the robustness of analyses was in some cases also amplified by the use of tools and intersectional approaches. For example, Colombia (Energy Communities) used the GIZ Audit Tool for Integrated Context and Human Rights Analysis (IPCA). Honduras (Livestock) undertook multiple kinds of mapping, including of gender-related needs and resource access. According to interviews, the choice of approaches was in some cases influenced by the experience of the project or individual responsible, including previous exposure to GESI-related tools. The Facility's guidance on conducting a Gender Analysis is flexible in supporting other formats and approaches if they are equally or more robust[5], something that likely leads to efficiencies for the project teams.

Challenges to the analyses included data gaps and/or limited time to collect further data to fill those gaps (including for Cabo Verde, Kazakhstan, Vietnam, South Africa, and Namibia), which affected some projects' abilities to evaluate quantitative, gender-disaggregated data as required in the GAP. This was sometimes the result of starting the analysis later (for earlier projects), something that will likely change for future cohorts. However, even more recent projects like Vietnam (Sustainable Industries) have indicated that they need more time to explore the needs of all GESI-related groups, and some projects faced issues with in-country data availability beyond their control.

[5] See, for example, the CfP 2024 GESI Analysis template.

The GAP indicates that, as part of the analysis, "project teams must pay particular attention to rigorously assessing the risks and opportunities in every sector of their respective countries"[6]. Risks were generally considered in the analyses, with the most robust assessment on security risks coming from Colombia (Colombia – Energy Communities). Projects in Pakistan, Nepal, and India interrogated risks around gender-based violence (GBV), and both Kazakhstan and Pakistan identified the potential for a "gender backlash" to the promotion of women's inclusion and equality. Other, non-security risks were also explored, including displacement of informal workers (India – Waste Management) and gentrification (Mongolia – Building Retrofitting). At least four projects also identified health risks and environmental hazards. Interestingly, however, many of these risks did not translate into a "do-no-harm" approach in the GESI APs (see Finding 3 below).

Finding 3: "Do-no-harm" approaches are not yet well incorporated into GESI APs, although some project stakeholders are aware of related processes. This may be linked to limited understanding of what do-no-harm means and, as a result, perceptions that these approaches are not relevant to Mitigation Action Facility-funded projects.

The Facility's GAP requires all projects, regardless of their level of ambition, to incorporate a "do-no-harm" approach. This approach refers to both 1) "ongoing analysis to ensure that potential risks of unintentionally perpetuating or reinforcing gender inequalities and social exclusion… are continuously and proactively monitored," and 2) by taking corrected or compensatory measures, where applicable. This is in line with increasing recognition in the climate adaptation and mitigation space of the importance of avoiding harm when it comes to gender and social inclusion as well as of incorporating a conflict sensitive lens into the design and implementation of projects[7].

Of those projects reviewed that have developed GESI APs (21 out of 26)[8], only one (Mongolia – Building Retrofitting) makes explicit use of the term "do-no-harm" in its AP, and this is only to reference it as an important requirement of the Mitigation Action Facility's GAP. Other APs address the underlying requirements of the approach by indicating that they will "prevent possible unintended negative impacts" (Mexico – SME Energy Efficiency) or by incorporating safeguards and complaint mechanisms (South Africa – Public Buildings and Infrastructure).

Despite a lack of documentation on "do-no-harm" approaches in GESI APs, three stakeholders did indicate during interviews that they are aware of these approaches and plan to incorporate them (despite this not having been documented in the AP itself). Another project stakeholder also pointed to the related approach of annual risk monitoring. In most of

[6] See GAP, page 10.
[7] As early as 2016, UN Women advocated for the UNFCCC to incorporate the principle of do-no-harm (see here). More recently, numerous organizations have spoken to the importance of adapting climate finance to conflict contexts, including through conflict- and gender-sensitive approaches that are more inclusive (see, for example, here and here).
[8] The remaining projects are not yet at the stage of developing GESI APs. They include Mauritius - Energy Efficiency (DPP), Brazil - E-Buses Industry (DPP), India - Industrial Clusters (DPP), the Philippines - Tidal Stream (IP), and Kenya – Small Vehicles E-Mobility (IP).

these cases, the familiarity with "do-no-harm" approaches was a result of previous exposure to the concept through other projects or funders.

This limited inclusion of "do-no-harm" language and approaches may be attributable to a limited awareness among project staff of what such an approach could look like in their context, as document review and interviews indicate that some do not believe it to be applicable. For example, one GESI AP (Rwanda – E-Mobility) notes the project "does not foresee any negative consequences" and will not "exacerbate any current challenges" for women and vulnerable groups. Another project stakeholder similarly described that there are very few possible negative outputs from the work. However, other project stakeholders *did* describe potential harms from their work, such as putting women in unsafe physical positions through new jobs or potentially disrupting social norms, indicating that do-no-harm is a relevant concept for any work at the intersection of climate, gender, and inclusion.

Finding 4: The introduction of the Mitigation Action Facility's GAP and associated requirements has likely led to increased consideration of groups beyond women as well as to increasing numbers of gender-responsive and gender-transformative activities included in the design of projects.

Before the CfP 2023, GESI was not required as part of DPP. Nonetheless, 11 of the 17 projects reviewed that were part of cohorts prior to CfP 2023 (65%) still conducted a Gender Analysis, and 15 completed a GESI AP (albeit later in implementation than required today). Both these older projects and new projects (CfP 2023 or later) incorporate similar gender-related activities such as training for women, gender-disaggregated analysis and data, financial tools targeting women, and gender-sensitive products (like EVs) or infrastructure.

More recently developed GESI APs (including for projects pre-CfP 2023), however, demonstrate more frequent consideration of groups beyond women such as youth and marginalised communities (i.e. South Africa - Public Buildings and Infrastructure and Pakistan - Battery Swapping Network). They also more frequently go beyond more tangible outputs like jobs, inclusion at meetings, and financial products to tackle awareness raising and the shaping of gender norms or beliefs. For example, Cabo Verde's – Electric Vehicles GESI AP, completed in 2025, includes gender-responsive and gender-transformative communication. GESI APs from newer projects also plan more to directly address institutional culture and the long-term sustainability of GESI-related work. This includes, for example, training staff and other project stakeholders on gender-sensitive approaches or GESI transformation (Pakistan – Battery Swapping Network and Vietnam – Sustainable Industries) and ensuring GESI-related accountability (Indonesia – Biogas).

Mitigation Action Facility GAP requirements and guidance as well as support provided through workshops and the external experts have likely contributed to these increasingly inclusive and holistic approaches to GESI. This was reflected in interviews, with stakeholders of more recent projects highlighting that incorporating gender-responsive activities is more streamlined with the Facility's GAP and one person even describing it as part of the project's "foundational DNA." The influence of the Facility's GAP even shows up in earlier projects with delayed starts, allowing them to develop a GESI AP and build buy-in from partners. This bodes well for newer projects, which will benefit from clear requirements and support from the start.

2.2 EQ2: Implementation Experience and Transformative Progress

As projects move from design to implementation, this second EQ asks about project experiences in implementing their GESI APs. In particular, it assesses progress on implementation, the implementation of gender-responsive and gender-transformative activities in particular, positive and negative unintended outcomes, and the degree to which GESI gains are likely to be sustainable beyond the project's lifecycle.

Finding 5: Many projects include gender-responsive activities, with some also planning gender-transformative pilots. Limited evidence to-date shows some promising progress, with important challenges related to resources, buy-in, and contextual considerations

There are numerous examples of gender-responsive activities planned for as part of the project GESI APs. These can be broken down into multiple categories; see **Table 4** below.

Table 4: Categories of gender-responsive activities

Category	Project Examples
Technical & Leadership Training	- To gain wider project acceptance and institutional buy-in for gender-responsiveness, the project integrated a business case for GEDSI within the wider training modules (Vietnam – Sustainable Industries) - Altering trainings to be inclusive of women's unique experiences in the sector (Brazil – Industrial Energy Efficiency) - Integration of gender topics into trainings (Mongolia – Building Retrofitting)
Communication & Outreach	- Awareness campaigns and communications that showcase women champions and role models in the sector (Cabo Verde – Electric Vehicles; Honduras – Livestock)
Institutional Mainstreaming	- Gender-responsive HR, recruitment, and procurement policies (Indonesia – Biogas; Kenya – Post-Harvesting Solar Cooling) - Ensuring relevant facilities are available for women workers (Namibia – Biomass) - Formalisation of informal sector workers and the creation of "Pink MRFs" (Material Recovery Facilities), which also contribute to financial viability (India – Waste Management)
Financial Inclusion	- Gender-sensitive lines of credit and financial products (Honduras – Livestock; Brazil – Carbon-negative Fertilizer) - Training financial institution staff on social and cultural considerations (Guatemala – Cookstoves)

Some of the project stakeholders interviewed for the evaluation noted that the Mitigation Action Facility's requirements were instrumental in ensuring these activities are included. One person, for example, said the project was gender-neutral at the start but moved to gender-responsive following the GAP. However, other stakeholders noted that they had already been gender-sensitive or gender-responsive, often due to the requirements of other funders.

Going beyond gender-responsive activities, six of the 14 (43%) projects in implementation with GESI APs indicated that they would be undertaking gender-transformative activities. This includes:

- **Gender-transformative communication campaigns** to challenge discriminatory social norms and gender stereotypes in Cabo Verde (Electric Vehicles) and Honduras (Livestock).
- **Training municipality staff** on gender-transformative approaches for workplace environments in Mozambique (Waste Management).
- **Inclusive involvement of marginalised community members** in value chains in Namibia (Biomass).
- **Ensuring that disability needs were included** (Pakistan - Battery Swapping Network)
- **Avoiding discrimination** based on caste (India - Waste Management)

There were also indications of significant progress in integrating gender considerations despite limited resources. The Mexico – SME Energy Efficiency project, for example, embedded gender into technical and financial frameworks, conducted market studies to gather gender-disaggregated data, and launched a mentoring program for women entrepreneurs, all with minimal additional funding. India's Waste Management project adapted gender activities during implementation, notably creating the women-run "Pink MRF" facility, formalising and training female informal workers, and supporting new income streams, often without dedicated project gender roles or budgets. Namibia's Biomass project is pursuing gender-sensitive design features like breastfeeding rooms, plans to hire staff for safety and wellness, and is deliberately budgeting for these initiatives internally. In South Africa (Public Buildings and Infrastructure), one project partner is a financial service provider that already focuses on designing products for vulnerable populations.

More detailed evidence on the progress to-date in implementing these activities, however, is more limited. Five recently completed Evaluation and Learning Exercises (ELEs)[9] found variable indications of progress. The Cabo Verde – Electric Vehicles project, for example, did not fully develop a GESI AP while under implementation. As a result, the ELE characterised the achievement of symbolic shifts in women's inclusion as drivers and mechanics as potentially positive for shifting stereotypes but not systematic. The Guatemala – Cookstoves project drafted its GESI AP late in implementation and was able to achieve moderate (albeit indirect) progress in the visibility, leadership, and decision-making roles of women. Mongolia – Building Retrofitting had a relevant and comprehensive GESI AP, and it showed progress in improving the living conditions and wellbeing for households, with positive effects for women and other groups. The Mexico – SME Energy Efficiency 2024 annual report also noted that the project had made progress on its gender-transformative pilot activity, estimating progress at 30% (although this is self-reported).

Project stakeholders cited a few, notable barriers to designing and implementing gender-transformative activities. These include limited time and budget for related activities (particularly, although not exclusively, for projects that undertook their analysis prior to 2024), contextual challenges such as laws and cultural norms, and the commitment of various project-level stakeholders to such activities (see **Findings 9** and **10**). Some projects, like India – Waste Management, were able to leverage community partnerships to overcome

[9] Cabo Verde – Electric Vehicles, Guatemala – Cookstoves, Honduras – Livestock, Mongolia – Building Retrofitting

budgetary constraints, which is a good example of creative problem solving but may not be possible for other projects.

It is also important to note that project documents and interviews do indicate overlap in what stakeholders consider to be responsive or transformative, with some describing the same kinds of activities as one or both depending on variation in project contexts. As the gender continuum is highly context dependent, this is not necessarily problematic but might point to a need for clarification and/or guidance.

Finding 6: There are multiple potential pathways to sustainability as indicated by project GESI APs and stakeholders, including through institutionalisation and partnerships.

Key to sustainability of these projects is embedding or institutionalising a gender lens and securing stakeholder buy-in. For example, the Brazil – Industrial Energy Efficiency project GESI AP notes that it plans to embed insights from its analysis into the project and through its implementing partners as a way of ensuring sustainability. The Indonesia – Biogas project also references institutionalising gender across functions (e.g., HR, budgeting, and monitoring) to build sustainability. Institutionalisation can also be done via training, capacity building, and awareness raising for key project staff. Project stakeholders echo this approach, with one person highlighting their work doing "road shows" for managers to increase buy-in for gender-responsive activities.

Another strategy noted by projects is ensuring policy alignment with key government institutions (Brazil – Industrial Energy Efficiency). Many of the projects also have an implicit sustainability strategy through activities that increase women's participation in sectors to which they are vital (Kenya – Post-Harvesting Solar Cooling) or by further developing financial systems that can support economic growth. However, there is limited evidence that gender-responsive or transformative approaches increase the financial viability of projects. While one project stakeholder said that the inclusion of women improved financial viability for a sector in which their participation was previously informal, another reported that the financial burden of being inclusive was a tough sell without it being required. More research is needed to understand the financial implications of the Mitigation Action Facility's GAP, including the ways in which it can be leveraged for financial viability (including among private sector actors).

Finding 7: While the evaluation revealed a handful of positive unintended outcomes, there are likely to be more positive and negative outcomes attributable to projects that are not captured through existing monitoring, evaluation, and learning mechanisms.

Several projects were found to have positive unintended outcomes. For example:

- According to its 2024 annual report, the **India – Waste Management** project has resulted in the replication of a cloth bag fair initiative called *Cheela Mela*, which supports livelihoods for women.

- The ELE of the **Guatemala – Cookstoves** project also noted unintended outcomes related to the increase in visibility and social recognition of women as well as related shifts in attitudes about women's roles in decision making.

- The **Mongolia – Building Retrofitting** project has contributed to more health and wellbeing outcomes for women and families than initially envisioned, likely driven by better heating and air quality, which have been linked to reduced absenteeism for women and other groups.

These examples demonstrate the utility of intentionally sharing success stories and associated lessons learned. Although there are few indications of positive or negative unintended outcomes, this may be due to the lack of a reporting structure for capturing them, including processes for in-depth reflection on these issues. The 2025 annual report template for projects requires details on the formal requirements of the GAP as well as progress in implementing the project's GESI AP. This includes describing "core achievements and learnings" as well as key challenges, which may yield insights on unintended outcomes. Notably, the template also asks projects to consider the GESI context and any developments to it. Encouraging projects to revisit their analysis is likely to be helpful in ensuring that GESI-related activities are appropriate and, therefore, effective and sustainable.

2.3 EQ3: Challenges, Opportunities and Learning

Focused on the internal and external landscape of GESI integration, this third EQ investigates the specific factors, challenges, and opportunities projects faced in developing and rolling out their GESI APs. In particular, it examines the key drivers behind successful design and implementation, the effectiveness of GFPs in facilitating these processes, and the extent to which projects fostered inter-project collaboration and knowledge sharing. Furthermore, it assesses the specific development, implementation, and financial hurdles encountered—including the GESI-responsiveness of indicators—to understand the strategies teams utilised to learn from their experiences and adapt their approach to diverse contexts.

Finding 8: Projects' ability to conduct and integrate a Gender Analysis into the project design varied widely based on individual experience and expertise as well as project history.

The depth of a Gender Analysis and the ambition of GESI APs often reflect the prior specialisation, experience, and individual interest of those project staff who are responsible for these deliverables (generally but not always the GFP). For example, one project has benefitted from a GFP who is an anthropologist and human rights specialist with extensive experience with international funders that also require gender-sensitive or gender-transformative programming. This individual has been able to conduct a very detailed, intersectional Gender Analysis that is likely to translate into a robust GESI AP. Similarly, another project lead with a formal education in gender studies saw the Facility-provided training as a "refresher" and demonstrated a strong understanding of gender-related issues that affect the project (as well as creative plans to address them). In other cases, although the GFP may not have an extensive personal background on GESI, they have taken a keen interest in understanding gender issues better and in developing in-depth Gender Analyses. These GFPs dug into the research, undertaking interviews and site visits to provide

important nuance to the analyses. As a result, these projects were able to produce high-quality, context-specific analyses that incorporated an intersectional lens and were brought into the overall project design.

Finding 9: Meaningful GESI integration is often driven by institutional buy-in and proactive senior leadership.

In addition to individual experience, institutional buy-in is a critical internal factor to effective GESI integration and the roll out of GESI APs. A supportive "boss" or others in leadership and project teams who prioritise GESI and gender-related approaches were identified as a primary driver of success in three projects. In one instance, this even led to the inclusion of gender-sensitive activities before the Gender Analysis was conducted or the GFP joined the team. As a result, the project was able to retroactively achieve GESI targets before the GESI AP was even drafted.

On the other hand, senior management that views GESI as only a "checklist" exercise or believe stereotypes such as "women are always on maternity leave" present important barriers to the implementation of GESI APs. In one such case, a GFP felt that they were doing the minimum by focusing on increased targets for female participation at events. Another GFP described how much work is required to get buy-in from management on gender-responsive activities, as they often cost more and are not as familiar. Additionally (and as noted in the Limitations section), the evaluation found that some project staff do not fully comprehend GESI components or requirements, which may be indicative of a lack of overall understanding and buy-in beyond GFPs. These projects demonstrate that both GFP and broader institutional stakeholder beliefs can impact the integration of gender-sensitive and gender-transformative activities and their results.

Finding 10: Broader sociocultural norms around gender as well as systems that discriminate on gender (such as financial systems) also play an important role in project GESI implementation.

The sociocultural contexts in which projects take place—including the intersectionality of gender, youth, socioeconomic status, sector, and education—plays a key role in their ability to effectively undertake gender-sensitive and gender-transformative activities, placing important limits on what a project can realistically achieve[10]. This is particularly the case in the transport and energy sectors, in which social, religious, and cultural norms heavily restrict women's mobility and safe access to certain spaces. There are also key interlinkages with socioeconomic status, which may determine if women must take the bus, can drive or ride in a rikshaw, or can afford an EV. Education also plays a role, as increasing women's participation is not possible if the skillsets are not there (such as with STEM qualifications for high-level technical roles). As one stakeholder put it, "when you don't have any women in the sector, it's hard to make something up, and you shouldn't". Alternatively, cases like South Africa (Public Buildings and Infrastructure) demonstrate that a conducive national policy environment can be an enabling factor in transforming gender issues in the energy sector.

Relatedly, some project stakeholders highlighted the perception of local financial service providers that women are "risky or unconventional borrowers", which creates a systemic

[10] This finding is backed up by the Guatemala (Cookstoves) ELE as well, which found that broader cultural barriers are a significant challenge for shifting attitudes about women.

barrier to accessing credit. Cultural norms can contribute to a perceived lack of demand for women-specific financial projects, as noted by two project stakeholders. This may become a self-fulfilling prophecy that limits financial inclusion by making partners reluctant to co-create new products. Given the Mitigation Action Facility's market approach, which targets commercially feasible projects, this results in a tension that projects must address to increase inclusion.

There are also less tangible implications of women's empowerment, including ideas that engaging in a new profession could "ruin a woman's life or prevent marriage" (as noted by one project stakeholder). This can even extend to safety and security concerns, as noted by one gender expert interviewed for the evaluation, making a "do-no-harm" approach even more important (see Finding 3). As an example response, one project hosted women-only events for awareness raising to limit their exposure. There are many cases in which norms and contexts forced projects to pivot away from activities that directly focused on engaging women to more creative ways to engage them in alternative positions or roles. This can have implications for gender-sensitive and, especially, gender-transformative outcomes.

Finding 11: The type and focus of Mitigation Action Facility support (including workshops and technical assistance) was generally highly appreciated by projects. Additional needs expressed by projects relate to more targeted support and more human and financial resources.

Most stakeholders interviewed who had participated in Facility-provided support or training praised it, finding the direct support of the Facility as well as workshops to be helpful and even "eye opening". At least a quarter of stakeholders interviewed, however, noted that they would have liked the training or support to more specific to their geographic or cultural context, sector, or relevant topics like communication (this was regardless of the project cohort). For example, some interviewees from projects in Africa and Latin America highlighted that approaches that work in one location may not work in another. Additionally, some found the focus on international standards and norms to be overwhelming and would have preferred more sector-specific examples.

One major challenge to converting trainings and support into action highlighted by projects was the lack of human and financial (budgetary) resources. For example, projects cited a lack of financial resources to hire technical staff to implement GESI APs or to effectively monitor and assess progress. In other cases, GFPs may lack sufficient experience or bandwidth to effectively carry out their roles. For one project, the GFP was originally a monitoring and evaluation lead, and this required a significant "mindset change" as well as a heavy reliance on TSU training. Several GFPs also noted that they wore multiple hats, and this created a significant burden on them in addition to limiting their ability to focus on gender effectively. Some also expressed concern about their abilities to replicate complex GESI activities without continued support and requested ongoing trainings. These challenges were more commonly referenced by older projects (which also are a larger share of the projects reviewed), but even newer projects stakeholders (CfP 2023 and 2024) noted that there should be better budgeting for GESI.

Finding 12: Project stakeholders indicate the need for clearer Mitigation Action Facility GAP requirements and additional language support.

There was limited stakeholder feedback that the format of required tools and annexes can sometimes be too simplistic to capture cultural nuances on the ground or that they are duplicative between GESI and non-GESI required documentation. This was especially true

when boxes had yes/no formats which could not capture the specific cultural context of the project. Additionally, non-English speaking teams noted they would benefit from additional linguistic accessibility. And although the most recent CfP (2026) is available in English, French, Spanish, and Arabic, the General Information Document[11] clearly explains that all information for the Mitigation Action Facility must be provided in English.

[11] See https://mitigation-action.org/wp-content/uploads/General-Information-Document-2025_English.pdf

3 Recommendations & Conclusions

Based on the findings, the evaluation team developed four key recommendations for the Mitigation Action Facility to consider as it develops GAP 2.0. The below table presents these recommendations at a high level along with the associated findings numbers.

Recommendation	Associated Findings
1. The Mitigation Action Facility's GAP 2.0 should include more detailed and (in some cases) stringent requirements for design and implementation, particularly as it relates to budgets for GESI activities and the GFP role, the level of effort expected for the GFP role, the depth of gender analysis required (including considerations of intersectionality), and "do no harm" minimum standards.	Findings 1, 2, 3, and 8
2. The TSU should further tailor support to projects in ways that support more in-depth peer learning and promote access to context-specific resources (e.g., those related to geography, sector, culture, language, and institutional capacity) while considering intersectionality.	Findings 10, 11, and 12
3. The Mitigation Action Facility's GAP 2.0 should incorporate requirements for projects to consider how they can build institutional capacity, buy-in and integration to increase the likelihood of impactful and sustainable projects, including through dedicated budgeting.	Findings 8 and 9
4. The Mitigation Action Facility should consider ways to increase its understanding of progress among projects and associated learnings, including by undertaking a more in-depth evaluation or building in additional opportunities for reporting or reflection.	Findings 5, 6, and 7

The recommendations are outlined in more detail below.

Recommendation 1: The Mitigation Action Facility's GAP 2.0 should include more detailed and (in some cases) stringent requirements for design and implementation, particularly as it relates to budgets for GESI activities and the GFP role, the level of effort expected for the GFP role, the depth of gender analysis required (including considerations of intersectionality), and "do no harm" minimum standards.

The findings indicate that some projects (in all cohorts) lacked sufficient budgets to undertake comprehensive Gender Analyses, to plan for multiple gender-responsive or gender-transformative activities, or to hire the gender-focused or technical staff needed to successfully undertake those activities. In some cases, this was compounded by the (inevitable) differences in projects and stakeholders' backgrounds and experiences. Key concepts like "do-no-harm" were also differently understood by project stakeholders, which resulted in variability in its application within projects.

To further streamline expectations on GESI integration for Facility projects and to ensure that projects have the resources needed to move toward gender transformation, the Facility should refine the requirements of the GAP 2.0 to:

- **More clearly define key terms** such as "do no harm" and intersectionality and how they might apply to Mitigation Action Facility projects. This would help to better ensure a shared understanding between projects of both the concepts and their application and, as a result, set them up for successfully incorporating them into the project design and implementation. It would also ensure projects are more aligned with broader changes in climate programming, which increasingly incorporates a conflict sensitivity lens.

- **Expand GESI-related budgetary requirements** for projects, including recommendations for increasing budgets for comprehensive Gender Analyses (that includes on-site, primary source information; tailored GESI-related team trainings (including for implementing partners); and more specific and ongoing GESI support. Proactively encouraging projects to think through their GESI needs can help ensure they have sufficient resources to both plan for and undertake effective GESI activities.

- **Further elaborate the GFP role and its responsibilities**, including levels of effort (LoE) and experience or background. For example, the 30% LoE for the role may be sufficient if the person filling the role has relevant education, experience, or interests. Clarifying the role's responsibilities would also help increase the related accountability and transparency of the position vis-à-vis the larger project team.

- **Update annexes and other requirements** to allow for more detail and specificity to account for contextual differences between projects. This could be an easy point for the Mitigation Action Facility to address by amending templates to allow space beyond "yes/no" responses for projects to provide more nuanced information and justifications and more accurately identify ground-level realities.

These changes will inherently require additional support from the TSU, and that should be appropriately planned for as well. Without this support, projects may struggle to move beyond a "gender-sensitive" approach toward the "gender-responsive" or "transformative" implementations the Mitigation Action Facility strives to achieve.

Recommendation 2: The TSU should further tailor support to projects in ways that support more in-depth peer learning and promote access to context-specific resources (e.g., those related to geography, sector, culture, language, and institutional capacity) while considering intersectionality.

The evaluation found a high demand for a shift away from general, overarching international GESI frameworks toward technical as well as sectoral and geographically specific toolkits and support. While general guidance is helpful for foundational understanding, it can lack the depth and practicality required for the complex contexts in which projects operate. To address this gap, the Facility's TSU should consider:

- **Establishing Peer Learning Mechanisms**: These could be focused on the GFPs and set up with as much or as little support from the TSU as necessary. For example, a WhatsApp group connecting GFPs could allow for the easy and self-directed sharing of resources and insights. The TSU could also host quarterly, regional learning calls that highlight case studies or allow for group brainstorming.

These are low-effort mechanisms that build connections and allow people to share what they already know more broadly.

- **Developing Industry-Specific Toolkits:** Future support could focus on developing guidance tailored to specific industries such as biomass, energy efficiency, heavy industry (e.g., steel), and transport. In response to requests from project stakeholders, these toolkits could include "real-world" examples relevant to specific technical challenges and geographies.

- **Moving Beyond Surface-Level Training:** Moving to specialised support will allow projects to address sector-specific GESI barriers. For instance, instead of general gender awareness, a project in the steel sector needs guidance on setting and reaching specific targets for female technicians in male-dominated environments. Stakeholders also requested support on topics like communications, data collection, and community consultation. This transition helps avoid the "one-size-fits-all" support trap where generic templates are insufficient for ground-level technical implementation. This could be supported by requiring projects to budget for more specific training based on their needs (see Recommendation 1).

- **Providing Guidance on Intersectionality:** Closely related to the deep understanding of regional / in-country social norms and industry context is the understanding of how different identities and their vulnerabilities intersect within the sector. This understanding is crucial for a better integration of GESI beyond gender as well as the mitigation of negative unintended consequences. Including guidance on intersectional lenses in sector-specific toolkits as well as in GFP training resources could further the "do-no-harm" approach and ensure real transformation.

- **Prioritising Regional Expertise:** To further support contextual and regional specificity, the Mitigation Action Facility should consider hiring regional GESI consultants and/or creating a pool or roster of diverse GESI experts in tune with on-the-ground realities. Projects can be screened for existing access to these kinds of resources and, where there are gaps (e.g., in the certain sector, geography or activity or for first-time recipients of Facility funding), required to plan for more tailored support. This would help ensure Gender Analyses and GESI APs are grounded in specific socio-cultural realities while providing essential technical scaffolding for partners to achieve high-quality, context-specific integration.

- **Translating Resources**: Translating resources into additional languages (such as Portuguese, French, and Spanish) and ensuring support modalities are available in those languages will increase their understanding and uptake, likely having a net positive effective on the GESI integration of projects and (as a result) their effectiveness and sustainability. If that is not something the Facility wants to pursue (noting that its working language is English), projects can be encouraged to budget for related support.

Recommendation 3: The Mitigation Action Facility's GAP 2.0 should incorporate requirements for projects to consider how they can build institutional capacity, buy-in and integration to increase the likelihood of impactful and sustainable projects, including through dedicated budgeting.

For GESI APs to be effective drivers of change rather than "checkbox" exercises, they must have the full support of senior management within implementing institutions. The Facility should consider ways to support this work, including:

- **Bringing GESI into any existing trainings or awareness raising activities done with leadership** among its implementing institutions. This would help ensure that leaders understand the importance of GESI and see it as an essential part of the work rather than an optional, standalone burden (hopefully increasing their buy-in and support for GESI-related activities).

- **Providing GFPs with specific resources or training on strategies for building institutional buy-in** for GESI-related activities. Peer learning mechanisms (such as those mentioned in Recommendation 2) could also support this.

- **Screening projects to assess their level of institutional buy-in** and, when relevant, encouraging or requiring those projects to budget for trainings or awareness raising for leadership.

Some combination of these options, depending on the project, will likely increase the buy-in of leadership for GESI-related activities, improving the likelihood that these activities continue beyond the project cycle. ELEs can be used as a mechanism to assess these efforts and identify lessons learned on effective approaches to building support, lessons that can be shared more broadly with other projects (particularly GFPs).

Recommendation 4: The Mitigation Action Facility should consider ways to increase its understanding of progress among projects and associated learnings, including by undertaking a more in-depth evaluation or building in additional opportunities for reporting or reflection.

This evaluation, which was conducted virtually, relied on a small number of project stakeholders and documents to answer questions about progress. As a result, some questions about the financial feasibility of projects or their unintended consequences were difficult to answer. Going forward, the Facility should consider ways to increase its understanding of progress among projects, including in ways that support the development and dissemination of learnings. The 2025 annual report template is a step in the right direction, although it may be difficult to gather sufficient detail from these reports, and ensuring learning may require more hands-on support for project stakeholders (e.g., facilitated learning discussions grounded in key learning questions). However, by asking projects to tell stories of successes or share unanticipated outcomes (including on specific topics like financial tools or gender norms), the report can be used as one tool in a toolbox for better understanding outcomes.

Other options for learning about project progress include peer-learning approaches (as described above) and more in-depth evaluation involving in-person site visits to focus on key projects or sectors at important moments. Furthermore, ELE approaches could be refined to include (i) ensuring that evaluation teams have access to the Gender Analysis and the GESI AP; (ii) including the GFP on the list of interviewees; and (iii) integrating GESI specific questions into all evaluation and learning exercise areas (i.e. not only in relevance, effectiveness and efficiency as the ELE questionnaire shows it now, but also in sustainability and learning), which would ensure that both evaluators as well as interviewees think of GESI as an integral part of the project and would provide more GESI data for progress reporting.

While these options would necessitate additional financial and human resources, more regular opportunities for learning about and between projects would likely be beneficial for achieving GESI-related objectives and for ensuring that project stakeholders also benefit from the learning.

3.1 Conclusions

As the Mitigation Action Facility prepares GAP 2.0, the evidence points toward four strategic levers:

1. clearer and more ambitious requirements
2. targeted and contextualised support
3. stronger institutional capacity and leadership engagement
4. improved learning and evaluation systems.

Together, these will help ensure that GESI become embedded, sustainable, and transformative components of Facility-supported climate action.

Annex 1: Evaluation Matrix

Process evaluation question	Sub-questions	Target Group	Analytical Method
EQ1: To what extent are projects developing GESI Action Plans (GESI APs) in line with the Mitigation Action Facility's GAP vision and objectives?	* How are gender outcomes being defined and prioritised in GESI APs, particularly in relation to the project's financial objectives?	DPP	Trend analysis of level of ambition/ focus on GESI relative to financial leverage and qualitive insights from projects on challenges they have faced in balancing both objectives.
	* Are the GESI AP actions realistic, relevant, and context-specific? Do they adopt a "do-no-harm" approach to gender?	DPP	Review of GESI AP actions against the Mitigation Action Facility's GAP
	* How robust is the GESI analysis? Have projects effectively screened for potential gender risks? * Are data and indicators disaggregated by sex and other social identities?	DPP IP	Review and rating of strength of GESI analysis using set of agreed criteria and benchmarks.
	* How well do the GESI APs align with international best practices and frameworks on GESI, including the Paris Agreement and the Lima Work Programme on Gender?	DPP IP	Mapping of each GESI AP against Mitigation Action Facility's GAP & vision
	How are GESI APs integrated into the financial architecture of the project (e.g., investment decisions, return models, risk assessments)?	DPP IP	Mapping of to what extent and how GESI APs cover the financial architecture of the project.
EQ 2: What is the experience for projects that are implementing their GESI APs?	* What is the progress on GESI APs as projects start implementation?	IP	Comparison of GESI AP milestones and results in annual reports with qualitative insights from projects to explain gaps

	Are there examples where gender-responsive design has contributed to financial viability (e.g., by expanding market reach, improving stakeholder buy-in, or enhancing sustainability)? Have there been unintended consequences because the initial design (especially of projects from older cohorts) was not gender responsive?	IP	Review of GAP, annual reports to identify examples with follow up qualitative insights from project interviews
	* To what extent has the GESI AP led to the project implementing gender-responsive or transformative activities? Including, closing the gender data gap and addressing the differential impacts of the financial system.	IP	Review of annual reports and using project interviews to identify positive stories of change.
	* What positive and negative unexpected consequences have projects experienced from preparing GESI APs?	DPP IP	Qualitative analysis from project interviews to identify trends in unexpected consequences
	* To what extent are projects implementing measures to ensure sustainability of GESI gains beyond project lifespan?	IP	Mapping of sustainability planning within GESI AP and identifying common risks to sustained changes through project interviews
	Have there been significant changes since the GESI AP has been implemented? Do you think these +/- changes can be attributed to the GESI APs, or would these have happened anyway?	DPP IP	Unpacking a causal link (if any) of GESI AP and potential impact
EQ 3: What challenges and opportunities have projects faced in developing their GESI APs?	* What key factors have contributed to the successful preparation and design of the GESI AP?	DPP	Qualitative analysis from project interviews to identify trends in contributing factors
	* What key factors have contributed to the successful implementation of the GESI AP?	IP	Qualitative analysis from project interviews to identify trends in contributing factors
	* What is the role of GFPs and their effectiveness in facilitating GESI AP implementation?	DPP IP	Qualitative analysis of feedback from project interviews
	* To what extent have projects fostered collaboration and knowledge sharing (i.e. learning between projects) on GESI?	IP	Qualitative analysis of feedback from project interviews
	* What main challenges have projects encountered during GESI AP development? (DPP)	DPP	Qualitative analysis of feedback from project interviews

	* Have there been any challenges that have come up in the implementation of the GAP?	IP	Qualitative analysis of feedback from project interviews
	Are indicators GESI-responsive? Are they targeted to GESI outcomes?	DPP IP	Qualitative analysis of feedback from interviews; expert review of indicators
	What kind of financial challenges have projects encountered that affect GESI AP roll-out?	IP	Qualitative analysis of feedback from project interviews
	* What strategies have projects used to address those challenges?	IP	Qualitative analysis of feedback from project interviews
	* How have projects learned from their experiences and adapted?	IP	Qualitative analysis of feedback from project interviews
Recommendations for Improvement:	* What specific recommendations can be made to improve Mitigation Action Facility's GAP implementation?	IP	Qualitative analysis of feedback from project interviews
	* How effective has the guidance, training and support from the Facility's TSU on GESI been and what are potential additional needs?	DPP IP	Quantitative analysis of results of online survey together with additional qualitative feedback from interviews
	* To what extent would GESI connect to larger Facility goals (e.g. on climate) for projects?	IP	Quantitative analysis of results of online survey together with additional qualitative feedback from interviews
	How can these challenges inform the roll-out of the Mitigation Action Facility's GAP 2.0 for 2026 onwards? What should TSU improve to anchor GESI better for upcoming projects in future calls?	DPP IP	Quantitative analysis of results of online survey together with additional qualitative feedback from interviews
	* What additional resources, support, or guidance would enhance GESI integration efforts?	DPP IP	Qualitative analysis of feedback from project interviews

Annex 2: Mitigation Action Facility GAP Milestones

Below are the milestones listed in the Mitigation Action Facility's GAP.

1. Define training and knowledge needs, agree on one or more suitable training plans, and organise relevant workshops.
2. Designate Gender Focal Points (GFPs) at the TSU and one per project and clarify the GFP's role and remit.
3. The TSU and Implementation Organisations are to actively assist partner countries in achieving gender justice through capacity development.
4. The MAF as a whole and all projects funded by it must strive to fulfil the minimum criteria to score an OECD DAC gender equality marker score of 1. All MAF projects are requested to implement their project activities in a gender-responsive and, where possible, gender transformative manner.
5. The TSU and Implementing Organisations are to educate and sensitise themselves (and project partners, where possible) about (a) national and regional commitments, strategies and policies concerning the inclusion and participation of socially excluded groups and (b) the current discussion on intersectionality.
6. The TSU and Implementing Organisations are to incorporate gender-sensitive and inclusive language into their external communication.
7. The TSU and Implementing Organisations should strive to raise awareness, share knowledge, and lead by example regarding gender-responsive climate action and promote the MAF's advancement of gender justice and empowerment.
8. With support from the TSU, Implementing Organisations are to redirect and/or pilot one activity toward greater gender responsiveness or transformation.
9. The TSU is to prepare the relevant documents to integrate gender mainstreaming into the project selection process and the preparation of the design and monitoring of new projects.
10. Implementing Organisations should successfully plan and implement their projects informed by their gender analyses and aligned with their GESI APs.
11. The TSU and Implementing Organisations are to draw up and use monitoring and reporting formats in line with the above-mentioned OECD DAC criteria through their (remaining) project cycle.

Annex 3: List of Documents Reviewed

Project Name	Document Title	Year	Author(s)
ACTION (Brazil)	Target Group Analysis	2024	United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)
ACTION (Brazil)	Gender Equality and Social Inclusion Action Plan	2024	United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)
Battery Swap (Pakistan)	Gender Equality and Social Inclusion (GESI) Analysis	2025	Dr. Kiran Siraj
Battery Swap (Pakistan)	Gender Equality and Social Inclusion (GESI) Action Plan	2025	Project Management Team (Draft)
Decarbonizing Indonesia Through Biogas	Annex on Gender Equality and Social Inclusion (GESI) Analysis	2025	Mashudi Noorsalim
Decarbonizing Indonesia Through Biogas	Gender Equality and Social Inclusion Action Plan	2025	Global Green Growth Institute (GGGI)
Efficient Use of Fuelwood and Alternative Fuels (Guatemala)	Efficient Use of Fuelwood and Alternative Fuels in Indigenous and Rural Communities in Guatemala: Gender Equality and Social Inclusion Gender Assessment and Action Plan	2024	Commissioned by the Inter-American Development Bank
Electric Mobility (Paraguay)	Gender and Safeguards Analysis	2023	Coordinated with institutional actors
Electric Mobility (Paraguay)	GESI Action Plan	2024	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
Empowering Cities (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan)	Gender Equality and Social Inclusion (GESI) Analysis	2025	Jeong Yun Park
Empowering Cities (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan)	Gender Equality and Social Inclusion Action Plan	2025	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

Project Name	Document Title	Year	Author(s)
Energy Communities (Colombia)	Target Group Analysis for Mitigation Action Facility Project in Energy Communities in Colombia	2025	Global Green Growth Institute (GGGI)
Energy Communities (Colombia)	Gender and Conflict Analysis "Sustainable Power and Resilience for Colombia's Energy Communities"	2025	Global Green Growth Institute (GGGI)
Energy Communities (Colombia)	GESI Action Plan	2025	Global Green Growth Institute (GGGI)
Energy Efficiency in Public Buildings and Infrastructure Programme (EEPBIP) - South Africa	Gender Equality and Social Inclusion Action Plan (GESI AP)	2025	GIZ in partnership with the Department of Electricity and Energy (DEE)
Energy Efficiency in Public Buildings and Infrastructure Programme (EEPBIP) - South Africa	Gender Equality and Social Inclusion (GESI) Analysis	2025	Ingula Yesive Consulting (Nondumiso Nsibande, Nonhlanhla Sibanda Moyo)
Energy Efficiency in Public Buildings and Infrastructure Programme (EEPBIP) - South Africa	GESI Toolkit Pilot Activity Description	Not Stated	Not Stated
Energy Efficiency in Small and Medium Enterprises (SME NAMA) - Mexico	Project Annual Report 2024 — Energy Efficiency in Small and Medium Enterprises as a Contribution to a Low Carbon Economy in Mexico	2025	Jorge Eduardo Atala Palacios
Energy Efficiency in Small and Medium Enterprises (SME NAMA) - Mexico	Gender Mainstreaming: Gender Analysis and Gender Strategy	2024	Implemented by GIZ
Energy Performance Contracting for Residential Buildings (EPCRB) - Mongolia	Gender Equity and Social Inclusion action plan for Energy Performance Contracting for Residential Buildings of Ulaanbaatar City (2022-2027)	2023	Naran Boldmaa, Ph. D
Energy Performance Contracting for Residential Buildings (EPCRB) - Mongolia	Gender Analysis for Energy Performance Contracting for Residential Retrofitting in Ulaanbaatar City	2023	Boldmaa Naran, Ph. D

Project Name	Document Title	Year	Author(s)
Energy Performance Contracting for Residential Buildings (EPCRB) - Mongolia	Gender Equality and Social Inclusion action plan for Energy Performance Contracting for Residential Retrofitting in Ulaanbaatar City (2023-2027)	2023	Naran Boldmaa, Ph. D
MAF-Ganadería HN (Honduras)	Informe Diagnóstico de Brechas de Género sobre Participación, Acceso a Recursos y Conocimientos en el Sector Ganadero	2024	Mentions Gretel Guerra (Especialista Género CATIE) and Dra. Claudia García
MAF-Ganadería HN (Honduras)	Strategy for Inclusion, Gender Equity and Equality, and Action Plan for Gender Equality and Social Inclusion GESI	2025	Mentions CATIE, SAG, and SERNA
NAMA GreenH2 (Costa Rica)	Gender analysis for green hydrogen for a decarbonized economy in Costa Rica	2022	Ana Eugenia Ureña Chaves, Kathrin Meyer
NAMA GreenH2 (Costa Rica)	Proposed Gender Equality and Social Inclusion (GESI) Strategy	2023	Karla Hernández
Otjikoto Biomass Power Station Project (Namibia)	Otjikoto Biomass Power Station Project Namibia – Gender and Social Inclusion Action Plan (GESI-AP)	2024	Not Stated (Responsible entity: NamPower)
PotencializEE (Brazil)	Gender analysis for the NAMA Facility "Transformative Investments for Energy Efficiency (TI4E)"	2019	Ariadne Santiago, Hanna Salian
PotencializEE (Brazil)	Project Annual Report 2024	2024	Mitigation Action Facility
PotencializEE (Brazil)	Gender Equality and Social Inclusion Action Plan	2024	GIZ / Brazilian Ministry of Mines and Energy (MME)
ProMEC (Cabo Verde)	Gender Analysis for ProMEC	2023	GIZ
ProMEC (Cabo Verde)	Annual Report 2023	2024	GIZ
ProMEC (Cabo Verde)	Gender Equality and Social Inclusion Action Plan	2025	ProMEC Team and Alicja Korek

Project Name	Document Title	Year	Author(s)
Promoting Sustainable Forest Management and Bioenergy (Nepal)	Target Group Analysis	2024	Helvetas
Promoting Sustainable Forest Management and Bioenergy (Nepal)	Gender equality & social inclusion analysis Report	2024	Basana Sapkota, Jane Carter, Rupa Chapagain
Promoting Sustainable Forest Management and Bioenergy (Nepal)	Gender Equality and Social Inclusion Action Plan	2024	Helvetas
Safiri Electric (Kenya)	Annex 11: Gender Equality and Social Inclusion Analysis and Action Plan	2025	Purity Munyambu, Ivy Murgor, Amos Mwangi, Sarah Cassius
Sainshand Solar District Heating Project (Mongolia)	Gender Assessment and Gender and Inclusion Action Plan (GIAP)	2025	Offset LLC
Small Vehicles E-Mobility (Rwanda)	Gender Analysis and Draft Action Plan	2022	Not Stated
Solar Powered Cold Storage (Kenya)	Target group analysis	2023	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
Solar Powered Cold Storage (Kenya)	Gender Action Plan for Kenya	2024	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
Sustainable Electric Mobility/Transport (Nepal)	Annex 13: Gender Strategy for Sustainable Electric Mobility in Nepal	Not Stated	GGGI and GIZ
Sustainable Electric Mobility/Transport (Nepal)	Gender Analysis for Sustainable Electric Transport for Nepal (SET4NPL)	2022	Anagha Neelakant
ValoRe (Mozambique)	Gender Roadmap	2024	Enabel
ValoRe (Mozambique)	Gender Equality and Social Inclusion Action Plan	2025	Enabel
VISION (Vietnam)	Gender Equality and Social Inclusion (GESI) Analysis	2025	Phan Thi Lan Huong

Project Name	Document Title	Year	Author(s)
VISION (Vietnam)	Gender Equality and Social Inclusion Action Plan	2025	Not listed on cover (WWF-Vietnam internal experts mentioned)
Waste Solutions for a Circular Economy in India	Gender analysis for the Waste Sector in India	2020	Chintan Environmental Research and Action Group, external consultant
Waste Solutions for a Circular Economy in India	Project Annual Report 2024	2025	GIZ India
Waste Solutions for a Circular Economy in India	Gender Equality and Social Inclusion Action Plan	2025	Jai Kumar, Bettina Loewentraut-Duran, Pallas Chandel

Annex 4: List of Stakeholders Interviewed

Project	Key Informant	Country	Title	Interview Date
Vietnam Sustainable Industries	Ha Pham Thi Viet (Ms.)	Vietnam	Project Manager, Decarbonization Project	24-Oct-25
Vietnam Sustainable Industries	Ms. Hang	Vietnam	WWF's Gender Advisor	24-Oct-25
Vietnam Sustainable Industries	Ms. Huong	Vietnam	WWF's Consultant on GESI	24-Oct-25
Mexico SME Energy Efficiency	Gabriela Herrera	Mexico	NAMA Contact	23-Oct-25
Mongolia Building Retrofitting Project	Uyanga Ganbat	Mongolia	GESI Focal Point	22-Oct-25
Kenya e-mobility	Purity Munyambu	Kenya	GESI Focal Point	29-Oct-25
Colombia Energy Communities	Julia Ines Madariaga Villegas	Colombia	GGGI: GESI coordinator	31-Oct-25
Colombia Energy Communities	Juan Fernando Higuita Pena	Colombia	GGGI: Team Lead	31-Oct-25
Colombia Energy Communities	Fabiola Del Carmen Berrocal Ramirez	Colombia	GGGI: MEL coordinator	31-Oct-25
Colombia Energy Communities	David Fernandez	Colombia	GGGI: Technical expert	31-Oct-25
Costa Rica Green Hydrogen	Kathrin Meyer	Costa Rica	Gender Focal Point	05-Nov-25
India Deep DC Industrial Clusters	Dr. Christiane Beck	India	Head of Unit International Donors	11-Nov-25
Mauritius De-Risking Facility for Energy Performance Contracting	Federico Antonio Canu	Mauritius	Financial Advisor, UNEP	11-Nov-25
Mauritius De-Risking Facility for Energy Performance Contracting	Martin Onyoin	Mauritius	GESI Consultant	19-Nov-25
South Africa EE in Public Buildings	Winnie Senoamadi	South Africa	GESI Focal Point	11-Nov-25
Brazil PotenecializEE	Lorena Freitas	Brazil		10-Nov-25

Project	Key Informant	Country	Title	Interview Date
Cabo Verde Electric Vehicles	Diana Dolores	Cabo Verde	Team Cabo Verde Electric Vehicles	23-Oct-25
Cabo Verde Electric Vehicles	Carina Helena	Cabo Verde	Team Cabo Verde Electric Vehicles	23-Oct-25
	Eder Shamir	Cabo Verde	Team Cabo Verde Electric Vehicles	
Cabo Verde Electric Vehicles	Gilson Correia	Cabo Verde	President, CERMI	03-Nov-25
Cabo Verde Electric Vehicles	Alicja Korek	Cabo Verde	External GESI consultant Gender Analysis	06-Nov-25
Kazakhstan Reactive Power	Ms. Gaukhar Nursha	Kazakhstan	UNDP GESI Focal Point	07-Nov-25
Kazakhstan Reactive Power	Oleg Khmelev	Kazakhstan	UNDP International Chief Technical Advisor	17-Dec-25
Kazakhstan Reactive Power	Ms. Jeong Yun Park	Kazakhstan	GESI Expert (former),	17-Dec-25
Kazakhstan Reactive Power	Aidos Akhmetov	Kazakhstan	Damu Fund Representative	17-Dec-25
Namibia Biomass	Iyaloo Shimutwikeni	Namibia	Projects, NamPower	07-Nov-25
Namibia Biomass	Camille Raverdy	Namibia	Project Manager	04-Nov-25
Namibia Biomass	Progress Kashandula	Namibia	CEO, Namibia Biomass Industry Group	04-Nov-25
Pakistan Battery Swap	Dr. Kiran Siraj	Pakistan	GESI Focal Point	28-Oct-25
Pakistan Battery Swap	Malik Muhammad Arslan	Pakistan	Technical and Policy Specialist	05-Dec-25
Kazakhstan Reactive Power	Silvia Sartori	Central Asia (Kazakhstan)	Independent Expert	23-Jan-25

Annex 5: Case Study – Battery Swapping Network in Pakistan

Background & Context

Country Context

Pakistan is a South Asian country of over 240 million people, with a total land area of approximately 881,913 km²[12]. It is also one of the most climate-vulnerable countries in the world. Its energy system is large, centralized, and heavily dependent on imported fossil fuels, exposing the economy to external price shocks, balance-of-payments stress, and energy insecurity. Pakistan's installed electricity generation capacity exceeds 45 GW, but effective available capacity is significantly lower due to fuel constraints, aging infrastructure, and transmission and distribution losses[13]. Electricity generation is dominated by thermal sources (coal, oil, and gas), which together account for over 60% of the power mix, while hydropower contributes around 25–30%, and wind, solar, and bagasse together remain below 10%, despite significant untapped potential[14].

Energy consumption patterns are highly uneven across sectors. Transport and power generation are the largest consumers of fossil fuels, with road transport dominated by petrol and diesel vehicles and a rapidly growing vehicle fleet concentrated in urban centres[15]. Public transport remains underdeveloped, while reliance on imported second-hand vehicles and two-wheelers continues to rise. In response, the Government of Pakistan has articulated ambitions to scale up electric mobility, local manufacturing of electric vehicles (EVs), and renewable energy deployment under policies such as the National Electric Vehicle Policy and updated Alternative and Renewable Energy (ARE) targets, aiming for 30% renewable electricity by 2030[16]. However, implementation remains slow due to fiscal constraints, institutional fragmentation, and limited grid readiness.

Pakistan's energy challenges are deeply intertwined with gender inequality and social vulnerability[17]. Women experience energy poverty differently and more acutely than men, particularly in rural and peri-urban areas where reliance on biomass for cooking persists. Women bear disproportionate burdens of unpaid care work, fuel collection, and household energy management, yet remain largely excluded from energy decision-making, asset ownership, and formal employment in the sector[18]. Women represent a small minority of the technical and leadership workforce in energy[19], and their participation in transport and power sector governance remains limited. Gender gaps in mobility are stark: women are

[12] World Bank (2026): Country Profile Pakistan
[13] IEA 2026: Pakistan - Countries & Regions - IEA
[14] Ibid
[15] Government of Pakistan, Ministry of Finance Economic Survey of Pakistan 2024
[16] Ibid
[17] Energia (2021): Energy Access and Gender in Pakistan Energy Access and Gender in Pakistan: Policy Brief - Energia
[18] Energia (2021): Energy Access and Gender in Pakistan Energy Access and Gender in Pakistan: Policy Brief - Energia
[19] Experience from Women in Energy Pakistan, a professional network for women in energy and climate since 2018

significantly less likely to own vehicles, access safe public transport, or benefit from emerging clean energy technologies such as rooftop solar or electric mobility[20].

Project Background

The Battery Swapping Network – Pakistan project aims to promote equitable and scalable electric mobility solutions in Pakistan by establishing a swapping battery infrastructure that addresses key barriers to EV adoption. The initiative is led by the Lahore University of Management Sciences Energy Institute (LEI) in collaboration with national partners including the Ministry of Industries & Production, Ministry of Energy (Power Division), National Energy Efficiency & Conservation Authority (NEECA) and the Ministry of Climate Change and Environmental Coordination, while the National Rural Support Programme (NRSP) is among the implementing partners[21]. The project was selected as part of the Call for Projects (CfP) 2023.

The project is in its implementation phase (IP) and is designed to increase the visibility and commercial viability of the battery swapping value chain for electric transport — especially electric three-wheelers (E3Ws) — by deploying a network of battery swapping stations and supporting powertrain electrification across major urban and peri-urban corridors in Pakistan. Addressing barriers such as range anxiety, limited residential parking, frequent power outages, and high upfront EV costs, the model integrates solar photovoltaic (PV) generation with swapping infrastructure to lower charging costs and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions while enhancing grid resilience[22].

In October, LUMS signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with Habib Bank Limited (HBL) to develop commercial financing schemes that will support private sector uptake of E3Ws and associated infrastructure under the project's framework. The partnership leverages MAF's first-loss guarantee to offer accessible financing channels to small and medium enterprises (SMEs) and e-mobility service providers, expanding investment in charging and swapping infrastructure while contributing to Pakistan's Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) by supporting climate mitigating E3Ws versus internal combustion alternatives and catalysing broader EV adoption.

The initiative also builds on LEI's broader research and innovation ecosystem. LUMS has established an eMobility Research and Development Centre, the first facility in Pakistan dedicated to testing and characterising EV batteries, motors, and related components, which will play a critical role in advancing the battery swapping project and informing policy and regulatory frameworks for sustainable transport infrastructure.

Direct beneficiaries of the project include E3W operators, fleet owners, service providers, and financing partners, while indirect beneficiaries span urban commuters, low-income passengers exposed to improved air quality, and local stakeholders who gain from reduced

[20] Garlick, R., Field, E., & Vyborny, K. (2025). Women's Mobility and Labor Supply: Experimental Evidence from Pakistan. IZA Discussion Paper, 17883.

[21] MAF (2026) Pakistan – Battery Swapping Network - Mitigation Action Facility

[22] Ibid

noise and emissions. The network is expected to help Pakistan transition toward a cleaner and more resilient transport system that mitigates emissions, enhances energy security, and opens pathways for domestic industrial participation in electric mobility value chains.

Methodology

For this case study, a document review took place and was complemented by two interviews with the project GFP and a Policy and Technical Specialist. Interviews took place between October and November 2025. The project was in its Detailed Preparation Phase (DPP) at the time of data collection.

Findings

Local context can inform how mobility links with safety.

Safety was interlinked with mobility when it comes to public transport and harassment. The project's gender analysis involved visiting district courts and legal aid offices to move beyond general assumptions and gain a direct understanding of the harassment women face in the transport sector and the systemic barriers they encounter when seeking legal recourse. Observations in the courts revealed that access to law differs significantly by gender. The gender analysis notes how cases are processed at the institutional level and indicated that women often felt more comfortable speaking informally with female lawyers about their experiences with harassment. This project offered a deep level of insight into the larger context that informs a project's long-term sustainability.

The early integration of GESI into a project's technical and financial DNA is helpful to ensure that inclusion is a core objective rather than a secondary consideration.

The project demonstrated that inclusive design is most effective when treated as a technical requirement from the outset rather than a peripheral social concern. By adopting a "whole-of-ecosystem" approach during the design phase, the team was able to move beyond general gender categories and embed social inclusion and disability directly into the project's technical specifications. This proactive integration allowed for hardware modifications, such as hand-operated braking systems for persons with disabilities and fully automatic vehicles, that would have been prohibitively expensive or difficult to retrofit later. The ecosystem perspective extended to schools (safe transportation of children), families (shared family rickshaws) and financial institutions. Furthermore, the project aligned itself with national climate targets like NDC 3.0 to ensure inclusion was central to the technical transition to electric vehicles, aiming for a Gender Marker score of 1 by embedding GESI into every activity in the logframe.

Prioritizing safety through intersectional research and institutional screening can ensure interventions do not inadvertently reinforce existing social hierarchies.

The project's analytical depth was the result of a layered, intersectional approach that systematically accounted for ethnicity, race, age, class, and disability. A core pillar of this design was identifying Safety Outcomes as a major metric, utilizing a "victim's perspective" gathered through visits to district courts and legal aid offices. This research revealed that mobility is inseparable from security, leading to the inclusion of infrastructure improvements

like better lighting in the project design. By identifying these systemic hurdles and institutional risks early, the project moved from being gender-neutral to truly gender-responsive, ensuring that safety and legal access were integrated into its core technical pillars.

Navigating restrictive cultural norms in masculinized sectors like energy and heavy industry often requires identifying strategic niches.

To address deep-seated cultural and religious norms that restrict female mobility in Pakistan's male-dominated transport sector, the project implemented a "Softer Jobs" strategy. Recognizing that placing women in high-visibility rickshaw driving roles could lead to social backlash or damage marriage prospects, the project prioritized professional opportunities in management and data analysis. Additionally, the team identified culturally acceptable niches for women, such as providing safe school transportation for children or promoting "shared rickshaws" operated by families. This strategic role allocation allows the project to work within the existing cultural context to achieve long-term, sustainable inclusion rather than triggering social resistance.

Overcoming financial resistance and high technological costs can incentivize participation among risk-averse, low-income households and smallholder farmers.

A major hurdle identified during the implementation phase was the reluctance of financial institutions to engage with women-specific products, which banks often perceived as risky or unconventional due to perceived low demand. In response, the project shifted toward a strategy of co-creating financial mechanisms with banks to reframe GESI as a strategic business opportunity rather than a threat to financial viability. Beyond institutional resistance, the transition faced significant technological cost barriers, driven by battery range limitations and the fact that 60% of the value chain is owned by China, which currently makes the technology unaffordable for many targeted users.

Methodological foresight and the role of technical support from entities like the Technical Support Unit are essential for helping national partners navigate evolving international donor obligations.

The project successfully employed mixed-methods data collection, including personal interviews and site observations, to gather authentic insights while maintaining "do-no-harm". Its approach considered the possibility of social backlash or damaging a woman's "social reputation or future marriage prospects" and prioritised professional opportunities like management and data analysis rather than high-visibility rickshaw driving. The goal was to address deep-seated norms without forcing women into roles they or their families might reject. The support from the Technical Support Unit (TSU), specifically through well-written templates, was highly valued for forcing the team to "go to the bottom of the problem". While the TSU's flexible timeline was essential for the time-consuming stakeholder consultations required in South Asia, the project team recommended that future GESI guidance be more culturally and regionally oriented to better reflect specific local dynamics.

Conclusions

The Pakistan Battery Swapping Project experience suggests that a successful roll-out of GESI priorities can be highly dependent on the GFP. Ensuring that the wider team is gender responsive and possesses an understanding of intersectionality may be necessary to support the larger institutionalization of GESI. This project's use of mixed-methods research—including site observations and visits to legal aid offices to understand harassment in transport—showed what may be required to move beyond binary data for deeper expertise. Ensuring the team is supported by a network of peers and has access to flexible TSU support is crucial for searching for answers to the "bottom of the problem". However, this exercise may be time-consuming and possibly may not have sufficient resource allocation.

Annex 6: Case Study – Biomass in Namibia

Background & Context

Country Context

Namibia, which gained independence from South Africa in 1990, is the driest country in Sub-Saharan Africa and has one of the lowest population densities in the world with a population of around 3 million in an area of 825,229 square kilometres[23]. Since its founding, poverty has declined in Namibia from 60.30% of the population in 1993 to 22.90% in 2024. While the country's energy related CO_2 emissions are estimated to be only 0.01% of total global emissions (3 Mt per year), its emissions have increased at least 77% since 2000[24]. Slightly more than half of Namibians have access to electricity[25]. Biofuels and waste account for around 83% of the country's domestic energy production, although hydropower is the major source of domestic electricity generation (70%)[26]. However, largely imported oil and oil products make up nearly 60% of the country's total energy supply and 70% of its final energy consumption.

In 2023, Namibia submitted a second update to its Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) that indicated the country would increase its net sink capacity by nearly 6% by 2030, including a reduction in energy emissions that account for 30% of total planned reductions[27]. This means the country will have to rely more on renewable and low emission energy sources. This NDC update also draws attention to the unique effects of climate change on women in the country, who are more likely to live in poverty and are therefore more likely to be affected by climate-related shocks. The NDC notes that climate-related shocks have severely impacted the sources of livelihood for the elderly, women, children, and those facing compromised health conditions. An additional, relevant goal of the NDC is to restore 15.5 million hectares of grassland savannah.

The framework for achieving gender equality and empowerment of women in Namibia is the Third National Gender Equality and Equity Policy (2025-2035), which follows from the initial National Gender Policy (2010-2020)[28]. It outlines relevant objectives including the promotion "of equal and equitable access to benefits from the environment and to decision-making structures… by women, men, girls, boys, PWDs and MCs" (persons with disabilities and marginalised communities). As part of this, Namibia would like to promote green energy sources. While there are organisations across Africa and Namibia seeking to increase women's participation in STEM and the energy sector[29], their participation remains limited due to cultural and educational factors.

[23] See World Bank statistics on Namibia here: https://data360.worldbank.org/en/economy/NAM
[24] See International Energy Agency (IEA) insights on Namibia here: https://www.iea.org/countries/namibia
[25] World Bank
[26] IEA
[27] This NDC is available here: https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/NDC/2024-01/FINAL%20UPDATED%20NAMIBIA%20NDC%202023.pdf
[28] The document is available here: https://www.scribd.com/document/883416785/22705-National-Gender-Equality-and-Equity-Policy-26-02-2025-finals
[29] See, for example, https://namibiaoilandgas.com/2025/11/25/women-driving-transformation-in-africas-energy-sector/ and https://wogen.org/about-us/.

Project Background

The Biomass – Namibia project (2024-2029) aims to build a 40-megawatt (MW) power plant that is fuelled by Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) certified wood collected from the bush. One of the projects selected for the Ambition Initiative – Round Two and implemented by the Namibia Power Corporation (NamPower) and the *Agence Française de Développement* (French Development Agency or AFD), Biomass – Namibia addresses dual needs related to Namibia's energy supply and the growth of invasive and undesired tree and shrub species in the bush. Project partners include the Namibia Biomass Energy Group (N-BiG) and the Namibia Nature Foundation (NNF)[30]. Multiple government ministries are also involved with the project, namely the Ministry of Mines and Energy (MME) and the Ministry of Environment, Forestry and Tourism, which have roles to play based on the various aspects of the project[31].

With a budget of EUR 25 million, the project is intended to demonstrate the use of the invasive bush in Namibia as a sustainable energy source at large scale[32]. The Otjikoto Biomass Power Station (OBPS) will therefore serve as a proof of concept in the country, driving investment into similar projects that will provide employment opportunities for communities and contribution to grassland rehabilitation. Harvesting of FCS-certified wood will depend on both long-term fuel suppliers (established harvesting contractors) and ad hoc fuel suppliers, which may be small scale harvesters, communities, or individuals. This expands the project's reach and allows for it to have a potentially positive economic impact on communities (as noted by one interviewee, it is important that the project does not solely benefit companies).

Regarding its mitigation goals, the project is expected to reduce around 500,000 tCO_2e. In addition, after completing its Gender Analysis in August 2024[33], the project's GESI Action Plan (AP) laid out goals related to increasing women's employment in the OBPS construction and operation as well as harvesting; providing women with vocational and other training; supporting women-owned farmers and landowners; ensuring women's participation in an Independent Expert Committee (IEC); and including women in research on bush thinning and restoration. At the time of the case study, however, the project was only in the initial stages of implementation, with most of the focus on building the OBPS as well as some limited technical assistance.

Methodology

This case study is based on a review of project's Gender Analysis and GESI AP as well as three interviews with four stakeholders, including representatives of NamPower, N-BiG, and AFD, as well as a Namibian climate and gender expert[34]. These interviews took place between November 2025 and February 2026.

[30] Additional implementing partners were funded by AFD.
[31] According to one stakeholder, the Ministry of Finance has also been involved in the project given its role in making government funding available for the project.
[32] See the project page here: https://mitigation-action.org/projects/namibia-biomass/
[33] Completed by a consultant hired by NNF.
[34] The evaluation attempted to schedule an interview with a representative from NNF but was unsuccessful.

Findings

Institutional barriers can affect the integration of gender-sensitive and gender-transformative activities and outcomes.

The Gender Analysis completed for the project included a review of the "institutional gender architecture" of each of the implementing entities. It noted both potential barriers and opportunities for GESI. For example, a 2022 study of NamPower indicated that staff were keen to increase gender equality in the company's culture, which had been characterized by "gender-based discrimination and harassment"[35]. In response, NamPower developed a Gender Equality and Equity Policy that was approved by its board in 2023, although the study indicated that more capacity development and training courses were likely needed and welcomed. Meanwhile, NNF (the staff of which are mostly women) was found to have a gender focal point, comprehensive Gender Policy and Code of Ethics, and a positive work culture. N-BIG was considered gender-aware but without many institutional structures to support more. This demonstrates the variability in institutional structures and cultures that these entities brought to the project.

Stakeholder interviews similarly indicated variability in awareness and knowledge of GESI-related issues (generally and in reference to the project). Of particular relevance to the project are issues described by one stakeholder at the leadership level of implementing partners. Managers may hold cultural beliefs or stereotypes about women that prevent their full participation in the project and at the plant. This aligns with the project's Gender Analysis, which notes that "traditional gender stereotypes and norms can still be very rigid in many Namibian communities…" These beliefs can function as barriers for women's participation in the project, although at least one stakeholder interviewed is trying to address this through presentations to leadership about the GESI AP and a "road show" to increase buy-in among senior managers.

The response of leadership to the GESI AP was described by one interviewee as a test case for NamPower, as requirements to incorporate GESI into operations are becoming more common among funders. For sustainable changes to institutional barriers grounded in historic cultural norms, the interviewee said, accountability will be essential. Even with the Mitigation Action Facility-required GESI AP developed for the project, the interviewee questioned to what degree those in charge at NamPower will adhere to it and allow women to work in leadership positions. Another aspect of accountability will be safe ways to report issues like harassment and a zero-tolerance policy that makes women feel safe in the OBPS environment. Additional supportive measures for changes in institutional structures mentioned were budgetary support for infrastructure, learning through real-world examples to open the eyes of senior management to how GESI can be considered, and Gender Focal Point (GFPs) that can raise awareness of GESI issues (particularly when it comes to the supply of fuel).

Do no harm requires addressing gender in ways that are sensitive to intersectional gender norms.

[35] See page 8 of the Gender Analysis.

The Gender Analysis notes that traditional gender norms are still very much in play in Namibia, with implications for social expectations, roles and responsibilities. In particular, the analysis notes that the physically demanding work of bush thinning and harvesting of wood needed for biomass is traditionally done by groups of men, while "women may be expected to prioritize their roles as caregivers, both within the family and the community…" Women also do not traditionally own land. Most importantly, there are safety concerns surrounding the harvesting of wood, and the analysis cites risks related to alcohol abuse, sexual harassment, violence, and poor healthcare. These risks were reflected by those interviewed, with one person noting that harvesting is difficult and that women do not feel safe working in remote areas under difficult physical conditions. While one interviewee said a GFP could be actively involved in identifying ways for women to safely participate in harvesting, another stakeholder indicated that asking women to participate in fuel collection was too dangerous. Indeed, the Gender Analysis indicates that the project would need to identify innovative technologies or other solutions to involve women at that step.

On the side of the biomass plant, most jobs are also held by men, with women occupying administrative roles[36]. This is also due to gender norms, particularly around women's roles as caretakers, although the Gender Analysis points out that other industries have responded by providing daycare services in factories. Another factor that the analysis points to are "issues around the recognition of women's authority in decision-making". These points, too, were reflected by stakeholders who noted that there need to be relevant facilities for women in power plants (such childcare and separate bathrooms, which are missing in older power plants) as well as reporting mechanisms for harassment, although other challenges like a lack of willingness to put women in leadership positions will remain an issue.

Despite these challenges, there was agreement among several stakeholders interviewed that women need to participate in benefit sharing as part of the project in ways that consider local practicalities. These local practicalities include the fact that women are less likely to indirectly benefit from the project since bush clearing is beneficial for commercial herders and farmers, most of whom are men[37]. Another key contextual reality as described by an external expert is that some men feel like they are disrespected or disempowered when women are empowered. This represents an important potential risk for the project.

Addressing GESI may be more complex than indicated in program documents and requires considering not only women but youth as well as intersectionality.

In providing an overview of GESI-related issues, the Gender Analysis considered regional characteristics for the Oshikoto and Otjozondjupa regions where the project will be implemented. This included differences in population demographics, education access, and teenage pregnancy. The analysis also includes a section on the San people, although it does not give much information on youth (outside of unemployment and poverty rates), persons with disabilities, or detailed consideration of how intersectionality affects people's participation in the sector and project. While the GAP does include activities related to youth (i.e., "youth empowerment… in fieldwork" and targets for youth in training), it is unclear to

[36] Gender Analysis
[37] Gender Analysis

what degree youth participation has been considered beyond youth-specific targets in activities.

An interview with an external expert indicated that intersectionality is a key issue in Namibia because cultural norms (such as those related to women) have important variations between ethnic groups as well as among those with different access to education. The expert also outlined important issues with engaging youth, noting that although youth in Namibia often do not have a voice in decision making, they are often the right group to change gender dynamics in sectors like biomass.

Although these dynamics are not described in-depth in project documents, some stakeholders do appear to have more detailed knowledge of the specific contexts of various groups and how this affects their engagement with the project. For example, one stakeholder described in detail how San communities (which are present in the harvesting radius of the project) have been affected by migration and resettlement on non-functional farms. To effectively engage with these groups, the project has worked with additional government ministries (including the Ministry for Agriculture, Fisheries, Water, and Land Reform) as well as the Vice President's Office. The project has also established an institutional stakeholder forum to keep project stakeholders updated on implementation progress as well as dialogue platforms that function as localised relationship and engagement mechanisms. It is unclear, however, to what degree these mechanisms operate in a GESI sensitive, responsive, or transformative manner as they are not explicitly including in the project's GESI AP.

Relatedly, a stakeholder interviewed gave the example of setting up a community pot of money that is held back from NamPower and used for community initiatives, although this is not described the GESI AP as part of the benefits sharing model. Indeed, this person described the need for governance structures that can make decisions on how this money should be used in the best interest of the community. These structures will be support by Namibia's Division of Disability Affairs and Marginalized Communities and will have a strong gender aspect to them. In San communities, for example, women have had a strong advisory role in these structures.

This complexity and possible entry points for supporting GESI inclusion and transformation are not fully captured in the program's GESI AP. Nor are additional requests for support voiced by stakeholders, such as the Facility's support in ensuring that the GESI AP comes to life as part of the project. These additional complexities and opportunities may, therefore, be missed in implementation and learning.

Conclusions

While project stakeholders indicate an in-depth knowledge of and attention to GESI-related issues, the project's Gender Analysis and GESI AP seem to stay at the surface level without sufficient consideration of either the challenges (such as those related to avoiding harm) and opportunities (going beyond training), particularly those going beyond women. While it is unclear what this will mean for the project given that it is still in the early stages of implementation, it is nonetheless important to consider how sociocultural norms, the complexity of community engagement, the limited consideration of GESI beyond women, and the already identified challenges of getting leadership on board will affect the project's

long-term ability to sustainably implement work that is aligned with Mitigation Action Facility's vision and objectives.

Annex 7: Case Study – Multi-country Reactive Power for Energy Savings in Kazakhstan

Background & Context

Country Context

Kazakhstan is the largest country in Central Asia, covering 2.7 million km², with a population of approximately 20 million people[38]. It is a resource-rich, upper-middle-income economy whose energy system has historically been shaped by abundant coal, oil, and natural gas reserves[39]. Kazakhstan is one of the world's top producers of oil and uranium, and fossil fuels underpin both domestic energy supply and export revenues. The country's installed electricity generation capacity exceeds 24 gigawatts (GW), with coal-fired power plants accounting for around 65–70% of electricity generation, followed by gas and large hydropower[40]. Renewable energy—primarily wind and solar—has expanded in recent years but still represents less than 5% of total electricity generation, despite Kazakhstan's vast wind corridors and high solar potential in southern regions[41].

In Kazakhstan, energy demand is primarily driven by heavy industry, energy-intensive mining, and metallurgy reflecting an industrial structure where fossil fuel revenues remain fiscally vital[42]. The country's transport system, which relies heavily on older petrol and diesel vehicles, contributes significantly to high per-capita emissions. In alignment with climate commitments under the Paris Agreement, Kazakhstan has pledged carbon neutrality by 2060[43], with interim targets to increase the share of renewables in electricity generation to 15% by 2030[44]. However, the pace of this transition is constrained by the dependence of certain regions on coal and the role of state-owned enterprises.

The energy transition raises critical just transition and social equity concerns, particularly for coal-dependent regions like Karaganda and Pavlodar where livelihoods and local budgets are tied to the fossil fuel economy. Decarbonization without proactive planning risks exacerbating regional inequalities and social unrest. These risks intersect with gender dynamics, as the energy and mining sectors remain male-dominated and are still shaped by Soviet-era industrial norms and prohibited profession lists. While women's overall labour

[38] World Bank. (2023). *World development indicators: Kazakhstan*. https://data.worldbank.org/country/kazakhstan

[39] International Energy Agency. (2023). *Kazakhstan energy profile*. https://www.iea.org/countries/kazakhstan

40 International Energy Agency. (2023). *Kazakhstan energy profile*. https://www.iea.org/countries/kazakhstan

[41] Asian Development Bank. (2022). *Kazakhstan: Sustainable transport and energy transition overview*. ADB.

42 International Energy Agency. (2023). *Kazakhstan energy profile*. https://www.iea.org/countries/kazakhstan

[43] United Nations Development Programme. (2023). *Kazakhstan's strategy for achieving carbon neutrality by 2060: Policy overview and implementation roadmap*. UNDP Kazakhstan.

[44] United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. (2023). *Nationally determined contribution of the Republic of Kazakhstan (updated submission)*. UNFCCC.

force participation in Kazakhstan is high at 61%, their representation in decision-making and technical roles declines sharply within extractive industries and energy utilities[45].

Gendered energy impacts are visible at the household level, where women in rural areas and mono-industrial towns are more exposed to energy price volatility and heating insecurity during harsh winters[46]. Unreliable or unaffordable energy systems increase the burden of unpaid care and household labour, yet these "time-poverty" issues often remain invisible in energy planning and demand forecasting[47]. Furthermore, although Kazakhstan is high performing in comparison to the region, women's voices are often underrepresented in consultations regarding energy reform, coal phase-down strategies, and renewable energy siting, which limits the overall inclusiveness of Kazakhstan's transition pathway though there are budding forums that increase representation of women in energy such as the KazEnergy Women Club[48].

Project Background[49]

In response to Kazakhstan's high levels of transmission and distribution losses and the urgent need to support decarbonization, MAF selected the Reactive Power for Energy Savings – Kazakhstan project in late 2024, which is funded with EUR 8.1 million and implemented by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in close collaboration with the Ministry of Energy of the Republic of Kazakhstan and technical partner Nazarbayev University Research and Innovation System (NURIS). The project's expected dates are from 2026-2031. The project was part of the Call for Projects (CfP) 2024.

The project addresses reactive power inefficiencies, a technical and economic challenge that undermines grid performance and increases energy losses during electricity transmission. Kazakhstan's electricity pricing structure, influenced by historically low, subsidized tariffs, has reduced incentives for grid upgrades and efficient power management. Reactive power compensation technologies, such as Static Var Compensators (SVC) and capacitor banks, are widely used elsewhere to enhance grid stability and reduce losses but have not yet been tested at scale in Kazakhstan's power system.

Aligned with Kazakhstan's updated Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) — including targets to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by 15% unconditionally and up to 25% conditionally by 2030 — the project aims to demonstrate the technical and economic viability of reactive power solutions, modernize grid infrastructure, and catalyse regulatory reforms to attract future investments in energy efficiency. By reducing transmission losses and

[45] International Labour Organization. (2023). *ILOSTAT database: Employment by sector and sex – Kazakhstan*. https://ilostat.ilo.org

[46] EBRD (2020): *The Role of Women in the Energy Sector in Kazakhstan.*

[47] EBRD (2020): *The Role of Women in the Energy Sector in Kazakhstan.*

[48] SECCA (2026): *The Gender and Energy Nexus: A Regional Overview from Central Asia.*

[49] All information in this section has been adapted from the Mitigation Action Facility's documents, including the review Kazakhstan – Reactive Power for Energy Savings - Mitigation Action Facility

improving the grid's capacity to integrate renewable energy, the initiative supports the country's broader decarbonization pathway.

Core components of the project include:

- Capital Expenditure (CapEx) grants to co-finance pilot installations of reactive power compensation technologies and to support follow-on investments potentially financed through green bonds or loans;
- Technical cooperation to develop national technical standards, enable regulatory and tariff reforms, build capacity among utilities and regulators, and raise awareness of the economic impacts of reactive power losses; and
- Pilot assessments and knowledge products that generate real-world data, reduce investor risk, and support future scale-up planned for Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan.

The project has been approved for implementation. While direct emissions reductions during the pilot phase are modest, the indirect mitigation potential for the project at scale is substantial, with significant CO_2 savings anticipated as reactive power compensation technologies are deployed more broadly. The project's demonstration and reform components are expected to unlock long-term investments in grid modernization, enabling more stable, efficient and renewable-ready power systems.

Direct beneficiaries include electric utilities, system operators, industry stakeholders, and the broader energy sector, while indirect beneficiaries encompass households, businesses, and communities that gain from more reliable, affordable and cleaner electricity. By advancing reactive power optimization, Kazakhstan is pioneering an innovative approach to energy efficiency and resilience — one that strengthens grid performance while contributing to national climate goals.

Methodology

In addition to review project documents, this case study includes interviews with the UNDP Gender Specialist, additional UNDP staff, a representation from the Damu Fund, and an external Gender and Energy Expert. These interviews took place between November 2025 and January 2026.

Findings

Proactive GESI integration is most effective when built upon a foundation of established regional research which can provide the necessary evidence base to highlight specific inequalities and vulnerabilities within a given sector.

The project undertook GESI Analysis beyond a desk review because of prior initiatives that the implementing organization, UNDP had built across Central Asia. The team was able to leverage existing data such as the energy companies Association, KazEnergy report on

Women in the Energy Sector[50]. The project faced a significant "data gap," relying on outdated national labour surveys—some from as far back as 2015—and struggling with a lack of gender-disaggregated statistics. This limited availability of recent information necessitated a reliance on external expertise and multilateral documents such as the World Bank's "Women, Business and the Law" (2024)[51] to validate findings in an environment where purely energy-focused policies often lacked explicit gender references.

The institutionalisation of GESI concepts can be significantly challenged by high government turnover and political transitions, which often lead to shifting institutional priorities and a loss of momentum in strategic coordination.

The project team identified "Just Transition" as a critical but "very new" concept in Kazakhstan, choosing to advance it through the "gender-energy nexus" by establishing an informal network of women in the just transition. These efforts were designed to create an enabling environment for women in a sector (engineering) that is still regarded as a male field and where men often "don't understand how women can go in this area". To combat these norms, the project collaborates with established groups like "Techno Women" and "Women in Energy" to promote STEM agendas and support "prominent champions" in the field.

However, the project team found that the institutionalization of these efforts remains a challenge because of frequent staff turnover within ministries, which prevents building a "solid internal history", as noted by one interviewee. This has led to repeating basic GESI training for new audiences every year when it comes to government partnerships. The team advocated having long term engagement with the government personnel to tackle this issue. A project stakeholder noted that hiring gender experts can be "tricky" even when resources are available since many gender specialists come from non-technical backgrounds such as law, rather than engineering, or strictly energy related technical fields**.** In general, engineering is regarded as a male-dominated field.

Implementing strategic private sector engagement through innovative financial mechanisms, such as guarantee funds and credit lines, allows projects to bypass government budget constraints.

A key achievement of the project was the expansion of partnerships with the private sector, engaging 25 "huge players" in the energy industry to undergo gender diagnostics and diagnostics-based action planning. This strategy was born from the observation that while the government may offer political will, it often lacks a dedicated budget or technical strategy for GESI, frequently limiting its support to "fancy events" and speeches rather than "constructive" actions. In contrast, the private sector is viewed as having more resources to implement changes, such as established "women's clubs" focused on leadership and work-life balance. By working with these large corporations, one stakeholder described the project as seeking to "change the attitude and narrative" regarding masculinity in the energy sector, addressing stereotypes that impact women's careers from the school level onward. With private sector partners, the project has more of the resources needed to do this.

[50] KazEnergy 2023**:** https://www.kazenergy.com/upload/document/development/zh_rol_2023_ru.pdf

[51] World Bank (2024): *Women, Business and the Law Report* WBL24_2-0_Kazakhstan.pdf

Regional experiences should not be generalized for GESI implementation, as international best practices mandate that every project must be guided by its own context-specific Gender/GESI analysis to address unique national, cultural, and sectoral realities

Kazakhstan presented a unique regional anomaly where female employment in renewable energy is actually *lower* than in traditional energy sectors. This was attributed largely to academic curricula remain "old-fashioned" and heavily tailored to the entrenched oil and gas industry. The project partnered with Atyrau Oil and Gas University to tailor programs for the energy transition. However, the Multi-country - Reactive Power for Energy Savings project experience points to how unique country contexts can even be in the same region so GESI experiences will have to be highly contextualized, instead of generalized by region since across Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan female renewable energy participation is estimated to be higher than in the traditional energy sector[52].

Conclusions

The Kazakhstan Reactive Power project demonstrates that a proactive approach leveraging established national research provides a robust foundation for embedding inclusion into technical energy transitions from the proposal stage. This is even applicable when high government turnover erodes GESI knowledge. Furthermore, because the government often lacks a dedicated budget or strategy for GESI, strategic private sector engagement remains a vital pathway for securing the resources and corporate buy-in necessary to implement meaningful diagnostics and action plans. Finally, Kazakhstan is a regional outlier where the legacy of high capital concentration in the extractive sector has lowered female participation in renewable energy. This disparity is compounded by misaligned academic curricula, a need for vocational training and institutionalizing the collection of multi-dimensional, sex-disaggregated data to ensure a gender-responsive transition.

[52] SECCA (2026): *The Gender and Energy Nexus: A Regional Overview from Central Asia.*

Annex 8: Case Study – Promotion of Electric Vehicles in Cabo Verde

Background & Context

Country Context

Cabo Verde is an archipelago of 4,033 square kilometres made up of ten small islands, nine of which are inhabited, with a total population of 524,877[53]. The country's energy sector comprises nine energy systems of different sizes and characteristics, ranging from 90.2 megawatt (MW) of generating capacity on Santiago Island to 1.7 MW on Brava Island. Most of the energy consumed in Cabo Verde is derived from petroleum products (butane, kerosene, oil, diesel, fuel oil, etc.)[54]. Fuel oil is mainly used in electricity generation, and diesel in the transport sector, the latter being the main energy consumer in Cabo Verde. The vehicle fleet consists mainly of imported second-hand cars (Europe, US, China)[55], and car ownership is likely to increase in the coming years as the country's economic situation improves[56]. This has led the Cabo Verde Government to promote electric vehicles as a strategy to reduce road transport-related greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions as well as increase the share of renewable energy from 20 percent at present to 100 percent by 2040 in alignment with the overall goal to fully decarbonise the electricity sector by 2040 (with a 50% penetration of renewables by 2030[57]). Many of the actions to mitigate transport sector emissions began in 2019 based on the Policy Charter for Electric Mobility (Carta de Política para a Mobilidade Elétrica or CPME) and the Action Plan for the Promotion of Electric Mobility (Plano de Ação para a Mobilidade Elétrica or PAME). The aim was to convert the entire government fleet to electric vehicles (EVs) by 2030 and phase out internal combustion engine vehicles (ICEVs) by 2050. It is important to note that women are underrepresented in decision-making in the energy and transport sectors in Cabo Verde and are less likely to own a car (in 2019, only 8.8% of female household heads owned a car, compared to 19.1% of males)[58].

Project Background

GIZ led the project "Promotion of Electric Mobility in Cabo Verde (ProMEC)" that was developed in 2019 in close collaboration with the National Directorate of Energy, Industry, and Commerce (DNICE) within the Ministry of Industry, Commerce and Energy (MICE). The project, which had a total budget of EUR 7.1 million, was implemented from 2020 to 2025, and was part of the Mitigation Action Facility's 5th Call for Proposals (CfP). ProMEC provided incentives for the acquisition of 600 EVs to individuals, transport sector companies and public administration institutions, the installation of a network of 40 commercial and 55

[53] World Bank (2024): https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.POP.TOTL?locations=C3-CV
[54] 85% in 2019 (IRENA, 2022).
[55] ProMEC Mid-term ELE (September 2023).
[56] Mitigation Action Facility website on ProMEC: https://mitigation-action.org/projects/cabo-verde-electric-vehicles/.
[57] National Energy Sustainability Plan, part of the National Energy Sustainability Plan 2021-2026.
[58] NAMA Facility 5th Call Proposal, Annexe 10, 2019.

private EV charging stations, and the implementation of five e-bus demonstration projects. The project also included training (e.g. on maintenance of EVs, installation and maintenance of charging stations, road rescue in case of accidents involving EV etc.) by GIZ and the national partner Center for Renewable Energy and Industrial Maintenance (CERMI) for public institutions and public transport providers from the private sector as well as operators of commercial charging stations[59]. Direct beneficiaries of the project included: (i) private households, companies, public institutions, and civil society organisations financially able to purchase EVs and/or EV charging stations; and (ii) institutions, firms and individuals who received training and technical assistance. This included, for instance, public transport companies and municipalities that received support to acquire electric buses as well as the company that was supported to establish commercial EV charging stations. Indirect beneficiaries included passengers of electric city buses, school buses and taxis.

ProMEC was designed at a time when the Mitigation Action Facility's GAP had not yet been rolled out. In fact, at the design stage, the in-country partner MICE agreed on a gender-neutral project design, with the actual NAMA proposal in 2019 showing gender-sensitive project design, thereby already demonstrating an understanding of the importance of including a GESI lens in project design even when it was not mandatory. The project's Gender Analysis was conducted in January 2023, roughly three years into implementation. The GESI AP was developed in March 2025, nine months before the project ended, which limited time and no additional budget available for a meaningful shift from a gender-sensitive to gender-transformative design.

Methodology

For this case study, a document review took place and was complemented by three interviews with (i) the implementing partner GIZ ProMEC, (ii) the project partner CERMI, and (iii) an independent GESI expert and author of the Gender Analysis[60]. Interviews took place between October and November 2025.

Findings

GESI-sensitive actions are very much dependent on the project team.

The original, gender-neutral project design, with the only gender indicator being the percentage of women to be trained (30%), did include gender-sensitive actions and objectives even before the GESI AP was developed. This included holding group discussions with women and girls during consultation for the planning of the commercial charging stations infrastructure; organising communication campaigns to raise awareness among women and girls about the EV sector by engaging female champions (e.g., a female mechanic joining ProMEC's promotional events, having a well-known female singer join an event, and incorporating a female driver into video advertisements); providing technical

[59] Mitigation Action Facility website on ProMEC: https://mitigation-action.org/projects/cabo-verde-electric-vehicles/
[60] An interview with MICE was requested through GIZ and the request then followed up by the OPM evaluation team three times, without any reply.

assistance on gender mainstreaming issues to the project's stakeholders; and collecting gender-disaggregated data in statistics, surveys or other documents.

The project did struggle with the minimum target for female participation in trainings due to partners not understanding the importance of meeting this target, and to the fact that some target groups simply did not have women with the necessary qualifications given that the subsector (in this case, maintenance of EVs) is heavily male dominated[61]. There are instances, however, where the target was achieved, i.e. CERMI's training on charging station maintenance did reach 40% of female participation.

Given these contextual constraints, the inclusion of gender-sensitive activities demonstrates how motivated the team was to "fight against stereotypes and how they actively tried to better understand underlying gender bias and barriers", as noted by one interviewee, even before a Gender Focal Point (GFP) joined the team. As soon as recommendations were provided by the Gender Analysis, these were considered where feasible and within scope, timeline and budget. This included naming a GFP and co-developing a gender-responsive and possibly gender-transformative activity, i.e. widening the awareness campaign on EVs and their potential for bringing more women into STEM studies and into transport or energy related labour force to schools to combat set social norms and empower girls and young women to seize the window of opportunity that the introduction of EVs might pose.

The GFP was added as a position late in the project after having been requested by Mitigation Action Facility and recommended by the Gender Analysis. Specific GESI training was provided to the GFP and other ProMEC team members, however they stated missing networking possibilities with other Facility projects due to the time zone they are in and due to language issues (as most interactions between GFPs happen in English and as the other Portuguese speaking project teams would mainly sit in Brazil). There was also little leeway in terms of timeframe and budget to significantly increase GESI activities after the GESI AP was developed.

The late development of a GESI AP limits possibilities for gender-responsive actions.

As the GESI AP was only finalised in March 2025 (within the last year of this five-year project), GESI activities could not be effectively incorporated into the project as the appropriate funding was not available. For example, the implementing team stipulated that a much wider awareness campaign to recruit women in STEM, including travelling to islands outside of Santiago, would have been useful but was deemed too time and cost intensive.

The late focus on GESI also impacted understanding of project partners on what gender meant for the project. While the ProMEC team stated in an interview that the MoU with CERMI was designed with a gender-responsive dimension (as the scope of CERMI's intervention clearly outlined the importance of gender equality and the promotion of the participation of women trainees and trainers in all training actions), CERMI's understanding differed. According to CERMI, only the percentage of female participants in their training of trainers (ToT) on e-mobility and charging stations was discussed, without any conversation about gender mainstreaming of training material or gender-sensitive planning of ToT

[61] Mitigation Action Facility Project annual report 2024

sessions (which is in line with the initial gender-neutral project design). CERMI stakeholders also indicated that they were not aware of the existence of a GFP.

The TSU support in the form of adapted training for the ProMEC team did help to build one possibly gender-transformative activity (a school awareness campaign), but the resulting impact on stereotypes and underlying social norms remains to be seen. As one interviewee said: "As soon as we received the recommendations [e.g. on widening awareness campaigns to other islands and to include schools as well], we did our best to implement them in the short timeframe we had left and within the budget".

Limited buy-in by the main implementation partner constrains impact of GESI activities

Interviews indicated that cooperation with the MICE is not always easy when it came to GESI due to a perceived lack of understanding of the importance of GESI among MICE staff. MICE and DNICE would have benefitted from more GESI-related engagement, "ideally from the beginning", as one interviewee noted. In addition, DNICE already struggles with limited human resources[62], which made it even more difficult to engage the Ministry when the project pivoted from gender-neutral to gender-sensitive (pushed by the ProMEC team) and then to gender-responsive (after the GESI AP and supported by the TSU).

All interviewees agreed that Cabo Verde needs policies for promoting gender in the energy and transport sector as well as for providing better working conditions for women if they are to be further integrated into the transport sector. One interviewee noted that there is a general "openness to have women in STEM"; another that e-mobility could be a "window of opportunity" for women to get into the energy and transport sectors as it is a rather new subsector and not yet necessarily set to be a male domain. However, there is also a persistent lack of government facilitation for promoting GESI in the energy and transport sectors and their nexus, and a lack in empowering women more generally. There are other actors in Cabo Verde, including women associations and nongovernment organisations that are lobbying to bring more women into the sector, and ProMEC's promotional activities were "a step into the right direction", an external expert said. To get better buy-in, the government would have needed to be more involved in the development and subsequent implementation of the GESI AP.

Conclusions

The findings show that although ProMEC has not achieved the Mitigation Action Facility's goal of being gender-responsive or -transformative in nature, this is because its design and inception began prior to the Facility's GAP roll out. Despite this, the project made valuable efforts to include gender-sensitive activities even before it later developed a Gender Analysis and GESI AP. When looking at the project activities after the GESI AP was put in place, it becomes clear that effort was made to change the project and to integrate GESI. Although the GESI AP was developed within the last year of the project's implementation, there were GESI activities that might have long-lasting impacts on gender stereotypes and norms

[62] ProMEC Mid-term ELE (September 2023)

related to who works in the energy and transport sectors and who owns cars, but this remains to be seen. This is particularly important as interviewees mentioned the need for the development and introduction of GESI-related policies in the energy and transport sectors in the country and stated that work had to be undertaken to ensure ownership of such policies by the Government, and especially MICE. Other important challenges included limited government buy-in (which may have been different with an earlier Gender Analysis) and matching expectations to budget allocation, project team expertise, and a trained and integrated GFP.