



GREEN
CLIMATE
FUND

Independent
Evaluation
Unit



**Progress Report on the
GAP Implementation**
February 2026

**Progress Report on the Implementation of
the Gender Action Plan:**
An interim deliverable



© 2026 Green Climate Fund Independent Evaluation Unit
175, Art center-daero
Yeonsu-gu, Incheon 22004
Republic of Korea
Tel. (+82) 032-458-6450
Email: ieu@gcfund.org
<https://ieu.greenclimate.fund>

All rights reserved.

Second Edition

This paper is a product of the Independent Evaluation Unit at the Green Climate Fund. It is part of a larger effort to provide open access to its research and work and to make a contribution to climate change discussions around the world.

While the IEU has undertaken every effort to ensure the data in this report is accurate, it is the reader's responsibility to determine if all information provided by the IEU is correct and verified. Neither the author(s) of this document nor anyone connected with the IEU or the GCF can be held responsible for how the information herein is used.

Rights and permissions

The material in this work is copyrighted. Copying or transmitting portions all or part of this report without permission may be a violation of applicable law. The IEU encourages dissemination of its work and will normally grant permission promptly. Please send requests to ieu@gcfund.org.

Citation

The suggested citation for this paper is:
Independent Evaluation Unit (2026). *Progress Report on the Implementation of the Gender Action Plan (GAP)*.
February. Songdo, South Korea: Independent Evaluation Unit, Green Climate Fund.

Credits

Head of the GCF Independent Evaluation Unit: Andreas Reumann
Evaluation task lead: Genta Konci, Evaluations Specialist
Editing: Greg Clough
Layout & Design: Josephine Wambui Ngala

A FREE PUBLICATION

Printed on eco-friendly paper



Table of Contents

List of Acronyms	c
I. Background	1
II. Methodology	3
III. Data availability and limitations	5
IV. Progress update on the implementation	6
V. Key findings and conclusions	13

List of Tables

Table 1: Nomenclature	6
Table 2: Update on GAP indicators	7



List of Acronyms

AEs	Accredited Entities
AI	Artificial Intelligence
APR	Annual Performance Report
COP	Conference of the Parties
DAE	Direct Access Entity
FPS	Funding Proposals
GA	Gender Assessment
GAP	Gender Action Plan
GCF	Green Climate Fund
IAE	International Access Entity
IEU	Independent Evaluation Unit
IRM	Independent Redress Mechanism
LLM	Large Language Models
NAP	National Adaptation Plan
NDAs	National Designated Authorities
PA	Priority Area
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
USD	United States Dollars



I. Background

Gender Action Plan

The updated Gender Policy (2019) and Gender Action Plan (GAP)¹ (2020–2023) were approved by the Board at B.24 (decision B.24/12). The updated policy introduces more explicit accountability mechanisms than the previous Gender Policy and Action Plan adopted at the ninth meeting of the Board (decision B.09/10).² It requires accredited entities (AEs) to integrate gender actions into project design through gender assessments and project-level gender action plans, and to report annually on progress against these actions through project-level GAP indicators. The policy is accompanied by an organization-wide Gender Action Plan (2020-2023) which operationalizes these policy commitments through priority areas (PAs), indicators, and timelines to guide implementation, monitoring and accountability. The GAP is structured around five PAs, measured through 28 indicators:

- (i) **Governance**, including gender parity, oversight, and internal audits and monitoring
- (ii) **Competencies and capacity development**, including strengthening gender knowledge, training, and institutional guidance
- (iii) **Resource allocation, accessibility and budgeting**, ensuring adequate resources and budgeting for gender objectives
- (iv) **Operational procedures**, embedding gender requirements throughout operational processes and the project life cycle, including mandatory gender assessments and project-level GAPs
- (v) **Knowledge generation and communications**, capturing lessons, disseminating guidance, and communicating progress

The GAP presents its indicators in a structured results and monitoring table organized under the five PAs (see Annex IV of the GAP). For each PA, specific implementation actions are designed for one or more indicators, including assigned responsibility, timing and reporting frequency, and indicative budget estimates. The indicator set combines institutional indicators and project-level indicators intended to be generated through proposals, project documentation, and implementation reporting. **Most indicators are quantitative and process-oriented and lack baselines and targets. While they are largely framed as counts and percentages, numerical targets are generally not specified.**

¹ This Action Plan should not be confused with project-level Gender Action Plans (GAPs), which are mandatory annexes to individual FPs and outline project-specific measures.

² Green Climate Fund (2015). Gender Policy and Action Plan, annex XIII to decision B.09/11 (document GCF/B.09/10), adopted at the ninth meeting of the Board, 24–26 March 2015. Available at: <https://www.greenclimate.fund/document/gcf-b09-10>



Reporting on the Gender Action Plan

At COP 29 in 2024, Parties urged the Board to adopt an updated GAP for the Fund's second replenishment period,³ noting that the previous plan covered 2020-2023 and encouraging continued alignment with the implementation of activities under the UNFCCC GAP once adopted.⁴ COP29 decision 3/CP.29 reinforced this expectation. However, the Secretariat responded by proposing a plan to develop the updated GAP by B.44, with formal Board approval scheduled for B.45 in 2026.

With respect to reporting against indicators aligned with the PAs of the Gender Action Plan 2020–2023, the Secretariat has continued its implementation beyond the original time frame.⁵

Scope of the assessment

During inception interviews, Board members and civil society stakeholders expressed concerns that the Secretariat has not systematically reported on GAP implementation using the indicators defined in the Gender Action Plan framework. In particular, stakeholders highlighted the need for an independent assessment to determine what has been achieved against GAP commitments, what has worked well, where gaps remain, and what corrective actions may be needed to strengthen organizational accountability and effectiveness.

In response to this request, the IEU assessed the implementation of the GAP, to examine the extent to which intended actions have been undertaken and progressed. This assessment aims to provide the Board with an overview of available data sources, monitoring undertaken, and a clearer understanding of organizational effectiveness in operationalizing the GAP.

³ United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (2024). Gender and climate change. Draft decision -/CP.29, agenda item 14, adopted at the twenty-ninth session of the Conference of the Parties (COP29), Baku, 2024. Available at:

https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/COP29_auv_agenda_item_14_gender.pdf.

⁴ In line with COP28 and COP29 decisions, together with corresponding CMA guidance, which urged the GCF Board to adopt an updated Gender Action Plan for the second replenishment period (2024-2027), to strengthen gender responsiveness in climate finance and to actively contribute to the implementation of activities under the UNFCCC Lima Work Programme on Gender (LWPG) and its Gender Action Plan, the Board has mandated the Secretariat to prepare a revised GAP for USP-2.

⁵ Green Climate Fund (2025). Fourteenth Report of the Green Climate Fund to the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, document GCF/B.42/09, considered at the forty-second meeting of the Board, 9 June 2025. Available at: <https://www.greenclimate.fund/document/gcf-b42-09>



II. Methodology

The IEU reconstructed and assessed progress against institutional GAP indicators to the extent possible, drawing on available documentation, internal reporting, interviews, and project portfolio data. This assessment was also supported by the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Large Language Models (LLM) for systematic analysis across existing databases, guided by established guidelines and protocols.

Desk review, dataset query, and AI-assisted document analysis^{6, 7, 8}

A structured desk review was applied to collect data on the GAP indicators covering institutional reporting and corporate documentation, including:

- Secretariat Annual portfolio performance reports to the Board for the period 2020 to 2024
- GCF reports to the UNFCCC, including annexes and the Tenth to Fourteenth Reports to the COP, were reviewed for coverage of gender-related reporting, including any mentions of GAP indicators or targets
- Independent Redress Mechanism (IRM) annual reports for the period 2020-2024 were reviewed to collect reporting on gender issues related to GAP indicators and targets
- GCF website, iLearn, public materials were reviewed for indicators relating to toolkits, posted resources, availability of guidance, training records and communications outputs for the period 2020-2025
- Financial statements and COP reports were reviewed for budgetary evidence for the period 2020 to 2025⁹

For other indicators based on administrative data, database queries were applied. This approach was also used for accreditation-related indicators via the accreditation dataset.¹⁰ The analysis is presented as percentage calculations, for example, the percentage of AEs meeting gender policy compliance.

An AI-assisted analytical tool was designed to systematically process, classify, and extract insights from project-level document repositories. The IEU team found that project-level operational indicators are distributed across a large number of project documents, including funding proposals (FPS), annual performance reports, project-level gender assessments and GAPs. The IEU team found that no GAP indicators are centrally tracked within a single GCF system. The approach consisted of:

⁶ The desk review covered these Priority Areas (PA); PA1, PA2, PA3, PA5

⁷ The dataset query covered PA1

⁸ This AI-assisted document analysis covered PA4 and readiness text analysis.

⁹ More details on the sources can be found in Annex 1.

¹⁰ Accreditation Dataset, owned by the GCF Secretariat and accessed in February 2025. The dataset does not contain a direct compliance tag. Compliance percentages were therefore derived using inverse logic applied to the accreditation conditions data: a) filtering conditions categorized as "Gender", b) applying keyword matching to condition descriptions to classify them as policy-related or competency-related, c) applying the assumption that if an AE was NOT assigned a gender-related condition, it was considered to have met the standard, whereas entities assigned such conditions were assessed based on whether condition had been fulfilled, and d) calculating compliance as the number of compliant entities divided by the total assessed.



- Automated existence checks for compliance-oriented indicators at the project level, for example, verifying if gender assessment and a GAP were available for each project.
- Semantic search combined with an LLM-based classification for indicators requiring interpretation of narrative evidence, for example, gender-balanced stakeholder consultations, demonstrated gender-related outcomes, costed gender budgets, and evidence of adaptive course corrections. This analysis is presented in quantifiable rates, such as x/y projects and percentages, with verification sampling performed where definitions may be ambiguous.

Quality assurance process

Across methods, guidelines and protocols were put in place to ensure the quality and accuracy of analysis.¹¹ Human validation was then conducted to review all AI selection and classifications. Across all AI-analysed indicators, 437 project-level classifications were human-reviewed, confirming 91.8 per cent accuracy.¹² At the chunk level, 860 classifications were reviewed, confirming 91.5 per cent accuracy. These results support a high level of confidence in aggregate statistics. Specific details on the quality assurance process are provided in Annex 2 of this report.

¹¹ “Planned” vs “demonstrated”: outcome indicators were counted only when results are reported (not aspirational language).

- Indicators requiring gender-balance count only when explicit sex-disaggregated participation is documented (percentages, counts, women’s groups consultations, etc.)
- Where indicator definitions can be interpreted broadly (e.g., “audit”), the matrix explicitly recommends sampling/verification to avoid over-claims.

- The human quality assurance process consisted of a desk review of a randomly selected, statistically significant sample of AI classifications. Sample sizes were calculated to ensure representativeness at a 95% confidence level. Reviewers independently verified AI outputs against source documents. Sampling methodology and confidence intervals are detailed in the Technical Documentation in the Annexes.

¹² 437 project-level classifications were human-reviewed, yielding 91.8% accuracy (95% confidence interval, meaning we can be 95% certain the true accuracy falls between: 88.8%–94.0%) with a mild under-classification tendency (21 missed positives vs 15 false positives). At the chunk level (the smaller text segments into which each project document is divided), 860 classifications were reviewed at 91.5% accuracy (95% confidence interval: 89.5%–93.2%).



III. Data availability and limitations

Several limitations affected this assessment, largely related to data availability, timing, and the design of existing reporting systems. First, some activities may have taken place but are not well documented in GCF reporting systems. As a result, there is a risk of undercounting progress through a lack of documentation. This is compounded by the fact that many projects remain at an early stage of implementation, and progress has not yet been reported in a way that allows meaningful assessment against several GAP indicators.

There is also a broad weakness in Annual Performance Reporting (APR), namely that reporting is activity- and output-based rather than focused on outcomes, results and explanations of change.

The indicators lack baselines and targets, which makes it difficult to assess progress over time. To address this, the team interprets performance primarily by examining changes over time and measuring whether trends were upward or downward.

Some specific outcome indicators, such as quality-of-life improvements, reduced vulnerability, and increased adaptive capacity, have limited data coverage. Other challenges relate to limitations in the Secretariat's administrative budget data, which do not allow clear identification of the resources earmarked for and executed on gender activities.

To address some of these challenges, the evaluation distinguished between “not measurable due to missing evidence” and “no progress” and explored alternative sources and proxy measures where feasible. The evaluation also drew on multiple data sources, including internal datasets and analytical tools, to triangulate evidence to the extent possible.

The lack of consistent data also means that findings should be interpreted as a high-level snapshot of available evidence rather than a definitive assessment of implementation. This assessment is intended to inform and support the independent evaluation of the GCF's approach to gender.



IV. Progress update on the implementation

This section presents the consolidated progress status across all 28 indicators of the GAP (2020–2023), with updates included up to 2025 when data are available, organized by the five PAs. Table 2 provides an at-a-glance view of each indicator's current status, key findings, and data source, with definitions of the status provided in Table 1. For this report, 215 FPs approved between 2020 and 2025 were analysed.

Because the indicators do not have baselines or targets, it is not possible to judge performance against pre-defined benchmarks. Instead, performance was assessed by examining whether there is evidence of progress over time and whether the indicator requirements are increasingly met. Detailed evidence and analysis for each indicator are presented in Annex 2 of this report.

Table 1: Nomenclature

Status	Definition
Strong Evidence	Indicator progressing over time, verified with strong evidence
Partial Evidence	Indicator progress could not be fully verified due to partial evidence
No Progress	Indicator has no progress, verified with evidence
No Data	Data not yet available or the indicator cannot be assessed from accessible sources

Table 2: Update on GAP indicators

PA	#	Action	Indicator	Key Finding	Evidence Basis	Status
PRIORITY AREA 1: GOVERNANCE	1	Approval of updated policy	Approval of the updated policy	Approved at B.24, Nov 2019 (decision B.24/12). Publicly available on the GCF website. Completed on schedule, no cost implications.	Board documents	Strong Evidence
	2	Periodic monitoring	Annual progress reports to the Board	All five Annual Portfolio Performance Reports (2020–2024) include dedicated gender sections with consistent narrative of high compliance. Main gap, no quantitative metrics to assess gender results.	Desk review (5 reports)	Strong Evidence
	3	Periodic monitoring	Reporting on gender issues covered in IRM annual report and COP annual report	GCF COP reports (Tenth - Fourteenth): Full compliance with dedicated gender sections in the report, comprehensive reporting on the evolution of gender work, specific GAP tracking was started in 2023 with the Twelfth report. IRM (2020–2024): Partial reporting on gender through safeguards mandate only. No dedicated section on gender, no disaggregated data, and no mention of GAP tracking.	Desk review (10 reports)	Partial evidence
	4	Accreditation requirements	% of AEs with policies and procedures on gender equality at accreditation	80% (43/54) ¹³ of AEs currently compliant (63% at accreditation and nine fulfilled conditions). 11 AEs are still in progress. DAE 78% vs IAE 86%.	Accreditation database ¹⁴ (54 AEs)	Partial evidence
	5	Accreditation requirements	% of AEs with gender equality competencies and track records at accreditation	89% (48/54) of AEs currently compliant (83% at accreditation and three fulfilled conditions). 6 AEs still in the process of fulfilling the requirements. DAE 88% vs IAE 93%.	Accreditation database (54 AEs)	Strong Evidence
	6	Accreditation requirements	% of direct access applicants/AEs requesting readiness support for gender Learn, Toolkit, GAP	68.5% (313/457) Increase from 65.1% (2020–2023) to 81.2% (2024–2025) ¹⁵	AI-assisted analysis (457 proposals)	Strong Evidence

¹³ AEs applying or seeking reaccreditation after 2020

¹⁴ Source: Accreditation Database, excel version, provided by Secretariat in February 2026.

¹⁵ QA: 90.2% accuracy (n=163)

PA	#	Action	Indicator	Key Finding	Evidence Basis	Status
			equality policies and procedures			
PRIORITY AREA 2: COMPETENCIES AND CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT	7	Increase knowledge	Number of stakeholders, NDAs, focal points and AEs that received gender training	307 enrollments in GCF NAP Gender Training (iLearn, 2023–2025). Participant type: Government 20%, UN/intl. orgs 27%, private sector 23%. Enrollment completion: Completed 26%, In-progress 28%, Enrolled 41% One channel only; no data for 2020–2022.	iLearn data (Chief Strategy and Impact Officer)	Partial evidence
	8	Disseminate toolkit	GCF gender toolkit disseminated and guidance provided to NDAs, focal points and AEs	2017 toolkit made publicly available. iLearn module as digital guidance channel (307 enrollees). In-person events referenced but not inventoried. Download/access data unavailable.	Desk review + iLearn data	Partial evidence
PRIORITY AREA 3: RESOURCE ALLOCATION, ACCESSIBILITY AND BUDGETING	9	Funding for gender	Approved budget amount for targeted gender support at project, programme or portfolio level	Project-level gender budget data is inconsistent (outliers, partial coverage, difficulty isolating gender lines). Cannot be reliably computed.	Desk review	No data
	10	Funding for gender	% of annual administrative budget earmarked by Secretariat for gender expertise, training, communications, and monitoring and evaluation	0.36% of the Secretariat Administrative budget ¹⁶ . USD 1.9m in gender-related contracts identified (2020–present): USD 859k consultants and USD 1,050k firms. Minimum estimate and it excludes staff time, embedded activities ¹⁷ .	Contract data and desk review	Partial evidence

¹⁶ Total Secretariat administrative budget 528,536,657 USD (2020-2025) Source: GCF Secretariat

¹⁷ Contract expenditure data on gender (PA3) captures contracts with "gender" in the title but does not cover staff time, embedded gender activities within broader contracts, or indirect spending.

PA	#	Action	Indicator	Key Finding	Evidence Basis	Status
	11	Guidance on GA and GAP	Guidelines issued and communicated to NDAs/focal points and AEs through GCF website and active outreach	iLearn modules and regional dialogue materials exist. Unclear whether guidance systematically communicated at each project start. Requires confirmation from Gender/Operations.	Desk review	No data
	12	Project design guidance	100% of approved FPs contain a gender assessment and project-level GAP publicly available on GCF website	88.3% (295/334) have both GA and GAP publicly available. Higher compliance in project GAP period after 2020. Recent gap likely due to FP upload lag. ¹⁸	Automated existence check	Partial evidence
	13	Toolkits and training	Number of training sessions on guidelines provided to NDAs/focal points and AEs and qualitative reporting	Training exists through legacy resources and IEU references. Systematic session count and qualitative reporting unavailable. Requires consolidated inventory.	Desk review	No data
	14	Toolkits and training	Number of toolkits, sourcebooks and references posted on GCF website	2017 one gender toolkit confirmed on website. Additional sector-specific resources not clearly evidenced; broader content audit may be needed.	Desk review	Strong Evidence
	15	Application of guidelines	% of projects that apply gender-balanced stakeholder consultations	48% (103/215) Small increase: 46.3% (2020–2023) → 50.0% (2024–2025). True rate likely higher (under-documentation)	AI-assisted analysis (213 projects)	Partial evidence
	16	Application of guidelines	Number of FPs whose principal objective is to	1 in 2020–2023, 1 in 2024–2025. 1% (2/215)	AI-assisted analysis (215 projects) ¹⁹	Partial evidence

¹⁸ In some cases, there is a delay in uploading documents to the project website. The FP is usually published first, and the supporting documents follow later, especially for more recent projects

PA	#	Action	Indicator	Key Finding	Evidence Basis	Status
			promote gender equality in climate action			
	17	Application of guidelines	Number of projects where women and men report improvements in their quality-of-life	5 projects 2.3% (5/215) of portfolio Only 31% of portfolio have reporting documents; among analysed (n=66): 7.6%. All cases in 2020–2023.	AI-assisted analysis (APRs/evaluations)	No progress
	18	Application of guidelines	Number of projects that demonstrate the reduced vulnerability of both women and men	4 projects 2% (4/215) of portfolio. Only 40% of portfolio analysed (n=86); among analysed: 4.7%. All cases in 2020–2023.	AI-assisted analysis (APRs/evaluations)	No progress
	19	Application of guidelines	Number of projects that demonstrate increased adaptive capacity of women and men to respond to the impacts of climate change	12 projects 5.6% (12/215) of the portfolio 39% of portfolio analysed (n=84); among analysed: 14.3%. Best-documented outcome indicator.	AI-assisted analysis (APRs/evaluations)	Strong evidence
	20	Application of guidelines	Number of projects that contain strategies and specific budgets to leverage co-benefits between gender equality and climate action	156 projects 73% (157/215) Consistently high: 75.2% (2020–2023) → 70.2% (2024–2025).	AI-assisted analysis (210 projects)	Strong Evidence

PA	#	Action	Indicator	Key Finding	Evidence Basis	Status
	21	Application of guidelines	Projects with resilient infrastructure measures in place to prevent economic losses and mitigate gender-related risks	24 projects 28% (24/86 ²⁰) of infrastructure-relevant projects. Decrease: 29.8% → 25.6%.	AI-assisted analysis (86 infrastructure projects)	Partial evidence
	22	Application of guidelines	Number of projects that have undertaken a gender audit and strengthened operational systems and made course corrections to mainstream gender	0 projects 0% (0/215) Zero projects met strict criteria (formal audit, systems strengthened, corrections implemented) out of 89 projects analysed.	AI-assisted analysis (strict re-analysis)	No progress
	23	Application of guidelines	Increase in the number of FPs with principal objectives of promoting gender equality in climate change	No increase Only two projects identified across entire period (1 per sub-period). No meaningful trend derivable from such small absolute numbers.	Derived from evidence gathered from indicator #16	No progress

²⁰ For the resilient infrastructure indicator, the portfolio denominator is restricted to infrastructure-relevant projects (86 projects) for that given period of time.

PA	#	Action	Indicator	Key Finding	Evidence Basis	Status
	24	Assess GAP implementation	Stocktaking report posted on the website	Gender-related materials and publications identified online. A formal stocktaking report not available.	Desk review	Partial Evidence
	25	Assess GAP implementation	Communications and dissemination strategy that addresses gender issues developed	Systematic gender integration in AE-focused communications: 8 Regional Dialogues and two Regional sessions for DAE, other joint trainings ²¹ . Framed as an integrated approach rather than stand-alone document.	Desk review	Strong Evidence
	26	Assess GAP implementation	Communication materials developed and disseminated to internal and external stakeholders	Examples verified: story articles, press releases, annual results reporting with gender-sensitive content. Comprehensive inventory would require communications input.	Desk review	No data
	27	Assess GAP implementation	Public outreach activities undertaken at the national and grassroots levels	Outreach content exists across portfolio/COP reporting and public media. Coverage highlights gender at project level rather than consolidated GAP progress.	Desk review	No data
	28	Assess GAP implementation	Multimedia campaign on gender equality and climate change launched at the country level	Not verified from available sources.	Desk review	No Data

²¹ Data covers the period 2020-2025



V. Key findings and conclusions

Finding 1: The updating of the GAP has been delayed. COP29's decision 3/CP.29, urged the Board to adopt a new GAP. However, the Secretariat only responded with a plan to develop the updated GAP by B.44, with formal approval by B.45 in 2026. Stakeholders expressed concerns that the Secretariat has not systematically reported on GAP implementation using the indicators defined in the Gender Action Plan framework.

Finding 2: Indicators do not have baselines or targets. Therefore, it is not possible to judge performance against benchmarks. In the GAP, 28 indicators are presented in a structured results and monitoring table organized under the above-mentioned PAs. For each PA, specific implementation actions for one or more indicators are provided, including responsibility, timing and reporting frequency, and indicative budget estimates. Most indicators are quantitative and process oriented. While indicators are designed as counts and percentages, numerical targets are largely not specified.

Finding 3: Many GAP indicators are poorly formulated. This assessment highlights a mismatch between the ambition of the GAP indicator set and its operational feasibility. In addition, many indicators lack core design features, such as clear baselines and targets, disaggregation requirements, verification protocols, and defined accountability, including a designated data owner within the responsible unit. Budgeting assumptions are also often weak. Several actions are described as having “no cost implications” despite requiring staff time, systems, and capacity for implementation and monitoring.

Less than 1 per cent of projects include an objective promoting gender equality and women's empowerment. This raises questions about the expectations underlying this indicator and the rationale for tracking it.

The PAs could be more clearly defined to support stronger indicator formulation. The current indicator set leans heavily towards compliance and output measures rather than outcomes and results. The indicator distribution is heavily concentrated in Operational Procedures, which contains 13. This suggests that the framework places its strongest emphasis on process, rules, and day-to-day operational practices. Competencies, and Capacity and Resource Allocation, with two indicators each, are the areas with the fewest measurements.

Finding 4: GAP indicators are not integrated into GCF's internal monitoring systems. GAP indicators are not integrated into the Secretariat's operational and monitoring systems. At the corporate level, the Integrated Results Management Framework and the Revised Readiness Results Management Framework do not systematically map GAP indicators. At the project level, APR reporting and results frameworks and log frames are not structured to generate consistent data for GAP monitoring. Reporting to the COP was provided primarily through narrative gender sections, but quantitative tracking of GAP indicators did not begin until the Twelfth GCF Report to the COP in 2023.

Finding 5: Progress is mostly seen in upstream work, while implementation-related indicators show slower progress. Overall, progress is most consistent for upstream activities,



while implementation-related indicators show limited progress or cannot be assessed due to gaps in reporting and data availability. This pattern is reflected across the five priority areas (PAs), as outlined below:

- I. **Priority Area 1 – Governance** shows that most indicators are verifiable and generally progressing.
- II. **Priority Areas 2 – Competencies and Capacity Development**, and **5 – Knowledge and Communications** show progress is only partially verifiable. Available evidence suggests that activities are taking place, but monitoring remains fragmented and does not yet support consistent, indicator-level tracking across the portfolio.
- III. **Priority Area 3 – Resource Allocation** shows limited progress and includes only two indicators. One relates to the share of gender-related administrative expenditure in the total administrative budget, which is only 0.36%, a very modest proportion. This figure may be lower if some contracts tagged as gender-related are only partially dedicated to gender work. The second indicator concerns project-level gender budgeting; however, this cannot be traced at present. This highlights the need for more specific requirements for AEs, together with stronger reporting provisions on gender budgeting, which are not yet in place.
- IV. **Priority Area 4 – Operational Procedures** show a more uneven pattern. Indicators linked to upstream design and approval requirements, such as the inclusion of gender assessments, costed actions, and gender-related co-benefits, perform relatively well. In contrast, indicators intended to capture outcomes and adaptive results, including quality-of-life improvements, reduced vulnerability, and increased adaptive capacity, as well as the gender audit requirement, show very low levels of verifiable reporting.

Some highlights:

- One-fifth of AEs are non-compliant with gender equality policies and procedures at the accreditation stage.
- Mitigation projects show increasing integration of gender considerations over time.
- The number of AEs requesting readiness support for gender has increased over time.
- Only 24% of participants enrolled in NAP gender training report completing the course.

In conclusion, despite some progress in readiness, as well as in compliance with gender action plans and assessments, overall progress across the indicators appears slow. This may partly reflect weaknesses in the instrument itself, including limitations in indicator formulation and the absence of targets against which progress can be measured. A revised action plan could consider these weaknesses by improving indicator design and introducing clear targets and baselines. This report provides important baseline- and target-related evidence that may not have been available when these indicators were originally formulated.

This report also highlights the need to properly integrate the new GAP within GCF monitoring frameworks and ensure that its indicators are coherently linked within the overall monitoring architecture, including at the project level.

Oversight roles and responsibilities within the GAP are also currently broad and insufficiently specific. Staff and divisions responsible for tracking remain unclear, and lack explicitly assigned accountability, including through relevant requirements in the performance frameworks of divisions



or designated staff. There are indications that the roles and responsibilities within the GAP are not adequately resourced.

Finally, based on this assessment and interviews, the implementation of the GAP lacks adequate budgets commensurate with the resources required to ensure that these indicators are tracked with the necessary level of effort, accuracy and reliability. While the gender policy describes the GAP as an essential, timely, systematic, and accessible planning and management tool intended to fulfil its core function of operationalizing the policy, implementation currently lacks tracking and reporting.

The ongoing independent evaluation of the GCF's approach to gender will further build on these findings, examining these aspects and identifying the underlying factors.
