



PUNCHING BELOW THEIR WEIGHT:

Monitoring the G7 support for adaptation and gender equality



Acknowledgements

This report was written by Sven Harmeling with inputs from Shaughn McArthur, Fanny Petitbon, Tonya Rawe, John Nordbo, and Camilla Schramek. This report was designed by Camilla Schramek.

This analysis was based on the data reported by the G7 to the OECD on their bilateral and multilateral financial support provided to developing countries (Creditor Reporting System). We acknowledge the OECD Secretariat for providing the raw data to CARE. The author takes full responsibility for the results (and their interpretation) which were obtained by analysing the project data according to the OECD adaptation marker and the OECD gender equality policy marker. The OECD itself prepared an analysis in 2016 which shows some similarities and thereby validates the methodological approach taken here. OECD, 2016: Making climate finance work for women: Overview of bilateral ODA to gender and climate change. <http://www.oecd.org/dac/gender-development/Making%20Climate%20Finance%20Work%20for%20Women%20-%20Copy.pdf>

COVER IMAGES

Top: CARE/Christoph Heinrich – Ahead of the 23rd UN climate negotiations taking place on behalf of Fiji in Bonn from November 6th until 17th, CARE participated in one of the largest climate marches Germany has ever seen.

Bottom: CARE/Johanna Mitscherlich – CARE has been working in Tambarawa for many decades, initiated village saving and loan associations, cereal banks and supports people to adapt to climate change

CONTENTS

1 SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS	4
2 KEY FACTS: WHO IN THE G7...	5
3 THE NUMBERS: HOW DO COUNTRIES SCORE	6
4 KEY FINDINGS PER COUNTRY: HOW DO THE G7 COUNTRIES SCORE?	9
5 GOOD PRACTICE IN GENDER EQUALITY AND ADAPTATION FINANCE	11
6 G7 ADAPTATION FINANCE: OVER-REPORTED AND IN DECLINE AFTER PARIS?	15
7 STATISTICAL ANNEX WITH G7 MEMBER DATA	17
8 CITATIONS	25

1. SUMMARY & RECOMMENDATIONS

This report presents, for the first time, a comprehensive analysis of the finance provided by the G7 group, as the main causers of climate change and main providers of climate finance, to developing countries for climate change adaptation and to what extent it promotes gender equality. This analysis is based on the over 16,000 projects in the OECD database supported by the G7 in 2013-2016. The results show that there is an urgent need to increase financial support for climate change adaptation with much stronger gender equality efforts.

Significant climate change impacts can no longer be avoided. The world is already experiencing devastating consequences, particularly in places where extreme weather impacts the living conditions of people living in poverty: Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Latin America and the Pacific Islands. Without urgent and ambitious action – including rapid, inclusive and low- to zero-emission development – climate change could push **100 million more people into extreme poverty by 2030¹, increase food insecurity²** and loss of livelihoods, and **fuel conflict and migration³**. Additionally, the world's poorest people – those who have both contributed the least to greenhouse gas emissions and have the least resources to adapt – are left to foot the climate change bill. The costs of climate change adaptation in developing countries is projected to increase over time, reaching amounts as high as **\$500 billion per year in the 2050s**, according to UN estimates.⁴ The higher the temperature increase will be, the higher will be the costs.

Providing financial support for adaptation to vulnerable developing countries is a core obligation for developed countries, and enshrined in the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Paris Agreement and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Yet, there is just over a year before the 2020 deadline for developed countries to mobilize \$100 billion per year to address the needs of developing countries in confronting climate change, a commitment which is based on the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change and has been reaffirmed through the Paris Agreement and related decisions. Gender inequality is a key driver of vulnerability to climate change impacts and other stressors. Investing in adaptation can promote gender equality, economic growth and stability, in line with the Paris Agreement's Article 7.5 which all governments agreed to. With this report, CARE aims to contribute to raising the ambition in this crucial area for international cooperation, and to identifying who is among the leaders and who lags behind. The analysis also provides the basis for a set of main recommendations.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The G7 must step up public finance for adaptation in developing countries to be at least 3 times 2016 levels by 2020. They must also achieve a 50/50 balance between adaptation and mitigation finance, in particular, by increasing support for projects with the principal adaptation objective (marker 2). Next steps towards these objectives should be announced at relevant G7 meetings and at COP24.
2. G7 countries should increase efforts to promote gender equality through their bilateral climate finance (and well as in multilateral mechanisms) in a recipient-driven manner, so that by 2020 at least 20% of the projects coded as adaptation pursue gender equality as a principal objective (marker 2) and at least 80% as a significant objective (marker 1).
3. All G7 countries should apply a more rigorous coding, where projects marked 2 clearly address the objectives of climate change adaptation and gender equality, respectively. This should also be reflected through more detailed project descriptions
4. To promote good quality adaptation and gender equality approaches, G7 countries must increase support for the implementation of the UNFCCC Gender Action Plan adopted at COP23, particularly through capacity support for integrating gender equality in adaptation actions.

2. KEY FACTS: WHO IN THE G7...

OECD markers for a) gender equality and b) climate change adaptation are used to categorise projects with regard to the relevance of certain objectives : 2 = Principal objective (when fundamental to project design and expected results). 1 = Significant objective (when explicit objective but not principal reason for a project). 0 = not targeted

... SPENT THE MOST ON ADAPTATION FINANCE FROM 2013 - 2016, AND WHO THE LEAST?

😊 For each of the EU institutions, Japan and Germany, the reported adaptation finance totals over USD 2bn, on average, between 2013-2016, if both projects with principal and significant adaptation objectives are accounted for. With regard to the "principal" adaptation projects, France, US and Japan rank the highest respectively.

😞 Italy contributed the least, followed by Canada, to adaptation finance. However, these countries are generally less significant donors as their economies are smaller compared to the rest of the G7.

... RAISED ADAPTATION FINANCE AFTER THE ADOPTION OF THE PARIS AGREEMENT, AND WHO DECREASED ADAPTATION FINANCE?

😊 Canada and the EU institutions show a positive trend with continuous increases since 2014, with the US stepping up in 2016 (under the Obama administration) compared to 2015 (this is unlikely to continue under the Trump administration).

😞 Unfortunately, all other countries show a decline in 2016, with Germany, France, the UK, and Italy staying above 2014 levels and Japan falling below 2013 levels. In 2016, the G7 reported approximately USD 26bn in climate finance, of which only 37% was for adaptation. This should triple and reach 50/50 with mitigation by 2020.

...STEPPED UP GENDER EQUALITY WITHIN ADAPTATION FINANCE IN 2016, AFTER THE PARIS AGREEMENT?

😊 In 2016, all countries except Germany allocated a higher *funding amount* than the 2013-16 average to projects with gender markers 1+2, while France, Germany, UK, US, and EU institutions also had a higher *number* of projects compared to the 4-year average. Positively, this indicates a level of increased attention to gender equality, but this trend must continue.

😞 Germany is the only country which, in 2016, funded adaptation projects coded with a gender equality objective with a smaller amount than its 2013-2016 average.

...DELIVERED THE HIGHEST SHARE OF ADAPTATION FINANCE WITH GENDER EQUALITY OBJECTIVES, AND WHO THE LOWEST?

😊 US (74%), Canada (71%), and Germany (61%) paid the most attention to gender equality (2013-2016 average, funding amount) within projects counted as adaptation. When only the "principal" objective of gender equality is considered, the US (30%), Italy (6.8) and the UK (3.3%) delivered the highest share of gender-equitable adaptation finance.

😞 Based on the 2013-2016 average, Japan (29%) and France (24%) rank the lowest, whereas Italy (36%) and France (29%) rank the lowest for 2016 alone. For the "principal" objective on gender equality (marker 2), the lowest performers on average/in 2016 are France (0.04%/0.1%) and Canada (0.4%/0%).

CAVEAT

There is the need for caution on the OECD coding, as previous analyses on adaptation finance have found a significant level of over-coding, varying by country. Over-coding means, for example, that projects are coded 2 which do not match the ambition of pursuing adaptation and/or gender equality as principal objectives, and similarly for marker 1. This report corroborates those findings, based on an analysis of gender marker 2 coded projects. OECD adaptation numbers also vary from those reported by countries under the UNFCCC reporting mechanism. Thus, using OECD numbers is not an endorsement of donor methodologies. However, the OECD numbers are the only ones which allow for cross-referencing the adaptation and gender equality markers. It is clear that further improvements are needed.

3. THE NUMBERS: HOW DO COUNTRIES SCORE?

Tables 1 and 2 show the main findings for the quantitative analysis of OECD numbers.

Table 1: Gender equality and adaptation finance in 2013-2016, absolute numbers in million USD*

Country	Gender 2	Gender 2 in adaptation projects	Gender marker 2+1	Gender 2+1 in adaptation projects	Total adaptation finance (average)	Adaptation in climate finance (average)	Trend in reported adaptation finance 2016
Canada	1.058	0,4%	179,673	71%	47-252	10/55%	Since 2014 ▲
France	0.303	0,04%	200,438	24%	829-924	32/32%	Below 2015 ▼
Germany	13.167	0,6%	1,343,055	61%	412-2229	7/35%	Below 2015 ▼
Italy	5.978	6,8%	26,014	30%	34-95	17/46%	Below 2015 ▼
Japan	54.855	2,4%	685,869	29%	476-2,370	6/28%	Below 2013 ▼
UK	27.669	3,3%	356,750	42%	211-904	14/54%	Below 2015 ▼
US	238.349	30,1%	585,936	74%	493-792	26/42%	Since 2015 ▲
EU Institutions	38.433	1,7%	1,394,989	60%	391-2,306	9/52%	Since 2014 ▲


Table 2: Gender equality and adaptation finance in 2016, absolute numbers in million USD

Country	Gender 2	Gender 2 in adaptation projects	Gender marker 2+1	Gender 2+1 in adaptation projects	Total OECD marker adaptation finance	Adaptation in reported climate finance	Trend in reported adaptation finance 2016
Canada	0	0%	345.617	69%	149/502	16/54%	Since 2014 ▲
France	1.210	0.1%	312.063	29%	1,064/1,080	35/36%	Below 2015 ▼
Germany	13.662	0.6%	1,226.127	50%	514/2,405	7/31%	Below 2015 ▼
Italy	19.106	29%	42.621	36%	19/66	14/48%	Below 2015 ▼
Japan	0.488	0.03%	969.151	53%	179/1,811	2/20%	Below 2013 ▼
UK	7.985	0.7%	479.529	44%	190/1,077	11/64%	Below 2015 ▼
US	360.846	35%	797.398	42%	1,040/1,045	44/44%	Since 2015 ▲
EU Institutions	111.081	2.8%	3,113.613	74%	757/4,041	10/53%	Since 2014 ▲

* Colours: Green: 2 best performers, yellow: medium; red: 2 lowest performers; for both tables on the adaptation finance columns: Lower number: Adaptation marker 2 only; higher number: adaptation marker 1+2 combined; countries' approaches vary in how they account the finance of adaptation marker 1 projects: Canada: 30%, EU Institutions 40%; France 40%; Germany 50%; Japan 100%; UK and USA: own method by project.


Figure 1 shows the average annual amounts per G7 member plus the EU institutions according to the different marker variations.

Figure 1: Adaptation finance by G7 member (2013-2016 average), based on OECD database




In a **sectoral perspective**, most of the adaptation finance between 2013-2016 was coded for projects in the water supply and sanitation sector (USD 8.5 billion), in agriculture (7.1 billion) and general environment work (USD 6.8 billion). However, when it comes to gender equality, the programmes supported in the agricultural sector seem to be most gender-sensitive among those three, with 9% targeting gender equality as “principal” objective, and 69% as “significant” objective. The support in the sector “Developmental Food Aid/Food Security Assistance” is of lower volume, but with even higher gender equality performance (11% with “principal”, and 80% with “significant” objective).

Figure 2: Ten sectors with most adaptation finance accounted for (2013-2016 total, 1000 USD) based on OECD database



Finally, the **recipient countries perspective** (Figure 3) shows which countries have been allocated most finance coded as adaptation from 2013-2016, and to what extent this targets gender equality objectives. Countries who generally receive a relative large amount of development cooperation also perform high in adaptation finance, which is due at least partially due to the coding system with adaptation marker 1. However figure 3 shows that there are significant differences when it comes to the inclusion of gender equality objectives. Vietnam's finance includes gender equality well below 50%, while the share for India, Ethiopia and Bangladesh is above that.

Figure 3: Ten countries receiving most adaptation finance from G7, and the inclusion of gender equality (2013-2016 totals, 1000 USD), based on OECD database



4. KEY FINDINGS PER COUNTRY: HOW DO THE G7 COUNTRIES' SCORE?

CANADA

Canada's numbers indicate a recent increase in adaptation finance, with a share of over 50% of its climate finance at the highest end of the range. Canada's adaptation portfolio performs best with regard to gender equality over the 2013-2016 average in relative terms, with a low performance in absolute number. While in 2016, Canada's gender-marked adaptation finance ranked above its 4year average, this number did not account for adaptation projects with a principal goal of gender equality. In June 2017, the Government of Canada launched its Feminist International Assistance Policy which, amongst other things, intends to support women's leadership in climate action and ensure that Canada's climate finance and overall plans acknowledge the particular challenges faced by women and girls. Holding the Presidency of the G7 in 2018, Canada supported the adoption of political commitments related to enhancing and financing adaptive capacity, such as gender-responsive disaster risk financing and insurance in vulnerable developing countries.

FRANCE

After an increase in adaptation funding through 2015, 2016 saw a disappointing decrease in absolute numbers, with adaptation finance consisting of only a third or less of overall climate finance. With regard to the role of gender equality in adaptation funding, France performs low across most parameters analysed. France counts almost all adaptation finance as marker 2 which seems questionable. In March 2018, the Government of France launched its International Strategy for Equality between women and men which, amongst others, aims at ensuring that climate funding contributes to women's empowerment, without, however, setting specific financial targets. It is encouraging that the AFD has recently started to systematically screen all projects funded through a sustainable development marker (resilience to climate, gender quality, good governance), but the new € 30 million funding facility "Adapt'Action" does not pay specific attention to gender equality.

GERMANY

Germany's adaptation funding decreased in 2016 and is significantly lower than 50% of all OECD-accounted climate finance. Germany has one of the highest total amounts of funding allocated to adaptation projects which promote gender equality, and ranks high, overall, regarding the number of projects supported with gender equality objectives. In 2014, Germany adopted a cross-sectoral strategy for its development policy, promoting the commitment to "apply a gender perspective to all measures and at all political levels."⁵ A recent study of Germany's adaptation finance concluded that there are still significant gaps in integrating gender.⁶

ITALY

Italy's adaptation funding remains at relatively low, with an exceptional peak in 2015, but with a relatively high share close to 50% at the upper end of the range. With regard to gender-equitable adaptation finance, the country performs low across almost all indicators. Italy organised the first G7 Ministerial on Gender in 2017 which also adopted a gender roadmap for a gender-responsive economic environment.

JAPAN

Japan's OECD reported adaptation finance declined below 2013 levels in 2016, the most significant decline among all G7 countries and the EU. The share in climate finance is less than a fourth. Japan's performance is low with regard to gender equality in adaptation, with the exception of absolute numbers in which they are one of the largest climate finance donors. In 2016, the Government of Japan approved a "Development Strategy for Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment" which also addresses climate change.⁷

UNITED KINGDOM

The UK's reported adaptation finance has decreased in 2016 compared to previous years, but with a relatively high share compared to the UK's mitigation finance reported under the OECD. With regard to gender equality in adaptation finance, the UK performance lands in the middle compared to the rest of the G7. The government's Department for International Development launched in early 2018 its new "Strategic Vision for Gender Equality: Her Potential, Our Future" which includes the commitment to integrate gender equality "in all our work across the board and track delivery through to results", including in the area of climate change.⁸

UNITED STATES

The US significantly increased its reported adaptation finance in 2016, with a relatively high share of overall climate finance, though still less than 50%. The US is among the highest performers in regards to promoting gender equality in adaptation finance, with the highest overall share in 2013-2016. However, the analysis of projects marked as gender equality 2 raises some doubts on the quality of the coding. In 2012, the US Agency for International Development adopted a new Gender and Women's Empowerment Policy. This strategy informed the integration of gender into the Agency's 2012-2018 Climate Change Strategy, which includes a call for all programming to use gender-sensitive approaches.

EUROPEAN UNION (G7 OBSERVER)

The EU is the highest overall adaptation finance provider with a strong increase in recent years. It also provides the most in absolute finance for adaptation projects which incorporate gender equality objectives, however. In 2015, the EU adopted the EU Gender Action Plan (2016-2020)⁹ followed by the European Consensus on Development (2017), which has climate change as a core area of work and which highlights the EU's commitment to promote gender equality "as a priority across all areas of action."¹⁰

5. GOOD PRACTICE IN GENDER EQUALITY AND ADAPTATION FINANCE

The OECD tracks aid in support of gender equality and women's rights using the **Development Assistance Committee (DAC) gender equality policy marker** – a qualitative statistical tool to record aid activities that target gender equality as a policy objective. The gender equality policy marker is used by DAC members as part of the annual reporting of their aid activities to the DAC to indicate whether each aid activity targets gender equality as a policy objective.

Table 3: Description of the OECD adaptation and gender equality policy marker
Based on OECD database

	OECD Adaptation Marker ¹¹	OECD Gender Equality Policy Marker
Principal (Marker 2)	When the adaptation objective is explicitly stated as fundamental in the design of, or the motivation for, the activity. Promoting the adaptation objective will thus be stated in the activity documentation as one of the principal reasons for undertaking it. In other words, the activity would not have been funded (or designed that way) but for that objective.	Gender equality is the main objective of the project/programme and is fundamental to its design and expected results. The project/programme would not have been undertaken without this objective.
Significant (Marker 1)	When the adaptation objective is explicitly stated but it is not the fundamental driver or motivation for undertaking the activity. Instead, the activity has other prime objectives but has been formulated or adjusted to help meet the relevant climate concerns.	Gender equality is an important and deliberate objective, but not the principal reason for undertaking the project/programme.
Not Targeted (Marker 0)	The activity was examined but found not to target the adaptation objective in any significant way.	The project/programme has been screened against the gender marker but has not been found to target gender equality.

Per se the OECD markers are not a tool to evaluate the good practice of such projects, but focuses on whether the projects coded pursue those objectives. As stated above, the experience from other analyses of OECD data is that a closer look is necessary.¹² If there is only a title or two-line description for a project, it is hard to judge to what extent it meets the coded objectives. By contrast, if a project is marked both adaptation 2 and gender 2, and the short description mentions neither climate change adaptation nor gender equality (or related concepts), it suggests that the project may be given a higher significance for these issues than seems to be justified, which is also called “over-coding”. A lower coding (e.g. 1) might be more appropriate.

Based on our programmatic experience from hundreds of projects, CARE has, over the last years, developed its own perspective on key parameters for high quality approaches with regard to adaptation, as well as gender equality (see Table 4). Gender equality refers to the equal enjoyment by women, girls, men and boys of rights, opportunities, resources and rewards. Women's empowerment is one critical aspect of working towards gender equality. Equality does not mean that women and men are the same but that their enjoyment of rights, opportunities and life chances does not depend on whether they were born male or female.¹³ CARE's Gender Equality Framework builds on three pillars: building agency, changing relations and transforming structures.

Table 4: CARE's perspective on adaptation good practice and gender equality good practice

ADAPTATION GOOD PRACTICE ¹⁴	GENDER EQUALITY GOOD PRACTICE ¹⁵
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Analyse climate risks, differential vulnerability and capacity of people, ecosystems and institutions 2. Ensure participation, agency, transparency and inclusion of all groups 3. Incorporate management of uncertainty and use of climate information 4. Promote anticipatory, flexible and forward-looking adaptation planning and decision making processes 5. Promote innovation, local (including traditional and indigenous) knowledge and technology 6. Ensure an integrated and holistic response with adaptive management of climate-related risks and impacts over time 7. Establish institutional arrangements and linkages which facilitate multi-stakeholder engagement 8. Integrate learning, capacity building, monitoring and knowledge management processes 9. Support ongoing and sustainable adaptation at scale 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A project intervention's relationship to gender roles and relations (working with or challenging existing roles and relations) 2. Gender analysis is the systematic attempt to identify key issues contributing to gender inequality 3. Adapted programming and specific gender activities to advance gender equality: agency, structure, relation 4. Participation in project processes: transparent information sharing; involvement in decision-making; responsive accountability mechanism 5. Monitoring and evaluation systems: Sex and age disaggregated data; protection risks and needs; analysis of unintended consequences; monitoring changing gender roles and relations

Box 1 highlights examples of key approaches in CARE's climate resilience work in the Asia-Pacific region, to illustrate concrete measures that can be undertaken to give strong attention to gender equality within climate change adaptation projects.

Box 1: CARE's gender equality and climate resilience work in the Asia-Pacific

CARE Australia has been working with communities in the Asia-Pacific region for over three decades, supporting women, their families, and local communities to build their capacities to prepare, adapt and respond to disasters and climate change. A recently developed report¹⁶ culminates desk- and field-based research across six of CARE Australia's country programs – Cambodia, Laos, Papua New Guinea, Timor Leste, Vanuatu, and Vietnam.

CARE has sought to better understand how gender and other factors intersect to influence people's vulnerability and capacity through a range of approaches and tools, including: the Gender Equality Framework (GEF); the Community Based Adaptation (CBA) Framework; gender and power analyses; climate risk, vulnerability and capacity analyses (CVCA); inclusive planning; and monitoring change from a gender perspective. Through the use of tools and approaches, CARE has been better able to recognise the different ways in which women, girls, and boys are exposed and sensitive to different risks, shocks and stresses. As a result, CARE has designed and implemented projects that are closer to the gender-responsive and gender-transformative objectives of the Gender Program Continuum.

CARE has helped build the **agency of women and girls** through building awareness and skills and creating structured space for critical self-reflection with key actors. For example, in **Timor Leste**, CARE designed and implemented dedicated training on sustainable agricultural techniques and home gardening, and supported the application of climate-resilient crops, sustainable water and land management practices, and risk mitigation, specifically for women. As a result, female members of farmer groups have increased knowledge, skills and confidence to apply sustainable techniques to mitigate risk.


CARE has changed the **power relations** through which people live their lives, building solidarity and leadership amongst women and girls, and synchronising approaches to engage men and boys. For example, in **Papua New Guinea**, core group members of a community-based adaptation project were designed to ensure equal representation from women, with members receiving training not only on technical aspects of the project, but also on leadership and gender equality. This helped members, particularly women, to gain influence at the household and community level.

CARE has **transformed structures**, such as social norms and policies, by working on service delivery with government and other actors; supporting alliances and movements for social change; and advocating for policy change. For example, in **Vietnam**, CARE's community-based adaptation project worked closely with the Women's Union to strengthen women's role in local governance structures and broaden their skills and expertise in climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction. As a result, the Women's Union gained capacity and expanded. In **Vanuatu**, a similar program was able to influence government policy by contributing to key policies, mobilising civil society involvement in the consultation process, participation of women on policy steering committees, and gaining responsibility to draft specific sections of policies.

6. G7 ADAPTATION FINANCE: OVER-REPORTED AND IN DECLINE AFTER PARIS?

It is concerning that the OECD marker numbers do not show a clear trend of increased funding for adaptation (figure 1). The opposite is true for various countries. France, Germany, Italy, Japan and the UK decreased their adaptation funding in 2016, after COP21. The decrease of Japan's adaptation funding, according to the OECD reporting is the most significant as it also fell below 2013 levels. In contrast, both the EU institutions and Canada consistently increased their adaptation finance since 2014, whereas the US raised investment in adaptation after a dip in 2015.

Figure 4: Reported adaptation finance 2013-2016, based on OECD data



The larger proportion of mitigation compared to adaptation finance is reason to demand increased investment in adaptation. Table 5 shows calculations of the division between mitigation and adaptation finance. This analysis focused on the detailed OECD data complements Oxfam's recent findings in the 2018 Climate Finance Shadow Report, which focused on the countries' official climate finance reporting to the UNFCCC (which missed the US 2015-16 report as this was not officially submitted). The detailed OECD numbers for 2016 were not available then.¹⁷ Both sets of numbers cannot be compared directly. It is clear that most of the G7 countries have an imbalance in investment, with many more resources spent on mitigation.

Table 5: The share of adaptation and mitigation finance show a large imbalance for most G7 countries, based on OECD and Oxfam 2018 data

Country	2015-2016 adaptation finance in overall OECD-marked climate finance		Adaptation in 2015-2016 UNFCCC climate finance reports ¹⁸	
	Adaptation principal	Adaptation principal + significant	Adaptation only	Adaptation + 50% cross-cutting
Canada	11% (\$76m)	57% (\$383m)	35% (\$41 m)	65% (\$75m)
France	33% (\$1.1bn)	33% (\$1.1bn)	17% (\$552m)	25% (\$805m)
Germany	7% (\$480m)	35% (2.4bn)	15% (\$927m)	20% (\$1.24bn)
Italy	20% (\$61m)	48% (\$142m)	N/A	N/A
Japan	3% (\$265m)	26% (\$2.5bn)	8% (\$803m)	10% (\$1bn)
UK	10% (\$232m)	58% (\$1.4bn)	21% (\$343m)	49% (\$819m)
US	37% (\$663m)	46% (\$819m)	3rd biennial report not submitted	
EU Institutions (excl. EIB)	9% (\$546)	53% (\$3.2bn)	23% (\$1.1bn)	30% (\$1.4bn)

It is only when both the OECD adaptation markers 2 and 1 are summed that a few countries approach or exceed a 50% adaptation share. However, various past reports have raised doubts on the accuracy of the coding, particularly regarding adaptation, and that many projects have been coded with a questionably strong adaptation component. This falls into a broader discussion on accounting and transparency practice which is significant amongst negotiators at the UNFCCC and practitioners at the OECD. For example, in a 2016 report that analysed 2012 data, all countries except Canada had more than half of their projects labelled as adaptation re-categorised to not being adaptation; insufficient data was available to include the USA in this analysis.¹⁹ In an analysis on the transparency of climate finance reports submitted under the UNFCCC, Germany, Japan and EU Institutions ranked best among the G7, and Canada and Italy worst.²⁰

Similarly, Oxfam estimated that only 20-50% of the finance reported as climate finance is sufficiently relevant to “deserve” this label. This adds to the findings of other analyses that have also found a significant level of overcoding resulting in de facto lower levels of adaptation support.²¹ Among the reasons for this over-coding, and the difficulty of assessing the appropriateness of the coding provided by donors, is incomplete information – even in the official OECD data tables, donors provide differing levels of detail on the projects’ objectives and activities.

For the purpose of this report, it was not possible to undertake a detailed analysis of all of the 16,000+ projects and their descriptions of objectives. Thus, we cannot provide a full update on the accounting practice. The analysis of the projects coded in 2016, however, confirm the doubts raised by other reports (see box 2).

Box 2: High adaptation and gender equality projects: a case of over-coding?

This box summarises the analysis of the largest projects and initiatives, by funding, which are labelled 2 for both adaptation and gender markers. We would expect that both adaptation and gender equality objectives are clearly stated in the project descriptions. This is both to showcase projects as well as assesses the adequacy of the rating based on the donor-provided information and data in the OECD system. Overall, there is strong indication that G7 countries are significantly over-coded for those projects reviewed here. Italy and Japan are left out of this summary due to insignificance of the size of funding that is marked 2 both in adaptation and gender equality.

CANADA

The single largest Canadian initiative with both markers 2 is the “African Climate Change fellowship program phase III (ca. USD 1 million, 2014)” by the Economic Commission for Africa, pursuing activities on “research, and training opportunities to African professionals, researchers, and graduate students.” The project description, however, does not mention gender equality or a specific focus on women which raises questions about the appropriateness of gender marker 2. In contrast, the South Asian Water Fellowships (the 2nd largest Canadian initiative) target 80% women participants and seems appropriately coded.

FRANCE

Judging France's coding is particularly challenging. The information provided in the OECD dataset is very short and vague. Among the programmes funded by France with both markers coded 2, none have either a focus on adaptation and/or on gender equality. The projects address multi-sectoral issues, water, and agriculture without further explanation. Moreover, France makes no use of the adaptation marker 1, in contrast to its mitigation coding. These findings suggests clear over-coding.

GERMANY

Only one of the German-funded projects (the 5th largest) claiming to meet both the gender-2 and adaptation-2 marker reveals an explicit focus on women and gender equality, which is the 2015, USD 0.672 million project aimed at promoting the economic empowerment of rural women farmers. the 6th largest project explicitly aims at building adaptive capacities to climate change. Three of the four projects with higher funding amounts take place in the area of agriculture and food security, only one project's description mentions specifically climate change. Therefore, it must be assumed that at least some of Germany's projects are over-coded.

UK

The largest project coded as 2 in both adaptation and gender equality is an initiative to scale-up disaster risk reduction in climate change adaptation, with USD 34 million, covering South-Saharan African countries. It aims to assist 10 million people, especially women and children. This project seems to be appropriately coded as principal adaptation and gender equality.

USA

Under the adaptation 2 and gender 2 markers, the US provided a number of CGIAR funded research grants with the World Bank totalling more than 200 million USD over the four years and covering various countries. According to the OECD description, these grants are dedicated to “reducing rural poverty, increasing food security, improving human health and nutrition, and ensuring sustainable management of natural resources.” While CGIAR research often pays attention to gender issues, the project description mentions neither climate change adaptation nor gender equality. Thus, this programme appears over-coded: A marker of 1 for both aspects seems more appropriate. Additionally, the second largest initiative – Evidence to Action – appears over-coded. This initiative focused on the important issues of family planning and maternal and child health, with an overall amount of approximately 70 million USD (2016) covering various countries. There is no indication that this has any specific climate change adaptation approach or considers climate change risks. Thus, even an adaptation marker of 1 might be inappropriate.

This analysis is sufficiently valid to not call those countries with the highest numbers “champions.” Instead, there is more work needed on transparency, information provided, and credible accounting.

7. STATISTICAL ANNEX

WITH COUNTRY-SPECIFIC ANALYSES

CANADA

Analysis by number of projects

Adaptation Marker	Gender Marker	2013	2014	2015	2016	2013-2016 average	2013-2016 share in overall projects (%)
2	2	4	2	4	0	2.5	2.54
	1	56	72	15	52	48.75	49.49
	0	64	59	36	30	47.25	47.97
	SUM	124.00	133.00	55.00	82.00	98.50	
1	2	2	0	1	0	0.75	0.45
	1	86	139	245	80	137.5	82.46
	0	24	28	33	29	28.5	17.09
	SUM	112.00	167.00	279.00	109.00	166.75	
1+2	SUM Gender 2	6.00	2.00	5.00	0.00	3.25	1.23
	SUM Gender 1	142.00	211.00	260.00	132.00	186.25	70.22

Analysis by funding allocated to projects (in 1000 USD)

Adaptation Marker	Gender Marker	2013	2014	2015	2016	2013-2016 average	2013-2016 share in overall projects (%)
2	2	748.39	999.74	941.61	0.00	672.43	1.42
	1	18,543.68	6,307.34	332.99	141,980.84	41,791.21	88.00
	0	6,064.77	4,911.65	1,923.89	7,210.27	5,027.65	10.59
	SUM	25,356.84	12,218.73	3,198.49	149,191.11	47,491.29	
1	2	1,534.85	0.00	7.28	0.00	385.53	0.19
	1	42,097.79	82,181.25	219,380.17	203,636.58	136,823.95	66.74
	0	65,437.39	13,878.47	42,277.25	149,657.09	67,812.55	33.08
	SUM	109,070.03	96,059.72	261,664.70	353,293.66	205,022.03	
1+2	SUM Gender 2	2,283.24	999.74	948.89	0.00	1,057.97	0.42
	SUM Gender 1	60,641.48	88,488.59	219,713.16	345,617.42	178,615.16	70.73

FRANCE

Analysis by number of projects

Adaptation Marker	Gender Marker	2013	2014	2015	2016	2013-2016 average	2013-2016 share in overall projects (%)
2	2	0	0	0	31	7.75	11.70
	1	3	5	9	60	19.25	29.06
	0	9	66	30	52	39.25	59.25
	SUM	12.00	71.00	39.00	143.00	66.25	
1	2	0	0	0	51	12.75	12.41
	1	0	0	5	186	47.75	46.47
	0	0	107	3	59	42.25	41.12
	SUM	0.00	107.00	8.00	296.00	102.75	
1+2	SUM Gender 2	0.00	0.00	0.00	82.00	20.50	12.13
	SUM Gender 1	3.00	5.00	14.00	246.00	67.00	39.64

Analysis by funding allocated to projects (in 1000 USD)

Adaptation Marker	Gender Marker	2013	2014	2015	2016	2013-2016 average	2013-2016 share in overall projects (%)
2	2	0.00	0.00	0.00	452.28	113.07	0.01
	1	45,739.83	195,905.22	247,842.57	302,273.47	197,940.27	23.88
	0	14,117.32	792,009.25	957,044.32	760,455.60	630,906.62	76.11
	SUM	59,857.16	987,914.47	1,204,886.89	1,063,181.36	828,959.97	
1	2	0.00	0.00	0.00	758.60	189.65	3.72
	1	0.00	0.00	200.92	8,578.38	2,194.83	43.04
	0	0.00	4,454.17	500.65	5,905.45	2,715.07	53.24
	SUM	0.00	4,454.17	701.57	15,242.43	5,099.54	
1+2	SUM Gender 2	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,210.88	302.72	0.04
	SUM Gender 1	45,739.83	195,905.22	248,043.50	310,851.85	200,135.10	24.00

GERMANY

Analysis by number of projects

Adaptation Marker	Gender Marker	2013	2014	2015	2016	2013-2016 average	2013-2016 share in overall projects (%)
2	2	6	4	7	6	5.75	3.65
	1	122	100	85	76	95.75	60.70
	0	41	44	55	85	56.25	35.66
	SUM	169.00	148.00	147.00	167.00	157.75	
1	2	16	17	16	20	17.25	3.37
	1	270	350	312	378	327.5	63.93
	0	106	154	185	225	167.5	32.70
	SUM	392.00	521.00	513.00	623.00	512.25	
1+2	SUM Gender 2	22.00	21.00	23.00	26.00	23.00	3.43
	SUM Gender 1	392.00	450.00	397.00	454.00	423.25	63.17

Analysis by funding allocated to projects (in 1000 USD)

Adaptation Marker	Gender Marker	2013	2014	2015	2016	2013-2016 average	2013-2016 share in overall projects (%)
2	2	2,231.70	844.73	5502.18	2,104.91	2,670.88	0.65
	1	268,199.00	260,619.69	284,378.56	145,786.73	239,745.99	58.08
	0	96,079.23	131,261.77	121,726.72	332,545.26	170,403.25	41.28
	SUM	366,509.93	392,726.19	411,607.46	480,436.91	412,820.12	
1	2	17,331.83	6,144.17	6,951.32	11,557.01	10,496.08	0.59
	1	690,448.67	1,229,903.60	1,373,537.04	1,066,677.95	1,090,141.82	60.98
	0	488,325.95	749,486.91	700,281.20	809,636.95	686,932.75	38.43
	SUM	1,196,106.46	1,985,534.68	2,080,769.56	1,887,871.90	1,787,570.65	
1+2	SUM Gender 2	19,563.53	6,988.90	12,453.50	13,661.92	13,166.96	0.60
	SUM Gender 1	958,647.67	1,490,523.28	1,657,915.60	1,212,464.68	1,329,887.81	60.44

ITALY

Analysis by number of projects

Adaptation Marker	Gender Marker	2013	2014	2015	2016	2013-2016 average	2013-2016 share in overall projects (%)
2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
	1	2	5	7	9	5.75	17.04
	0	11	15	60	26	28	82.96
	SUM	13.00	20.00	67.00	35.00	33.75	
1	2	0	4	7	5	4	3.05
	1	41	45	41	26	38.25	29.14
	0	76	56	132	92	89	67.81
	SUM	117.00	105.00	180.00	123.00	131.25	
1+2	SUM Gender 2	0.00	4.00	7.00	5.00	4.00	2.42
	SUM Gender 1	43.00	50.00	48.00	35.00	44.00	26.67

Analysis by funding allocated to projects (in 1000 USD)

Adaptation Marker	Gender Marker	2013	2014	2015	2016	2013-2016 average	2013-2016 share in overall projects (%)
2	2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	1	720.44	469.94	5,136.62	12,478.05	4,701.26	13.78
	0	9,846.29	2,569.35	98,194.58	7,053.43	29,415.91	86.22
	SUM	10,566.73	3,039.29	103,331.20	19,531.47	34,117.17	
1	2	0.00	1,685.41	3,119.68	19,105.61	5,977.68	11.19
	1	18,325.02	9,305.75	22,673.91	11,037.31	15,335.50	28.71
	0	14,347.09	8,786.44	88,911.52	16,395.94	32,110.25	60.11
	SUM	32,672.11	19,777.60	114,705.11	46,538.85	53,423.42	
1+2	SUM Gender 2	0.00	1,685.41	3,119.68	19,105.61	5,977.68	6.83
	SUM Gender 1	19,045.46	9,775.69	27,810.54	23,515.35	20,036.76	22.89

JAPAN

Analysis by number of projects

Adaptation Marker	Gender Marker	2013	2014	2015	2016	2013-2016 average	2013-2016 share in overall projects (%)
2	2	1	0	1	0	0.5	0.62
	1	18	13	36	11	19.5	24.22
	0	65	78	53	46	60.5	75.16
	SUM	84.00	91.00	90.00	57.00	80.50	
1	2	29	23	0	2	13.5	6.66
	1	77	52	55	53	59.25	29.22
	0	147	161	118	94	130	64.12
	SUM	253.00	236.00	173.00	149.00	202.75	
1+2	SUM Gender 2	30.00	23.00	1.00	2.00	14.00	4.94
	SUM Gender 1	95.00	65.00	91.00	64.00	78.75	27.80

Analysis by funding allocated to projects (in 1000 USD)

Adaptation Marker	Gender Marker	2013	2014	2015	2016	2013-2016 average	2013-2016 share in overall projects (%)
2	2	77.57	0.00	83.61	0.00	40.29	0.01
	1	179,168.53	13,054.19	10,785.27	49,118.27	63,031.56	13.24
	0	528,195.34	762,379.36	233,541.07	128,436.94	413,138.18	86.76
	SUM	707,441.44	775,433.55	244,409.95	177,555.20	476,210.04	
1	2	147,679.63	71,092.66	0.00	487.97	54,815.06	2.97
	1	352,380.45	167,220.24	832,783.04	919,545.18	567,982.23	30.73
	0	848,634.61	1,298,849.33	2,082,159.13	671,967.95	1,225,402.75	66.30
	SUM	1,348,694.69	1,537,162.22	2,914,942.16	1,592,001.10	1,848,200.04	
1+2	SUM Gender 2	147,757.20	71,092.66	83.61	487.97	54,855.36	2.36
	SUM Gender 1	531,548.97	180,274.42	843,568.30	968,663.45	631,013.79	27.15

UNITED KINGDOM

Analysis by number of projects

Adaptation Marker	Gender Marker	2013	2014	2015	2016	2013-2016 average	2013-2016 share in overall projects in %
2	2	2	0	5	0	1.75	1.98
	1	35	56	36	26	38.25	43.34
	0	48	43	53	49	48.25	54.67
	SUM	85.00	99.00	94.00	75.00	88.25	
1	2	5	5	10	5	6.25	4.81
	1	58	25	98	100	70.25	54.04
	0	27	22	73	92	53.5	41.15
	SUM	90.00	52.00	181.00	197.00	130.00	
1+2	SUM Gender 2	7.00	5.00	15.00	5.00	8.00	3.67
	SUM Gender 1	93.00	81.00	134.00	126.00	108.50	49.71

Analysis by funding allocated to projects (in 1000 USD)

Adaptation Marker	Gender Marker	2013	2014	2015	2016	2013-2016 average	2013-2016 share in overall projects in %
2	2	1,275.60	0.00	39,716.13	0.00	10,247.93	4.84
	1	109,286.80	112,472.02	45,614.13	40,852.12	77,056.27	36.39
	0	56,702.70	173,493.73	118,095.12	149,609.28	124,475.21	58.78
	SUM	167,265.10	285,965.75	203,425.38	190,461.40	211,779.41	
1	2	31,522.53	13,106.41	17,073.86	7,984.74	17,421.89	2.74
	1	134,660.27	54,482.24	388,261.20	430,692.56	252,024.07	39.59
	0	25,627.18	34,980.04	959,411.69	448,366.41	367,096.33	57.67
	SUM	191,809.99	102,568.69	1,364,746.75	887,043.71	636,542.28	
1+2	SUM Gender 2	32,798.14	13,106.41	56,789.99	7,984.74	27,669.82	3.26
	SUM Gender 1	243,947.07	166,954.26	433,875.33	471,544.68	329,080.34	38.79

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Analysis by number of projects

Adaptation Marker	Gender Marker	2013	2014	2015	2016	2013-2016 average	2013-2016 share in overall projects in %
2	2	57	101	96	217	117.75	27.21
	1	58	70	70	323	130.25	30.10
	0	100	154	190	295	184.75	42.69
	SUM	215.00	325.00	356.00	835.00	432.75	
1	2	39	65	17	0	30.25	18.50
	1	75	137	105	0	79.25	48.47
	0	65	106	39	6	54	33.03
	SUM	179.00	308.00	161.00	6.00	163.50	
1+2	SUM Gender 2	96.00	166.00	113.00	217.00	148.00	24.82
	SUM Gender 1	133.00	207.00	175.00	323.00	209.50	35.14

Analysis by funding allocated to projects (in 1000 USD)

Adaptation Marker	Gender Marker	2013	2014	2015	2016	2013-2016 average	Share in overall projects in %
2	2	41,653.56	57,710.35	54,301.54	360,846.15	128,627.90	26.08
	1	112,932.76	144,968.64	89,587.19	436,551.90	196,010.12	39.74
	0	95,189.67	194,867.03	141,588.81	242,955.38	168,650.22	34.19
	SUM	249,775.99	397,546.02	285,477.54	1,040,353.42	493,288.24	
1	2	99,487.91	285,162.10	54,234.25	0.00	109,721.06	36.78
	1	219,154.19	171,630.55	215,523.82	0.00	151,577.14	50.80
	0	33,735.03	71,709.64	37,930.73	4,852.64	37,057.01	12.42
	SUM	352,377.13	528,502.29	307,688.80	4,852.64	298,355.21	
1+2	SUM Gender 2	141,141.47	342,872.45	108,535.79	360,846.15	238,348.96	30.11
	SUM Gender 1	332,086.95	316,599.19	305,111.01	436,551.90	347,587.26	43.19

EUROPEAN UNION INSTITUTIONS

Analysis by number of projects

Adaptation Marker	Gender Marker	2013	2014	2015	2016	2013-2016 average	2013-2016 share in overall projects in %
2	2	1	0	2	0	0.75	2.73
	1	6	3	10	21	10	36.36
	0	25	7	18	17	16.75	60.91
	SUM	32.00	10.00	30.00	38.00	27.50	
1	2	1	1	2	3	1.75	2.34
	1	25	9	50	57	35.25	47.16
	0	35	30	49	37	37.75	50.50
	SUM	61.00	40.00	101.00	97.00	74.75	
1+2	SUM Gender 2	2.00	1.00	4.00	3.00	2.50	2.44
	SUM Gender 1	31.00	12.00	60.00	78.00	45.25	44.25

Analysis by funding allocated to projects (in 1000 USD)

Adaptation Marker	Gender Marker	2013	2014	2015	2016	2013-2016 average	2013-2016 Share in overall projects in %
2	2	1,117.43	0.00	22,290.68	0.00	5.852.03	1.49
	1	49,684.08	86,904.88	143,547.72	571,934.09	213.017.69	54.39
	0	288,285.80	48,514.23	168,567.63	185,607.63	172.743.82	44.11
	SUM	339,087.31	135,419.11	334,406.02	757,541.72	391.613.54	
1	2	10,262.10	0.30	8,981.11	111,081.08	32.581.15	1.70
	1	784,809.82	146,969.82	1,211,775.79	2,430,598.08	1,143.538.38	59.74
	0	548,532.54	770,363.00	891,581.41	741,347.43	737.956.09	38.55
	SUM	1,343,604.46	917,333.12	2,112,338.31	3,283,026.58	1,914.075.62	
1+2	SUM Gender 2	11,379.53	0.30	31,271.78	111,081.08	38.433.17	1.67
	SUM Gender 1	834,493.90	233,874.69	1,355,323.51	3,002,532.17	1,356.556.07	58.84

CITATIONS

- ¹ World Bank, 2015: Shock waves – Managing the impacts of climate change on poverty. <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/22787/9781464806735.pdf>
- ² FAO, 2017: World hunger again on the rise, driven by conflict and climate change, new UN report says. <http://www.fao.org/news/story/en/item/1037253/icode/>
- ³ CARE, 2016: Fleeing Climate Change: Impacts on Migration and Displacement. <https://careclimatechange.org/publications/fleeing-climate-change-impacts-migration-displacement/>
- ⁴ UNEP, 2016: The Adaptation Gap Report. <http://climateanalytics.org/files/agr2016.pdf>
- ⁵ BMZ, 2014: Gender Equality in German Development Policy. Cross-sectoral strategy. https://www.bmz.de/en/publications/type_of_publication/strategies/Strategiepapier340_02_2014.pdf
- ⁶ Lottje, C., 2017: Anpassung an den Klimawandel: Wie gut unterstützt Deutschland die Entwicklungsländer? (Adaptation to climate change: how well does Germany support developing countries). <http://www.deutscheklimafinanzierung.de/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/Analyse77-Finanzierung-Anpassung.pdf> Bread for the World, Heinrich Boell Foundation, CARE, Germanwatch, Oxfam.
- ⁷ Government of Japan, 2016: Development Strategy for Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment. <https://www.mofa.go.jp/files/000178748.pdf> It explicitly recognises that climate change and natural disasters (among other factors) makes the environment surrounding women severer, and that development policy "has come to be further required in response to such changes".
- ⁸ DfID, 2018: DFID Strategic Vision for Gender Equality: Her Potential, Our Future. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/dfid-strategic-vision-for-gender-equality-her-potential-our-future>
- ⁹ EU, 2015: Council Conclusions on the Gender Action Plan 2016-2020. <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/media/24467/st13201-en15.pdf>
- ¹⁰ EU, 2017: European Consensus on Development. https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/sites/devco/files/european-consensus-on-development-final-20170626_en.pdf
- ¹¹ OECD: OECD DAC Rio Markers for Climate. https://www.oecd.org/dac/environment-development/Revised%20climate%20marker%20handbook_FINAL.pdf
- ¹² Adaptation Watch, 2015: Toward Mutual Accountability: The 2015 Adaptation Finance Transparency Gap Report. http://www.adaptationwatch.org/s/AW_Report_24-11-15-53nq.pdf ; ActAlliance, 2018: An analysis of the Climate Finance Reporting of the European Union. <https://actalliance.eu/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/Analysis-of-the-climate-finance-reporting-of-the-EU.pdf> ; Lottje, C., 2017: Anpassung an den Klimawandel: Wie gut unterstützt Deutschland die Entwicklungsländer? (Adaptation to climate change: how well does Germany support developing countries). <http://www.deutscheklimafinanzierung.de/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/Analyse77-Finanzierung-Anpassung.pdf> Bread for the World, Heinrich Boell Foundation, CARE, Germanwatch, Oxfam.
- ¹³ CARE, 2014: Tackling the double injustice of climate change and gender inequality. https://careclimatechange.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/Double_Injustice.pdf
- ¹⁴ CARE, 2016: Adaptation Good Practice Checklist. <https://careclimatechange.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/Adaptation-Good-Practice-Checklist.pdf>
- ¹⁵ <http://gender.care2share.wikispaces.net/file/view/CARE+Gender+Marker+Guidance.pdf>
- ¹⁶ CARE, 2018: Enhancing Resilience through Gender Equality. Gender equality and women's voice in Asia-Pacific resilience programming. Research report. https://careclimatechange.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/REPORT_Gender_Equality_Enhancing_Resilience.pdf
- ¹⁷ Oxfam, 2018: 2018 Climate Finance Shadow Report. Assessing progress towards the \$100 billion commitment. <https://www.oxfam.org/en/research/climate-finance-shadow-report-2018>
- ¹⁸ Extracted from Oxfam 2018 (ibid.)
- ¹⁹ Adaptation Watch, 2015: Toward Mutual Accountability: The 2015 Adaptation Finance Transparency Gap Report. http://www.adaptationwatch.org/s/AW_Report_24-11-15-53nq.pdf
- ²⁰ Adaptation Watch, 2016: Towards Transparency: The 2016 Adaptation Finance Transparency Gap Report. <http://www.adaptationwatch.org/s/Adaptation-Watch-Report-2016-Digital-FIN.pdf>
- ²¹ See sources in endnote XI



Founded in 1945, CARE International works around the globe to save lives, defeat poverty and achieve social justice. We put women and girls in the centre because we know that we cannot overcome poverty until all people have equal rights and opportunities. CARE International works in 93 countries around the world to assist more than 63 million people improve basic health and education, fight hunger, increase access to clean water and sanitation, expand economic opportunity, confront climate change, and recover from disasters.

To learn more, visit: www.careclimatechange.org