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## Abbreviations and Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADB</td>
<td>Asian Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AfDB</td>
<td>African Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIIB</td>
<td>Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOTAS</td>
<td>Petroleum Pipeline Corporation of Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP</td>
<td>British Petroleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRICS</td>
<td>Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAREC</td>
<td>Central Asia Regional Economic Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDAW</td>
<td>Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EaDB</td>
<td>Eurasian Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBRD</td>
<td>European Bank for Reconstruction and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGC</td>
<td>Essential Gender Checklist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIB</td>
<td>European Investment Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESMF</td>
<td>Environmental and Social Management Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESMP</td>
<td>Environmental and Social Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>Environmental and Social Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAP</td>
<td>Gender Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRW</td>
<td>Human Rights Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IADB</td>
<td>Inter-American Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBRD</td>
<td>International Bank for Reconstruction and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDI</td>
<td>Inclusive Development International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFC</td>
<td>International Finance Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFI</td>
<td>International Financial Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPRA/ELSAM</td>
<td>Institute for Policy Research and Advocacy in Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMGSY</td>
<td>Mukhya Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana / India Gujarat Rural Roads Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDB</td>
<td>New Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBC</td>
<td>Oman Broadband Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIDF</td>
<td>Regional Infrastructure Development Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGBV</td>
<td>Sexual and Gender-Based Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TANAP</td>
<td>Trans Anatolian Natural Gas Pipeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Summary

Almost three years into AIIB operations this desk-based report presents a gender scorecard and analysis of the first 24 AIIB approved projects based strictly on reviewing AIIB/Co-financiers’ public documents. Of the 24 projects reviewed, 17 are co-financed with other IFIs (71 percent) and 7 (29 percent) are self-financed by the AIIB. Of the 24 projects reviewed, 11 are devoted to energy and power; 7 to transportation; 3 to Financial Intermediaries (FIs); and 1 each to telecommunications, urban development, and water supply.

This documentary gender analysis:
- Allows us to identify AIIB/Co-financiers’ project commitments and lack thereof to identify and address gender and human rights issues.
- Provides baseline project benchmarks (some strong, some weak) to hold project implementation impacts accountable.

This report applies Gender Action’s ten rights-based Essential Gender Checklist (EGC) indicators to score and rank the gender dimensions of the first 24 AIIB investments project-by-project (See Annex 1).

On the surface 3 out of the 24 (12.5 %) AIIB projects reviewed ranked strongly and 6 (25%) moderately for gender sensitivity. The majority of projects, 15 (62.5%), ranked weakly. Six out of seven AIIB self-financed projects ranked weakly for gender sensitivity. The three projects ranked strongly based on project documentary promises are all co-financed.

However, on the ground implementation feedback so far is not promising. Early implementation feedback forebodes the possibility that a greater proportion of projects than this scorecard suggests could actually have harmful gender impacts.

Examples of early fieldwork questions come from Indonesian women and men on-the-ground who have found no evidence that project gender commitments on paper are being implemented:

First, the Indonesian Regional Infrastructure Development Finance (RIDF) project documents make gender sensitive promises to uphold “zero tolerance” against violence and screen subprojects for potential sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV). However, Indonesian CSO RIDF monitoring has found no evidence that subproject implementation has included SGBV prevention. Similarly, while the RIDF Project Operations Manual promises to include “Gender-responsive Planning and Budgeting, and subproject evaluations disaggregated by gender”, CSOs on-the-ground report that there is no evidence that these measures have been taken (IBRD 2017b).

Second, Indonesian CSOs found no evidence that the Indonesian National “Slum Upgrading” Project (NSUP) is collecting gender-disaggregated data as promised in NSUP project document promises (IPRA/ELSAM 2017 & 2016). Indonesian CSOs have also identified a failure to carry out meaningful gender-specific consultations despite project document promises that women will participate in all project cycle activities (IBRD 2016a). In addition, Gender Action’s assessment found NSUP Project documents do not require measures to prevent SGBV despite women’s and girls’ high risk of exposure to SGBV in IFI-financed slum redevelopment projects (Zuckerman & Abah 2016).
The report’s conclusions and recommendations highlight:

**Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV):** Three fourths of projects disregard SGBV although large infrastructure projects are highly susceptible to this abuse. All projects must design and implement measures to prevent SGBV.

**Mention of Women and Gender:** Five projects completely fail to mention women’s and other gender equality issues. Most projects fail to discuss how projects differentially impact men, women and sexual minorities. Sixty percent of projects ignore gender and human rights issues. All projects must address these essential gender issues.

**Gender and Human Rights:** Projects that do mention women unilaterally promote women’s economic empowerment without complementarily promoting gender equal rights. All projects should complementarily promote gender equal rights and economic empowerment for men, women and sexual minorities.

**Resettlement:** Of 13 projects entailing resettlement only 1 offers it voluntarily. None provide affected people full information and based on it the opportunity to accept or reject resettlement and compensation terms prior to project approval. None of the 13 projects acknowledge that loss of land and livelihoods caused by resettlement increases unpaid care burdens, especially women’s. Projects entailing resettlement should not be approved until affected women and men receive full information and accept or reject terms for resettlement and compensation. Compensation offered must cover new unpaid burdens that fall mostly on women.

**Gender, Other Social and Environmental Risks:** AIIB/Co-financiers risk categories ignore gender-related risks including SGBV that pervades infrastructure construction. It is high time that IFI environmental and social risk categories mandatorily include gender based-risks, and existing risk indicators systematically consider gender dimensions. All projects must rigorously identify and prevent potential gender related risks.

**Fossil Fuels and Extractives:** Almost half, or 11 of the first 24 loans the AIIB approved, support energy and power. They consist of projects that claim to be clean energy but are not such as natural gas. Four projects invest in gas pipelines and gas-fired plants, arguing gas is cleaner than coal and oil. However, gas’ invisible harmful methane emissions belie this assumption. Gender Action fieldwork demonstrates that extractive investments including in gas projects discriminate against women and particularly harm women’s health and livelihoods (CEEB & Gender Action 2006; Gender Action & FOEI 2011). AIIB/Co-financiers should end all investments in fossil fuel extractives that harm all people’s health and livelihoods and risk our planet’s sustainability (Zuckerman 2017a).

**Financial Intermediaries (FIs):** About 13 percent of the initial 24 investments are in FIs. FIs’ indirect subproject financing through other financial institutions such as commercial banks lack transparency and accountability. Despite IFI promises to apply ESF safeguards to FI investments they rarely do so (IDI 2016). FIs pose the highest-risk gender, other social and environmental risks. Until ESF standards are strictly applied to every FI subproject, AIIB/Co-financiers should avoid investing in highly risky, unaccountable FIs.

**Gender Equal Access to Training and Employment:** Almost all projects fail to provide gender equal training and employment opportunities. They all must do so.

**Accountability Mechanisms:** Almost all projects fail to discuss accountability mechanisms, let alone from a gender point of view. All projects must not only discuss accountability mechanisms but inform affected women, men and sexual minorities of available complaint and redress mechanisms. All accountability mechanisms must take gender discrimination cases including the anticipated AIIB accountability mechanism.

**Gender Policy:** At this time the AIIB lacks a gender policy, which is prerequisite for all projects to systematically identify and address gender issues. The AIIB must develop and implement a strong mandatory gender policy.
Introduction

**Brief AIIB Background**

The AIIB, which began operating in early 2016, is one of the world’s youngest multilateral government-owned International Financial Institutions (IFIs).\(^1\) Launched by China, the AIIB already has already attracted about 85 developing and developed member countries, most of whom are eligible to borrow Bank loans for infrastructure projects and whose corporations may compete for contracts to sell goods and services for AIIB-financed projects. The majority of AIIB operations during its initial years have been co-financed with traditional IFIs (Table 5). While they have been centered in the Eurasia region, the AIIB has announced plans to expand lending to Africa and Latin America.\(^2\)

Almost three years into AIIB operations this desk-based report presents a gender scorecard and analysis of the first 24 AIIB approved projects based strictly on reviewing AIIB and co-financiers’ public documents. Of the 24 projects reviewed, 17 are co-financed with other IFIs (71 percent) and 7 (29 percent) are self-financed by the AIIB (Table 5). The AIIB co-financed these projects with the World Bank, Asian Development Bank, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, European Investment Bank and Islamic Development Bank. All projects that this report ranked strongly and moderately for gender sensitivity were co-financed with other IFIs (Table 5).

Of the 24 projects reviewed, 11 are devoted to energy and power; 7 to transportation; 3 to financial intermediaries; and 1 each to telecommunications, urban development, and water supply (Table 2; Annex 2).

Through applying Gender Action’s rights-based Essential Gender Checklist (Annex 1), on the surface 3 out of the 24 (12.5 %) AIIB projects reviewed ranked strongly and 6 (25%) moderately for gender sensitivity. The majority of projects, 15 (62.5%), ranked weakly. Six out of seven AIIB self-financed projects ranked weakly for gender sensitivity. The three projects ranked strongly based on project documentary promises are all co-financed (see Table 5). Rarely if ever have Gender Action’s numerous desk-based IFI gender assessments conducted over 16 years presented as positive gender findings as did this report.\(^3\)

However, on the ground implementation feedback so far is not promising. Voices from women and men on-the-ground present a more realistic picture than do the IFI paper promises that this report analyzes. Early implementation feedback forebodes the possibility that a greater proportion of projects than this scorecard suggests could actually have harmful gender impacts. This report’s more positive gender findings than usual’s contrast with early negative on-the-ground feedback reflects IFIs’ continuous practice of co-opting CSO ideas on paper.

---

\(^1\) The BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa) owned New Development Bank is the other new IFI. The NDB, which launched at the same time as the AIIB, so far has a smaller loan portfolio that initially targets its five owner countries. It plans to expand loans to other developing countries.

\(^2\) To facilitate this expansion, the AIIB signed agreements to co-finance projects with the African Development Bank (AFDB) and Inter-American Development Bank (IADB) (Financial Times 2018).

\(^3\) Gender Action’s IFI gender analyses have sometimes assessed desk-based IFI documents and sometimes combined desk studies with field-based evaluations. See examples of both approaches in reports linked at http://www.genderaction.org/publications.html
This documentary gender analysis:
- Allows us to identify AIIB and co-financers’ project commitments and lack thereof to promoting gender equal human rights.
- Provides AIIB and co-financers’ baseline project benchmarks (some strong, some weak) to hold project implementation impacts accountable.

The next few paragraphs provide an example of fieldwork reporting from Indonesian women and men who demonstrate lack of implementation of gender-based promises captured in this report’s strong and moderate gender scoring of two AIIB/co-financed Indonesian projects. These Indonesian examples highlight how AIIB/co-financed project implementation is not adhering to documentary promises (IPRA/ELSAM 2017 & 2016). These examples might portend that other AIIB/co-financed projects may not keep rhetorical promises. The two Indonesian project examples include the:

**Indonesian Regional Infrastructure Development Finance (RIDF) approved March 2017 co-financed by the AIIB and World Bank:** Based on IFI project documents alone, this report’s scorecard gave the RIDF, a Financial Intermediary (Fi) project, a strong gender sensitivity ranking (Table 2; Annex 2). However, feedback from women and men on-the-ground reveal these gender promises are being ignored, resulting in potentially harmful impacts on women and others (Fried 2018).

While the AIIB has not publicly revealed which RIDF subprojects it is financing, the co-financer World Bank stated that four RIDF infrastructure investments are road projects (World Bank 2018). IFI roads projects raise red flags because they have triggered substantial adverse environmental and social impacts. In fact RIDF project documents make a gender sensitive promise to uphold “zero tolerance” against violence and promise to screen subprojects for potential sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) based on recognizing that “violence against women and children” often results from male labor influxes (WB 2016f). While this promise adheres to the World Bank recommendation to prevent SGBV resulting from male labor influxes, CSOs on-the-ground report that there is no evidence that the IFIs have taken SGBV prevention measures in the RIDF project.4

Similarly, while the RIDF Project Operations Manual promises to include “Gender-responsive Planning and Budgeting, and subproject evaluations disaggregated by gender”, CSOs on-the-ground report that there is no evidence that the IFIs have undertaken these measures (IBRD 2017b).

**Indonesian National “Slum Upgrading” Project (NSUP) approved June 2016 co-financed by the AIIB and World Bank:** Based on analyzing project documents alone, this project that aims to improve access to urban infrastructure and services in targeted Indonesian slums, received a moderate gender sensitivity ranking. Similar to the RIDF project, feedback from women and men on-the-ground reveal that documentary gender promises are being ignored, resulting in possible harmful impacts on women, men, boys, girls and sexual minorities.

For example, Indonesian civil society organizations (CSOs) found that gender-disaggregated data is not being collected in the NSUP geography despite project document promises to do so (IPRA/ELSAM 2017 & 2016). Indonesian CSOs have also identified a failure to carry out meaningful gender-specific consultations despite project document promises that women will participate in all project cycle activities (IBRD 2016a).

---

4 World Bank recommendations to prevent SGBV in operations can be found in its Global Gender-Based Violence Task Force: Action Plan for Implementation (World Bank. November 2017. (d)). SGBV is Gender Action’s term; the World Bank report’s term is Sexual Exploitation and Abuse/Gender-Based Violence (SEA/GBV).
Moreover, Gender Action’s assessment also found that NSUP Project documents do not require measures to prevent SGBV despite women’s and girls’ high risk of exposure to SGBV in IFI-financed slum redevelopment projects (Zuckerman & Abah 2016). AIIB’s neglect to identify and prevent SGBV in the NSUP places women and girls at high risk of sexual assault.

This Introduction closes by flagging a few salient AIIB-financed project issues having gender and other social and environmental impacts:

**Financial Intermediaries (FIs):** At this time about 13 percent of AIIB loans comprise FIs; however the AIIB expects FIs to occupy an increasing share of its portfolio. The AIIB’s first 24 investments include 3 FIs: the above-discussed RIDF as well as the IFC Emerging Asia Fund (EAF) and the India Infrastructure Fund (IIF). FIs permit IFIs to make loans to intermediaries such as commercial banks, which in turn make loans to subproject entities. FIs are required to adhere to IFI environmental and social safeguard policies but evidence demonstrates they fail to do so (IDI 2016). For example, AIIB-funded EAF financed subprojects include the Myanmar STC Group’s fossil fuel-generating coal mine expansion subproject that is harmful to women’s and men’s health and the global climate. The EAF and IIF contain gender insensitive documents. In contrast the RIDF documents use gender sensitive language but CSOs on-the-ground report that project implementation is far from gender sensitive.

**Fossil Fuels and Extractives:** Among sectors, almost half or 11 of the first 24 loans the AIIB approved support energy and power. Not all of them provide clean energy as claimed. We just mentioned an AIIB FI-financed coal project in Myanmar. Natural gas provides another example. Of 24 projects reviewed 4 invest in gas pipelines and gas-fired plants. AIIB/co-financier project documents argue that gas is cleaner than coal and oil. However, gas’ invisible methane emissions, which are extremely harmful to health, belie this assumption. Moreover, past Gender Action fieldwork demonstrates that gas pipeline investments discriminate against women and adversely impact women’s health and livelihoods (CEEB & Gender Action 2006; Gender Action & FOEI 2011). Our past findings demonstrated the following IFI gas pipeline project patterns across countries: They eliminated women’s farming and fishing livelihoods; employed males almost exclusively in constructing infrastructure and even in office jobs; increased women’s dependence on men; drove some women into sex work out of desperation; and led to increased sexually-transmitted infections, trafficking in women, violence against women, and stillbirths — the latter caused by toxic pollution from inevitable oil and gas leaks.

**Privatization:** AIIB/co-financier operations are increasingly based on public-private partnerships (PPPs) entailing surging private corporate financing. This PPP model tends to generate higher private and lower public sector gains (Alexander 2018). It usually requires government guarantees for private sector defaults or failures (Alexander 2018). It may trigger a vicious cycle whereby developing countries borrow IFI funds to repay old IFI debt. History demonstrates that this IFI debt financing/repayment model can squeeze public spending on health, education and other basic needs even when IFIs and governments promise to protect them.

**AIIB’s Gender Structure:** At this time the AIIB lacks a gender policy. Following the AIIB’s launch in 2016, Gender Action initiated meetings with senior management several times requesting that the AIIB: (1) Create and implement a strong mandatory gender policy; (2) Train all staff to routinely implement the policy in all operations; and (3) Hire senior gender experts to lead these processes.\(^5\) Gender Action provided the AIIB with ideas and tools for creating a gender policy and identifying and addressing its investments’ gender impacts. Meanwhile, the AIIB hired a senior social specialist with gender expertise but still lacks dedicated gender experts needed to ensure all operations prevent gender rights violations. The AIIB specialist

\(^5\) In-person meetings between Elaine Zuckerman and senior AIIB officials occurred on December 13, 2016 and October 30 and November 3, 2017.
expressed commitment to ensuring Bank investments promote women’s economic empowerment to boost economic growth but not complementary gender equal human rights. Publicly-financed IFIs must promote women’s, men’s and sexual minorities’gender equal human rights as well as economic empowerment.

While the AIIB lacks a gender policy, its Environmental and Social Framework (ESF) vision statement “recognizes the importance of gender equality for successful and sustainable economic development and the need for inclusiveness and gender responsiveness in the Projects it supports”. The Environmental and Social Policy (ESP) requires clients to consider gender in designing operations and hold gender-inclusive consultations. Despite these requirements, this report’s gender project analyses and scorecard found more than half of the first 24 AIIB approved project documents neglect the ESF vision statement’s gender sentiments to promote gender equality and one third of projects reviewed failed to hold gender-separate and gender-equal consultations. The Indonesian examples demonstrate that early implementation is not adhering to gender design requirements.

**Methodology**

**Project Scorecard:** Scoring and ranking the gender dimensions of the first 24 AIIB projects (see Project Analyses section) emerges from our project-by-project application of Gender Action’s ten rights-based Essential Gender Checklist (EGC) indicators (See Annex 1). Overall each project can garner 1 or 2 points per indicator for a maximum of 20 points.

Table 1 describes project numeric scoring ranging from +20 to below 0 expressed also as prose ranks and color coded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numeric Scores</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Color Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14-20</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-13</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-6</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Analyses:** Each of the 24 project analyses begins with AIIB/Co-financier loan commitment amounts. The amounts are followed by one-paragraph Project Descriptions. The descriptions contain mostly verbatim AIIB/Co-financier project document language. They include an AIIB statement on environmental and social risk categories that are contained in the Bank’s Environment and Social Framework (ESF) (See Box 1).
Applying the EGC Indicators: Following the Project Descriptions, the Project Analyses assess to what extent AIIB/Co-finance project documents address our ten EGC indicators.

Resettlement: Resettlement is flagged in the Project Analyses’ Gender & Human rights paragraphs because it often entails involuntary dislocation that harmfully disrupts men, women, boys and girls’ lives and undermines their rights to land, water, and other basic needs. But it is women who bear the greatest burden of finding new schools, health services, housing, income and other basic needs (Mehta 2009). Sometimes involuntarily displaced residents never receive promised compensation. Instead, they lose their assets, other belongings and income in a new life of homelessness. In these dire circumstances girls and women exposed to the elements might become victims of sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) (Zuckerman & Abah 2016).

Recommendations: Each project analysis ends with recommendations that if implemented could mitigate harmful gender impacts and outcomes. However, the AIIB cannot improve its gender sensitivity isolated from addressing intersectional issues including, where relevant, resettlement/displacement, exposure to toxic pollutants and absent, inadequate and/or belated consultations that usually follow rather than precede project approval.

Project Analyses Tables

Table 2 presents a summary color code analysis of each project’s gender ranks by EGC indicators and overall. Annex 2 presents a full detailed version of this Scorecard. The Scorecard summarizes the findings of our desk-based project-by-project analyses that follow Table 5.

**Box 1. AIIB Environmental and Social Risk Categories (AIIB 2016a)**

The AIIB ESF contains these four environmental and social risk categories and mitigation requirements:

- **Category A** projects present the highest environmental and social risks. Their impacts are irreversible, cumulative, diverse or unprecedented and may affect an area larger than the project sites. AIIB requires Category A projects to complete an environmental and social impact assessment (ESIA), which examines potential negative impacts and provides recommendations for improvement.

- **Category B** projects have few adverse environmental and social impacts. Depending on the project circumstances, AIIB might require a narrower ESIA or similar analysis.

- **Category C** projects have minimal negative environmental and social impacts and are not required to provide an ESIA. But they are required to review possible project environmental and social impacts.

- **FI (Financial Intermediary)** projects financing involves provision of funds to or through an FI. The AIIB requires FI clients to categorize all subprojects and monitor the environmental and social impacts in a manner consistent with AIIB policies.
Table 2. Summary Scorecard: Gender Sensitivity of 24 AIIB Approved Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Action</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Gender and Human Rights</th>
<th>Gender Equality</th>
<th>Sexual and Gender-</th>
<th>Gender Data</th>
<th>Gender and Care Work</th>
<th>Gender Impact</th>
<th>Gender Impact</th>
<th>Gender Impact</th>
<th>Gender Impact</th>
<th>Gender Impact</th>
<th>Gender Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENERGY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aijan: Trans Anatolian Natural Gas Pipeline (TANAP) Project</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt: Round II Solar PV Feed-in Tariffs Program</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andhra Pradesh 24x7 - Power for All Project</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSPORTATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Score **green** = strong gender sensitivity, **yellow** = moderate gender sensitivity, **red** = weak gender sensitivity.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Score green = strong gender sensitivity yellow = moderate gender sensitivity red = weak gender sensitivity purple = likely harmful gender impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oman: Duqm Port Commercial Terminal and Operational Zone Development Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oman: Railway System Preparation Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan: National Motorway M-4 Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan: Dushanbe-Uzbekistan Border Road Improvement Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FINANCIAL INTERMEDIARIES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asia: IFC Emerging Asia Fund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India: The India Infrastructure Fund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia: Regional Infrastructure Development Fund Project (RIDF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TELECOMMUNICATIONS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oman: Broadband Infrastructure Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>URBAN</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia: National Slum Upgrading Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WATER</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philippines: Metro Manila Flood Management Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The ten gender indicators comprise the Essential Gender Checklist (EGC) in Gender Action’s Gender Toolkit for International Finance-Watchers (Gender Action 2017). The EGC rankings provide the basis to deduce patterns and outliers for this report’s analysis.
Building upon Table 2’s patterns, Tables 3 and 4 demonstrate that 62.5 percent of project documents have weak gender sensitivity; a quarter of project documents are moderately gender sensitive; and only 12.5 percent of project documents are strongly gender sensitive, but as the Introduction explained they are likely strong on paper only although not in implementation. That two thirds of projects are weakly gender sensitive highlights that the AIIB/Co-Financiers spottily produce gender-sensitive project documents. All IFIs have a long way to go to meet their gender commitments on paper and especially during project implementation.

Table 5 demonstrates that all three projects ranked as having strong gender sensitivity are co-financed. This is not surprising since established IFIs have ramped up gender expertise in response to CSO pressure while the young AIIB is only beginning to do so. Even the eight co-financed projects with strong and moderate gender sensitivity on paper must follow up by implementing their gender commitments on-the-ground.

A few specific patterns that emerge from our project analyses include:

- 18 (75 percent) of projects fail to take into consideration women’s, girls’, and sexual minorities’ susceptibility to sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) in infrastructure projects that lack preventive measures (WB 2017d).
- Almost three fourths of projects do not consider gender and human rights; women and girls’ predominant unpaid care work burden; and gender dimensions of project outputs. AIIB/Co-Financier projects must promote gender equal rights. These IFIs must undertake measures to reduce women and girls’ unpaid care work, which impedes their participation in project design and implementation and access to outputs or benefits.
- The best ranked category is gender inputs because one third of projects each ranked strongly, moderately and weakly gender sensitive for inputs such as women’s participation in project consultations.

A more detailed discussions of patterns can be found in the report’s Conclusions and Recommendations.

Table 3. Patterns: Gender Sensitivity: Numeric Scores, Ranks, and Color Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numeric Scores</th>
<th>#/% of Projects</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Color Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14-20</td>
<td>3 / 12.5%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-13</td>
<td>6 / 25%</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-6</td>
<td>15 / 62.5%</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Patterns: Project Gender Sensitivity by Indicator and Overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall Score</th>
<th>Gender and Human Equality</th>
<th>Gender Equality</th>
<th>Sexual and Gender-Based</th>
<th>Gender Access</th>
<th>Gender Context</th>
<th>Gender and Care</th>
<th>Gender Inputs</th>
<th>Gender Outputs</th>
<th>Gender Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Patterns: Project Gender Sensitivity by Financing Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Financing</th>
<th># / % of Projects</th>
<th>Strong # / % of the Type</th>
<th>Moderate # / % of the Type</th>
<th>Weak # / % of the Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIIB Self-financed</td>
<td>7 / 29%</td>
<td>1 / 14%</td>
<td>6 / 86%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-financed with WB</td>
<td>5 / 21%</td>
<td>2 / 40%</td>
<td>1 / 20%</td>
<td>2 / 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-financed with ADB</td>
<td>4 / 17%</td>
<td>2 / 50%</td>
<td>2 / 50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-financed with IFC</td>
<td>2 / 8%</td>
<td>2 / 100%</td>
<td>2 / 40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-financed with EIB</td>
<td>2 / 8%</td>
<td>1 / 50%</td>
<td>1 / 50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-financed with EBRD</td>
<td>1 / 4%</td>
<td>1 / 100%</td>
<td>1 / 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-financed with multiple IFIs</td>
<td>3 / 13%</td>
<td>1 / 33%</td>
<td>2 / 67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Analyses Energy and Power

Azerbaijan: Trans Anatolian Natural Gas Pipeline (TANAP) Project

Approval Year: 2016
Approved Amounts (billion USD): $0.6 (AIIB); $0.8 (WB-IBRD); $1.3 (EIB); $0.5 (EBRD); $1.4 (Borrower); $1.0 (BOTAS, Turkey); $1.0 (BP); $2.0 (private commercial sources)

Project Description

The Project aims to (a) integrate Azerbaijan with regional and European energy markets by strengthening its connectivity and transit role and (b) improve energy supply security of Turkey and South Eastern Europe (AIIB 2016j). The Project is categorized as high risk, with an Environmental and Social Category of A.

Gender Analysis

Overall Gender Analysis: Weak Gender Sensitivity

Gender and Human Rights
The Project document does not take a human rights or a gender perspective. It relies on WB Environmental and Social Safeguard policies that neglect gender dimensions. The Project entails land acquisition and thus resettlement affecting 936 people who mostly occupy agricultural land (EIB 2016). Project documents do not analyze the gender dimensions of this dislocation.

Gender In/Equality
The Project document recognizes inequality between affected men and women, particularly that “most of the impacted landowners are men” (AIIB 2016j). However, it does not discuss that women farmers working for male landowners are in a precarious power dynamic. Overall, it emphasizes that the Project will have “positive provisions for women” (IBRD 2016b).

Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV)
The Project document fails to take into consideration women’s, girls’, and sexual minorities’ susceptibility to SGBV during construction projects caused by influxes of laborers. Such SGBV frequently plagues infrastructure projects that lack preventive measures (WB 2017d).
Gender Data
The Project collects sex-disaggregated data and sets targets for women’s involvement. It expects women to participate in community consultations and will gauge the percentage of consultations held separately for women with a target gradually rising over the course of five years from 18 to 40 percent (AIIB 2016j). It aims to employ women in construction but at a mere five percent.

Gender Context
The Project document does not consider gender dimensions of Azeri social, economic, legal and political contexts differentially affecting men, women, and sexual minorities that would for example highlight patriarchal decision-making structures. Such an analysis would reveal that Azeri women have been pushed back into unpaid homemakers’ roles while also conducting subsistence farming in the context of men migrating for employment to Russia and Ukraine (CEE Bankwatch & Gender Action 2006).

Gender Access
The Project takes measures to ensure a much too low women’s employment participation rate. Quantitatively, the Project aims to achieve a low five percent women’s employment target. It justifies this quota by claiming that the Project will enable five percent of women “to earn additional income for their households”. This low target suggests a gender-insensitive Project assumption might be either that most women already earn income from other sources or they need not do so since men are the breadwinners. Qualitatively, the Project strives to target “unskilled women” with work “in the catering or cleaning unit of the construction camp sites” (IBRD 2016b). Providing menial low-wage project employment opportunities for women is discriminatory.

Gender and Care Work
The Project document neither recognizes nor proposes measures to reduce unpaid care work conducted predominantly by women. Without deliberate measures to alleviate time-consuming unpaid care, women are stymied from participating in income-earning opportunities.

Gender Inputs
The Project strives to offer separate consultations with women and men during the construction and operations phase “to ensure the female villagers have an opportunity to provide feedback” (AIIB 2016j). The Project has already conducted women-only focus group consultations regarding land acquisition but it is unlikely that the gender-separate consultations were gender-equal (WB 2016d). This is because plans include an 18 percent low quota of women to be consulted in the first year set to rise to 40 percent in the final year.

Gender Outputs
The Project document does not acknowledge ways in which women benefit from reliable energy.

Gender Impact
The Project’s land acquisition will affect 936 people who mostly occupy agricultural land (EIB 2016). Women are affected disproportionately because 43 percent of Azerbaijani women are employed in agriculture, while 32 percent of men engage in agriculture (WB 2017a). Thus the Project specifically discusses female landowners. The Project document states that during the compensation process it “will not discriminate against female owners in value negotiation” (WB 2016d). Also, the Project will provide “gender-specific investments” through TANAP’s Social and Environmental Investment Program which aims to “create sustainable development opportunities for the local population and improve quality of life” (IBRD 2016b). The Project document does not address the harmful health impacts of natural gas.
**Recommendations** The Project should:

- Increase the low quota of five percent employment for women as much as possible, ideally aiming for 50 percent.
- Provide training to unskilled women to increase the quality of their project employment away from menial jobs to higher-skilled administrative, technology and construction jobs.
- Provide baseline and monitoring data on the percentage of women’s income relative to men’s before and after TANAP.
- Expand consultations for women-only sessions to ensure that the numbers of consulted men and women are roughly equal.
- Ensure that both female and male landowners and field workers receive equal resettlement compensation.
- Avoid natural gas projects to prevent harm to women’s and men’s health and the environment.

---

**Bangladesh: Natural Gas Infrastructure and Efficiency Improvement Project**

Approval Year: 2017  
Approved Amounts (millions USD): $60 (AIIB); $167 (ADB); $226 (domestic resources)

**Project Description**

The objective of the Project is to improve efficiency in gas production in Titas Gas Field and to expand the capacity of the gas transmission pipeline between Chittagong and Bakhrabad. The expected impact of the Project is increased energy sector contribution to sustainable economic growth in Bangladesh (ADB 2016b; AIIB 2017c). The Environmental and Social Category of the Project is A and the Project risk is high.

**Gender Analysis**

**Overall Gender Analysis**

Weak Gender Sensitivity

**Gender and Human Rights**

The Project document does not address human rights or gender justice. It fails to consider human rights violations from involuntary resettlement of 5,693 people through acquisition of private land (AIIB 2017c). It also does not address negative environmental effects on the health, safety, and security of women and men caused by methane and other toxic natural gas emissions.

**Gender In/Equality**

The Project document does not acknowledge inequality between men and women. It states that there are “no gender elements” due to “limited opportunities for gender mainstreaming” (ADB 2016b). Stating that the Project lacks gender elements is shortsighted because gender inequalities pervade Project construction, resettlement terms, and other issues.

**Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV)**

The Project document does not recognize situations where SGBV is likely to occur, although SGBV caused by influxes of laborers frequently plagues infrastructure projects that lack preventive measures (WB 2017d).

**Gender Data**

The Project document fails to include sex-disaggregated data.
Gender Context
The Project document does not consider gender dimensions of Bangladeshi social, economic, legal and political contexts differentially affecting men, women, and sexual minorities that would for example highlight patriarchal decision-making structures.

Gender Access
The Project document does not consider how gender unequal access to jobs inhibits women from finding employment as good as men’s during Project implementation. For example, it does not recognize that women can participate in the construction of compressors and the pipeline. Without the explicitly promoting women’s role in construction, most infrastructure jobs are likely to go to men. Some women may lose their stalls or businesses due to Project implementation. Construction may provide a temporary way for them to replace lost income.

Gender and Care Work
The Project document neither recognizes nor proposes measures to reduce unpaid care work conducted predominantly by women. Without deliberate measures to alleviate time-consuming unpaid care, women are stymied from participating in income-earning opportunities.

Gender Inputs
The Project’s Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) is said to be “transparent, understandable, gender-responsive, and culturally-appropriate” (AIIB 2017c). It is unknown if and how low-income Bangladeshi women and men will be informed about the GRM. Also, if it fails them, it is unknown if and how they will know about the next-level complaint mechanism - the ADB’s Compliance Review Panel, which to date has never taken a gender discrimination complaint (ADB b). It is also unclear whether and how women, men, and sexual minorities are included in consultations throughout the Project cycle.

Gender Outputs
There is no indication that Project outputs, such as easier access to energy, will reach women, especially in low-income communities.

Gender Impact
The Project document notes that 5,693 people will be resettled because of permanent acquisition of private land (AIIB 2017c). Conforming to the ADB’s Safeguard Policy Statement (2009) the Project document calls for further review of involuntary resettlement including gender-specific oversight through external monitoring of land acquisition issues (ADB 2009). This measure implicitly recognizes that relocation often permanently adversely affects women’s income and decision-making roles.

Recommendations The Project should:
• Not finance natural gas projects because they generate methane that contributes to climate change hurting everyone’s health and our planet’s future.
• Collect baseline and monitoring data on women’s and men’s employment rates in the construction process.
• Take deliberate measures to provide women with alternative income-earning skills and jobs because permanent involuntary resettlement puts women at risk of loss of income and household control.
• Prioritize men’s and women’s equal participation in the Project jobs.
• Explain and clarify the GRM and the Compliance Review Panel mechanisms to ensure women and men understand their Project rights, are able to express their Project-related concerns, and file complaints redress if needed.
Bangladesh: Distribution System Upgrade and Expansion Project

Approval Year: 2016
Approved Amount (millions USD): $165 (AIIB)

**Project Description**

The Project aims to enhance distribution capacity and to increase the number of rural and urban electricity consumers in Bangladesh. The Project has two components: (i) provision of about 2.5 million service connections to rural consumers; and (ii) upgrade of two grid substations and conversion of 85 km of overhead distribution lines into underground cables in north Dhaka (AIIB 2016e). The Project is classified as category B under the Environmental and Social Policy.

**Gender Analysis**

**Overall Gender Analysis** Weak Gender Sensitivity

**Gender and Human Rights**

The Project does not approach the electricity distribution facilities improvement from a gender or human rights perspective. It does, however, recognize that affordable and reliable energy is crucial for poverty reduction. If the Project delivered electricity to poor men and women, it could be a factor enabling rights to education, health, and water services. But this is a big “if” since most IFI electricity distribution projects have not sustainably delivered electricity to poor households (AIIB 2016e).

**Gender In/Equality**

The Project document fails to acknowledge inequalities between women and men in Bangladesh.

**Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV)**

The Project document fails to take into consideration women’s, girls’, and sexual minorities’ susceptibility to SGBV during construction projects caused by influxes of laborers. Such SGBV frequently plagues infrastructure projects that lack preventive measures (WB 2017d).

**Gender Data**

The Project does not collect sex-disaggregated data. It seeks to gather data only on the number of transformers and length of cables installed (AIIB 2016e).

**Gender Context**

The Project document does not consider gender dimensions of Bangladeshi social, economic, legal and political contexts differentially affecting men, women, and sexual minorities that would for example highlight patriarchal decision-making structures.

**Gender Access**

The Project document fails to recognize that poor women, men, and sexual minorities are hindered in accessing energy due to lack of resources such as technology, funds, and information. It creates employment opportunities for skilled and unskilled workers who are mostly men, but it does not state that it intends to provide access to women and sexual minorities (AIIB 2016e).
Gender and Care Work
The Project document does not acknowledge that rural Bangladeshi women are overwhelmingly responsible for supplying household energy through their unpaid, time-consuming labor collecting firewood and other fuels for cooking and other energy needs. Without deliberate measures to alleviate time-consuming unpaid care, women are stymied from participating in income-earning opportunities.

Gender Inputs
It is unknown whether women will be involved in any activities at any stage of the Project cycle. The Project document mentions a feedback-provision mechanism through consultations but does not require both women’s and men’s equal participation (AIIB 2016e).

Gender Outputs
The Project document does not explain how increased access to energy and enhanced technology could relieve women-specific burdens such as reduced unpaid manual labor.

Gender Impact
The Project document overlooks how it can address women’s needs for reliable energy supply that would positively impact their welfare.

Recommendations The Project should:
• Design and implement measures to prevent SGBV that pervades IFI construction works.
• Recognize and address Bangladeshi institutional structures that benefit men who have dominant decision-making roles.
• Target women with employment and training to promote Project-related income-generating opportunities.
• Address women’s unpaid labor-intensive energy activities including firewood and other fuel collection and caring tasks by providing specific time-saving technology to free women’s time up for income-earning activities.
• Include women and men equally in consultations before, during, and after implementation and convene separate consultations for each gender.
• Explicitly identify and address women’s and men’s differential Project roles and needs.

China: Beijing Air Quality Improvement and Coal Replacement Project

Approval Year: 2017
Approved Amounts (millions USD): $250 (AIIB); $228.33 (Beijing Municipality); $30 (China Clean Development Mechanism Fund); $252.77 (Beijing Gas Group)

Project Description
The objective of the Project is to improve air quality and reduce air pollutants, such as CO2 emissions, particulate matters, SO2 emissions, and NOx emissions, through replacing coal with natural gas in rural villages in Beijing’s outskirts. Upon completion, the Project will provide gas service connections to approximately 216,751 rural households, and reduce coal consumption of around 650,000 tons annually in Beijing (AIIB 2017p). The Project’s Environmental and Social Category is B.
Gender Analysis

Overall Gender Analysis Weak Gender Sensitivity

Gender and Human Rights
The Project document does not take a gender or human rights perspective. The Project is aligned with AIIB’s Environmental and Social Policy (ESP) which is supposed to guide the Beijing Gas Group’s (the borrower) Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP). Although AIIB’s ESP recognizes the importance of gender equality, borrower’s ESMP fails to promote women’s and gender equal rights.

Gender Inequality
The Project document does not acknowledge inequalities between men and women in affected rural communities.

Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV)
The Project document fails to take into consideration women’s, girls’, and sexual minorities’ susceptibility to SGBV during construction projects caused by influxes of laborers. Such SGBV frequently plagues infrastructure projects that lack preventive measures (WB 2017d).

Gender Data
The Project fails to collect any baseline and monitoring sex-disaggregated data although gender inequality, such as in income disparity and education attainment, are much more disproportionate in rural than in urban areas. The Project document states that it will gather data on air pollution and ambient noise levels.

Gender Context
The Project document does not analyze social, economic, and other gender dynamics in affected rural Chinese households (Li et al. 2014).

Gender Access
The Project document mentions that locals “can be hired for construction activities” (AIIB 2017p). However, hiring locally is not mandatory. The Project fails to detail employment opportunities for local residents, whether women or men. As with all infrastructure projects, an external worker influx can pose a threat to women’s well-being.

Gender and Care Work
The Project document fails to discuss or propose measures to alleviate women’s unpaid care burden that is disproportionately heavy in rural communities.

Gender Inputs
The Project document ensures its commitment to “the effective use of public consultation and information disclosure” (AIIB 2017k). However, it fails to explicitly include women in the dialogue or ensure gender equal participation.

Gender Outputs
The Project document recognizes women as major beneficiaries because it aims to “change [...] cooking fuel to clean energy” (AIIB 2017p). While gas that generates methane is not really clean energy for the outdoors environment, inside households it is cleaner than coal and therefore should improve health impacts for women who have been cooking over coal-powered stoves.
Gender Impact
The Project document claims that it “will not cause any negative social impacts” promising no land acquisition for laying and repairing natural gas distribution pipes (AIIB 2017k).

Recommendations The Project should:
Protect women from SGBV which frequently occurs in construction investments.
• Gather baseline and monitoring sex-disaggregated data on Beijing rural social and economic indicators and participation of women and men in all Project stages.
• Take deliberate measures to provide employment for local men, women, and sexual minorities during all stages of the Project to ensure gender equal employment opportunities.
• Adapt goals and objectives to meet differential needs of men, women, and sexual minorities by examining gender relations in rural Chinese communities.
• Reconsider funding natural gas projects because natural gas produces methane that harms women and men’s health.

Egypt: Round II Solar PV Feed-in Tariffs Program

Approval Year: 2017
Approved Amounts (millions USD per solar power plan): approx. $17.5 - $19 (AIIB); $41 (IFC)

Project Description

Egypt Round II Solar PV Feed-in Tariffs Program consists of 11 photovoltaic solar power plants (the subprojects). The objectives of the Project are to (i) increase Egypt’s generation capacity by exploiting its vast renewable energy potential and help the country to meet its power demand; and (ii) reduce the dependence on gas and fuel for electricity generation and move to a more balanced and environmentally sustainable energy mix (AIIB 2017l). The Project’s Environmental and Social category is B.

Gender Analysis

Overall Gender Analysis Weak Gender Sensitivity

Gender and Human Rights
The Project document does not take a human rights or a gender perspective. The Project relies on the IFC 2012 Policy on Environmental and Social Sustainability Performance Standards that hardly address gender justice and lacks discussion of women’s rights (IFC 2012; Zuckerman 2017b).

Gender In/Equality
The Project document does not acknowledge inequalities between men and women, or discrimination against sexual minorities.

Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV)
The Project document does not recognize that SGBV is common during infrastructure project construction and therefore, it fails to properly protect women, girls, and sexual minorities (WB 2017d).
Gender Data
The Project document does not specify that it will collect gender-desegregated data. It will collect baseline and monitoring data on the “number of residential customers that will benefit from the electricity supplied by the Project” (AIIB 2017).

Gender Context
The Project document does not consider gender dimensions of Egyptian social, economic, legal and political contexts differentially affecting men, women, and sexual minorities that would for example highlight patriarchal decision-making structures.

Gender Access
The Project document fails to recognize how women’s disadvantaged gender roles prevent them from meaningfully participating in all Project stages. Without explicit Project measures to engage women, their voices are likely to be ignored and their needs disregarded.

Gender and Care Work
The Project document neither recognizes nor proposes measures to reduce unpaid care work conducted predominantly by women. Without deliberate measures to alleviate time-consuming unpaid care, women are stymied from participating in income-earning opportunities.

Gender Inputs
The Project will employ up to 500 workers in all Project cycle stages (IFC 2017). At the same time a Project document states that it will not discriminate based on gender or sexual orientation (IFC 2017).

Gender Outputs
The Project document does not actively target women as beneficiaries although women’s energy needs differ from men’s. For example, women spend time collecting firewood and other fuels for cooking.

Gender Impact
There will be no land acquisition. Still, the Project is likely to have harmful gender-distinct impacts due to its complete neglect for women throughout the Project cycle.

Recommendations  The Project should:
• Protect women from potential SGBV which would undermine women’s dignity, safety, health, and overall well-being.
• Provide training to unskilled women to ensure their contribution to Project jobs is meaningful.
• Take deliberate measures to include women in the full Project cycle.
• Accommodate women’s gender-distinct power needs.

India: Andhra Pradesh 24x7 – Power for All Project

Approval Year: 2017
Approved Amounts (millions USD): $160 (AIIB); $240 (WB); $171 (Govt. of Andhra Pradesh)
**Project Description**

The project aims to increase the system capacity to deliver electricity to customers and to improve the operational efficiency and system reliability in distribution of electricity in selected areas in the State of Andhra Pradesh (AIIB 2017d). The Project risk is *medium* and its Environmental and Social Category is B.

**Gender Analysis**

**Overall Gender Analysis** Strong Gender Sensitivity

**Gender and Human Rights**
The key Project document does not take an explicit gender or human rights position. It relies on the WB Environmental and Social Safeguard policies (ESSPs) that largely ignore gender issues (WB 2017b). However, the Project will require land acquisition, most of which will be on a voluntary basis. As discussed below, there is a disconnect among project documents: The Project’s Resettlement Policy Framework ignores gender-specific impacts while its Gender Action Plan Resettlement Plan expresses concern that women might not be fairly compensated (WB 2016e).

**Gender In/Equality**
The Project document recognizes that women in India “face inequalities compared to men across a number of human development indicators and socio-economic variables” (WB 2016e). It also acknowledges rural women’s vulnerability to potential negative impacts of Project implementation (WB 2016e).

**Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV)**
The Project document recognizes that women’s security is jeopardized during the construction phase. Therefore, it aims to minimize blockage of access roads. It also stresses that expected increased electricity “reduces the security concerns through lighting of street and public spaces” (WB 2016e).

**Gender Data**
Andhra Pradesh prepared an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) which includes a Project Gender Action Plan (GAP) that details demographic data on the State’s women especially infant and maternal mortality rates. It does not relate these data to electricity. Also, the Project document gauges the percentage of women participating in consultation meetings and sets a target that gradually increases from 5 to 25 percent during implementation (AIIB 2017d).

**Gender Context**
The Project document discussion of legal and economic effects of land loss and temporary damages from resettlement acknowledges that “women usually do not have property rights and therefore, might not receive their share of compensation” (WB 2016e).

**Gender Access**
The Project document does not discuss how it can improve women’s, men’s, and sexual minorities’ equal access to Project benefits.

**Gender and Care Work**
A Project document recognizes that improved and reliable power supply will ease traditionally feminine household burdens such as “cooking and washing clothes” (WB 2016e).
**Gender Inputs**  
A Project document emphasizes the need to effectively address “views of the womenfolk” through established feedback mechanisms which include consultations (AIIB 2017d). Also, the GAP aims to maximize women’s input and their participation during all Project stages (WB 2016e).

**Gender Outputs**  
Project outputs such as access to efficient, reliable, and affordable electricity supply explicitly target both women and men. Expected benefits respond to differential gender needs, thus further promoting women as beneficiaries.

**Gender Impact**  
The Project will require land acquisition, most of which will be on a voluntary basis. Still, the ESMF will apply to situations when the involuntary land acquisition is “unavoidable.” The Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) notes that “involuntary resettlement may result in long-term hardship for affected people” (WB 2016c). The GAP further includes a gender-specific Resettlement Plan, different from the RPF, which explicitly integrates women.

**Recommendations**  
The Project should:
- Provide specific examples of rural women’s vulnerability to potential negative impacts of Project implementation.
- Increase women’s participation rate in consultation meetings to 50 percent.
- Create women-only consultation groups in order to facilitate active and meaningful contributions which tend to subside in the presence of men.
- Collect baseline and monitoring sex-disaggregated data on participation in Project participation and benefits.
- Improve women’s access to Project jobs by recruiting and training women during all stages.

---

**India: Transmission System Strengthening Project**

Approval Year: 2017  
Approved Amounts (millions USD): $100 (AIIB); $50 (ADB); $153.47 (Power Grid Corporation of India Limited)

**Project Description**

The objective of the Project is to enhance capacity of electricity supply in India’s Southern Region and re-balance peak and off-peak energy sharing from the surplus areas of Northern and Western Regions to the deficit areas in the Southern Region. The expected main result of the Project is the increased capacity of electricity supply added in the Southern Region of India (AIIB 2017o). The Transmission System Strengthening Project builds on the more comprehensive ADB-financed Green Energy Corridor and Grid Strengthening Project in India (ADB 2017d). The Project’s Environmental and Social category is B.

**Gender Analysis**

**Overall Gender Analysis** Moderate Gender Sensitivity

**Gender and Human Rights**

The Project document does not take a gender or human rights approach. The ADB categorizes the Project as
having “no gender elements” (ADB 2018). The Project will apply ADB’s Safeguard Policy Statement which contains a gender focus without explicitly promoting women’s rights (ADB 2009).

**Gender In/Equality**
The Project document classifies female-headed households as a vulnerable group (AIIB 2016g). However, it fails to advocate for equality between men, women, boys and girls and sexual minorities.

**Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV)**
The Project document does not take into account women’s susceptibility to SGBV which is frequent during infrastructure construction projects (WB 2017d).

**Gender Data**
The Project document does not collect baseline or monitoring sex-disaggregated data.

**Gender Context**
The Project document presents some gender-disaggregated socio-economic background information about residents in affected areas (AIIB 2016g). Otherwise, it does not explain women’s disadvantaged position in the Southern Region.

**Gender Access**
The Project document ensures that women and men employed in Project-related activities will receive equal wages and health and safety provisions (AIIB 2016g). The Project also says that “local people will be engaged during construction [...] as per their skillset” (AIIB 2016g). However, it does not contain measures, such as quotas or onsite daycare, to remove obstacles keeping women at home and incentivize female employment.

**Gender and Care Work**
The Project document states that women’s main occupation is “household work” and that their main economic activity is agriculture (AIIB 2016g). However, it does not acknowledge that improved access to electricity could lessen their unpaid household work.

**Gender Inputs**
Women already participated in on-site consultations and will continue to do so throughout the Project cycle. The Project document does not explain the consultations’ gender structure or female-specific requests (AIIB 2016f).

**Gender Outputs**
The Project document fails to consider how women benefit from more stable and accessible electricity.

**Gender Impact**
The Project document does not require land acquisition. However, due to planting 1845 towers, some agricultural land and private plantations will temporarily stop producing crops (AIIB 2016g). The Project document will provide compensation at market rates to all affected people. Failing to recognize and address gender discriminatory land ownership practices the Project states that “no negative impact on women is foreseen” (AIIB 2016g).

**Recommendations**
The Project should:
- Protect women from SGBV which often occurs due to construction’s inflow of labor.
- Target women with Project-related job opportunities especially because the Project flags temporary
damages to agricultural land that could undermine women’s livelihoods.

- Recognize that women’s welfare and livelihoods could benefit from improved access to power if the Project ensures outputs alleviate unpaid cooking, cleaning, and other household work.
- Ensure gender-equal compensation for lost income and grant compensation directly to women farmers who predominantly work in agriculture, although men are the main landowners.

---

**Indonesia: Dam Operational Improvement and Safety Project Phase II**

Approval Year: 2017  
Approved Amounts (millions USD): $125 (AIIB); $125 (WB); $50 (Govt.)

**Project Description**  
The Project aims to increase safety and functionality of existing dams in selected locations and strengthen operation and management capacity for dam safety (AIIB 2017a). The Project has been granted Environmental and Social Category B and high Project risk status.

**Gender Analysis**

**Overall Gender Analysis**  Weak Gender Sensitivity

**Gender and Human Rights**  
The Project document does not take a gender and human rights perspective. The Project implementation is guided by the WB Environmental and Social Safeguard Policies that lack an explicit gender focus.

**Gender In/Equality**  
The Project document recognizes the need to address women’s vulnerability in Indonesia. While it acknowledges that it does not have a specific gender focus, it generally strives to promote “gender equality to challenge perceptions and norms” (IBRD 2017a). Its discussion of food security and poverty, however, fails to address gender differences.

**Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV)**  
The Project document does not recognize situations where SGBV is likely to occur especially around construction sites (WB 2017d).

**Gender Data**  
The Project document will gather sex-disaggregated data on beneficiaries of reduced dam failure such as the risk of flooding. It aims for 50 percent of all beneficiaries to be women. However, it is unclear how it intends to achieve that target without an explicit plan to reach women-headed households and women farmers.

**Gender Context**  
The Project design and implementation do not consider gender dimensions of Indonesia’s social, economic, legal and political contexts differentially affecting men, women, and sexual minorities that would, for example, highlight patriarchal decision-making structures.

**Gender Access**  
While the Project document recognizes women’s critical role in agriculture and acute need for reliable water resources, it does not detail how women will gain improved access to water. Without specifically targeting women’s access, they are unlikely to benefit. Also, the Project only briefly considers how women can
contribute to watershed management that is a key Project activity (IBRD 2017a). The Project document does not discuss local labor force employment which should target both men and women.

**Gender and Care Work**
The Project document fails to acknowledge women’s labor and time spent on traditionally feminine, unpaid care work including fetching water which is relevant to the Project.

**Gender Inputs**
The Project document establishes public consultations, but it does not explicitly promote feedback from women or gender-equal participation.

**Gender Outputs**
Although the Project document identifies women as most vulnerable it fails to explicitly target women as beneficiaries. Without plans to reach women farmers, they risk not fully benefiting from Project outputs.

**Gender Impact**
In the long-run, it is unknown how the dam rehabilitation will impact women, men, and sexual minorities. It is good that a Project document explicitly acknowledges that improved dam safety will benefit women “who are the most vulnerable to downstream flooding and dam failure” (IBRD 2017a).

**Recommendations**
The Project should:
- Create an explicit plan to achieve a 50 percent target for female participation in consultations.
- Design and implement measures to facilitate women’s increased access to water supply close to their households and to end their unpaid time-consuming burden fetching water.
- Ensure job opportunities for women during the dam rehabilitation process to increase women’s employment and skills.
- Target providing water access specifically to women farmers.

---

**Myanmar: Myingyan Power Plant Project**

Approval Year: 2016
Approved Amounts (millions USD): $20 (AIIB); approx. $280 (IFC, ADB, and commercial lenders)

**Project Description**

The Project’s 225 MW power plant will be the largest Gas-Fired Independent Power Producer (IPP) in Myanmar increasing much needed reliable and clean energy to meet the country’s demand (currently installed power capacity in Myanmar is around 4,700 MW). When completed, the new facility will help ease the country’s severe deficit (AIIB 2016h). The Project’s environmental category is A.

**Gender Analysis**

**Overall Gender Analysis**
Weak Gender Sensitivity

**Gender and Human Rights**
The Project document does not identify energy as a human right or analyze gender-based power needs. Gas
and other extractive-based industries often discriminate against and harm women’s health and livelihoods (Zuckerman 2017 a). The Project document relies on the IFC 2012 Performance Standards (PSs) that address environmental and social sustainability but ignore women’s rights (Zuckerman 2017 b). The Project plans to displace and involuntarily resettle five to eight families.

Gender In/Equality
The Project document does not acknowledge inequalities between men and women, or discrimination against sexual minorities.

Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV)
The Project document fails to take into consideration women’s, girls’, and sexual minorities’ susceptibility to SGBV during construction projects caused by influxes of laborers. Such SGBV frequently plagues infrastructure projects that lack preventive measures (WB 2017d).

Gender Data
The Project document does not collect sex-disaggregated data.

Gender Context
The Project document does not consider gender dimensions of Myanmar social, economic, legal and political contexts differentially affecting men, women, and sexual minorities that would for example highlight patriarchal decision-making structures.

Gender Access
Overall the Project document emphasizes macroeconomic and infrastructure benefits. While it mentions the “possibility of employing women”, it does not require that women be employed or that women and men be employed equally (ADB c). It does not recognize that gender inequalities hinder poor men, women, and sexual minorities from accessing Project benefits, namely energy.

Gender and Care Work
The Project document acknowledges that women’s traditional domestic responsibilities are time and labor consuming. It also assumes that the Project’s productivity increase will improve women’s living conditions (ADB c). However, the Project contains no explicit measures to make energy affordable to poor women which is essential to reducing their unpaid labor-intensive household burdens.

Gender Inputs
The Project will provide women with decision-making venues such as consultation meetings and “possible livelihood improvement programs” (ADB c). The details of these programs are unclear. It is unknown whether more men than women will be consulted or whether they will participate equally. It is unknown whether any men and women living in the Project area were consulted about whether they want a toxic gas-fired plant at all and whether promised consultations related to involuntary resettlement will gender-sensitively target women separately (AIIB 2016h).

Gender Outputs
Through the transmission of electricity, the Project has a “direct potential to make a contribution to individual households” (ADB c). However, lacking criteria to ensure energy connections target low-income households and communities, the Project is unlikely to benefit poor women, men, and sexual minorities.

Gender Impact
The Project, that plans to displace five to eight families, will consult local communities on issues pertaining to
potential involuntary resettlement (AIIB 2016h). The Project document states that it strives to “carry out meaningful consultations” with women regarding land acquisition, but does not specify how it will explicitly engage female voices. Absent explicit requirements IFI project resettlement usually harmfully impacts women whose livelihoods depend primarily on farming (ADB 2015b; Zuckerman 2017a). Also, the Project funds a gas-powered plant that intrinsically generates harmful health and environmental emissions.

**Recommendations**

The Project should:

- Consult with local men and women before project approval about whether they want a gas-fired plant in their community and whether they want to be resettled.
- Desist from framing a gas-powered plant as providing “clean energy”.
- Include women and men equally in Project employment and job training opportunities.
- Engage female voices through women-only consultations.
- Ensure that rural, low-income households are prioritized energy beneficiaries to alleviate poor women’s unpaid care work and provide them income-earning opportunities.

---

**Pakistan: Tarbela 5 Hydropower Extension Project**

Approval Year: 2016  
Approved Amounts (millions USD): $300 (AIIB); $390 (WB); $124.5 (Govt. of Pakistan)

**Project Description**

The Project comprises the installation of a power house at the fifth tunnel of the Tarbela Dam and construction of a transmission line to connect the power to the national grid. The Tarbela Dam was originally constructed in the 1970s (AIIB 2016k). The Project Environmental and Social Category is A and the Project risk is high.

**Gender Analysis**

**Overall Gender Analysis** Weak Gender Sensitivity

**Gender and Human Rights**

The Project document fails to address human rights or gender issues. It relies on the World Bank Environmental and Social Safeguard Policies which fail to include gender dimensions. The Project includes resettlement without disclosing a prepared Resettlement Action Plan (BIC 2017). There is no reason to believe it protects women who usually lose farmland and livelihoods during resettlement. It promises to improve on previous World Bank-funded Tarbela dam projects’ harm to resettled men and women who remain impoverished (BIC 2017).

**Gender In/Equality**

The Project document does not explore any areas of gender inequality.

**Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV)**

The Project document fails to take into consideration women’s, girls’, and sexual minorities’ susceptibility to SGBV during construction projects caused by influxes of laborers. Such SGBV frequently plagues infrastructure projects that lack preventive measures (WB 2017d).

**Gender Data**

The Project gathers sex-disaggregated data for consultations and employment. The Project aims for at least 25
percent of consultation meeting members to be women but it should aim for gender equality. One half of Project review and reappraisal will be based on priorities identified by women. It is unclear how it intends to achieve these targets (AIIB 2016).

**Gender Context**
The Project document does not consider most gender dimensions of Pakistani social, economic, legal and political contexts differentially affecting men, women, and sexual minorities that would for example highlight patriarchal decision-making structures. It does recognize that the majority of affected women are “restricted to household activities” (WB 2016b).

**Gender Access**
The Project does not promote women’s participation in design, planning, and implementation. It intends to employ mostly local labor during construction, but it fails to explicitly encourage women’s employment. Still, the Project promises to employ at least one female in a position of authority (a so-called “office bearer” whose role needs explaining) (AIIB 2016k).

**Gender and Care Work**
The Project document recognizes that the majority of affected women are “restricted to household activities” (WB 2016b). However, it fails to provide measures to alleviate women’s household burden so they could seek Project employment and income.

**Gender Inputs**
The Project sets up Community Based Organizations (CBOs) to hold consultations with beneficiary community members, 25 percent of which will be women (AIIB 2016k). However, Project information has not been made available to local women and men in accessible languages (BIC 2017).

**Gender Outputs**
The Project document does not specify how the reduction of energy shortages will directly impact women. Women, as traditional unpaid caregivers and household managers, have energy needs, for example for cooking and cleaning.

**Gender Impact**
In at least two ways the project is likely to harmfully impact women, men, and sexual minorities in different ways (AIIB 2016k). First, through the expected “loss of agricultural land with associated loss of income and livelihoods”. Second, through resettlement that fails to provide a gender-sensitive plan for affected communities. Positively the Project document recognizes that “due to increased use of trucks and other vehicles on the local roads, elderly people, women, and children will be more exposed to dangerous situations.” It thus develops a Traffic Management Plan aiming to protect local communities, especially the groups cited (WB 2016b).

**Recommendations**
The Project should:
- Design and implement measures to prevent SGBV that women and girls are often exposed to during construction.
- Highlight if and how increased access to energy will reduce women’s unpaid care burden.
- Provide employment and training opportunities for women in order to increase their earned income.
- Ensure that consultations raise women’s participation threshold to 50 percent and guarantee women’s meaningful participation in public hearings.
- Analyze the differential gender impacts and prevent harmful effects on women, men, and sexual minorities of the land acquisition and resettlement plans.
Tajikistan: Nurek Hydropower Rehabilitation Project, Phase I

Approval Year: 2017
Approved Amounts (millions USD): $60 (AIIB); $225.7 (International Development Association); $40 (Eurasian Development Bank)

Project Description
The Project aims to rehabilitate and restore the generating capacity of three units of the Nurek hydropower plant, improve their efficiency, and strengthen the safety of the Nurek dam. It consists of three components (1) Power Plant Rehabilitation; (2) Dam Safety; (3) Technical Assistance (AIIB 2017h). The Environmental and Social Category of the Project is B and the Project risk is high.

Gender Analysis

Overall Gender Analysis Moderate Gender Sensitivity

Gender and Human Rights
A Project document lists international agreements signed and ratified by the Republic of Tajikistan that are relevant to the Project, among them the Aarhus Convention which promotes environmental rights and human rights (WB 2017c). However, the Project document does not mention women’s or gender-equal rights.

Gender In/Equality
The Project document neither acknowledges nor discusses inequalities between women and men.

Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV)
The Project document fails to take into consideration women’s, girls’, and sexual minorities’ susceptibility to SGBV during construction projects caused by influxes of laborers. Such SGBV frequently plagues infrastructure projects that lack preventive measures (WB 2017d).

Gender Data
The Project collects sex-disaggregated data in several domains. They include measuring (1) Beneficiaries: the percentage of female electricity consumers aims to grow from a baseline of 0 percent to 49.3 percent after four years; (2) Grievances: a Project data indicator has a goal to address 100 percent of grievances disaggregated by gender; (3) Consultations: the Project lists the number of female and male participants in 2016 consultations indicating that women made up 48.6 percent (85 out of 175) of all five meeting attendees (AIIB 2017h; WB 2017c).

Gender Context
A Project document provides one gendered dimension of the Tajik economy, that 68 percent of women are employed in the agriculture sector. Otherwise, The Project documents do not consider gender dimensions of Tajik social, economic, legal and political contexts differentially affecting men, women, and sexual minorities that would for example highlight patriarchal decision-making structures.

Gender Access
Even though consulted participants stressed the need to employ local women during implementation, the Project failed to create job opportunities aimed specifically at local women (WB 2017c).
Gender and Care Work
The Project documents that promise increased household electricity connections fail to consider potential positive effects such as relieving women’s burden collecting fuel and permitting boys and girls to do school homework.

Gender Inputs
The Project promises “gender-informed” consultations (WB 2017c). During the aforementioned 2016 consultations, almost 50 percent of participants were women and meetings included “heads of women committees (informal and formal)” (WB 2017c).

Gender Outputs
A Project document states that its output, access to adequate and reliable electricity, will reach 4.2 million women, roughly commensurate to all Tajik women (AIIB 2017h).

Gender Impact
A Project document recognizes that household use of toxic solid fuels disproportionately affects the health of women and children who collect the fuel and spend many hours near the stove (AIIB 2017h).6 By supplying reliable hydropower to Tajik consumers, the Project will alleviate respiratory and reproductive health diseases. Also, the Ministry of Labor, Migration, and Employment will collect information on hazardous professions where women’s labor will be restricted. No details explain which Project-related professions are hazardous to women, whether they are also hazardous to men and what their impact might be. Since the Project does not include land acquisition and resettlement one assumes no long-term relocation and livelihood impacts will arise.

The Project does not specify how the rehabilitated dam will affect female or male farmers (WB 2017c).

Recommendations
The Project should:
• Implement a plan to prevent SGBV that women are vulnerable to during infrastructure projects.
• Include women and men equally in Project employment and job training opportunities.
• Recognize how access to sustainable electricity benefits women by reducing their traditionally unpaid cooking and cleaning roles and girls’ and boys’ education.
• Explain the nature of Project professions referred to as hazardous to women, clarify how women will be protected, and discuss whether these professions are also hazardous to men and whether men also need protection.

Transportation

Georgia: Batumi Bypass Road Project

Approval Year: 2017
Approved Amounts (millions USD): $114 (AIIB); $114 (ADB); $87.2 (Govt. of Georgia)

6 Field research demonstrates that emissions from oil pipelines dramatically harmed women’s reproductive health, resulting in stillbirths (CEE Bankwatch & Gender Action 2006).
**Project Description**
The objective of the Project is to improve regional connectivity and efficiency of road transport along the East–West Highway in Georgia. The Project will construct a new two‐lane road approximately 14.3 km long in a key section of the East–West Highway that skirts the port city of Batumi (ADB 2017c). The Project’s Environmental and Social Category is A, and the Project has been classified as *medium* risk.

**Gender Analysis**

*Overall Gender Analysis Moderate Gender Sensitivity*

**Gender and Human Rights**
The Project lacks a serious gender and human rights perspectives although Georgian national regulation, which serves as the Project’s legal framework, strives to protect human rights (ADB 2017a). The Project document promises to conform to all ADB policies relating to gender (ADB 2017b). It also mentions the implementation of a “gender action plan” (ADB 2017c). However, no Project-specific gender action plan is available to the public. The Project requires involuntary resettlement and land acquisition affecting 1244 people and 217 households (ADB 2016a).

**Gender In/Equality**
A Project document acknowledges inequalities between women and men in Georgia. It is mindful of women’s vulnerabilities and their low bargaining power during land acquisition. Inconsistent with these acknowledgments, the Project claims to have “no gender elements”, which would imply that the Project need not address gender issues (ADB 2017b).

**Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV)**
The Project document fails to take into consideration women’s, girls’, and sexual minorities’ susceptibility to SGBV during construction projects caused by influxes of laborers. Such SGBV frequently plagues infrastructure projects that lack preventive measures (WB 2017d).

**Gender Data**
The Project Monitoring System [PMS] will collect data and evaluate performance. It suggests that “[w]here relevant, indicators will be differentiated by gender” (ADB 2017c). However, there is no further explanation of how “gender relevance” will be determined. Despite recognizing women’s vulnerable position during land acquisition, the PMS fails to propose necessary baseline and monitoring indicators on men’s and women’s land ownership and use in Project areas.

**Gender Context**
The Initial Poverty and Social Analysis (IPSA) recognizes that women and men use transport differently and therefore, have different mobility needs (ADBa). It provides gender insight into the transportation sector by explaining that women usually drive only in the capital. Outside of the capital, women are likely to use public transportation (ADBa).

**Gender Access**
The Project commendably prioritizes women affected by involuntary resettlement for Project-related jobs. However, it does not create a formal framework for greater “employment opportunities for women.” Still, the Project promotes separate sanitation facilities and equal wages for male and female workers (ADB 2017b).
**Gender and Care Work**
The Project document neither recognizes nor proposes measures to reduce unpaid care work conducted predominantly by women. Without deliberate measures to alleviate time-consuming unpaid care, women are stymied from participating in income-earning opportunities.

**Gender Inputs**
A Project Grievance Redress Committee which resolves complaints and grievances through community participation includes women representatives, who are likely to disproportionately be women if this is voluntary unpaid community work (ADB 2016a). Project documents state that “extensive consultations were conducted” on involuntary resettlement, but do not specify if women were explicitly included (ADB 2017c).

**Gender Outputs**
The IPSA maintains that the Project has no potential to empower women even though it prioritizes employment of women affected by resettlement and promotes gender-equal wages (ADBa). This divergence reflects the Project’s inadequate gender analysis and/or inconsistent content across Project documents. The bottom line is that the Project fails to actively include women in the benefits of road network improvements such as, for example, encouraging women to drive and facilitate their access to markets and jobs. Absent explicit inclusion, women tend to be neglected as beneficiaries.

**Gender Impact**
The Project requires involuntary land acquisition and resettlement affecting 217 households with 1244 people, 53 percent of whom are women (ADB 2016a). The Project document addresses relevant gender impacts in several ways. First, during resettlement, women-headed households, categorized as “vulnerable households,” will receive “vulnerable people allowances” equivalent to three months of minimum subsistence. Second, women will be prioritized for Project-related jobs (ADB 2016a). Third, an independent consultant will conduct a post-implementation survey measuring potential differential impacts of resettlement on men and women (ADB 2016a). Fourth, aside from resettlement, a Roads Department supervision consultant will monitor Project impacts including gender dimensions via quarterly reports (ADB 2017c). Which gender dimensions will be monitored is not specified.

**Recommendations**
The Project should:
- Publish its promised Gender Action Plan.
- Prevent sexual assaults and gender-based violence on women and girls by male construction workers.
- Collect baseline and monitoring sex-disaggregated data on the number of Project-generated jobs by type.
- Implement its “Initial Poverty and Social Analysis” promise to integrate unspecified gender concerns by taking these specific measures:
  - Conducting social and gender analyses of road and transport patterns to assess how women and men can fully benefit from improved road networks and consider the results in planning and implementing road/transport projects.
  - Improving secondary, feeder and access roads to maximize positive impacts on women’s livelihoods and access to services.
  - Considering incentives for women’s employment and career development in the sector given that women are overrepresented amongst the unemployed.
  - Addressing economic opportunities for men and women along Project-related transport corridors by providing places for them to sell produce and other goods, and facilitating training in business development and financial literacy, to benefit from improved commercial opportunities.
  - Planning and coordinating roadside infrastructure development such as sidewalks, street lighting, sanitary and other facilities that specifically benefit female and sexual minority travelers.
  - Considering use of visual information on public transport to discourage sexual harassment of female
travelers and promote transport safety (ADB a).

- Design and implement measures to reduce women’s time-consuming unpaid care burden to facilitate their participation in paid Project jobs.

India: Gujarat Rural Roads (MMGSY) Project

Approval Year: 2017
Approved Amounts (millions USD): $329 (AIIB); $329 (Govt. of Gujarat)

Project Description
The Project aims to improve road transport connectivity by providing all-weather rural roads to about 4,000 villages in all the 33 districts of the state of Gujarat. The Project plans to achieve this objective by constructing rural roads to provide second and third connectivity, providing first connectivity (to villages where not available currently), upgrading existing metal and earthen roads to black-top roads, widening of roads, construction of roads and bridges to complete missing links and structures, provide approaches to educational institutions, and construction and upgrading of roads passing through tribal areas (AIIB 2017g). The Project’s Environmental and Social Category is B and the Project’s risk is medium.

Gender Analysis

Overall Gender Analysis
Moderate Gender Sensitivity

Gender and Human Rights
A Project document states that it will be implemented with full respect for tribal people’s human rights, yet it fails to directly and intersectionally address women’s tribal and caste issues (AIIB 2017i). Also, it fails to acknowledge all affected people’s rights as tribal areas make up a small Project-funded section. Aside from tribal people’s rights, the Project documents lack a human rights or a gender perspective.

Gender In/Equality
The Project document does not identify any areas of gender inequality.

Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV)
The Project documents do not explicitly mention SGBV. Still, they ensure that both female and male employee toilets will have “adequate lighting” and “proper door[s] and fastenings” so as to “secure privacy” (AIIB 2017f). These toilet provisions can contribute toward prevention of SGBV. The Project documents should recognize this contribution to reducing SGBV.

Still, the Gujarat Project must take additional measures to prevent SGBV. The potential influx of workers poses particular SGBV risks to the women and girls residing in the communities along the Project roads (WB 2017d). The Project needs to design and implement measures to prevent the SGBV that has occurred in other IFI transport projects, revealed by media around the World Bank Uganda Transport Sector Development Project (UTSDP). UTSDP exposed vulnerable Ugandan girls to sexual harassment, statutory rape, unwanted pregnancies, and child labor (WB a). Both projects involve extensive road rehabilitation over a large area containing culturally-distinct communities. Both projects entail an influx of labor into poor rural areas. Even though the Uganda Project called for the employment of local labor, the contractor still brought in outside male construction workers who not only sexually harassed female employees but also raped and impregnated over 30 young girls.
That is not to imply that local male laborers might not abuse women and girls. Rather it underlines that it is essential to train all Gujarat Project construction workers regardless of whether they are local or external in SGBV-prevention to ensure women and girls are not sexually abused.

In some ways, the Gujarat Project positively differs from the Ugandan project by avoiding: (i) Involuntary resettlement caused by land acquisition for road “expansion and realignment”; and (ii) Inclusion in a countrywide “Transport Sector Development Project” that lost focus on the complexities of specific road restoration segments (WB 2009).

Gender Data
The Project, which intends to hire both men and women, will gather sex-disaggregated implementation data on female “workforce” participants (AIIB 2017e). It does not, however, measure women’s and men’s participation in any other Project stages such as for example, Project design or benefits.

Gender Context
Even though a Project table extensively analyzes general socio-economic Scheduled Tribe characteristics, it fails to assess tribal gender dynamics such as, for example, the proportion of women’s and men’s unpaid household burdens and female and male employment rates. Only for 2 tribes (out of 13) does the Project document mention that women make “palm leaves, mat brooms and other [household] articles” and that they participate in agriculture (AIIB 2017i).

Gender Access
The Project will ensure that Emergency Medical Services address rural pregnant women’s needs (AIIB 2017f). The Project will hire both women and men, but it does not specify what type of work women and men will each do. It ensures that children and women in construction camp sites will receive routine medical check-ups twice a month (AIIB 2017f). Gender-distinct rest and toilet facilities will be made available on sites where workers of both sexes are employed (AIIB 2017f). Also, a half-day training module on mitigation of negative social impacts will be organized for “contractors/female laborers” (AIIB 2017f). It is unclear why only this 1 training session, out of 12 planned sessions, targets women. Critically missing are training sessions on gender issues for all employees.

Gender and Care Work
In construction camp sites where more than 30 women are employed, the Project promises “a room of reasonable size” for children under the age of 6 who might need care (AIIB 2017f). This is commendable but why is there a minimum threshold number of 30 women workers to provide space for children to reduce women’s care burden? If the goals are to attract and maintain women workers, then child care must be provided regardless of the number of women employed.

Gender Inputs
The Project document states that women-only consultations for tribal populations will be held during Project preparation (AIIB 2017i).

Gender Outputs
The Project document mentions that 46 percent of beneficiaries are women citing that “46 percent of state’s population is female” (AIIB 2017f; AIIB 2017g) However, it does not consider possible women- specific Project benefits such as, for example, greater access to healthcare and educational facilities, and increased opportunities for women to sell produce and establish businesses that roads often enable.

---

7 The number of 30 pregnant girls was reported to the author in person by Moses Ntenga, Director of Uganda’s Joy for Children, April 21, 2017.
Gender Impact
The Project precludes private land acquisition. Instead, its goal is “rehabilitation of existing roads and building new roads in defined alignments wherein the land already belongs to the Roads and Buildings Department” (AIIB 2017f).

Recommendations The Project should:
• Upgrade its Environmental and Social Category to A to increase required internal scrutiny on gender-insensitive dimensions.
• Delve into the intersection of tribal people’s and women’s rights.
• Require strong direct supervision by contractors who have gender expertise in order to avoid another Uganda tragedy.
• Expand the socio-economic Scheduled Tribe characteristics table to include each tribe’s gender dynamics (AIIB 2017i).
• Implement strict policies to prevent SGBV, for example, by training male construction and other workers.
• Develop and implement training for all contracted employees of the on gender-related issues that can arise during the project cycle.
• Provide child care facilities for all employed women regardless of whether 30 or more women are employed on sites.
• Consult all women separately at all Project cycle stages from identification through monitoring and evaluation.
• Promote female beneficiaries’ potential benefits from access to improved road networks, such as facilitating taking children’s school transport, obtaining household needs, and marketing produce.
• Provide gender-equal Project employment opportunities.

India: Bangalore Metro Rail Project - Line R6

Approval Year: 2017
Approved Amounts (millions USD): $335 (AIIB); $583 (EIB); $255 (Govt. of India); $612 (Govt. of Karnataka)

Project Description
The objective of the Project is to provide efficient and high-capacity north-south connectivity through the center of Bangalore by expanding the city’s metro system. The primary beneficiaries are the commuters who travel along the corridor for economic and social activities, and the secondary beneficiaries are the residents and commercial establishments along the corridor. The expected main result of the Project is an improvement of the overall mobility of urban population through better connectivity (AIIB 2017r). The Project’s Environmental and Social Category is A and the overall risk is rated as high.

Gender Analysis

Overall Gender Analysis Moderate Gender Sensitivity

Gender and Human Rights
The Project document fails to take gender and human rights positions. The Project relies on the 2009 EIB Statement of Environmental Principles and Standards which mostly neglects of gender-equal rights (EIB 2009). The Project will involuntarily relocate approximately 1,950 households.

Gender In/Equality
The Project document does not recognize inequalities between women and men in Bangalore.
Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV)
The Project document fails to address women’s susceptibility to SGBV common during transportation infrastructure construction (WB 2017d). However, the Project takes pride in the positive effect it aims to have on local women’s safety once the metro line is completed (AIIB 2017r).

Gender Data
The Project document contains a resettlement framework that claims that it will monitor the effect land acquisition has on women-headed households (EIB 2017c). It will use a “Social Impact Assessment Study” to gather these data (EIB 2017c).

Gender Context
The Project document does not consider most gender dimensions of Bangalore’s social, economic, legal and political contexts differentially affecting men, women, and sexual minorities. It does, however, mention that Bangalore’s female literacy rate is 84 percent (EIB 2017b).

Gender Access
Even though the Project plans to create 450 to 620 Project-related jobs, it fails to provide incentives for employment of women (AIIB 2017r).

Gender and Care Work
The Project document acknowledges women’s time spent on unpaid care work stating that “improved connectivity will support women in the workforce who have responsibilities at both work and home” (AIIB 2017r).

Gender Inputs
A Project document states that women’s voices will be heard during resettlement-related consultation meetings. It does not, however, stipulate requirements, such as scheduling women-only discussions at times convenient for women and convening gender-equal numbers of participants (EIB 2017c).

Gender Outputs
A Project document that mentions a nationwide decrease in female workforce participation claims that Project outputs will stimulate Bangalore area women’s employment (AIIB 2017r). It maintains that women will benefit from Bangalore transportation network safety, comfort, and accessibility improvements.

Gender Impact
The Project requires involuntary resettlement of 1,950 households and acquisition of 3.2 square meters of public entity-owned land. Although the Project has already been approved, the final scope of the land acquisition will only be determined once a census is completed (EIB 2017a). A Project document repeatedly emphasizes protecting women as a vulnerable group during resettlement (EIB 2017c). However, it fails to detail steps towards ensuring women and men are equally and fully compensated.

Recommendations The Project should:
• Adequately invest in SGBV prevention given women and girls’ susceptibility to abuse during large infrastructure construction projects.
• Provide gender-equal Project employment opportunities.
• Organize women-only consultation meetings at times suitable for women where they are assured they can frankly express their concerns and requests about resettlement and other Project-related issues.
• Revisit resettlement plans in order to:
o Ensure women and men obtain equal compensation because unfair property ownership practice favors men.
o Provide women with alternative income-earning skills to replace an expected loss of income from resettlement.

---

**Oman: Duqm Port Commercial Terminal and Operational Zone Development Project**

Approval Year: 2016
Approved Amounts (millions USD): $265 (AIIB); $88.33 (Special Economic Zone Authority Duqm)

**Project Description**
The Project aims to help Duqm Port capture its full economic potential through improved transport efficiency, strengthened logistics services, facilitated mineral exports, and reduced supply chain delivery time and cost for a wide spectrum of industries in the new Duqm Special Economic Zone and its broader part hinterland. The Project will mainly include civil works for the construction of port-related infrastructure (AIIB 2016). The Environmental and Social Category is B and the Project risk is *medium*.

**Gender Analysis**

**Overall Gender Analysis** Weak Gender Sensitivity

**Gender and Human Rights**
The Project does not take a gender or human rights perspective. It aligns with AIIB’s gender-sensitive Environmental and Social Policy (ESP) (AIIB 2016). The ESP promotes gender equality and inclusiveness although not from women’s and sexual minority rights perspectives.

**Gender In/Equality**
The Project document does not acknowledge inequalities between men and women, or discrimination against sexual minorities.

**Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV)**
The Project document fails to take into consideration women’s, girls’, and sexual minorities’ susceptibility to SGBV during construction projects caused by influxes of laborers. Such SGBV frequently plagues infrastructure projects that lack preventive measures (WB 2017d).

**Gender Data**
The Project design does not integrate baseline sex-disaggregated data. It also fails to require monitoring data to measure women’s and men’s potential use of the Port and potential employment in Port construction.

**Gender Context**
The Project document does not consider gender dimensions of Omani social, economic, legal and political contexts differentially affecting men, women, and sexual minorities that would for example highlight patriarchal decision-making structures.

**Gender Access**
The Project’s implementation details include creating employment positions like accounting, internal and external auditing, and reporting. A Project document briefly outlines the national Labor Law regarding employment of women, however, it does not specify how to include women in any Project positions. Without
explicitly targeting women for employment and training opportunities, the vast majority of jobs will likely be occupied by men (AIIB 2017j).

Gender and Care Work
The Project document neither recognizes nor proposes measures to reduce unpaid care work conducted predominantly by women. Without deliberate measures to alleviate time-consuming unpaid care, women are stymied from participating in income-earning opportunities.

Gender Inputs
The Project document does not address gender inequalities in Oman which limit women’s ability to partake in all stages of Port construction including the expected logistics operations. The Project fails to provide gender-disaggregated consultations for women to voice their Port preferences and needs.

Gender Outputs
The Project documents do not propose measures to include women in expected export mechanization, logistics improvements, and production increases. Explicitly targeting women’s participation in Project outputs could foster their economic and social independence.

Gender Impact
The Project document neither recognizes nor promotes any long-term impacts and actions that could advance gender equal rights.

Recommendations The Project should:
• Consider how the Port can benefit men’s and women’s status in Oman.
• Require collection of baseline and monitoring data on women and men’s employment in construction, logistics and Port usage.
• Coordinate training and jobs for women during the Port construction.
• Target women’s participation in expected logistics operations aimed to increase regional trade and export of Omani products.

Oman: Railway System Preparation Project

Approval Year: 2016
Approved Amounts (millions USD): $36 (AIIB); $24 (Oman Global Logistics Group)

Project Description
The Project aims to achieve full readiness for the construction of a new railway system that will support the Sultanate of Oman with the diversification of its economy and develop the Sultanate position as a transport hub and as an exporter of minerals (AIIB 2016i). The Project has been classified as Environmental and Social Category C with medium Project risk.

Gender Analysis

Overall Gender Analysis Weak Gender Sensitivity

Gender and Human Rights
The Project document fails to address human rights or gender issues. It relies on AIIB’s Environmental and Social
Policy (ESP) which deems the Project low-risk because “no physical works are to be carried out” (AIIB 2016i). However, the Project’s aim to achieve full construction readiness provides an opportunity to prevent gender and human rights violations that pervade construction projects.

**Gender In/Equality**
The Project document does not address inequalities between men and women.

**Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV)**
The Project document fails to take into consideration women’s, girls’, and sexual minorities’ susceptibility to SGBV during construction projects caused by influxes of laborers. The railway preparation Project provides an ideal opportunity to flag and prevent SGBV that frequently plagues infrastructure projects (WB 2017d).

**Gender Data**
The Project does not require or reference any sex-disaggregated data. Although it promises to gather information on land acquisition, socio-economic and environmental aspects through “baseline surveys,” it fails to offer to collect baseline data on gender-specific issues (AIIB 2016i).

**Gender Context**
The Project document does not consider gender dimensions of Omani social, economic, legal and political contexts differentially affecting men, women, and sexual minorities that would for example highlight patriarchal decision-making structures.

**Gender Access**
The Project document fails to recognize how Omani gender inequalities are likely to inhibit women’s opportunities to partake in implementation. Since the Project predominantly focuses on operational readiness and non-labor-intensive jobs without explicitly ensuring women’s participation, it probably misses an opportunity to involve women.

**Gender and Care Work**
The Project document neither recognizes nor proposes measures to reduce unpaid care work conducted predominantly by women. Without deliberate measures to alleviate time-consuming unpaid care, women are stymied from participating in income-earning opportunities.

**Gender Inputs**
The Project document provides no platform for consultations from any community members, neither men nor women. It does not propose strategies to reduce women’s barriers to participation in Project activities.

**Gender Outputs**
The Project document neglects women’s and men’s differential transportation roles and preferences. Without explicit inclusion of women stakeholders in Project preparation, their railway design needs are likely to be overlooked.

**Gender Impact**
This preparatory railway system phase aiming to establish railway construction readiness, fails to identify any long-term gender-specific impacts.
Recommendations The Project should:

- Use this preparation opportunity to establish a railway that will equally serve and satisfy both men and women.
- Include in readiness plan measures to train workers to prevent sexual abuse given the prevalence of SGBV in construction investments.
- Ensure that the “baseline survey” gauges, and later employs, gender-specific data explicitly integrating women into Project job opportunities.
- Aim to increase women’s employment and skills by recruiting and training women during early and subsequent Project cycle stages.
- Design and implement stakeholder consultations during this preparatory and subsequent construction projects.

Pakistan: National Motorway M-4 Project

Approval Year: 2016
Approved Amounts (millions USD): $100 (AIIB); $100 (ADB); $34 (Department for International Development UK); $39 (Govt. of Pakistan)

Project Description

The Project will aim to achieve an efficient and safer transport corridor between Islamabad, Faisalabad, and Multan to ensure enhanced connectivity between the various parts of Pakistan. The Project will construct 64 km of the four-lane, access-controlled national motorway M-4 connecting Shorkot and Khanewal in Punjab province (AIIB 2016b). Environmental and Social Category is A, and the Project risk is medium.

Gender Analysis

Overall Gender Analysis Weak Gender Sensitivity

Gender and Human Rights
The Project documents contain neither human nor gender rights perspectives. It cites the ADB’s 2009 Safeguard Policy Statement which contains references to gender and women but lacks a substantive women’s rights perspective (ADB 2009). Involuntary resettlement and land acquisition will displace 23,186 people of which 2,754 will lose 10 percent of their productive land.

Gender In/Equality
The Project document acknowledges inequalities between men and women in regions with high rates of poverty. Despite this acknowledgment, the Project “inclusive and sustained economic growth” goal fails to ensure gender inclusivity.

Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV)
The Project document fails to take into consideration women’s, girls’, and sexual minorities’ susceptibility to SGBV during construction projects caused by influxes of laborers. Such SGBV frequently plagues infrastructure projects that lack preventive measures (WB 2017d).
Gender Data
The Project document promises that “relevant” indicators will be disaggregated by gender. However, it neither specifies which indicators are gender-relevant nor how it will use them (ADB 2015a).

Gender Context
The Project document recognizes traditional socio-cultural practices in Pakistani communities that hinder women from participating in the implementation cycle (ADB 2015a).

Gender Access
The Project promises “employment and business opportunities” for “unskilled labor” “during execution of civil works.” It ensures that the National Highway Authority (NHA) bidding documents and contracts are gender-sensitive. It intends to “provide equal wage[s] to male and female workers for work of equal value.” Despite these promising possibilities, a Project document reinforces traditional gender dynamics and inequalities by arguing that “it is unlikely for women to participate” (ADB 2015a).

Gender and Care Work
The Projects documents neither recognize nor propose measures to reduce unpaid care work conducted predominantly by women. Without deliberate measures to alleviate time-consuming unpaid care, women are stymied from participating in income-earning opportunities.

Gender Inputs
A Project document states that it will include affected women in consultation meetings. However, it fails to require female-only groups to ensure women’s meaningful participation (ADB 2015a).

Gender Outputs
There is no indication that Project outputs such as better road connectivity and services such as rest stops will accommodate differential needs of women and men.

Gender Impact
Involuntary resettlement and land acquisition managed by the NHA is a major social concern. It will displace 23,186 people of which 2,754 will lose 10 percent of their productive land. The main risk is that women, who are predominantly farmers, will lose their source of income and status within a patriarchal land-owning and decision-making structure. There is no mention of women’s inordinate uprooting, household moving, and resettlement burdens. Only one “social safeguard management consultant,” who may lack gender expertise, will assist with resettlement (AIIB 2016b). It is unknown whether any gender policies will guide NHA’s displacement design.

Recommendations
The Project should:
• Develop women’s job-related skills by providing training and equal employment opportunities.
• Explicitly incentivize women to apply for and fill income-earning positions, instead of using traditional “socio-cultural practices” as an excuse for low women’s employment.
• Provide gender-specific consultations (50 percent being women) ensuring that female voices are heard and addressed.
• Ensure that the highway design suits gender-specific needs based on analyzing women’s and men’s travel patterns.
• Target women specifically with Project benefits such as increased connectivity and higher mobility which reduce women’s burdens including child, partner and elder care and performing errands.
• Enhance resettlement plans by eliminating likely harmful impacts on women.
Monitor resettlement implementation to ensure proposed gender-sensitive plans are carefully implemented.

Tajikistan: Dushanbe-Uzbekistan Border Road Improvement Project

Approval Year: 2016
Approved Amounts (millions USD): $27.5 (AIIB); $62.5 (EBRD); $15.9 (Govt. of Tajikistan)

Project Description
The Project aims to enhance the connectivity and mobility along the Tajikistan segment of the Asian Highway Network and the CAREC Corridor 3. The Project will rehabilitate and upgrade the 5 km section between Avicenna Roundabout and West Gate of the Dushanbe-Uzbekistan border road (AIIB 2016d). The Project’s Environmental and Social Category is B and the overall risk is rated as medium. The Project entails temporarily displacing nine business units and potentially two informal businesses/market stalls with a promise to provide relocation assistance (AIIB 2016d).

Gender Analysis

Overall Gender Analysis
Weak Gender Sensitivity

Gender and Human Rights
The Project document does not take a human rights or a gender perspective. It indirectly addresses environmental and social issues through the EBRD’s 2008 Environmental and Social Policy (ESP) (EBRD 2008). ESP protects a string of disadvantaged groups, including women, during potential resettlement programs by promising dignified relocation, training, and compensation. However, ESP’s ten specific performance requirements do not directly address gender inequality. The Project may temporarily displace nine business units and two informal businesses.

Gender In/Equality
The Project document does not acknowledge inequalities between men and women, or discrimination against sexual minorities.

Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV)
The Project document fails to take into consideration women’s, girls’, and sexual minorities’ susceptibility to SGBV during construction projects caused by influxes of laborers. Such SGBV frequently plagues infrastructure projects that lack preventive measures (WB 2017d).

Gender Data
The Project design does not include sex-disaggregated data. It fails to require sex-disaggregated benchmark and monitoring data to measure women’s and men’s different road service needs and potential road usage.

Gender Context
The Project document does not consider gender dimensions of Tajik social, economic, legal and political contexts differentially affecting men, women, and sexual minorities that would for example highlight patriarchal decision-making structures.
Gender Access
The Project document fails to identify or propose remedies to gender inequalities affecting women’s access to Project outputs.

Gender and Care Work
The Project document neither recognizes nor proposes measures to reduce unpaid care work conducted predominantly by women. Without deliberate measures to alleviate time-consuming unpaid care, women are stymied from participating in income-earning opportunities.

Gender Inputs
The Project seems to depend on men’s inputs only since the Project document lacks measures to involve women in road reconstruction. It also fails to recommend strategies to reduce women’s barriers to Project cycle participation, such as women-only consultations.

Gender Outputs
The Project document does not target outputs that would serve women’s needs. For example, it does not recognize that women’s use of an improved road network could facilitate their income-earning activities such as delivering produce to market and traditional female unpaid work such as taking children to school, performing household errands, grocery shopping, etc.

Gender Impact
The Project document discusses temporarily displacing nine business units and potentially two informal businesses/market stalls. It promises to “address the need to provide relocation assistance” (AIIB 2016d). It mentions “potential” economic assistance for displaced businesses. But it fails to consider whether these business units and market stalls are owned and staffed by men or women and respond with gender-sensitive measures.

Recommendations
The Project ought to:
• Complement its current economic approach with gender and human rights-based strategies.
• Adopt and implement safeguards and monitoring procedures, to protect women from abuse because women are often SGBV victims during road construction.
• Integrate women into the full Project cycle including through separate gender-sensitive consultations, employment opportunities, and other benefits.
• Redesign resettlement plans to prevent harmful relocation impacts on women.

Financial Intermediaries

Asia: IFC Emerging Asia Fund

Approval Year: 2017
Approved Amounts (millions USD): $150 (AIIB); $150 (IFC)

Project Description
The International Finance Corporation (IFC) Emerging Asia Fund (the Fund) invests in the IFC’s proprietary pipeline of investments in Emerging Asia. The Fund, which has a target size of US$1 billion, aims to select
equity and quasi-equity investments in companies, entities or other arrangements to build a diversified portfolio of investments across Emerging Asia (AIIB 2017m). The Project’s Environmental and Social category is FI which means that the AIIB largely relinquishes decision-making power and oversight (IDI 2016).

**Gender Analysis**

**Overall Gender Analysis** Weak Gender Sensitivity

**Gender and Human Rights**
The Project document does not mention human rights or gender justice. It is a “returns-driven” investment fund which is expected to have a “measurable development impact” (AIIB 2017m). The Fund screens sub-investments promising to adhere to the IFC’s gender-deficient Policy and Performance Standards (PPSs) (Zuckerman 2017). Unfortunately, IFC-managed FIs’ track record demonstrates a pattern of sub-investments breaching the PSSs, failing to promote gender-equal rights, and endangering the lives and livelihoods of men and women in subproject areas (IDI 2016).

**Gender In/Equality**
The Project document does not acknowledge inequalities between men and women, or discrimination against sexual minorities.

**Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV)**
The IFC PPSs, to which the Project sub-investments are supposed to adhere, fail to protect women from SGBV abuse. Many FI subprojects entail forcible resettlement and construction works without preventing women’s, girls’, and sexual minorities’ susceptibility to SGBV during construction projects caused by influxes of laborers. Such SGBV frequently plagues infrastructure projects that lack preventive measures (WB 2017d).

**Gender Data**
Neither the Project document nor the IFC PPSs discusses the need to collect sex-disaggregated benchmark and monitoring data.

**Gender Context**
The Fund will approve projects throughout Asia’s established, developing, and frontier markets (AIIB 2017m). However, the Project fails to provide any social, economic, political, or legal context for men and women in the region or its countries.

**Gender Access**
The Project document fails to stipulate female, male and sexual minorities’ participation in sub-investments.

**Gender and Care Work**
The PPSs on which the Project relies, fail to consider and address ways in which predominantly women’s unpaid care burden hinders their economic, social and political opportunities that are overwhelmingly granted to men.

**Gender Inputs**
The Project does not require sub-investments to provide women an opportunity to participate in consultations and other Project cycle activities.
Gender Outputs
The Project document neither recognizes how women and men can differentially benefit from infrastructure or other sub-investments nor promotes gender-specific beneficial outputs.

Gender Impact
The Bank delegates decision-making to the Fund. It requires that the Fund categorizes subprojects (environmental and social categories A, B, C, and FI) and complies with the Bank’s Environmental and Social Framework which upholds gender equality. However, FI subprojects have historically not addressed gender-related harmful impacts on women, men and sexual minorities. It is problematic that the Bank’s indirect subproject-financing hinders monitoring the gender impacts of each approved subproject.

Recommendations
The Project should:
• Resist relegating all subproject decision-making and oversight to the Fund given gender insensitive IFC-managed FI outcomes.
• Ensure all subproject activities adhere to a human rights-based approach.
• Require that each Fund-approved sub project create a Gender Action Plan ensuring men’s, women’s and sexual minorities’ rights are protected and their well-being is not compromised.
• Take measures to protect women, girls and sexual minorities from SGBV in all its subprojects.
• Ensure that each sub-investment employs local residents including women and men as equally as possible.

India: The India Infrastructure Fund

Approval Year: 2017
Approved Amounts (millions USD): up to $150 (AIIB); $600 (“other investors”)

Project Description
The India Infrastructure Fund (the “Fund”) makes private investments in the infrastructure sector in India. By investing in the Fund, the AIIB (the “Bank) objective is to expand its equity and loan investments sourcing pipeline. The Fund enhances the Bank’s development impact by increasing the number of investments the Bank can indirectly transact. It also allows the Bank to indirectly make investments that it would not have been able to execute on its own (AIIB 2018). The environmental and Social category is Financial Intermediary (FI) which likely means that the AIIB largely relinquishes decision-making power and oversight (IDI 2016).

Gender Analysis

Overall Gender Analysis Weak Gender Sensitivity

Gender and Human Rights
The Project document fails to take gender and human rights approach by passing responsibilities and decision-making onto the financial intermediary (FI), the Fund. The systematic troubling record of gender and human rights violations of historic FI subprojects financed by other IFIs does not bode well for men’s, women’ and sexual minorities’ rights in Fund’s subprojects.

Gender In/Equality
The Project document fails to acknowledge inequalities between women, men, and sexual minorities in India.
Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV)
The Project document fails to take into consideration women’s, girls’, and sexual minorities’ susceptibility to SGBV during construction projects caused by influxes of laborers. Such SGBV frequently plagues infrastructure projects that lack preventive measures (WB 2017d).

Gender Data
The Project document does not encourage collection of baseline and monitoring sex-disaggregated data in any of its subprojects.

Gender Context
The Project document does not consider gender dimensions of Indian social, economic, legal and political contexts differentially affecting men, women, and sexual minorities that would for example highlight patriarchal decision-making structures.

Gender Access
The Project document fails to stipulate female, male and sexual minorities’ participation in sub-investments.

Gender and Care Work
Since the Project relegates decision-making to subprojects, it fails to acknowledge women and men’s differentiated care burdens.

Gender Inputs
The Project document does not ensure that women will equally participate with men in any subproject consultations or other activities.

Gender Outputs
The Fund focuses on investments in sectors such as energy, utilities, transportation, and logistics which can effectively target differential needs of women and men. However, the Project misses an opportunity to ensure that subprojects benefit women, men and sexual minorities equally.

Gender Impact
The Bank delegates decision-making to the Fund. It requires that the Fund categorizes subprojects (environmental and social categories A, B, C, and FI) and complies with the Bank’s Environmental and Social Framework which upholds gender equality. However, FI subprojects have historically not addressed gender-related harmful impacts on women, men and sexual minorities. It is problematic that the Bank’s indirect subproject-financing hinders monitoring the gender impacts of each approved subproject.

Recommendations The Project should:
- Ensure gender safeguards are applied to every subproject to prevent and alleviate harmful effects on women and men.
- Increase women’s skills and employability by requiring all subprojects have gender-equal training and employment opportunities.
- Provide gender context for all potentially impacted, Indian men, women and sexual minorities.
- Monitor all subproject impacts on women, men and sexual minorities to ensure systematic achievement of gender equal rights and benefits across subprojects.
- Resist relegating all subproject decision-making and oversight to the Fund given gender insensitive IFC-managed FI outcomes.
Indonesia: Regional Infrastructure Development Fund Project (RIDF)

Approval Year: 2017
Approved Amounts (millions USD): $100 (AIIB); $100 (WB); $203 (Govt. of Indonesia); $3 (Swiss Secretariat for Economic Affairs)

Project Description

The project objective is to increase access to infrastructure finance at the subnational level through creation of a sustainable Financial Intermediary, called the Regional Infrastructure Development Fund (RIDF). RIDF channels funds from the AIIB, the World Bank, and the government to subnational governments. RIDF is a domestic financing solution for urban infrastructure, and is a core element of a national platform for sustainable urbanization (AIIB 2017b). The Project risk is medium and it intends to categorize each subproject under an A, B, or C category for social and environmental risk. The Project will require “temporary relocation of traders” (IBRD 2017b). Following civil society critiques of violations and lack of compliance with the World Bank and AIIB environmental and social safeguards during the development of RIDF, including inadequate consultation with affected communities and protection of indigenous peoples the World Bank, the World Bank board approved a $100 million loan, which was 20 per cent of the initially approved loan.8

Gender Analysis

Overall Gender Analysis Strong Gender Sensitivity

Gender and Human Rights
The Project documents lack a gender-equal rights focus. However, a Project document provides a human rights perspective particularly focusing on indigenous and other affected peoples’ rights (WB 2016f). The Project uses the World Bank Environmental and Social Safeguard Policies which neither include a gender safeguard nor explicitly address gender inequality. The Project will require “temporary relocation of traders” (IBRD 2017b).

Gender In/Equality
The Project document ensures that its subprojects will address issues of “gender equity” (AIIB 2017b).9

Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV)
A Project document recognizes that “violence against women and children” can result from a labor influx (WB 2016f). Therefore, screening for subprojects’ social impacts will incorporate potential SGBV issues. The Project upholds “zero tolerance” against violence (WB 2016f).

Gender Data
The Project’s Operations Manual includes “Gender-responsive Planning and Budgeting, and subproject evaluations disaggregated by gender” to facilitate gender-sensitive implementation (IBRD 2017b).

Gender Context
A Project document acknowledges that distinct communities’ “gender roles” differ and thus strives to emphasize social dynamics within affected groups (WB 2016f).

---

8 CSO criticisms were expressed in a letter from 47 civil society organizations, including Gender Action, to the World Bank Group (IPRA/ELSAM 2017).

9 Extensive advocacy by civil society and other advocates successfully led to this Project’s language promoting gender equality through gender-responsive planning, budgeting and zero-tolerance for SGBV.
Gender Access
The Project document suggests that each subproject social assessment explicitly targets women’s employment (WB 2016f).

Gender and Care Work
The Project documents neither recognize nor propose measures to reduce unpaid care work conducted predominantly by women. Without deliberate measures to alleviate time-consuming unpaid care, women are stymied from participating in income-earning opportunities.

Gender Inputs
This Project provides multiple opportunities for gender inputs. First, a Project document promises to set up training on gender awareness to target stakeholders (local government officials and community groups) (AIIB 2017b). Second, the RIDF commits to employ gender experts on an as-needed basis although it does not detail what situations would qualify for engaging them. It requires that the gender experts hold at least a graduate level degree and eight years of experience (IBRD 2017b). Third, the screening of each subproject will include a questionnaire with a “gender focus” (WB 2016f). Finally, women-only consultation groups will be convened both within this Project and subprojects in order to gauge women’s particular needs and perspectives (AIIB 2017b). This would hopefully establish an inclusive feedback platform. The RIDF also ensures that when it is “inconvenient” for women to attend consultation sites, they will be visited at their homes (WB 2016f).

Gender Outputs
The Project document only discusses urban “residents” as beneficiaries without considering women’s and men’s differentiated needs (AIIB 2017b).

Gender Impact
The Project will require “temporary relocation of traders” (IBRD 2017b). A Project document promises that when a subproject involves resettlement, the Project will require a “gender analysis” (WB 2016f). One hopes that a gender-sensitive resettlement plan will ensue from the “gender analysis.”

Recommendations The Project should:
• Ensure that approved subprojects, promised to be gender-sensitive, explicitly identify and address differential women’s, men’s, and sexual minorities’ needs.
• Recognize and mitigate women’s unpaid care burden.
• Develop and implement measures to prevent harmful resettlement impacts on women in addition to promising subproject-specific resettlement “gender analyses”.

Telecommunications

Oman: Broadband Infrastructure Project

Approval Year: 2017
Approved Amount (millions USD): approx. $239 (AIIB)

Project Description
The objective of the Project is to improve telecommunications connectivity in Oman and increase the digital literacy and productivity of human capital. Finance provided to Oman Broadband will be used to rollout a
fiber optic broadband cable network to c. 406,003 homes/premises by the end of 2021 comprising Phase 1 of the rollout of a national network. The Project comprises laying cables of c. 4,097 km, dropping cables of c. 9,535 km and installing supporting infrastructure such as fiber distribution hubs. Upon completion, 80% of Muscat will be fiber-ready for connection with gigabit-capable optical networks. The Project will improve Oman’s information and communication technology infrastructure, thereby increasing the attractiveness of Oman as a destination for manufacturing businesses and strategic logistics services (AIIB 2017q). The Project’s Environmental and Social Category is B.

**Gender Analysis**

**Overall Gender Analysis** Weak Gender Sensitivity

**Gender and Human Rights**
The Project document provides a human rights dimension by listing conventions applicable to the Broadband Infrastructure Project. Among them is CEDAW which “ensures that non-discrimination against women is enshrined in HR policies and practices for the proposed Project.” The Project aligns with the AIIB Environmental and Social Policy (ESP).

**Gender In/Equality**
The Project document does not acknowledge inequalities between men and women, or discrimination against sexual minorities.

**Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV)**
The Project document fails to take into consideration women’s, girls’, and sexual minorities’ susceptibility to SGBV during construction projects caused by influxes of laborers. Such SGBV frequently plagues infrastructure projects that lack preventive measures (WB 2017d).

**Gender Data**
The Project document does not gather sex-disaggregated baseline and monitoring data.

**Gender Context**
The Project document does not consider gender dimensions of Omani social, economic, legal and political contexts differentially affecting men, women, and sexual minorities that would for example highlight patriarchal decision-making structures.

**Gender Access**
The Project provides jobs during the construction phase (OBC 2017). However, it misses an opportunity to target women with employment, reducing the likelihood of their accessing Project-related jobs. Similarly, it makes no attempt to ensure that broadband connections target women and men equally although Oman’s digital divide favors men (Khokhar 2017).

**Gender and Care Work**
The Project document neither recognizes nor proposes measures to reduce unpaid care work conducted predominantly by women. Without deliberate measures to alleviate time-consuming unpaid care, women are stymied from participating in income-earning opportunities.

**Gender Inputs**
As a part of its “Community engagement and information disclosure” plan, the Project intends to consult all stakeholders, amongst which is the Omani Women Association at Muscat (OBC 2017).
Gender Outputs
The Project document fails to specify how improved information infrastructure benefits women. It does not acknowledge that, for example, women’s access to broadband networks increases their digital literacy, which in turn enhances their social inclusion and economic empowerment.

Gender Impact
Since construction activities take place on public land, the Project will not involve involuntary resettlement. The Project mentions “a risk of inadequate labour and working conditions” due to contractors’ disregard of Omani labor regulations (OBC 2017). By failing to protect workers, the Project might expose them to avoidable danger. By failing to target women, it is likely that most jobs will be men’s.

Recommendations The Project should:
• Include a plan to prevent SGBV against women and girls given its pervasiveness in infrastructure investments.
• Collect baseline and monitoring sex-disaggregated data on local men and women’s Project- provided employment and usage of broadband networks.
• Incentivize employment of women by ensuring equal job opportunities and on-job training.
• Organize women-only consultations in all Omani communities affected by Project activities.
• Design and implement measures to increase women’s access to improved telecommunications for example by providing digital literacy training sessions and closing the Internet gender digital divide.
• Protect the safety of both men and women working on Project construction sites by requiring and ensuring that contractors adhere to safety requirements and labor laws.

Urban Development

Indonesia: National Slum Upgrading Project

Approval Year: 2016
Approved Amounts (millions USD): $216.5 (AIIB); $216.5 (WB); $1,310 (Borrower)

Project Description
The objective of the Project is to improve access to urban infrastructure and services in targeted slums in Indonesia. It aims to (a) support institutional strengthening and capacity building; (b) provide integrated planning support and capacity building for local governments and communities; (c) implement subprojects to support primary and secondary infrastructure improvement; (d) provide technical support, management and advisory services; (e) ensure preparedness and rapid response measures to address emergencies (AIIB 2016c). The Project Environmental and Social Category is B and the risk is moderate. The original risk classification of the project was A (high risk), yet over time it was downgraded to a B (moderate), which requires much less environmental and social monitoring (IPRA/ELSAM 2016). Language connoting Category A impacts, such as forced resettlement, has been removed, and resettlement is referred to as “voluntary” without providing reasons for such changes (IPRA/ELSAM 2016).

A policy briefing released by a coalition of concerned Indonesian legal, environmental and human rights organizations detailed a number of Project implementation failures that were linked to a possible intentional omission of application of safeguards in the design phase (IPRA/ELSAM 2016).
Gender Analysis

Overall Gender Analysis Moderate Gender Sensitivity

Gender and Human Rights
The Project uses the WB Environmental and Social Safeguard Policies which largely lack gender and human rights perspectives. IPRA/ELSAM’s analyses show that Project implementation entails rights violations (IPRA/ELSAM 2016). The Project that promises to improve water supply, drainage, waste collection, and sanitation for slum dwellers should be addressed through human rights lens, however, it fails to do so. The Project may entail involuntary resettlement of overcrowded slum communities.

Gender In/Equality
To some extent the Project document recognizes gender equality: It promotes a gender focus in slum upgrading operations and the ESMF requires that the list of participants in land consolidation (which entails voluntarily rearranging buildings in a more orderly manner) includes both men and women (WB 2016a) although it is unclear whether both genders would be equally represented. Also, an example Field Appraisal Form asks whether the Project will “[a]dversely affect the livelihoods and/or the rights of women” (WB 2016a).

Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV)
The Project document does not take into account women’s susceptibility to gender-based violence especially in the process of slum redevelopment which often fails to provide promised immediate resettlement resulting in homelessness that puts women and girls at risk of sexual assault (Zuckerman & Abah 2016). A morass of Indonesian Government policies complicates the means through which women might seek help. Currently, there are 422 national and local discriminatory policies against women in Indonesia (HRW 2017). Inadequate AIIB and Government of Indonesia Project preventive measures will likely expose women and girls to SGBV.

Gender Data
The Project collects sex-disaggregated data. Project indicators on access to water, sanitation, and waste collection are recorded by number and percentage of women and men. However, the Project does not specify setting gender-specific baseline and monitoring indicator targets (AIIB 2016c). One-half of beneficiaries, 4.85 million, are expected to be women but verifying actualization will be impossible without baseline and subsequent monitoring indicators (WB 2016a).

Gender Context
The Project document recognizes how women’s roles in Indonesian slum communities differ from men’s. It notes that women are affected more severely than men by urban poverty. The Project design incorporates a gender gap analysis. However, it is worrisome that the gap analysis does not measure and compare the equivalency (or lack thereof) between World Bank and government policies. It is also concerning that references to the ESMF have not been updated or amended to reflect that certain cited laws have been repealed (IPRA/ELSAM 2016).

Gender Access
The Project aims to employ field-based implementation facilitators, 30 percent of whom will be women. Additionally, it will employ a “gender specialist” whose responsibility will be to assess whether women are actively participating in all stages and revise the Project design to accommodate women-specific needs (IBRD 2016a).
Gender and Care Work
The Project document promises maternity leave for female facilitators. However, the facilitators have only a one year contract and it is unclear whether they will be paid. The Project document fails to recognize the need for paternity leave for childcare to alleviate the female care burden.

Gender Inputs
The Project explicitly facilitates women’s opportunities to participate in all Project stages. It promotes active female contribution which, during previous projects, has not been “sufficiently meaningful” (IBRD 2016a). The Ministry of Finance will monitor participation of women and men. Feedback, especially from women, will be used to refine Project design and decision-making processes.

Gender Outputs
The Project ensures that women benefit from outputs by gauging the percentage of women slum dwellers who are satisfied with the quality of new urban infrastructure and services.

Gender Impact
The Project may involve potential resettlement of overcrowded, disaster-prone slum neighborhoods, but it does not provide housing in relocation sites. The complexity and the size of the project lacking potential resettlement information creates a large potential for unaddressed grievances (AIIB 2016c). Lack of recognition of female land rights, loss of homes and livelihoods, and heightened exposure to SGBV could disproportionately harmfully impact Indonesian women.

Recommendations
The Project should:
• Re-categorize as Environment and Social Category A risk level.
• Recognize situations where SGBV is likely to occur especially during slum destruction and redevelopment.
• Expand sex-disaggregated data to include detailed information on all consultation sessions and decisions regarding resettlement to ensure women’s and men’s continuous access to houses, livelihoods, and safety.
• Provide comprehensive, gender-sensitive resettlement plans for slum dwellers who may face relocation.
• Raise the Project goal to employ 30 percent women field-based implementation facilitators to 50 percent.

Water Supply
Philippines: Metro Manila Flood Management Project
Approval Year: 2017
Approved Amounts (millions USD): $208 (AIIB); $208 (EIB); $85 (Govt. of the Philippines)

Project Description
The Project objective is to improve flood management in selected areas of Metro Manila. This will be achieved by constructing new and modernizing existing pumping stations and their supporting infrastructure, by improving solid waste management practices within the vicinity of drainage systems served by the selected pumping stations, and by supporting the resettlement of impacted individuals (AIIB 2017n). The Project’s Environmental and Social Category is A and the Project risk is classified as high.
Gender Analysis

Overall Gender Analysis Strong Gender Sensitivity

Gender and Human Rights
The Project document does not address gender and human rights issues but it strives to empower and protect women through some of its provisions. The Project is guided by the WB Environmental and Social Safeguard Policies which fail to address gender-specific issues. The Project is expected to relocate around 2,500 households.

Gender In/Equality
The Project document recognizes that resettlement efforts “could exacerbate gender disparities and inequalities.” It also states that “[w]omen carry the brunt of managing the adverse impacts of relocation.”

Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV)
The Project document notes that women who attended consultations requested street lights due to frequent crime. However, the Project failed to further address this need.

Gender Data
The Project plans to “generate [sex]-disaggregated data from consultations, censuses, socio-economic surveys, asset surveys, compensation, and livelihood restoration programs” (AIIB 2017n). It will “monitor gender indicators throughout the Project implementation period and assess gender impacts at the end of the Project” (AIIB 2017n). The Project will evaluate success by gathering sex-disaggregated data on the number of beneficiaries. Its target quota for the proportion female beneficiaries is 50 percent.

Gender Context
The Project document provides a comprehensive description of traditional gender-distinct roles during floods emphasizing that while men are in charge of labor-intensive jobs, women take up the care burden. It will also conduct a gender analysis which will emphasize gaps between women and men across “human endowments, jobs, ownership and control of assets, and voice.”

Gender Access
The Project will take necessary steps to understand women’s drainage-related problems and will design drainage areas to accommodate gender-based needs. It aims to also “provide access to training programs for at least one female household member” (AIIB 2017n). It does not elaborate on training program details.

Gender and Care Work
The Project document acknowledges that lack of economic opportunities in “off-city resettlements” pushes men to leave their families in search of a stable income. This forces women “to manage the meager income,” heading the household and keeping the family together. It also recognizes that “community livelihood activities” are led by women. All these female care activities tend to be unpaid or at best underpaid.

Gender Inputs
The Project document promises to include women’s voices in all Project consultations. It will try to understand women’s specific needs regarding both Project implementation and its output, the drainage area. The Project document also promises “representation of women from different economic groups during consultations and meetings by ensuring consultation/meeting venues are discussed with women to promote freer and uninhibited participation by women, and that female facilitators are mobilized and, if found appropriate, separate meetings for women are organized” (AIIB 2017n).
Gender Outputs
The Project document claims that women will benefit greatly from Project outputs because reduced flood conditions improve children’s safety and allow women to carry on with regular household routines.

Gender Impact
The Project plans to relocate 2,500 households. It promises to ensure that “women play an important role in analyzing and deciding on resettlement options” (AIIB 2017n). It also promises to monitor specific gender impacts. It aims to “ensure livelihood restoration programs are informed by intensive discussions with women” (AIIB 2017n). The Project recognizes that many women rely on waste-picking for their livelihood. The Government will implement training programs at relocation sites to provide an alternative source of income for both women and men.

Recommendations the Project should:
• Design and implement measures to protect women and girls from SGBV which is prevalent during construction projects and intensifies during relocation (WB 2017d).
• Address women’s concerns regarding the lack of street lights.
• Target local women and men with Project-related work as an alternative to the jobs they are likely to lose due to resettlement.
• Provide training for post-Project jobs ensuring women and men have dignified work that provides a living income.
• Ensure women and men receive equal compensation from resettlement because women are often not recognized as property owners.

Conclusions and Recommendations
The conclusions and recommendations below emerge from both our Project Analyses and other salient issues raised throughout this desk-based report. While this report’s conclusions, based on analyzing AIIB project documents, cannot replace field study findings that might be different, we hope our recommendations will incentivize the AIIB to keep improving its gender track record.

Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV)
Conclusion: A striking recurring finding is that 18 projects (75 percent) disregard sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) on paper even though large infrastructure projects are highly susceptible to this type of abuse. An exception is the Indonesia RIDF project which recognizes that violence against women and children can result from labor influx and commits to screen subprojects for SGBV. However, on-the-ground reports reveal that RIDF implementation has not included SGBV prevention measures.
Recommendation: All projects must consistently design and implement measures to prevent SGBV.

No Mention of Women and Gender at All
Conclusion: Five projects completely fail to mention women and gender equality issues at all. It is impossible that these projects will not differentially impact women and men in both positive and negative ways. Most projects fail to discuss how projects differentially impact men, women and sexual minorities. This is reflected in 14 projects (58 percent) completely ignoring gender and human rights issues.
Recommendation: Every AIIB-financed project should at least identify and address how projects differentially impact men, women and sexual minorities.
**Gender and Human Rights**

**Conclusion:** The AIIB’s emerging approach to gender issues unilaterally promote women’s economic empowerment but does not complementarily promote gender equal rights.

**Recommendation:** All AIIB projects should both promote women’s economic empowerment and complementarily promote gender equal rights for men, women and sexual minorities.

**Resettlement**

**Conclusion:** A significant body of research demonstrates harmful gender and other social and environmental impacts of resettlement, a euphemism for displacement and dispossession (Mehta 2009). Loss of land and livelihoods caused by resettlement increases unpaid care burdens especially for women. Of 13 projects entailing resettlement only 1 offers it voluntarily. None of the AIIB projects reviewed consider this heavy burden on women. A bad practice example is India’s Bangalore Metro Project that requires involuntarily resettling 1,950 households. The Project was approved before a relevant census that would have revealed the scope of land acquisition was completed. Two projects that are likely harmful to women because of resettlement are Tajikistan’s Dushanbe-Uzbekistan Border Road Improvement Project and Bangladesh’s Natural Gas Infrastructure and Efficiency Improvement Project.

**Recommendation:**

AIIB/Co-financiers must respect and support local women and men’s rights to their land, livelihoods and natural resources. Projects that include displacement should not be approved until affected women and men have been fully informed of and accepted or rejected the proposed resettlement and compensation terms. AIIB/Co-financiers must carefully apply this approach to Tajikistan’s Border Road Improvement Project, Bangladesh’s Natural Gas Infrastructure Project and all other projects entailing displacement.

**Gender, Other Social and Environmental Risks**

**Conclusion:** AIIB/Co-financiers risk categories ignore gender-related risks. An example is ignoring enhanced SGBV risk in construction projects caused by influx of workers who often sexually assault women and girls (World Bank 2017c). Many of the projects present this risk. Incorporating the risk of SGBV into project risk assessments would expand the number of high-risk A projects.

**Recommendation:** It is high time that IFI environmental and social risk categories expand to explicitly include gender based-risks, and existing risk indicators systematically consider gender dimensions. All projects must rigorously identify and prevent potential gender risks.

**Fossil Fuels and Extractives**

**Conclusion:** Almost half, or 11 of the first 24 loans the AIIB approved, support energy and power. They consist of projects that claim to be clean energy but are not. Take the example of natural gas. Of 24 projects reviewed 4 invest in gas pipelines and gas-fired plants. Their project documents argue that gas is cleaner than coal and oil. However, gas’ invisible harmful methane emissions belie this assumption. Gender Action fieldwork demonstrates that gas and other extractive-based investments discriminate against women and harm women’s health and livelihoods (CEEB & Gender Action 2006; Gender Action & FOEI 2011). Another concern is that AIIB investments in FIs such as the Emerging Asia Fund, finance fossil fuel projects such as coal, for example through the Myanmar STC group coal mine expansion subproject. Doing so underlines the dangers of investing in Financial Intermediaries discussed below.

**Recommendation:**

The AIIB/Co-financiers should end all investments in fossil fuel extractives that harm people’s health and livelihoods and risk our planet’s sustainability (Zuckerman 2017a).

**Financial Intermediaries (FIs)**

**Conclusion:** The AIIB’s initial three FI investments include the: (1) Emerging IFC Asia Fund, (2) India Infrastructure Fund and (3) Indonesia Regional Infrastructure Development Fund. FIs indirect subproject
financing through other financial institutions such as commercial banks lack transparency and accountability. Despite IFI promises to apply ESF safeguards to FI investments they rarely do so (IDI 2016). They also fail to adhere to IFI gender policies and strategies. They pose the highest-risk gender, other social and environmental risks. At this time FIs compose about 13 percent of AIIB operations but the proportion of FIs in the AIIB portfolio is expected to escalate.

Recommendation:
The AIIB and all IFIs should avoid highly risky and unaccountable FI subproject investing.

**Gender Equal Access to Training and Employment**

Conclusion: Most projects fail to provide gender equal training and employment opportunities.

Recommendation: All projects should provide gender equal training and employment opportunities. This report’s Project Analyses recommended gender equal training and employment opportunities in 23 projects.

**Accountability Mechanisms**

Conclusion: Only one project, the Bangladesh Natural Gas Infrastructure investment, discusses the project’s Grievance Redress and Compliance Review Panel Mechanisms from a gender point of view.

Recommendation: All project documents should explain relevant accountability mechanisms to ensure women and men understand their rights to complain, are able to express their Project-related concerns, and know how to file complaints for redress if needed. Accountability mechanisms must take gender discrimination cases.

**Gender Policy**

Conclusion: At this time the AIIB lacks a gender policy, which is a prerequisite for all projects to systematically identify and address gender issues.

Recommendation: The AIIB must develop and implement a strong mandatory gender policy.
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Annex 1

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong> Approaches gender issues from a human rights perspective <em>(gender and human rights)</em>;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong> Acknowledges and seeks to redress inequalities between men and women, boys and girls; explicitly promotes equality between men and women, boys and girls <em>(gender in/equality)</em>;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.</strong> Provides and analyzes sex-disaggregated data as part of the background/justification for the project’s existence and design; includes sex-disaggregated indicators for project monitoring purposes (including data on gender participation in planning, implementation and monitoring and evaluation <em>(gender data)</em>;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.</strong> Evaluates situations where gender-based violence (GBV) may be more likely to occur and proposes methods to prevent GBV in affected households, communities and among project workers <em>(gender-based violence)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.</strong> Analyzes gender relations, dynamics and inequalities within relevant political, legal, geographic, economic, historical and/or social contexts to be considered throughout the project cycle <em>(gender in context)</em>;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.</strong> Examines how gender inequalities uniquely affect men and women/boys’ and girls’ abilities to participate in the project cycle and benefit from project outputs and outcomes, including whether user fees and other harmful conditions promoted through the project may differentially affect access to services for men and women, boys and girls <em>(gender access)</em>;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.</strong> Identifies and seeks to value men’s and women’s differential unpaid time devoted to traditionally feminine care work, including cooking, cleaning, child care, and water and fuel collection <em>(gender and care work)</em>;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.</strong> Promotes the equal opportunity for those who are directly or indirectly affected by the project to participate throughout the project cycle—from planning to implementation to monitoring and evaluation—including women, marginalized men, and other vulnerable groups, as appropriate; collect data on participation by gender <em>(gender inputs)</em>;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9.</strong> Plans project outputs and outcomes that accommodate and respond to the differential needs of men and women, boys and girls <em>(gender outputs)</em>; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.</strong> Considers the differential longer-term impacts of projects and/or IFI-endorsed policies on women and men, boys and girls <em>(gender impact)</em>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Annex 2

## Scorecard: Gender Sensitivity of 24 AIIB Approved Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Action</th>
<th>Overall Score</th>
<th>Gender and Human Rights</th>
<th>Gender Equality</th>
<th>Sexual and Gender-Based Violence</th>
<th>Gender Data</th>
<th>Gender Context</th>
<th>Gender Access</th>
<th>Gender and Care Work</th>
<th>Gender Inputs</th>
<th>Gender Outputs</th>
<th>Gender Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENERGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan: Trans Anatolian Natural Gas Pipeline (TANAP) Project</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh: Natural Gas Infrastructure and Efficiency Improvement Project</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh: Distribution System Upgrade and Expansion Project</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China: Beijing Air Quality Improvement and Coal Replacement Project</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt: Round II Solar PV Feed-in Tariffs Program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India: Andhra Pradesh 24x7 - Power for All Project</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India: Transition System Strengthening Project</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia: Dam Operational Improvement and Safety Project Phase II</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar: Myingyan Power Plant Project</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan: Tarbela 5 Hydropower Extension Project</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan: Nurek Hydropower Rehabilitation Project, Phase 1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia: Batumi Bypass Road Project</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India: Gujarat Rural Roads (MMGSV) Project</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India: Bangalore Metro Rail Project - Line R6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oman: Duqm Port Commercial Terminal and Operational Zone Development Project</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oman: Railway System Preparation Project</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan: National Motorway M-4 Project</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan: Dushanbe-Uzbekistan Border Road Improvement Project</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINANCIAL INTERMEDIARIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia: IFC Emerging Asia Fund</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India: The India Infrastructure Fund</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia: Regional Infrastructure Development Fund Project (RIDF)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELECOMMUNICATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oman: Broadband Infrastructure Project</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia: National Slum Upgrading Project</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines: Metro Manila Flood Management Project</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- **green** = 2 points = strong gender sensitivity; **yellow** = 1 point = moderate gender sensitivity; **red** = 0 points = weak gender sensitivity; **purple** = -1 point = likely harmful gender impacts.
- Note: The ten gender indicators comprise the Essential Gender Checklist (EGC) in Gender Action’s Gender Toolkit for International Finance Watchers (Gender Action 2017). The EGC rankings provide the basis to deduce patterns and outliers for this report’s analysis.